

rii.” Every age has its own “soznatel’nye assotsiatsii” and “svoe sushchestvovanie vo vzaimodeistvii c okruzhaiushchei sredoi” (44). I endorse Antoshchenko’s conclusion that this was a method becoming a crusade toward a respectful and purposeful “cherty uchenogo i grazhdanina” (40) that also prompted Vinogradov’s efforts to improve public education. Though Vinogradov’s intellectual starting point may have been the formation of feudal societies, the end points of his teaching and public work were the origins, contexts, and democratic and liberal potential in the histories of every European society. Whether he was adapting the historicized theory of comparative politics of Aléxis de Tocqueville or trying to assist the Osvobozhdenie movement by sending articles from abroad, Vinogradov’s focus was on the prospects for a civil society in Russia.

The questions Antoshchenko’s study of Vinogradov raises about civil society in European history and in Russian society are as urgent for Russia today as in Vinogradov’s lifetime. This study complements other leading intellectual and political biographical studies of Russian liberals, like Richard Pipes’s two works on Petr Struve (1970 and 1980) and Melissa Stockdale’s on Miliukov (1996). Vinogradov is well served by this study.

ADRIAN JONES

*La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia*

***A History of Russian Philosophy, 1830–1930: Faith, Reason, and the Defense of Human Dignity.***

Ed. G. M. Hamburg and Randall A. Poole. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2010. xv, 423 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$120.00, hard bound.

At first glance, and when considered in the abstract, this volume can seem a bit off-center. It brings together some two dozen, incredibly knowledgeable scholars and asks them to help create a collection that shows Russian intellectual life’s deep interest in—and concern to properly ground and defend— notions of individual rights and freedom, rooted in a fundamental commitment to human dignity. This may seem “off-center” because, generally speaking, Russian thinkers are not famous for this. Yes of course, one may certainly point to famous passages from *The Brothers Karamazov* or Vissarion Belinskii’s letters, in which heaven itself is rejected should entry require a single child’s tear. But both because of generations of scholarly commentary claiming Russia knew no Renaissance, and because of the collectivism, merciless historicism, and materialism of mainline Bolshevik power, Russian intellectual history has sometimes been written as if the individual had little purchase (but was only a kind of occasional sideline interest) in Russian intellectual history.

As the editors explain, the purpose of this volume is to correct that impression and to show that what was “most characteristic and best about Russian philosophy” in the “long nineteenth century” (1830–1930) was “its humanist tradition” (3). They believe that from the first articulation of specifically “Russian” forms of modern philosophical speculation in the 1830s, through the repression of this endeavor in Soviet Russia in the late 1920s, Russian thinkers turned again and again to “the nature of human beings, our intrinsic value, our rights before one another and the state, and our historical lot” (22) and tried to place the preservation of this unique human mission at the center of their thought. In formal philosophical terms, both the editors and some of the authors (Sergey Horujy in particular) contend that this humanism descended, not from modern or Renaissance secondary texts, but from Orthodox Christian theology, in a tradition extending centuries beyond the foundation of the Muscovite state. If this “deepest and broadest current in Russian philosophy” (4–5) has been obscured, the editors contend, this is more because of the political power of Russian utopianism (and its dystopic consequences) than because of the formal content of Russian thought itself.

This is, needless to say, a broad and bold argument, which can be accused of being overly simple (especially in my telegraphed, reviewer’s summary), and can also be said to exclude a great deal of the material that traditionally would be covered in surveys or courses on the history of Russian thought. Indeed, in announcing this book to be a “history of philosophy,” the editors have already shrunk the typical terrain quite a bit. Since

Isaiah Berlin's *Russian Thinkers* (1978, gathering essays written much earlier), it has been a common prejudice that the originality of Russian intellectual history is to be sought, not in formal philosophy, but in broader, more affective, less academic, more performative realms of "social thought"—art, politics, and ideology. This book, then, stands that conception on its head and says, in effect, that it is precisely in grappling with human worth as a formal philosophical question (albeit one with profound practical consequences) that this tradition really matters.

One of the many pleasures of this finely produced and edited collection is deciding how one feels about this contention. Viewed through this prism, the whole fulcrum of Russian intellectual history shifts away from its famous "golden age" of the mid-nineteenth century (handled quickly here by four synthetic essays) toward a more fine-grained historical reading of its heady fin-de-siècle idealist and religious and literary circles. For my own part, while unsure if I would use the resulting collection itself as a "history of Russian philosophy," I was extremely impressed both by the care and acumen of the editors—who provide, among other things, a marvelous bibliography—and by the consistently high literary quality of the individual contributions. Most amount to miniature histories of the thinker or phenomenon under analysis. Thus, for example, Stuart Finkel's essay on Nikolai Berdiaev's conception of the human tasks of the Russian emigration presents a nice capsule portrait of "Russia Abroad" itself; likewise, Martin Beisswenger's fascinating attempt to show the links between humanism and Eurasianism also neatly describes the movement as a whole. Thus, unlike many collections of essays, this volume has both encyclopedic and monographic dimensions; its overarching argument is thought-provoking for specialists, even as its parts could be used for undergraduate or graduate courses. (The whole, unfortunately, is rather prohibitively expensive for classroom use.) It is, in short, a real gift to the field.

JOHN RANDOLPH  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

***The Kings and the Pawns: Collaboration in Byelorussia during World War II.*** By Leonid Rein. Studies on War and Genocide, vol. 15. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011. xxiii, 434 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Indexes. Tables. \$110.00, hard bound.

The issue of Belorussian collaboration with the German occupying authorities has been correctly identified by Leonid Rein as an important topic that has been largely neglected by existing scholarship. Most notably Christian Gerlach's monumental work on German policies of "calculated murder" on occupied Belorussian territory devotes scant attention to collaboration (*Kalkulierte Morde*, 1999). Bernhard Chiari's critical analysis of Belorussian society during the war (*Alltag hinter der Front*, 1998), based on a wider reading of Russian-language sources, includes studies of the Belorussian Self-Aid organization and also the local police but does not address directly the broader issue of political collaboration and is confined almost exclusively to western Belorussia, as is my own study of local police collaboration in the Holocaust and anti-partisan warfare (*Collaboration in the Holocaust*, 1999).

In his introduction, Rein promises to remedy these shortcomings, by covering a variety of forms of collaboration, including the role of the local administration and also economic collaboration, and by covering the entire territory of Belorussia. He also includes a theoretical overview, which offers a comparative perspective on collaboration throughout occupied Europe. He does not, however, discuss the preference of some historians, such as Christoph Dieckmann, to eschew the term *collaboration* altogether, in favor of the morally less loaded term *cooperation* (*Kooperation und Verbrechen*, 2003).

Rein's book, with its broad-based approach to the issue does offer some new insights. In particular, his discussion of collaboration by the Orthodox Church in Belorussia demonstrates that the Germans did not always get their own way, as Metropolitan Pantelejmon remained reluctant to break all traditional ties to the Moscow Patriarch. There were cer-