

SOCIAL THOUGHT IN TSARIST RUSSIA: THE QUEST FOR A GENERAL SCIENCE OF SOCIETY, 1861–1917. By *Alexander Vucinich*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1976. xi, 294 pp. \$15.50.

This volume is the most recent of Professor Vucinich's efforts to present a comprehensive picture of the impact of scientific thought and the development of a rationalistic tradition in Russia. It is an encyclopedic endeavor and possesses all of the strengths and defects of such projects. While presenting interesting surveys of several schools of social thought, Professor Vucinich tends to slight the complex issues and tensions in the individual thinkers studied. Furthermore, the differences among members of a school of thought and the conflicts among contending schools are only briefly sketched. Given the quantity and quality of the materials analyzed and described, only a very astute principle of organization would have succeeded in presenting the subject. The book, unfortunately, lacks such a principle and remains a collection of loosely structured essays. The internal organization of its eight chapters appears casual. One finds in each of them a mixture of biography, intellectual history, comparative analysis, and criticisms and appreciations of the contributions of individual authors and schools to the development of scientific sociology. There is no evident principle of symmetry or balance, but Professor Vucinich faithfully adhered to the principle of inclusion stated in his introduction.

Vucinich's book establishes for Russian sociology (as did Julius Hecker's survey in 1915) what was and continues to be true of sociology in general: Its concerns and development are connected to its historical milieus in several ways. Models and modes of analysis developed in other disciplines, particularly the natural sciences in this period, affected the development of sociology. However, the political, social, and cultural milieu of tsarist Russia and the Russian intelligentsia's peculiar position affected the way in which Russia's foremost thinkers used these models and modes of analysis, and largely explains the unusually strong Russian tendency to equate the development of sociological theory with the propagation of a socialist program. Vucinich is fully justified in devoting the largest single section of his book to the school of sociological thought which most clearly reflected these developments, the rich and varied Russian school of subjective sociology. Most later schools showed the influence of Lavrov and Mikhailovskii, either by way of imitation of them or reaction to them, while they themselves reflected the influence of the extreme scientism of the 1860s and reacted differently to Marxism. Though one can pick points with Vucinich in this section, as well as others, one must second his appreciation of the populist thinkers, whose pioneering theoretical work is still not sufficiently appreciated by today's radical sociologists.

The Kantian revival and its impact upon Russian sociology is one of the central themes of the book, and it is not limited to the discussion of the subjective sociologists who, led by Lavrov, actually anticipated Neo-Kantianism. As Vucinich points out, Russian social thinkers sought to develop complete systems well-grounded in ontological and epistemological verities, and they struggled with the traditional dualisms in European philosophy. The interaction of positivistic, Kantian, and Marxist epistemologies and ontologies yielded rich controversies during the last years of the old regime. One might question here Vucinich's allocation of space with respect to his analysis of Marxism. He was apparently more impressed by Marxist "heresies" than by "orthodox" Marxism, for he devotes relatively little space to the latter in the two sections of the book devoted to Marx's Russian disciples.

Aside from chapters on populism and Marxism, both of which yielded evolutionary and revolutionary currents, there is a short chapter on the anarchism of Michael Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin. The chapter entitled "The Philosophy of History and Social Theory" (a heading under which the entire book might have been

subsumed) discusses mainly the theories of N. Ia. Danilevskii and A. S. Lappo-Danilevskii. Finally, Vucinich devotes virtually a chapter each to the contributions of V. A. Kistiakovskii and M. M. Kovalevskii. The spectrum of schools represented reflects Vucinich's concerns with the scientific goals, quality, and connectedness with future developments in sociology of their major representatives. Several of them are forgotten pioneers, their contributions obscured by the reputations of European and American sociologists and philosophers of history whose work entered the intellectual mainstream. Given the close ties between sociology and ideology in Russia and the character of the regime, many of Russia's foremost social thinkers conducted their work while on the run, so to speak. Others suffered the fate of being branded as heretics in postrevolutionary Russia as well. Some suffered because of Russia's relative inaccessibility to Western scholars, often as much a consequence of Western attitudes as of Russia's peculiarities. Vucinich has done well to make some of Russia's most distinguished thinkers accessible to nonspecialists.

Unfortunately, the character of the book, neither a full survey of Russian social thought nor a well-balanced study of carefully selected and organized problems, will diminish its appeal both to the general reader and the specialist. The former will find too much about too few and the latter too little about too many thinkers, despite Professor Vucinich's erudition and intellectually honest effort. Neither of these can be doubted, though one can question some of his judgments and his reliance upon the judgment of others. For example, his reliance upon H. E. Kaminski's comparison of Marx and Bakunin did not improve the quality of his discussion. I found no factual errors as such, except for the obvious typographical error on page 71 which dates *The People's Cause* 1898 instead of 1868.

PHILIP POMPER
Wesleyan University

IDEOLOGIES AND ILLUSIONS: REVOLUTIONARY THOUGHT FROM HERZEN TO SOLZHENITSYN. By *Adam B. Ulam*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1976. x, 335 pp. \$15.00.

LENIN IN ZURICH: CHAPTERS. By *Alexander Solzhenitsyn*. Translated by *H. T. Willetts*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976. vi, 309 pp. \$8.95.

LENIN V TSIURICHE: GLAVY. By *A. Solzhenitsyn*. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1975. 241 pp. Paper.

The characterization of V. I. Lenin as a historical personality has challenged several generations of writers, but the overall results have perhaps been more confusing than enlightening. It is a rare author who can find a genuinely new path in the enterprise, and the books here in hand represent the efforts of two just such explorers. It is all the more intriguing to compare the points on which these two books cross because Ulam devotes one of his chapters to the consideration of *The Gulag Archipelago*, and he has also described *Lenin in Zurich* as "art in search of historical truth" (*New Leader*, May 24, 1976).

Ideologies and Illusions is vintage Ulam; most of the essays have been published before. For persons who enjoy reading his lively and challenging thoughts, the work is a pleasure. To be sure, some of it seems dated (for example, a reference to a "recent *Lenin's Miscellany*"), but as an Ulam sampler it could serve well in the classroom were it not for its exorbitant price in hard cover.

Solzhenitsyn's work has received far-ranging publicity and review. Solzhenitsyn himself chose to unite these chapters, excerpted from his trilogy on Russia and World