

Russian as possible to an Anglophone readership. The projects echoed Slava's interests in poetry (particularly Pushkin and Tsvetaeva), the theater, the culinary arts, the spiritual (especially regarding Russian Orthodoxy), the philosophical, and the inherent transformational power of culture. Slava's son Alex mentioned to me in a phone conversation that it struck him that his father was always "otherworldly." He meant that Slava focused on the invisible reality beyond the corporeal world. This explained Slava's attraction to writers such as Olga Sedakova and Marina Tsvetaeva, for whom otherworldly orientation was central.

A humanist in the finest sense of the word, Slava in recent times had become greatly disillusioned with his native Russia's turn from democracy. Instead of visiting Russia as he often used to, over the last few years he began to travel to Kazakhstan to promote Russian studies there, giving lectures and working with graduate students on their research. He also traveled to conferences in Granada, Spain to explore connections between Russian and Spanish culture. His range of interests was ever expanding.

I could not have asked for a better friend or colleague in this world than Slava and I will sorely miss him. Besides our collaborative work together, I will miss our myriad friendly conversations, as well as our personal and professional meetings in Lewisburg, in State College, and at conferences throughout the U.S. We published six books of annotated translations together and were in the process of finishing three more when he died. Slava's colleagues in the Comparative Humanities program at Bucknell Katie Faull and James Shields plan to organize a Festschrift in his honor. *Vechnaya pamiat'* (eternal memory) to Slava! We who knew him well will never forget him as a generous colleague, a great friend, and a wonderful soul.

MICHAEL M. NAYDAN
Pennsylvania State University

Abbott "Tom" Gleason, (1938–2015)

Abbott Gleason passed away on Christmas Day 2015 of complications from Parkinson's disease. Tom, as he was known, taught at Brown University from 1968 until retirement in 2005. He directed the Wilson Center's Kennan Institute from 1980 until 1982. Tom was long associated with Brown's Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs and chaired the university's History Department.

As Tom revealed in his memoirs *A Liberal Education*, his youth in the 1950s and 1960s was divided between Washington, D.C. and Cambridge, Mass., where he completed both his undergraduate and graduate education at Harvard before joining the Brown Faculty. He also taught at Tougaloo College, a historically black institution in Mississippi, while participating in the Civil Rights Movement during the 1960s.

Driven by a profound quest for the meaning of European modernity in all of its horrors and achievements over the past two centuries, Tom's work was rooted in a moral vision that had been informed by liberalism, while always remaining mindful of its shortcomings. His writings are marked by a consistent effort to tie intellectual inquiry to the reality of individual human experience—be it Ivan Kireevskii's painful struggle to properly educate his son Vasily; or George Orwell's physical agony as he sat in forced isolation in the Scottish Hebrides after World War II struggling to complete what would become his landmark novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*; or, nineteenth century Russian revolutionary Ivan Pryzhov's identification of self with dogs, "particularly with dogs that had been beaten, chained up, and otherwise abused."

He understood that biography can be historiography, as is obvious from a 2000-page volume of articles that he helped to edit re-examining Nikita Khrushchev.

As with Kireevskii—and indeed, in very different ways like Orwell or, for that matter, any number of Russian writers, artists, and intellectuals—this concern with the reality of the individual human experience led Tom to engage in a “search for wholeness” in a modern world seemingly broken apart by European social theory since the French Revolution. He did so not only by writing perceptive intellectual history, but also as a father, husband, teacher, colleague, and friend.

Tom’s penchant for a good tale well told became more than entertainment. However abstract his subject, Tom never lost sight of the profound humanity of the story he wanted to tell and the thoughts he sought to analyze. Tom always seemed to want to insure that the compelling human drama in which intellectual history is embedded did not disappear from view. Thus, any consideration of Tom’s contribution to American and world historiography about Russia must begin with his efforts both to humanize the story that he sought to tell and to place Russian development within an appropriate comparative perspective.

As Tom moved through life, he came to sense greater depth and weight in the concept of totalitarianism, and wrestled with what in fact was at stake in the debates swirling around the term. His interrogation of the history of the concept of totalitarianism led Tom to lift some of the central issues of Russian radicalism out of their Russian context and to place those debates within a broader world surrounding European liberalism. Tom eventually would explore a shared anti-liberal impulse among Fascism, Nazism, and Bolshevism that found expression in violence and a combination of voluntarism with elitism. Tom argued that discomfort with the “softness” of the liberal response to European modernity drove critics to a form of activist statism which found dynamic realization in mass movements at the dawn of the twentieth century that often were rooted in nationalism and a surface traditionalism.

Tom’s scholarship consistently wrestled with the shadow cast by history, culture, and mental constructions of the past throughout his career, beginning with his study of Ivan Kireevskii and continuing on through Russian radicalism and George Orwell to the meaning of the Russian North. His world was much like that of Henrik Ibsen, who wrote in Act Two of his 1881 play *Ghosts* that “It is not only what we have inherited from our fathers and mothers that exists again in us, but all sorts of old dead ideas and all kinds of old dead beliefs and things of that kind. They are not actually alive in us; but there they are dormant, all the same, and we can never be rid of them.”

This intellectual universe often stood at direct odds with paradigms in social science which look to homo economicus for explanation. Rather, his own “search for wholeness” led Tom to populate his works with people who would similarly find rational actors to be strangely uni-dimensional and incomplete. Tom remained throughout his life a refined connoisseur of the human comedy for whom any attempt to reduce the human experience to a mathematical equation, no matter how elegant, simply spoils the fun.

Tom’s career became an extended search for Ibsen’s ghosts in the twentieth century. It is an enterprise that has shed considerable light on the Russia of the past as well as the Russia of our time. Tom consistently wanted his readers to reconsider the notion that the Bolshevik Revolution swept away all that had come before simply by eradicating the social groups which had dominated Imperial Russia prior to 1917.

In the last years of his life, Tom was a prolific painter and was elected Artist Member of Providence’s Art Club. His pictures were shown at a special exhibit at the Watson Institute.

Throughout his career, Tom Gleason reminded us that out of date mental maps define our contemporary world in very real ways. We must explore and understand

the contours of those maps if we are to understand the world in which we live. This is a lesson that Tom Gleason taught us all: namely, that our understanding of existence on this planet will remain incomplete until and unless we fully and enthusiastically embrace, as he argued in European and Muscovite cases, “the idiosyncratic human individual, rooted in a complex, concrete, dense historical tissue.”

BLAIR A. RUBLE
Woodrow Wilson Center