The Pleiade: Five Scholars Who Founded Russian Historical Studies in America

There never was a more brilliant cohort of Russian historians in the English-speaking world, nor will there ever likely be again. Five extraordinary students in Michael Karpovich’s seminars of 1946–1947 at Harvard University went on to dominate the Russian historical field in America for some four decades. They took the lead at the three preeminent centers of Russian historical study in postwar America—Martin Malia and Nicholas Riasanovsky at Berkeley, Leopold Haimson and Marc Raeff at Columbia, and Richard Pipes at Harvard. At these institutions, they collectively trained the overwhelming majority of prominent Russian historians and between them much of the broader field. They also opened or creatively developed many fields and periods of Russian historical inquiry—more than any other cohort then or since.

This study is deeply personal. At Harvard in the late 1980s and early 1990s, my graduate-student colleagues and I often debated who were the “most important” historians of Russia. Our lists usually included all five. After I finished my PhD in 1992, I frequently exchanged letters with Pipes, an exemplary correspondent. The Pleiade continued to fascinate me, the term suggesting itself quite naturally: Terrence Emmons around the same time referred to the cohort as “a remarkable pleiad.”

In a diary entry I penned on June 9, 1995, I had already laid out the basic premise of this study. “In the field of Russian history in America,” I wrote,
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there are four Titans, most of them now passing from the scene. All four studied together at Harvard in the late forties under Karpovich. Three are “conservative” and stand over against the entire profession, now dominated by “revisionist” social historians. One is a “radical” and in a manner of speaking spawned the social history movement in the field. The three, Pipes, Malia, and Raeff (I have never considered Riasanovsky one of them), although they have much in common and believe many of the same things, do not get along or in any way form a cohesive front. Haimson, with his “canonical” text (Pipes’s jibe) on “Social Stability in Urban Russia” of 1966–1967 [sic],\(^4\) legitimized the study of the “worker phenomenon” in late Imperial Russia, thereby creating an entire school . . . . The Three have written books about political ideas, institutions, and movements. The One has written little, but the totality of it, as well as most of the work of his students has concerned social formations and movements. The work of the Three’s students has covered an extremely wide range of topics, because those mentors never sought to found intellectual “schools.”

Malia’s work as a public intellectual beginning in the mid-1990s reinforced my admiration. In the late 1990s, I began to correspond with Raeff, who proved himself not just an excellent correspondent but also a kind and generous person. In these years, I began to see Riasanovsky more and more as belonging with the Three. The One remained the One—inimitable, an outlier, a lightning rod, a school-builder. Two decades later, while working on a biography of Richard Pipes, I returned to the project, a labor of love.

My intentions were to explore the influence of Karpovich on the scholarly and intellectual development of the Pleiade, to draw their collective portrait, to delve into their mutual relations, and to trace the impact each scholar exerted on the field of Russian history. During the research, I read virtually all the publications of the Five. Haimson, I discovered, had written far more than I had

imagined. Pipes gave me unrestricted access to his vast unpublished archives (the archives of Malia and Riasanovsky, housed at the Bancroft Library at Berkeley, remain inaccessible; those of Raeff at Columbia’s Béchmeteff Archive nearly so). Correspondence among them and between all of them (save Haimson) and Karpovich and Isaiah Berlin also proved helpful. Dozens of their friends, colleagues, students, and family members sharing with me knowledge and reminiscences made the study possible. Ideas expressed by the panelists and audience of a roundtable on the Pleiade at the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies (ASEEES) annual meeting in Washington in 2016 further shaped my thoughts. The conclusion I reached was surprising even to myself: that of the Five Richard Pipes has exerted the greatest influence in the field.

Of Russian, Polish, and Georgian ancestry, Michael Karpovich was born in 1888 in Tiflis, Georgia. During the 1905 revolution, he was drawn to the Socialist-Revolutionaries, spent a month in jail, and was forbidden to live within the Caucasus. Gradually, he drifted toward the more moderate Constitutional Democrats. In fall 1906, he commenced historical studies at Moscow University and spent the following academic year in Paris at the Sorbonne. Back in Moscow, he took classes with V. O. Kliuchevskii, as well as with his student M. M. Bogoslovskii. Karpovich continued to study Russian history into World War I. In 1916, he began administrative work for the Special Councils set up the previous year to organize supply and other aspects of the war effort. He departed in May 1917 as secretary to the newly appointed ambassador of the Provisional Government to Washington, Boris A. Bakhmetev. Despite the coming to power of the Bolsheviks in fall 1917, Karpovich remained employed at the Russian Embassy until mid-1922. He was invited in 1927 to teach Russian history at Harvard University, the country’s most important center for Russian historical studies. In fact, by that point only a handful of Americans had defended
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dissertations or published scholarly works on Russian historical topics—and all but one had received their training at Harvard.6 Their advisor was the father of Russian studies in America, Archibald Cary Coolidge, who advocated a geographically and climatically determinist interpretation of the Russian national character. Its hallmarks, in his interpretation, included physical hardiness, forbearance, and a tendency to political absolutism.7

Karpovich was a humanist. He founded Harvard’s Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, of which he served as chair in 1949–1954, by recruiting the brilliant Russian émigré Roman Jakobson, who brought fourteen graduate students and three junior faculty with him from Columbia University.8 Karpovich was a leading organizer within the Russian émigré community and a promoter of Russian culture and Russian and Slavic studies in America. As part of this work, he edited or co-edited for many years the Russian émigré Journal Novyi zhurnal and The Russian Review. Karpovich was not drawn to the Russian Research Center, a flourishing social scientific think tank in the 1950s, whose fellows were typically not experts in Russian history and culture.9

Haimson, Pipes, Raeff, and Riasanovsky attended Karpovich’s seminar in fall 1946. The course focused on the reign of Alexander I, though some of the students’ papers went beyond this time frame. Raeff conducted his research on Western Europe and the Decembrists, Riasanovsky on the Petrashevsky Circle, Haimson on Bakunin’s formative years, and Pipes on the origins of the Westerner-Slavophile Controversy. Malia took the seminar the following year and wrote about the
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Populists in the 1870s. Malia recalled a lot of counterfactual discussion—such as if Alexander II had lived and the consultative assembly had been created, “could the constitutional experiment have started earlier and worked out?”—because Karpovich “would have of course liked to have seen Russian history work out differently.”

Karpovich, whom his graduate students affectionately called “Karpy,” was, according to Pipes, “friendly and supportive, . . . even tempered and modest,” unlike the other Russian émigrés at Harvard. Indeed, Dimitri von Mohrenschildt, with whom Karpovich coedited The Russian Review, wrote that he “was that rarest phenomenon among Russians—an even-tempered, well-balanced man of moderate views.” Karpovich and his émigré friend and colleague from Yale University, George Vernadsky, contracted to publish a multi-volume history of Russia. Vernadsky contributed his allotted five volumes, but Karpovich did not. Pipes attributes this failure to “his active engagement in émigré affairs,” his editorial work, and also to the chronic illness of his wife, which required him “to assume many household duties.” (Karpovich himself admitted in 1944, “Quite literally I am perishing because of the combination of family cares, teaching, and public work.”) Nevertheless, according to Pipes, “Karpovich well deserves to be ranged alongside his Yale colleague because he was singularly influential as a teacher, which Vernadsky was not.” Leopold Haimson added to Pipes’s assessment an emphasis on “the exceptional tolerance” that Karpovich “displayed for
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different points of view, including ones with which he did not necessarily agree.”¹⁶ David Engerman
considers it only a slight exaggeration to assert that Karpovich was the “principal ‘founding father’
of the American school of Russian Studies.”¹⁷ Karpovich certainly trained the vast majority of
Russian historians of the next generation.¹⁸

Karpovich’s overarching interpretation of Russia’s historical development, which ran
counter to that of Coolidge, who had recruited him, was of a country fully within the orbit of
European civilization, with any differences a matter of degree and not of kind, and moving along the
path toward democracy in the years before World War I.¹⁹ Karpovich was, according to Martin
Malia, “most eloquent when he reached the reign of Alexander I, for this was the beginning of
Russia’s universal, as opposed to purely national, significance; moreover, it was the beginning of his
Russia. . . . the golden age of Russian civilization: the world of the Pushkin Pleiade, of the
Decembrists, of the idealist ‘circles’ of the ‘thirties and ‘forties, of Turgenev.”²⁰ Karpovich,
according to Raeff, “totally rejected such ideas as the Russian soul, the Russian idea, and the
unchangeable national character of any people.”²¹ As Pipes recalled, he also fought vigorously
against “the conception that Bolshevism was somehow typically Russian” and “emphasized a liberal
tradition in Russia and the Western tradition in Russia.”²² Of the five, only the views of Malia and
Riasanovsky largely aligned with Karpovich’s on these matters. Raeff in fact completely rejected his
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mentor’s Westernizing outlook. “The more I reflect on the life and fate of Karpy,” wrote Raeff in 1958, “the more I feel that he has exemplified—alas—many of the things that Dostoevsky warned against when he talked of the Russians’ propensity to fall under the sway of Western thought and culture.”23 Karpovich also “spoke of the dangers of ‘big theories.’”24 Here it seems that all but Haimson and Malia took heed. Karpovich’s efforts to impart to his students “his skepticism, a sense of balance, ‘wisdom,’ and caution in matters historical”25 were perhaps his most important legacy, though which of them took these lessons most to heart is open to debate.

Raeff later recalled that Karpovich “was not actively engaged in research and scholarship himself.”

Therefore (my opinion) he did not suggest areas of research for new interpretations. He was very well read—as a true Russian intelligent would be—mainly in literature, so that he was an excellent critic, especially in the sense that he could challenge any generalization that seemed to him too sweeping or questionable. He also was very kind and friendly, so that he read everything submitted very conscientiously and in reasonably short time. Some of my friends told me that he worked on their dissertations with them—my own experience (as well as that of Pipes and Malia) was that he accepted what we submitted with only a few comments on style and organization. None of us three were “inspired” by him and for none did he open new vistas or raise new problems, but he was encouraging. As a classroom lecturer he was brilliant: clear, organized, with proper balance of fact and comments.26

Karpovich’s skill in seeing flaws or new angles in any argument—a key element of his general skepticism and wariness of “big theories”—stemmed in part from his ability to place them in a
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broader comparative context. Russia’s prerevolutionary educated elites—scholars, intellectuals, and even government officials—kept carefully abreast of topics relevant to their interests in the major European countries and rarely thought of Russia in isolation from them. Karpovich himself knew European history inside and out: he taught a yearly survey course at Harvard on the history of Western Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries.27 (His other lecture courses surveyed Imperial Russian history from Alexander I to 1917, which he taught from 1927, and Russian intellectual history, which he began offering in 1947.28)

Most of the Pleiade followed in Karpovich’s footsteps in pursuing comparative history, apparently agreeing with Alain Besançon, who wrote in his preface to Raeff’s survey of Imperial Russian history that the “field is inhospitable and does not nourish scholars adequately: the culture is limited and the history sad. I know of few Russian historians who have not been tempted at one moment or another to cross the Berezina and to seek solace in the fertile and sunny lands of the West.”29 Haimson was the outlier, for whom Russia seems to have been a greater object of idealization than was Europe, because in Russia the first socialist revolution in history had occurred. None of the five admitted to Karpovich having been a true mentor or an intellectual inspiration. All appreciated his kindness but none regarded him highly as a scholar. Already in 1950, Riasanovsky, who wrote such devoted letters to Karpovich and described him in a letter to Isaiah Berlin as “his usual charming self,” nevertheless admitted he did not expect him to publish any more

scholarly works, despite his former promises.  

Several years later, Raeff similarly admitted that “I am still a bit skeptical about Karpy ever doing any serious writing.” Even Malia, who was the closest to Karpovich intellectually, later opined that Crane Brinton was “the only one in the department who had ideas.” For a scholar who prized ideas above all, this was a damning criticism.

In an extensive interview Alla Zeide conducted with Pipes in 2006, he described Karpovich as “a brilliant lecturer” but “remote” as a graduate advisor, though “he was always there if you needed him.” Pipes also admitted that Isaiah Berlin had exerted a “more profound influence” on his intellectual and scholarly development. For one thing, “there wasn’t a great deal of intellectual interchange” with Karpovich. He did not even provide his graduate students with reading lists. Asked further about Karpovich’s influence, Pipes suggested that Karpovich’s kind demeanor drew students to Harvard where, after the war, “the atmosphere was electrifying.” Karpovich’s former students, who “were attached to him personally,” honored his career with a Festschrift and a celebratory dinner in spring 1957. But the contributions were very diverse: “You cannot speak of a school here.”

Like Karpovich himself, the Pleiade were strikingly cosmopolitan, all with working fluency in Russian, French, and German. All but Malia started out with a mother tongue other than English, but even he became so fluent in Russian and French as often to pass for a native. He was the first American admitted to study at the prestigious École normale supérieure in Paris. Haimson and Raeff completed much of their early schooling in French. By age five, Riasanovsky was reading and writing in Russian, French, and English. As a professor, he would tell jokes in seminar
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indiscriminately in the three languages.\textsuperscript{34} Pipes’s first languages were German and Polish (he and his wife, Irene, spoke Polish with each other until the birth of their son, Daniel, in 1949).\textsuperscript{35} Haimson, Raeff, and Malia taught courses as visiting professors in Paris. Each spent at least a couple of years doing research in Paris and loved the city. Pipes, Riasanovsky, and Haimson gave formal lectures at Soviet universities. Haimson organized scholarly collectives with colleagues in Paris, Leningrad, and Moscow.

As immigrants, Pipes and Raeff started out feeling as though they did not quite belong in America. In 1958, Pipes wrote to his friend, “we feel at least as much at home and one civilization as in the other (or as little), . . . Perhaps we can enjoy the best of both worlds and cease worrying that we belong to neither.”\textsuperscript{36} In 1959, Raeff wrote in that Europe “is really the only place where I feel truly at home”\textsuperscript{37} and once told a graduate student that he had “no identity” except as “a man and a European.”\textsuperscript{38} Yet gradually both came to feel like Americans. Malia seems to have preferred Paris and was often late getting back to Berkeley (Riasanovsky would then conduct his classes).\textsuperscript{39} Haimson always felt more comfortable in Paris. He even preferred Russia to America (“I lived a more isolated life in the United States than in Russia,” he later confessed),\textsuperscript{40} an idea none of the other four could have remotely entertained. Alone among them, Riasanovsky found a way to belong to the prevailing culture through a fanatical devotion to the U Cal sports teams.

All of them were extraordinarily erudite, with funds of knowledge, both classic and obscure, always at their fingertips. They all had amazing memories, though Riasanovsky seems to have had
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something like total recall, with the “ability to recite entire texts verbatim.”\textsuperscript{41} He could, moreover, recite poetry “endlessly”\textsuperscript{42} and in three languages.\textsuperscript{43} Raeff would quote from his huge stock of poetry, in both Russian and French, to make a point or illustrate an idea.\textsuperscript{44} What Richard Wortman wrote about Raeff can be asserted of all five: they “came out of a European tradition pursuing scholarship as an end in itself, as, one might say, a sacred calling.”\textsuperscript{45}

They were politically diverse. Students typically had a hard time guessing the politics of Raeff and Riasanovsky, though they were generally conservative culturally and socially. Early on, Malia had sympathies for the left, but he eventually grew staunchly conservative. Pipes was conservative but voted Democratic and admired Kennedy.\textsuperscript{46} The popular protests of the late 1960s in both Cambridge and Paris, however, coupled with the Soviet achievement of nuclear parity in the late 1960s, drove him sharply to the right. Haimson remained a man of the left throughout.

Their attitudes toward religious belief and practice also varied. Haimson and Raeff were secular Jews for whom faith had no personal meaning. Raeff was raised in a secular household without any Jewish culture (his mother was only half Jewish); he did not have a bar mitzvah. As a youth, he had tried to find faith but could not. He was respectful of his wife’s devout Catholicism and agreed to take part in a Catholic wedding ceremony at the time of their 25th anniversary.\textsuperscript{47} Haimson was preparing for his bar mitzvah and had learned the requisite Hebrew texts, which he could still recall later in life, but the outbreak of the war and the need to flee Europe kept him from performing the rite. As for so many Jews, the Holocaust dramatically brought home to him what it
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meant to be a Jew. He remained religiously agnostic, however, only occasionally sparring over the existence of God out of intellectual sport.\textsuperscript{48} Nor, in contrast to Raeff, did he ever consider religion an important subject of historical study. Pipes, also a Jew, has a deep faith in God but never attended much more than services on the high holy days. Malia was a fairly devout Catholic though not a regular churchgoer. Riasanovsky was by far the most religious, attending Russian Orthodox church regularly, taking an active part in his parish, and frequently expressing his faith overtly. When Norman Pereira lost his grandfather in 1967, Riasanovsky put his arm around him and “suggested that we pray together.”\textsuperscript{49}

All five wrote their dissertations on various aspects of intellectual history. This focus has five main explanations. Intellectual émigrés like Karpovich preferred it. It was in vogue in post-War American academe and was easy to pursue without archives. Ideas seemed above all to have driven Russian history toward the Revolution. And at Harvard, Isaiah Berlin was a frequent invited lecturer beginning in January 1949. All five, save Haimson, grew close to Berlin and fell under his captivating spell.\textsuperscript{50} Pipes and Haimson worked on revolutionaries, Malia on radicals, Riasanovsky on conservatives, and Raeff on liberals. In later work, they all traced the origins and development of the Russian intelligentsia: Raeff focusing on the late eighteenth-century nobility; Riasanovsky on early nineteenth-century government officials and opposition figures; Malia on the intellectual ferment of the second quarter of the nineteenth century; and Haimson and Pipes on the last decades of the Old Regime.
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“Probably the best mind among Russian historians,” according to Marc Raeff, Malia had a passion for discovering, thinking through, discussing, and imparting ideas. Archival research did not interest him. He lived for the life of the mind and seemed oblivious to popular culture. His nephew, Rick Croarkin, recalled a conversation in which Malia had no idea who the pop star Michael Jackson was, at a time when “most of the planet knew his name.” By contrast, he took Croarkin to the Metropolitan Opera for two short Italian operas, one of them *Pagliacci*, and explained the action in detail throughout.

Born in 1924 to middle-class Irish Catholic parents, Malia had a happy and placid childhood. During the war, he studied Russian and then served in Navy intelligence in Alaska, where he worked closely with Soviet ship captains. After demobilization, Malia started graduate school in the Slavic Department at Harvard but quickly switched to history. He conducted his doctoral work on Alexander Herzen, because he had “dreamed up the plausible adaptation of the socialist idea in Russia,” though Malia “wasn’t that interested in Herzen per se.” He completed the dissertation during two years (1949–1951) at the École normale supérieure, among brilliant intellectuals in thrall to Marxism-Leninism, arguing vehemently and compellingly against them. Malia then took a non-tenure-track instructorship at Harvard.

In 1957, when Karpovich retired, Malia, now an assistant professor, contributed to his Festschrift an erudite inquiry into Friedrich Schiller’s celebration of inner freedom and individual dignity as deeply stirring the founders of the Russian intelligentsia. Here Malia formulated his idea of the cultural gradient:
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The farther east one goes, the more absolute, centralized, and bureaucratic governments become; the greater the pressure of the state on the individual, the more serious the obstacles to his independence, the more sweeping, general, and abstract are ideologies of protest for a compensation. And the aesthetic ideal of man is the most abstract and disembodied of all possible ideals.57

Because the Russians “lived in a world where every detail was an affront and an outrage to the dignity of the individual,” these early radical thinkers poured their heart and soul into abstractions and raised them to the level of an absolute. The English, he argued further, “agitated for the particular rights of Englishmen; the French for the universal rights of man; and the German sought freedom in the realm of the ‘pure’ idea.”58 The Russians sought to impose that ideal on the whole of society and even humanity. In other words, the activities and thoughts of the Russian intelligentsia of the 1840s and 1850s led more or less straight to 1917 and Bolshevik social engineering.

Since Malia had no other publications, the Karpovich chair went to Richard Pipes at the end of 1957. Pipes long believed that Karpovich had been “disappointed that Malia, to whom he was closer intellectually, was not appointed his successor.”59 In 1958, Malia joined Riasanovsky at Berkeley. They team-taught a popular Russian intellectual history course, which was often a debate between the two of them, and not only about ideas: Riasanovsky felt he had to carry the whole administrative burden.60 From 1970, Malia also taught courses on European intellectual history.61 He was a brilliant lecturer,62 but not very approachable.63 One student recalled him speaking “way
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above the level of discourse for the students, addressing the topics as if it were an advanced PhD seminar.\textsuperscript{64} He was principal advisor for relatively few graduate students, though his intellectual offspring included some PhD’s in European intellectual history.\textsuperscript{65} Two Russianists he trained, Terrence Emmons and Stephen Kotkin, became pillars of the field. Kotkin later recalled deep and lengthy conversations ranging across the intellectual and political history of the West. He talked with remarkable clarity about Pascal and Tolstoy, Thucydides and Hegel. With the slightest prompting, he unwound the stories and significance of medieval heresy and of absolutist monarchy, the breakthrough to liberty and, amid the urge for equality, the difficult advent of democracy.\textsuperscript{66}

Malia was never a very supportive mentor, however; students could not rely on him to write letters of recommendation.\textsuperscript{67}

Malia’s magisterial \textit{Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism} finally appeared in 1961.\textsuperscript{68} In order to interpret intellectual developments in Russia in the second quarter of the nineteenth century and to place Herzen, the “gentry revolutionary,” into his historical context, Malia mastered European thought, especially German idealism. The book advances an interpretation of history as strongly influenced if not determined by ideas and ideologies. Malia halted his story in
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1855, when Herzen grew more moderate (and more attractive to Karpovich) and therefore was no longer a harbinger of revolution.

Malia spent 1962–1963 in the USSR on a Guggenheim Fellowship ostensibly to work on the Populists, though in fact he intended not to bury himself in documents but to plunge into intellectual encounters. Malia’s failure to focus on his research gave the authorities an excuse to denounce him in the press for his excessive interest in “the locations of corrective labor camps” and efforts to inquire about “the attitude of the creative intelligentsia.” Informed sources suggested that the purpose of the denunciation was to warn Soviet citizens to stay away from popular American visiting scholars. Malia did not return to the USSR until 1988. Meanwhile, he focused on European history.

Malia and Riasanovsky recruited Reginald Zelnik, an Emmons PhD, to teach Russian labor and Soviet history. Zelnik who arrived at Berkeley in fall 1964, plunged right into the Free Speech Movement. Malia also got involved, passionately seeking to defuse tensions, defend the university, and, as he recalled, stop ideology from hijacking the movement. More than ideas were hijacked: most Russianists began working with Zelnik, a deeply involved mentor and a youthful leftist. The two scholars became intellectual adversaries, sparring in department meetings, Malia with an “icy steel-like demeanor,” and “maneuvering” behind the scenes. Zelnik tried to keep his graduate students away from Malia’s “corrupting” influences.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Malia frequently lectured at the Collège de France and the École des hautes études in Paris. One set of lectures was transcribed and published in 1980 in French (the
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book was translated into Russian but not English).  

Malia’s main argument was that the Russian Revolution, like the French Revolution of 1789, was a “great revolution,” which involved the participation of all the main elements of society—the peasantry, industrial workers, the middle class, and high elites. The fact that Russia experienced such a revolution, in Malia’s interpretation, showed that Russia was part of the broader Western historical development. The key factor in both the success of the Bolsheviks’ coming to power and the horrors of Stalinism was, he argued, the power of ideology.

Malia was in Paris when François Mitterrand was elected president in May 1981 and seemed poised to impose socialism. Disillusioned, Malia departed for Poland where Solidarity, the first independent trade union within the Soviet Bloc, was challenging Communism in Poland. Back in Paris, after the imposition of martial law in December, Malia launched his career as a public intellectual in the New York Review of Books, to which he became a regular contributor. His main argument was that Solidarity constituted an existential threat to the Polish socialist state.

When Gorbachev came to power in 1985, Malia began to pay more attention to Western historical scholarship on the USSR and was incensed to find the “revisionists” explicating Soviet historical development as “normal,” rather than as an impossible attempt to create utopia on earth. In 1990, Malia (under the pseudonym “Z”) caused a sensation by arguing that the Soviet system was unreformable. (Malia annoyed several colleagues when he initially refused to admit his authorship.) In 1994, he developed this idea further in The Soviet Tragedy. Along with a relentless critique of revisionism, he explained the failure of the Soviet experiment as the inevitable result of a
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thoroughgoing implementation of Marxist ideas, in particular the suppression of the market economy. Without the market, the system grew ever more inefficient, requiring tight information control and mass coercion.

This interpretation was so greatly at odds with the views prevailing in the mainstream of the profession that Malia felt beleaguered. Yet his work was taken very seriously. At the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in Boston in 1996, Malia was the subject of two panels. The first, a roundtable chaired by Robert C. Tucker of Princeton, grouped Malia with one nemesis against another nemesis: “Pipes and Malia vs. the Haimson School: Better Political or Social History?” The second, also a roundtable, this one chaired by Tsuyoshi Hasegawa, was devoted entirely to The Soviet Tragedy.” Geoffrey Hosking and Ronald Grigor Suny faced off as participants, along with Malia himself.81 Revisionist social historians like Suny almost completely disagreed with Malia’s interpretation, but they often appreciated his belief in the centrality of ideology in late Imperial Russian and Soviet history and the attention he paid to revisionist social history, unlike Pipes, who tended to dismiss it.

Five years later, Malia came out with a book he had been working on since the 1960s, entitled Russia under Western Eyes.82 Emphasizing both Western influences on Russia and Western perceptions of Russia, he argued that from the era of Peter the Great Russia was accepted as a part of Europe and, starting in the late nineteenth century, Russian ideas began echoing back in the other direction, gradually more powerfully. Malia’s last book, History’s Locomotives, which was edited posthumously by Emmons,83 ranges across five centuries and seeks the roots of great European revolutions in the stirrings of dissent that had produced the Reformation. A chain of revolutions led

---

81 Thanks to Jon Giullian, Watson Library, the University of Kansas, for help tracking down the details of these panels.
inexorably to 1917, which was then hijacked by the utopian ideology of Marxism. Malia had thus fulfilled his “lifetime project . . . to figure out revolutions and to get the pattern of European history overall”—an interest inspired by Crane Brinton, not Michael Karpovich.84

Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, was born in Harbin, Manchuria, in 1923. His father was a distinguished expert on Chinese and Mongol law, and his mother a well-regarded fiction writer. His family moved to Oregon in 1938 where he attended the University of Oregon. His rigorous upbringing made college seem “like country club life.”85 During the war, he served in Army intelligence in Europe and was decorated for bravery.

After completing his Master’s degree at Harvard, Riasanovsky went to Oxford, where he wrote a dissertation on the Slavophiles for Isaiah Berlin. This topic was not much to the liking of Karpovich, who preferred to emphasize Westernizing trends in Russia, but he helped Riasanovsky revise and publish the project.86 The book is a collective biography of six Russian intellectuals who, deeply influenced by Western Romanticism and German idealistic philosophy, perceived in Russia a unique and profoundly humane culture, grounded in Orthodoxy, and capable of saving Russia from the evils of the West.87 (Riasanovsky’s later work on Eurasianism was a variant on this theme.88)

In a 1952 review essay, Riasanovsky rejected the characterization of prerevolutionary Russia as inherently expansionist and imperialistic.89 This article echoed one by Karpovich that had come out the year before.90 While staunchly anti-Soviet throughout his life, Riasanovsky was

84 Malia Interview, 42.
86 Riasanovsky Interview, 74; Karpovich to Riasanovsky, March 20, 1951, Box 6, Karpovich Papers, BA.
89 Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, “Old Russia, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe,” American Slavic and East European Review 11, no. 3 (October 1952): 171-88.
nevertheless also something of a Russian patriot who, like Karpovich, could not abide the idea of some inherent and eternal Russian “soul,” or indeed of any national essence.

Riasanovsky next worked on the doctrine of Official Nationality, the official ideology of Nicholas I’s Russia. Karpovich offered detailed but highly critical comments on the book manuscript. Above all, he believed that Riasanovsky exaggerated the doctrine’s impact in Russian life and was wrong to present it as a variant of European Romanticism. Riasanovsky replied with counterevidence, including support for the autocracy by Gogol’, “one of the greatest writers in the history of the world.” It was as if he wanted to cover his insights about an anti-European and anti-modern Russia with professions of love for Russian culture. The book came out in 1959.

In 1963, Riasanovsky published *A History of Russia*. Over the next 30 years—and five editions—it sold more than 200,000 copies, and introduced countless students in America and abroad (translated into many languages, it became required reading for the French university examination) to a balanced interpretation of Russia, of which Karpovich would have been proud. Probably in connection with this publication, the history department at Yale University tried to woo Riasanovsky away from Berkeley in 1964 with the offer of an endowed chair. (Berkeley, in turn, named him the Sidney Hellman Ehrman Professor of European History in 1969, an honor he kept until his retirement in 1997.)

Riasanovsky was a popular teacher. In the late 1950s, he had taught the Western Civilization survey course, once to over 1,000 students. He found it hard “to think of a good historian of Russia
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96 Riasanovsky Interview, 222.
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who is not at least a passable historian of Europe.”  

He directed twenty or twenty-five doctoral dissertations, giving them plenty of freedom but also support. Many fondly recalled meeting with him in “Café Riasanovsky,” just off campus, at 2440 Bancroft Way. According to Norman Pereira, Riasanovsky “calmly and with unfailing good humor occupied the middle ground—in more ways than one—between the mercurial Malia on the right and the impassioned Zelnik on the left. And his teaching style “was also somewhere in the middle between Malia’s brilliant but detached lecturing and Zelnik’s intense personal mentoring.” Others who worked with him describe him as extraordinarily erudite, always professional, judicious, holding them to the highest standards.

Riasanovsky’s next book, an overview of Charles Fourier’s thought, reflected a lifelong scholarly interest in French utopian socialism. Seven years later, he came out with *A Parting of Ways*. Roughly half the book consists in an overview of Official Nationality and Slavophilism, along with (more briefly) the Westernizer response. He admitted that “the Russian educated public was more westernizer than Slavophile in its orientation and inclinations,” and grew ever more so during the reign of Nicholas I.

A key figure in nearly all of Riasanovsky’s work was Peter the Great. Against him the Slavophiles articulated their doctrines. Official Nationality upheld him as the founder of the modern Russian state. Presenting many assessments of Peter—both positive and negative—across nearly

---
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three centuries was the purpose of his next book. Riasanovsky does not interpret the meaning of Peter in Russian history, though he himself seems more to admire the monarch than to question his methods. The book was successful in America; it was selected by the History Book Club.

Seven years later, he came out with a thin volume on the origins of Romanticism. It argued that the romantic vision emerged from a pantheistic apprehension of the world as one organic and interconnected whole. They thought this perception was taking them beyond Christianity, closer to God and the truth, but they found instead a horrifying wasteland. Such seems to have been Riasanovsky’s conception of what life would be outside Christ and the Trinity.

Riasanovsky’s last book reflected on what it meant to be Russian. If in his previous book he sought to emphasize the foundational nature of his religious faith, then this book was apparently meant to defend the worth of the Great Russian nation. The book catalogs what he considers essential ingredients giving rise to the Russian identity. The adoption of Christianity in 988 was perhaps the most important juncture in Russian history—a turning toward Europe, though with the East-West Schism of 1054 also a source of suspicion of the West. The Byzantine emphasis on ritual, formalism, and monasticism strongly influenced Russian culture. Another important ingredient was the “struggle between the forest and the steppe,” or between the sedentary Slavs and the marauding nomadic peoples, leading to a sense of geopolitical vulnerability. These ingredients of the Russian identity emerged early and formed part of its foundation for the next several hundred years. It is ironic that Richard Pipes had mined precisely those same ingredients, when seeking explanations for Russian geopolitical aggressiveness, absolutist proclivities, and xenophobia.
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Born in Moscow in 1923, Marc Raeff was the only child of a professional couple: Victoria, a biochemist, and Isaac, an engineer. After the Revolution, Isaac had served the Soviet government as an inspector of machinery purchases in Czechoslovakia, then refused a recall to the USSR, instead moving the family to Berlin around 1926–1927, and in 1933, after the Nazis took power, on to Paris, where Marc graduated from lycée. There he “assimilated the French skepticism and semi-sarcastic attitude,” according to Lillian Raeff, though this may have also been combined with “the Russian intelligentsia’s critical attitude toward the existing order of things.” The family immigrated to the United States in April 1941 and settled in the Upper West Side of Manhattan. During the war, Raeff served as an interpreter for German POWs in camps around the U.S.

Without having completed any college courses, Raeff talked his way into a PhD program at Harvard in 1946. He opted for Russian history, as a relatively understudied field, and entered with a thorough grounding in modern Western historiography and the classics of German sociology and political theory. For his dissertation, Raeff selected a topic dear to Karpovich: liberal thinking about the peasant commune in the reign of Alexander II. The year before sprinting to completion in 1950, he landed a job at Clark University in central Massachusetts.
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During his career, Raeff published more detailed scholarship on more varied topics—including the historical impact of ideas, Russian officialdom, institutional development, the evolution of Russian political thought, governmental reform, the influence of Western ideas and institutions in Russia, political movements in Russia, nationalities policy, Russia as Empire, historiography, the Russian emigration, cultural and religious history, legal studies, and Russian national consciousness, among others—than any other member of the Pleiade and perhaps than any other Russian historian in the English-speaking world. Only the highlights can be touched upon here.

Raeff’s first book focused on the Siberian reforms implemented in 1822 by the statesman Michael Speransky. The volume shed light on the ways of life of Siberian ethnic minorities and the impact on them of the Russian colonial enterprise, a focus that would find significant attention from scholars only decades later. Next came a biography of Speransky. A believer in the rule of law, of rational institutions, and a well-trained bureaucracy, Speransky conceived and advocated wide-ranging plans for constitutional reform, of which the creation of the State Council was the only fruit; framed the rules and institutions for a bureaucracy that governed the country until the end of the Old Regime; and, perhaps most important, led the efforts to codify Imperial law for the first time since 1649. In this approach “economic and social laissez-faire liberalism was to be established by bureaucratic methods combined with a political conservatism which stressed the pedagogical function of the bureaucratic state.” In the chapter Raeff contributed to the 1957 Karpovich Festschrift, he admitted that Russia continued to lack a “homogeneous, efficient, alert, and

---

politically conscious policy-making bureaucracy.” As a result, arbitrary autocratic power remained staunchly intact.

Raeff spent the academic year 1957–1958 in Paris on a Guggenheim Fellowship examining the origins of the Russian intelligentsia. A 1959 article argued that liberalism had emerged in Western Europe from a vibrant society and in defense of social, economic, and cultural interests and values, which were only weakly defended within the aristocracy of Russia. A second article that year stressed the centrality of state service to the identity and self-perception of the eighteenth-century Russian nobility. An article the following year contended that the affirmation by intellectuals like M. M. Shcherbatov of Peter the Great’s transformation of Russia fostered radical activism in later decades.

Raeff’s burst of high-quality publications got him a job at Columbia University in 1961. He kept somewhat aloof from university life in order to focus on his teaching and research, but was a committed and respected “citizen.” A formal and somewhat hands-off mentor, he was extremely diligent about providing historiographical suggestions, reading and commenting on written work, and writing recommendations. Raeff also encouraged PhD students “to dive into the archives and explore new avenues, especially in the newer genres of social and cultural history.” He grew close to some of his senior graduate students and usually went on a first name basis with them after their thesis defense.
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Two more articles, which came out in 1962, pointed to the Russian elites’ abstract and universalizing cast of mind, reinforced by the study of natural law and inescapable (almost always negative) comparisons of Russia and Western Europe, and by their rootlessness, fostered by their lack of ancient ancestral estates. Russian problem-solving presupposed generic and absolutizing, rather than organic and evolutionary, solutions. These studies led up, and contributed, to Raeff’s cultural and intellectual prosopography of the eighteenth-century Russian nobility. Its key argument is that obligatory service to the state, the acquisition of Western learning and ideals in which the importance of Enlightenment thinking was paramount, the lack of established independent institutions, absolute authority over one’s own serfs and other underlings, and constant movement at the pleasure of the monarch gradually alienated noblemen from both the state and the Russian people and fostered in them a tendency toward political extremism and utopianism. Such an interpretation meshed well with Malia’s reading of the ideological extremism of Russian intellectuals.

Raeff’s next big focus was Russian governance. He began with an investigation of Grigori Potemkin’s expansion into the Southwest as an extension of Catherine’s authority and charisma in a way that hindered further organic imperial development. (Raeff found a similar overshadowing of the legal and the rational aspects of governance by the personal and the charismatic in Catherine’s domestic policy.) He pursued this theme further, emphasizing Russia’s manner of integrating conquered territories, at a time when few scholars stressed the multinational character of the Russian
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Empire. The pattern involved balancing significant tolerance for diverse aspects of culture, social organization, tradition, and beliefs with a gradual effort to bring uniformity across the land.

Peter and especially Catherine, Raeff argued, were inspired in part by the European administrative philosophy of cameralism, which emphasized rationalism, individual initiative, and self-interest and presupposed implementation by “intermediary bodies” and trained officials. Raeff developed this idea further in his 1983 study of cameralist methods of governance in the German lands and Russia, which emphasized the difficulty of their transplantation in the East, because of inadequate social institutions and “intermediary bodies.” The will for reform was there, but the social and economic infrastructure was lacking.

Raeff’s last major study was a history of the Russian emigration. The flood of Russian émigrés to major cities throughout the world re-created a Russian environment and contributed powerfully to Russian culture. (As usual, while Raeff was preparing the study, he brought out numerous articles, which expanded on its more important aspects.) He thus anticipated and contributed to a new subfield of Russian historiography, emigration studies.

Richard Edgar Pipes was born in 1923, to an assimilated upper-middle-class Polish-Jewish family in Polish Silesia. His father was a businessman and a Polish veteran of World War I. Soon after the Nazi occupation of Warsaw in 1939, the family escaped via Italy and Spain to the United States.
States. After two years at a small Midwestern college, he was drafted into the Army Air Corps.  
Pipes was sent for Russian language training to Cornell University, which granted him a B.A. on the basis of this work.

In spring 1947, Pipes took Crane Brinton’s seminar, in which he studied the “military colonies” set up under Alexander I.143 Pipes describes this undertaking as a utopian plan to completely renovate the Russian countryside by forcing soldiers to form self-sufficient communities. He also linked it to later political developments: he had been “vaguely conscious of an analogy between the colonies of Alexander I and Soviet collective farms.”144 Pipes’s two seminar papers came close to Riasanovsky’s early interests chronologically and thematically, but Pipes viewed the both Slavophilism and the autocratic impulse toward control as negative indices of an underlying Russian political culture. Pipes was also drawing near to Malia’s argument about the Russian tendency to take Western ideas to their extreme and Raeff’s concern with the weak legal culture in Russia.

Pipes’s dissertation investigates Marxist and Bolshevik nationality theory.145 Karpovich approved the topic, “albeit reluctantly: he preferred us to work on the ‘other Russia,’ especially the pro-Western, Liberal Russia which was all but forgotten at the height of Stalin’s tyranny.”146 The final chapter explores what Pipes called the “New National Policy,” which “involved the positive use of national emotions, much as the N.E.P. entailed the use of economic self-interest as an incentive.”147 Karpovich encouraged him to build his first monograph around this chapter, focusing

144 Pipes, Russia Observed, 3.  
on policy rather than theory. The book received the American Historical Association’s George Louis Beer Prize. He quickly produced several related articles and book chapters focused on the multinational (and imperialistic) character of the Russian Empire and Soviet state. This was a topic that had rarely been researched in a broad and systematic way and would become a central scholarly focus for the field only decades later. (Few of Karpovich’s other PhD students investigated Soviet history, the preserve of Merle Fainsod.) Pipes’s focus in the book was the Bolshevik re-conquest and domination of most of the Imperial Russian borderlands, but with a twist:

by granting the minorities extensive linguistic autonomy and by placing the national-territorial principle at the base of the state’s political administration, the Communists gave constitutional recognition to the multinational structure of the Soviet population. In view of the importance which language and territory have for the development of national consciousness, . . . this purely formal feature of the Soviet Constitution may well prove to have been historically one of the most consequential aspects of the formation of the Soviet Union.149

In other words, it was potentially like a ticking time bomb ready to blow apart the state. Like many of Pipes’s books, it remains in print. (Mark Von Hagen still considers it the best book in any language on the Russian Revolution and Civil War era.)150

Like Raeff, though even more so, Pipes has produced such a vast quantity of scholarship that only highlights can be mentioned.

Pipes’s post-doctoral project concerned Russian conservative political culture. A Guggenheim Fellowship enabled him to work in Paris in 1956–1957 on Nicholas Karamzin, the founder of the modern Russian literary language, one of the country’s earliest historians, and a

150 Personal communication with Mark Von Hagen, October 9, 2016.
defender of Russian absolutism. (In December 1957, Pipes was appointed Karpovich’s successor.)
Pipes came out in 1959 with a critical edition (in both English and Russian) of Karamzin’s defense
of Russian absolutism.  

151 Pipes emphasized Karamzin’s strong devotion to unlimited sovereign power, suggested that it was a fundamental attribute of Russian political culture, and hinted that such a conservatism might eventually return to prominence in Russia. Like Pipes’s first book, it achieved the status of a classic and was brought out in a new edition in 2005.  

By this point, Pipes was already working on a biography of Peter Struve, who strongly influenced the evolution of both Marxism and, eventually, nationalism in Russia. The project took him 20 years to complete because of other projects along the way.  

153 He wrote dozens of book reviews, had already been contributing as a public intellectual to The New Republic and The New Leader, often commented on Soviet foreign and domestic policy, organized two conferences at Harvard’s Russian Research Center (on the Russian intelligentsia in 1960 and on the Russian Revolution in 1967), served as an editor of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, published a slim volume on relations between Marxist intellectuals and industrial workers in St. Petersburg in the 1890s and two articles on the Populist antecedents of Russian Marxism,  

154 produced a 200-year slice of a college textbook on Western civilization (1968)—and that was just in the 1960s.

During that decade at any given time he also supervised a dozen or more graduate students, many of them future leaders of the field, including Daniel Field, Richard Stites, William Rosenberg,
and Abbott Gleason. Ironically, although Pipes personally liked all four, they did not repay the favor. In fact, they and many others despised Pipes. It was probably his politics, though maybe also his formality and his unwillingness to engage in lengthy intellectual discussion, that alienated so many. The main exceptions were those with conservative views and women, who gratefully recalled Pipes treating them no differently than their male colleagues. Presumably their expectations were lower, or at least the men’s, higher. All conceded their debt to Pipes for launching the first Kritika (1964–1984), a quarterly journal intended both to review Soviet historical monographs and to enhance graduate training. Nowhere else in America were budding Russian historians working so closely on actual scholarship as part of an editorial team with their mentor. The number of completed Pipes PhD declined throughout the 1970s, as Berkeley and Columbia displaced Harvard as the great centers for graduate study in Russian history.

Pipes’s scholarly works displayed coherence but also multidimensionality. For example, in the 1970s he was working simultaneously on four major projects with almost entirely different time frames. First, he carried forward his biography of Peter Struve past 1905. Second, he wrote his broad interpretation of Russian political history from earliest times to the late nineteenth century, Russia under the Old Regime (1974). Third, he was beginning his magisterial history of the Russian Revolution. Finally, he was engaged in a serious study of Soviet foreign policy. This involved testifying before congressional committees, consulting for the CIA, publishing roughly 20 articles, and presenting scores of invited lectures. All this work, moreover, was accompanied by continued scholarly output on such topics as Russian conservatism, the origins of the term intelligentsia, Soviet nationalities problems, and Catherine II and the Jews. He also directed the Russian Research Center in 1970–1973.

---

Each of Pipes’s main projects had a big impact. His Struve biography is one of the half-dozen best and most important English-language biographies in Russian history, as well as a wide-ranging intellectual history of the last decades of Imperial Russia. *Russia under the Old Regime* is still the most ambitious and significant broad interpretation of Russian history ever written. As with Malia’s cultural gradient argument, Pipes began with the question of Russia’s close relationship to Europe. The central question for Pipes, however, was why Russian society never managed effectively to constrain government. He concluded that too many features of European political culture were missing, including autonomous towns, an aristocracy rooted in the land, an independent judiciary, and unassailable private property rights. Pipes’s 1,500-page narrative of the Russian Revolution (1990, 1994) will probably never be rivaled in terms of drama, profundity, and also controversy. But historically speaking, his fourth project was the most important, because against almost the entire Sovietological, journalistic, policymaking, and broader intellectual communities in America, Pipes argued forcefully and ultimately convincingly to enough people who mattered that the Soviet military buildup represented a threat to the United States. This outlook resonated with Ronald Reagan, who appointed Pipes senior Russian and East European expert in the National Security Council at the start of his administration. Pipes, who argued in print that “Economically and culturally” the USSR was “a power of the second rank,” to confront it with a multipronged (economic, diplomatic, cultural, military) grand strategy—a doctrine embodied in National Security Decision Directive 75. Pressuring the Soviet Union was not an end in itself for Pipes, however, but only a means to prod it toward reform, to undermine “the conservative hawks who don’t want to democratize” in favor of “reform-minded . . . Russian nationalists” in the Kremlin, as he revealed in

156 See Engerman, *Know Your Enemy*, 264–69, 272–76.
an interview with *Time* magazine in early 1982. After he left office in late 1982, Pipes developed his ideas further, arguing that “the forces making for change are becoming well-nigh irresistible” and again insisting that U.S. pressure could “promote these forces” by means of manifold pressure. This was prescient argumentation advanced just months before Gorbachev took the reins of power in Moscow.

Pipes also achieved greater renown in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia than any other Western historian. From the late 1950s, when he first visited the USSR, until the fall of communism, Soviet journalists and scholars regularly denounced his work. An entire book, with the name “Pipes” in the title, pursued this goal—a unique distinction in Soviet historiography. Yet many Soviet dissidents looked to Pipes as a beacon of hope, and when the USSR collapsed, his major works were published in Russian in huge print-runs, making him something of a household name.

Many revisionist social historians in Western countries rejected Pipes’s politically centered interpretations. Yet Pipes seems to have brushed off such criticism. He wrote to the maverick economist Igor Birman in 1994: “I never allow intellectual disagreements to affect personal relations—that is, unless the other party chooses to do so (which, unfortunately, happens all too often).” Taking offense at criticism of his views, therefore, “would be uncivilized.” Nor does he seem ever to have doubted his capacity to understand Russian history correctly. As he wrote to fellow Harvard contrarian David Landes in 1990, “You ask me how it feels to be recognized as having been right: to this I must respond that I had been so convinced of it all along that it never
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bothered me to be criticized for my views.” 164 Many scholars and intellectuals of a conservative outlook shared this assessment. Walter Laqueur, for example, acknowledged that Pipes “was courageous to write at the time when the dominant school was revisionism. He thought that the Soviet experiment was a disaster, and of course this was vindicated.” 165

From the time of his retirement from teaching in 1995, Pipes produced a flood of scholarly books and popular articles, even delving into Russian art history. 166 In 1999, he stepped out into comparative economic history with Property and Freedom. Drawing on wide reading in political theory, history, and social science, Pipes argued that political freedom is best grounded in private property rights, since property ownership can finance political activity and shield a political actor from repression. For this insight, he won the prestigious Bruno Leoni Prize in 2015. 167 Other notable volumes were a continuation of his earlier work on conservatism as the fundamental political culture of Russia, 168 and a brief biography of the man who helped Gorbachev to formulate his policies of reform, Alexander Yakovlev. 169 For decades, Pipes was a sought-after public intellectual, giving scores of invited public lectures in America, Europe, and Russia. He was still publishing book reviews in such venues as The New York Review of Books in 2016. 170 Several of his books have been translated into a total of 20 languages and have sold tens of thousands of copies.

The outlier of the five was Haimson. A bohemian, a radical, a supporter of the student protests of the late 1960s, a social historian with a vast scholarly following, a man who practically
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never wore a necktie, an inveterate smoker who ignored prohibitions on smoking, an admirer throughout his life of the USSR, he was a scholar who loved forming scholarly collectives.

Leopold Henri Haimson was born in 1927 and raised in Brussels by Russian émigré parents. They fled amid the German invasion and emigrated to the United States in 1940. Haimson entered Harvard in 1942 at 15, having lied about his age. Admiration for the Red Army’s triumph over Nazi Germany pushed him toward Russian history. He sought little guidance from Karpovich. In fact, he spent most of his graduate years in New York City on Navy-sponsored research into the psychology of Russian behavior under the supervision of Margaret Mead, an advocate of the hypothesis of the impact of swaddling on Russian national character. 171

He completed his dissertation in 1952, 172 and three years later published it, with few revisions, as The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism. 173 The study presents a psychological analysis, up to 1905, of Plekhanov, Aksel’rod, Martov, and Lenin. Its leitmotif is the ways in which the concepts “consciousness” and “spontaneity” influenced their development as intellectuals and revolutionaries. For a scholar who later emphasized underlying social structures, this was an interesting start. Applying psychological analysis to his subjects was also a novel approach in Russian history at this point. His presentation of Lenin as displaying underhanded and hyper-controlling tendencies (using “Machiavellian tactics,” he “steam-rollered” opponents [171]), as well as his hatred for liberalism, was consonant with the interpretation Pipes began to develop a few years later. Interestingly, Haimson supplied a thin scholarly apparatus, a propensity he exhibited throughout his career.

172 Leopold Haimson, “Consciousness and Spontaneity: Explorations into the Origins of Bolshevism and Menshevism” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1952).
In spring 1956, Haimson was invited to teach Karpovich’s Russian intellectual history course at Harvard. According to Jonathan Beecher, there were only three people enrolled, Beecher himself and two graduate students. “Haimson lectured formally just as he would have lectured to an audience of 100. He didn’t invite, or take, questions during the lectures. If we wanted to talk with him, he said, ‘Come to my office hours.’” Beecher loved the course, especially Haimson’s intellectual passion, his empathy for his subjects, his sophisticated analysis, and his encouragement of digging deeper into the complexity of Russian thought.174

That fall, Haimson landed a position at the University of Chicago. There he trained such future leading members of the profession as Richard Wortman and Richard Hellie. Wortman called Haimson’s introductory lecture course “brilliant” and his mentor, compared to the other faculty, “the shining light.”175 At the memorial service for Haimson on March 25, 2011, in the Italian Renaissance revival St. Paul Chapel at Columbia, where Raeff’s memorial service had taken place three years earlier, Wortman recalled that Haimson immediately impressed him “with his enthusiasm, eloquence and energy. I had not encountered anyone like him; I still have not encountered anyone like him.” The life of the mind and Russian history were everything to him. “His love for Russia and the Russian intelligentsia was passionate; he conveyed it to his students, in a dramatic, moving way. And when he spoke about Russia he was larger than life, commanding, dominating.” Perhaps “domineering” would have been an equally applicable term. According to Wortman, “Leopold quickly and clearly distinguished between those who belonged to his circle and those who didn’t—there could be no mistakes about that. But those who did belong were fired with a sense of importance, destiny, the significance of their work, a calling.”176

175 Richard Wortman to the author, September 29, 2016.
During most of his Chicago years (1959 to 1965), Haimson headed the Inter-University Project on the History of the Menshevik Movement. He immersed himself in the Menshevik world, through interviews and wide ranging research, spending much time in New York City. From these encounters, he published texts and interviews but little of his own work.\footnote{See, for example, Leopold H. Haimson, ed., \textit{The Mensheviks: From the Revolution of 1917 to the Second World War}, with contributions by David Dallin et al.; trans. Gertrude Vakar (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).} His investigations led Haimson to question the accepted Western interpretation, advanced certainly by Karpovich, of the Russian Revolution of 1917 as an accidental occurrence brought on by the hardship of the war.\footnote{For example, in Michael Karpovich, \textit{Imperial Russia, 1801–1917} (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1932).} In a book chapter of 1960, his central question was why didn’t Russia’s social forces join together to confront the state?—\textit{the} central question of Pipes’s big essay on Russian history, \textit{Russia under the Old Regime} (1974).\footnote{Leopold Haimson, “The Parties and the State: The Evolution of Political Attitudes,” in \textit{The Transformation of Russian Society: Aspects of Social Change since 1861}, ed. Cyril E. Black (Harvard University Press, 1960), 110–45.} Most important, in a two-part \textit{Slavic Review} article in 1964–1965, Haimson argued that twin polarizations—between workers and educated society on the one hand and society and the government on the other—had fatally weakened social stability in urban Russia on the eve of the war.\footnote{Haimson, “The Problem of Social Stability in Urban Russia.”} Colleagues in the West responded with a debate pitting “optimists” against “pessimists.” The study became an instant classic, pulled droves of budding scholars toward social history, and inspired the revisionist approach to the Russian Revolution.

During these years, Haimson made his first trips to the USSR and became passionately engaged with Soviet scholars. He was elated by the positive response of younger Soviet colleagues to a paper he presented in Moscow in 1962 at the Institute of History and the warm personal relations he formed with several of them, including V. S. Diakin, A. M. Anfimov, and Iu. I.
Kirianov. He spent a good part of the 1965–1966 academic year doing archival research in Moscow. The archivists treated him very well. As he wrote to Raeff, he was “buried under a mountain of dela.” For the rest of his career, collaborative scholarship with Soviet (and then Russian) colleagues became a central goal of his life’s work. The perestroika years were his best from this point of view: he had freer access to scholars and other intellectuals and more latitude for joint enterprises. (The materialism of the 1990s tempered his enthusiasm.)

In 1965, Haimson left Chicago and joined Raeff at Columbia University, thanks in part to a glowing recommendation from Pipes. Haimson made a big impact at Columbia through the training of dozens of graduate students. He taught them to pay careful attention to the specifics of how historical actors expressed themselves, to avoid obvious interpretations, and, following the Annales School, to break down historical developments into “structures,” “conjunctures,” and “events.”

Haimson and Raeff were both devoted to their graduate students (though apparently neither was much interested in undergraduates). Their strengths and talents complemented each other. Raeff was cerebral, distant, formal, and dry and living in New Jersey, but an erudite comparativist; Haimson was passionate and emotional, “like a poet” and living right near campus. They were “like Yin and Yang,” according to Samuel Ramer. Whereas Raeff devoted himself to home-cooking, Haimson was a gourmet, “knew and appreciated haute cuisine, had deep knowledge of French
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Though both scholars were devoted to the life of the mind, Raeff was more of a homebody, much more down-to-earth; Haimson, though a bohemian, savored high living. Wortman recalled him staying during the Gorbachev era “in the old Leningrad Hotel (now part of the Astoria), where it was said the poet Esenin ended his life. He luxuriated in the old-world opulence, sat on a couch reading, writing, and enjoying a drink, with Cuban cigars strewn about the room.” Like Zelnik at Berkeley, Haimson was worried that Raeff might “corrupt” his graduate students. Thus, during frequent leaves of absence he would recruit such trusted replacements, as Alfred Rieber.

As in any close-knit family, there were downsides and tensions. Haimson put very little distance between himself and his PhD students, something Raeff did not appreciate. Some pointed to a rivalry between these two towering figures, which complicated affairs for their graduate students, though others had no trouble working with both. There were jealousies among Haimson’s students and other admirers, many of whom competed for his attention and built up a cult-like status around him.

Haimson delighted in collaborative scholarly ventures. A 1968 graduate seminar evolved into a book on Russian rural politics in 1905–1917. Haimson’s contribution emphasized the intransigent dominance in Russia’s countryside of some 30,000 hereditary nobles. His paper at one meeting of an ongoing Seminar on Russian and Soviet social history in Philadelphia argued that by fall 1917 the vast majority of industrial workers staunchly supported the Bolsheviks and that active

---

190 Richard Wortman to the author, October 1, 2016.
191 Alfred Rieber to the author, November 28, 2016.
192 Personal communication with Lillian Raeff, December 16, 2015.
193 For example, Robert Edelman to the author, May 28, 2016; Personal communication with Mark Von Hagen, October 9, 2016.
194 For example, Peter Holquist to the author, September 21, 2015.
or passive support of all major social groups ensured Bolshevik victory in the Civil War. A series of European workshops in 1975–1990 focused on the development of labor movements in the early twentieth century; the central focus was Russia, with other countries serving as test cases more than stand-alone investigations. Haimson’s main concerns were the militancy of Russian metal workers and the growing discontent of Russian workers in general. Another series of workshops took place in Leningrad/St. Petersburg in 1990–1998. At one, he supplied evidence that the Russian masses increasingly demanded to be treated with dignity. At another, he concluded that by mid-1917 social tensions had grown so deep that any option but the Bolshevik one was doomed to fail. At the final conference, he contended that the failure of liberal political leaders to join hands with workers and soldiers predetermined the Revolution’s outcome.

In some of his later work, Haimson returned to the question of leadership. Martov remained his hero, but he could not shake free from a grudging admiration for the Machiavellian Lenin who

alone had taken charge of the chaos and imposed consciousness on spontaneity. 203 Thus everything fit into his Annaliste schema: the long-term polarization was exacerbated by the medium-term events of the grueling World War, but only the consciousness and individual decisions of skilled Vyborg district workers transformed the spontaneous, mass demonstrations of late February 1917 into a revolution and made possible the conscious Leninist “overturn” on October. The binary “spontaneous-conscious,” with which Haimson began his career, remained central in his historical understanding to the very end.

***

The Pleiade kept in touch after they finished graduate school for several years. Malia wrote quite friendly letters to Pipes in the 1950s. Years later, however, speaking of his relationship with Pipes during graduate school, he said: “I barely knew him.” 204 He was also clearly resentful even decades later that Pipes had landed the Harvard job. 205 They clashed publicly more than once in the New Republic and the Times Literary Supplement, as well as in a debate at Berkeley. 206 Pipes considered Malia’s The Soviet Tragedy “very intelligent and well written,” though “not, really, a historical study but an essay of the kind that is very popular in France where Malia has his intellectual roots.” 207 Raeff agreed that Malia’s “actual production has been so limited, that it is impossible to say what he is in fact as an historian.” He also saw him as “something of an aloof, very private individual, maybe even a bit of a cold fish.” 208
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Malia later admitted that his favorite of the Five was Raeff, because of his quadri-lingual cosmopolitanism and historical erudition. By contrast, “the others were grimly, narrowly focused on Russia.”\textsuperscript{209} Such a judgment really could be made only of Haimson, whose argument that October 1917 “was not caused by the war,” was simply ridiculous to Malia.\textsuperscript{210} In this, the other three—as well as Karpovich—would have agreed with Malia wholeheartedly.

Malia and Haimson exchanged a few letters from 1964 to 1972, mostly requesting from each other letters of recommendation for projects that never materialized. In the early 1970s, in his Russian history survey at Berkeley, Malia “clearly sympathized with the Haimson thesis” on dual polarizations in Russia on the eve of World War I.\textsuperscript{211} In his last letter to Malia, Haimson praised his review of Nadezhda Mandelstam’s memoir \textit{Hope against Hope}.\textsuperscript{212} Yet Haimson reviled Malia’s later interpretation of Marxism as the cause of Stalinism: he vehemently objected to placing Malia’s \textit{The Soviet Tragedy} on the syllabus of a course he team-taught in the 1990s with Yanni Kotsonis and then, having relented, refused to attend the session in which it was discussed.\textsuperscript{213} By contrast, Haimson included Pipes’s \textit{Russia Under the Old Regime} on his colloquium syllabus of fundamental readings in late Imperial Russia, presumably because Pipes’s argument that Russian political culture led to Stalinism was more congenial to him.\textsuperscript{214}

While Malia apparently did not greatly respect Riasanovsky’s intellect,\textsuperscript{215} the latter admired Malia as a scholar with a “very sharp and skeptical mind, and who at the same time is magnificent in
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yet as a colleague he found him unreliable and lamented his lack of productivity. He admitted that Malia’s focus on politics beginning in the 1980s made him more productive but felt also “probably less of a scholar.”

Pipes and Haimson exchanged a few dozen letters from 1958, mostly relating to the Menshevik Project, of whose governing board Pipes was a member. Haimson carefully read Pipes’s book manuscript on Russian social democracy and pressed him to emphasize more the role of social democratic intellectuals in the organization of St. Petersburg workers. Pipes promised to “try to correct this.” Later in the year (1962), Pipes heaped praise on Haimson’s work on the Mensheviks: “Yours seems to me to be one of the few postwar projects which will really leave a lasting mark on Russian studies.” Their relationship broke down in 1966, however. Haimson strongly urged Pipes to invite Soviet scholars to the conference on the Russian Revolution he was organizing. But Pipes demurred, patiently explaining that the best Soviet historians would not be allowed to attend,

and if by some chance they were permitted to come, they would have to deliver canned papers of the kind that have almost wrecked international historical conferences. . . . the group would inevitably include one or more KGB agents whose job it would be to observe and note, and who, by their presence, would certainly constrain free discussion.

Haimson was not swayed. He replied, “I think it is probably best to count me out as far as the plans for the conference are concerned. My regards to Irene.”

---
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Years later, Haimson claimed that he had fallen out with Pipes over his willful misinterpretations of documents in his social democracy book, which seems unlikely given their exchange of letters about the manuscript. By contrast, Pipes seems to have understood Haimson very well, seeing in him “a kind of personal and intellectual excitability, a certain lack of proportion and balance, and an inability to gauge the value of time, his own as well as that of others, but these shortcomings can be interpreted as the obverse side of a brilliant mind with its impatience and temperaments.”

Pipes invited Riasanovsky to serve as a visiting professor at Harvard in fall 1961 and made arrangements for his stay in Cambridge. Riasanovsky “was glad to know” that Pipes found the Soviet portion of his *History of Russia* “rather too kind to Stalin,” because although anti-Soviet he always tried to present the most balanced interpretation. Still, years later Riasanovsky admitted that in regard to the USSR, he “was always more in favor of hard policy although of course completely short of preventive war.” He in fact even sympathized with the view that it was Star Wars [the Strategic Defense Initiative] that finished the Soviet Union off.

Riasanovsky and Haimson apparently had no relationship at all. Riasanovsky’s review of Haimson’s first book, while kindly pointing out its positive contributions, is mostly a scathing critique. “The account is glib and superficial,” he notes. “The basic contrast between ‘consciousness’ and ‘spontaneity,’ between men of thought and men of feeling [as an] approach generally suffers from vagueness and sloppiness.” This was a strikingly harsh review from a typically generous scholar.
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Riasanovsky and Raeff corresponded occasionally from the late 1950s to 1986. Raeff did not think much of him as a scholar. He wrote to Pipes that his thesis “was a very competent, unimaginative summary of the existing conceptions on the subject.” Still, he and Riasanovsky had “a rather pleasant chat” in Chicago at the AHA meeting in 1953, and Riasanovsky recommended Raeff’s candidacy for a position at the University of Pennsylvania in 1959.

Haimson and Raeff corresponded abundantly from 1959 to 1984, often in French. They clashed over the student protests of 1968 and whether to tenure Sheila Fitzpatrick a decade later. Raeff did not find much value in Haimson’s social scientific methods. As he wrote back in 1958 to Isaiah Berlin, “the behavioral approach in political science and sociology only produces rather sterile pilot studies.” Years later he called it “groundless and inconceivable for a historian to extrapolate from events at one point into the future, for example, from the strikes of 1912–1914.” Moreover, “in 1917 Russian society completely collapsed and therefore the events of the revolution unfolded in a completely different set of circumstances from those in 1914.” A more direct repudiation of Haimson’s celebrated argument would be hard to imagine.

Of the Five, Pipes and Raeff had the closest relationship for the longest period of time. They exchanged dozens of letters throughout the 1950s. The friendship was strong enough to weather Raeff’s sometimes crotchety attitude, at least until 1959 when the correspondence broke off. Raeff later admitted that the rift “may have” been his fault, which was also the impression of Lillian
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Raeff. Their regular correspondence recommenced in the mid-1970s and continued until the year before Raeff passed away in 2008.

***

Despite contrary claims, Karpovich strongly influenced the Pleiade’s intellectual development. Malia followed closest in Karpovich’s footsteps. He derived his signature concept—the cultural gradient—from his mentor. The corollary that Russia was a European country was also vintage Karpovich. So, as well, was Malia’s emphasis on the danger of unbridled ideology. When Malia extended this insight to blame Stalinism primarily on Marxist principles, however, it seems likely that Karpovich would have counseled a more careful balance between the impact of ideology and historical factors. For years, Riasanovsky called himself Karpovich’s “grateful pupil” but also (to others) insisted that Karpovich had not inspired his scholarly evolution. He often focused on topics uncongenial to his mentor. Yet he ultimately adopted positions very close to those of Karpovich—such as on Official Nationality and Russian patriotism. Far more skeptical, but also deeply appreciative, were Pipes and Raeff. They saw eye to eye on such crucial matters as the weakness of Russian institutions, the utopian and therefore impractical strain within Russian intellectual life, the overweening power of the state, the imperialistic tendencies of Russian foreign policy, and the conservative nature of Russian political culture. They gratefully appreciated Karpovich’s skeptical, comparative, and analytic approach to history, but they were far more pessimistic than he about the chances for a fortunate historical evolution of Russia. As in so much else, Haimson was the outlier. He rejected nearly everything in Karpovich’s approach in favor of a social scientific analysis and a search for what Karpovich would have considered simplistic interpretations of Russia’s development. If Malia and Riasanovsky heeded their mentor too much, Haimson did so too little. Yet, ironically, on one matter Haimson was the closest to Karpovich: as an
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organizer of a community, in this case not the Russian émigré community in America but an international community of *marxisant* scholars.

Although Karpovich published very little, his personal kindness and intellectual openness to diverse ideas, his willingness to support any intellectual venture his students wished to pursue, his avoidance of pushing specific research topics, his wide-ranging comparative historical framework, and his critical brilliance and ability to discern logical and rhetorical flaws in arguments undoubtedly made him a superb graduate advisor. The fact that he was at Harvard, a great intellectual center, the one endowed with the most resources for pursuing Russian history, surely explains the constellation around him of the Pleiade and many other budding scholars. Karpovich was rightly proud of his intellectual progeny and reveled vicariously in their scholarly triumphs. He singled out Pipes and Malia as his most talented apprentices, according to his son Sergei, though his personal favorite was Malia.236

Together, the Pleiade founded Russian historical studies in the United States through their training of nearly all the major Russian historians either directly or indirectly and through the new fields and subfields they established or developed to a high level, including social history (Haimson), labor history (Haimson), institutional and legal history (Raeff), intellectual history (Malia), emigration studies (Raeff), conservative thought (Riasanovsky and Pipes), nationalities (Pipes). They also developed important themes, such as the Revolution as inevitable (Haimson), the cultural gradient (Malia), Russian political culture as determinant (Pipes), the power of ideas and ideology (Malia), the otherness of Russia (Pipes), and the contribution of law to politics (Raeff). Riasanovsky’s textbook may have exerted a bigger sway than any other single book by introducing hundreds of thousands of students to the field.

Is it possible to establish which of the five had the greatest impact? Pipes was the most prolific: he published more books than the others combined. His *h*-index (a metric that quantifies
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authors’ citation frequency) is by far the highest—30, compared to 21 for Raeff, 16 for Riasanovsky, 15 for Malia, and 12 for Haimson.\textsuperscript{237} Of course, these numbers do not capture the extraordinary influence Haimson exerted through interpersonal relations with his graduate students and broader following.

Haimson’s intellectual brilliance and passion shone through his frequent otherworldliness, lack of common sense, inattention to practical detail, and forgetfulness. There is no doubt of the mental virtuosity and erudition of the other four or of their devotion to scholarship as to a sacred calling, but none was possessed of intellectual passion to anything like the same degree as Haimson. His dedication to scholarship was fueled by faith in a cause greater than the pursuit of truth, namely, the hope for a transformation of the world according to the teachings of Marx. This faith is embodied in a 1988 photograph showing Haimson in Moscow, fist aloft, holding himself straight with an impish smile, scruffy hair, a pipe at his lips, and, in the background, a sign reading “Russian Communist Workers Party Central Committee.” A caption says: “An old Social Democrat in the new Russia.”\textsuperscript{238}

The Pleiade all cared about their graduate students, though perhaps Malia least of all, but none with the abandon of Haimson. Seymour Becker recalled him making irate interventions when his advisees were not selected for fellowships or academic employment.\textsuperscript{239} Haimson trained three cohorts of graduate students. His eclectic brood at the University of Chicago pursued a wide variety of scholarly interests. At Columbia, in the early years, he tried, often successfully, to impose a social history, worker-oriented agenda. In his later years at Columbia, his focus, in addition to industrial workers, was an \textit{Annaliste}-based emphasis on linguistic analysis and attention to mentalities. This third cohort also fell strongly under the influence of Stephen Kotkin, who stepped in to teach a

\textsuperscript{237} I am grateful to Sandy De Groote at the UIC Library for help with processing and formatting citation data from Google Scholar.

\textsuperscript{238} Potolov, Ot redaktora, in \textit{Rabochie i intelligentsiia Rossii}, 22.

Soviet seminar in 1990. Kotkin brought not only a brilliant intellect, but also an emphasis on ideology he had imbibed from Malia and a critical analysis taken from Foucault. Given the dramatically varied scholarly pursuits of these three cohorts, it seems difficult to talk about a Haimson “school.” There was undoubtedly a personal loyalty to Haimson as a passionately devoted mentor to those graduate students and scholars whom he considered part of his inner circle. But did his interpretations of Russian history have powerful resonance either within that circle or outside it?

Ultimately, one can argue that of the five, Pipes was the most influential, even among scholars. Haimson’s faith in Marxism, enthusiasm for the Russian Revolution, and belief in the centrality to Russian historical development of skilled workers command scant intellectual allegiance today. His alertness to the nuance of language as a method for understanding cultural evolution, and especially his zealous, if somewhat unbalanced, brilliance remain with those he taught and befriended. But little of his interpretations of Russian history retain force. Yes, Russia on the eve of the World War was unstable, but why? Why did the revolution descend into a hell of violence and autocracy? Malia’s argument, that extremist ideology was to blame, when he developed it forcefully in 1994, provided a welcome corrective to two decades of social history “with the politics left out,” whose elaboration was fostered above all by Haimson. It is hard to argue against the idea that the imposition in any society of “integral socialism,” that is, the complete eradication of private property and the market, will inevitably destroy its economy and result in political absolutism. Malia was surely right that the Bolsheviks had two choices: continue forward with integral socialism or modify their program. After the partial “retreat” of the New Economic Policy, they chose the former. But why?
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Only Pipes, of the Pleiade, provided an answer, an interpretation he began developing at the very start of his career and continued to build on for over a half-century. Russia’s political culture, he argued, is authoritarian. Russians tend toward absolutism, prefer strong leaders, disrespect the law, feel a weak allegiance to institutions. Wittingly or unwittingly the other four undergirded this contention in a variety of ways. Raeff’s work on the “well-ordered police state,” which emphasized the weakness of “intermediary bodies” in early modern Russia as the prime factor inhibiting successful political and social convergence with European best practices, rendered him and his old friend far closer intellectually than any of the other members of the Pleiade. Riasanovsky, a Russian patriot like Karpovich, earnestly wanted to develop “normalizing” interpretations of Russian history. Yet his emphasis on the Official Nationality and Slavophilism brought out the “otherness” of Russian political culture. Karpovich wanted him to see Official Nationality as a marginal intellectual phenomenon, but Riasanovsky was too good a scholar to deny what his evidence was telling him: the authoritarian ideology had broad intellectual appeal. Malia’s overarching scholarly interpretation, beginning with his first publication, provided an explanation for why radical ideology worked so powerfully in Russia: the weakness of society and the overweening authority of the government fostered extremist thought and made it difficult for politically centrist agendas to attract fervent allegiance. In other words, his underlying interpretation of Russian history was at odds with his Karpovichian adherence to the dogma of modern Russia as a Europeanized Western country and brought him closer to Pipes than he overtly professed.

The same is undoubtedly true of a host of other Russian historians who would be loath to admit any intellectual affinity or filiation with Richard Pipes, a “Cold War hawk,” a “hardliner,” a “right-winger,” the chair of the Team-B strategic committee, an official in the Reagan administration. Yet in researching this article, I conversed with many scholars who admitted to me that ultimately “Pipes was right.” In particular, several believe that the return to authoritarianism under Vladimir Putin can be understood best from a Pipesian perspective. A shift has certainly been
evident in the field. In fact, one might conclude that in Russian history there are two main “schools” or “trends.” One stems from Karpovich and other contemporary Russian émigrés like Alexander Gerschenkron. Its main thesis is that all societies tend to develop according to a set pattern, in the direction of greater and greater freedom, with an ultimate convergence toward Western cultures. Probably the origin of this idea lies with Hegel. Of course, Malia and Riasanovsky were followers of this school, and so perhaps was Haimson. The other interpretation is perhaps primarily that of Pipes, with antecedents going back to Montesquieu analytically and to myriad travelers’ accounts since the early modern era experientially. As surprising as it might seem, given the rancorous debates and animosities in the 1980s and 1990s between Pipes and the social history revisionists, it seems that ultimately the “Pipes school” will prove more enduring than any other.