

book is the better for that. She does not attempt, for example, to gloss over or condone Herzen's approval, at certain times, of Jacobin terror and political dictatorship, or the highly selective nature of his presentation of the outlook of the Russian intelligentsia to a western readership, or his colossal self-regard. She also appreciates the factual unreliability of his work *My Past and Thoughts*, which was due in part to its hybrid nature as both memoir and artistic creation in which Herzen himself played the role of tragic hero. (Curiously, there is no sustained discussion of this work in *The Discovery of Chance*, although it is commonly acknowledged as one of Herzen's masterpieces and indeed one of the great monuments of classical Russian literature, broadly understood.) Kelly's tone is less dispassionate, however, when it comes to Herzen's disputes with thinkers who in the early years of the reign of Alexander II feared that the strident expression of radical opinion might compromise an exceptional opportunity for far-reaching reform. She castigates "liberals" who saw dangers in Herzen's persistent vilification of the social, economic, and political order in western Europe, and also historians who have wondered whether Herzen's critique of the contemporary west helped to discredit moderate political opinion in mid-century Russia and thus to damage the prospects for the acquisition of new freedoms and the development of civil society there. At the same time, she acknowledges the good sense of Herzen's acceptance, by the mid-1860s, of precisely those points that the early Russian liberals to whom he had been close in the 1840s had been making: revolutionism posed risks, moderation and gradualism had certain merits, and the existence of a bourgeoisie could bring some benefits to a society.

*The Discovery of Chance* is a penetrating and highly readable account of Herzen's life and thought. It is set in a rich context, paying close attention at appropriate points to the numerous thinkers and scientists whose ideas most deeply affected Herzen at one time or another. Of the main studies of Herzen in English (the others are by Martin Malia and Edward Acton) this book is—and for a long time will no doubt continue to be—the most complete.

DEREK OFFORD  
University of Bristol, UK

***Russia in the German Global Imagination: Imperial Visions and Utopian Desires, 1905–1941.*** By James E. Casteel. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016. Pitt Series in Russian and East European Studies. xx, 251 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Maps. \$28.95, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.125

In his seminal study on the German "Russia complex" of the first half of the twentieth century, *Der Russland-Komplex: Die Deutschen und der Osten 1900–1945*, Gerd Koenen convincingly argued that Ernst Nolte's thesis of a "causal nexus" between Bolshevism and Nazism narrows the perspective in an objectionable way. Similarly to the majority of the German left, considerable segments of the political right, too, were not only traditionally mesmerized with "Russia" but also with the Soviet experiment. This goes even for the Nazi party and its leadership.

In the footsteps of Koenen, but based on a different corpus of travelogues, articles in newspapers and magazines, pamphlets, books, and archival sources by lesser-known German contemporaries, among them "intellectuals, nationalist activists, government officials, and other observers and commentators" (6), Caseel investigates "Germans' fear of and fascination with the Soviet Union" (172) in three fields: "the rhetoric of colonization inherent in German travelers' efforts to make sense of the Soviet project; the transformed German spatial imaginary, as evidenced by Germans' discussion of

Soviet developments in Siberia; and the growing attention paid by German officials, national activists, and the press to the situation of ethnic German populations in the Soviet Union” (172–73). This main part of the book, entitled “Mapping ‘the East’ between the Wars” (89–170), is preceded by an almost equally long introductory part on “Nationhood and Imperial Rivalry through World War I” (17–88). Here the author goes well back into the nineteenth century and the early modern period and stresses the significance of what Klaus Zernack has termed Tsarist Russia’s and Prussia’s combined “negative policy towards Poland” (*negative Polenpolitik*) as the basis for the strategic partnership between St. Petersburg and Berlin in later decades. Here too, the interest in Siberia in the German Empire by agricultural experts like Otto Auhagen, social scientists like Max Weber, geographers like Friedrich Ratzel, politicizing historians like Otto Hoetzsch, and even novelists like Karl May, forms one of the focuses. Yet, in World War I, German expansionist policy was, of course, focused on Russia’s western parts—the Baltic lands and Ukraine—with the short-lived Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of March 1918 as a culmination point. Whereas the expertise of this cohort of German specialists on Russia was on demand in the Weimar Republic and its revisionist *Ostpolitik*, the Nazis relied on “experts” from their own ranks, among them dubious figures like the Russia-born ideologist Alfred Rosenberg or the Georgian agronomist Michael Achmeteli.

The author treats the Hitler-Stalin Pact of August 23, 1939 as a mere intermezzo preceding June 22, 1941 as the actual turning point in a century-long special relationship. There is, however, also the alternative explanation of this pact as the apogee of a German-Russian *wahlverwandtschaft*, or as Susanne Schattenberg claims, that the pact was concluded not despite contradicting ideologies but because of the many structural commonalities of both dictatorships and due to the mutual admiration of the two leaders for each other (“Diplomatie der Diktatoren. Der Molotov-Ribbentrop-Pakt,” in *Osteuropa*, 2009). Likewise, in his book *The Devils’ Alliance. Hitler’s Pact with Stalin, 1939–1941*, Roger Moorhouse portrays the Nazi-Soviet cooperation of 1939 to 1941 as the fourth partition of Poland.

One would have expected that the author draw also on Walter Benjamin’s depressing *Moscow Diary* of his disillusioning stay in Moscow from December 1926 to January 1927, as he would have profited from reading Martin Schulze Wessel’s groundbreaking study on the other—Russian—side of the medal (*Russlands Blick auf Preussen: Die polnische Frage in der Diplomatie und der politischen Öffentlichkeit des Zarenreiches und des Sowjetstaates 1697–1947*).

*Russia in the German Global Imagination* is a well-written, knowledgeable, and insightful analysis of the Germans’ ambivalence toward the empire in the east—an ambivalence that in the beginning of the twenty-first century resembles what it was at the beginning of the twentieth, and which is currently much stronger felt than during the intervening Cold War decades.

STEFAN TROEBST  
Leipzig University

***Governing Post-Imperial Siberia and Mongolia, 1911–1924: Buddhism, Socialism, and Nationalism in State and Autonomy Building.*** By Ivan Sablin. New York: Routledge, 2016. xii, 233 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. Maps. \$160.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.126

Those who lived through the first few decades of the twentieth century in eastern Siberia experienced not just war, revolution, and foreign intervention, but also an