But this utopia, Liebich concludes, should not be limited by Mannheim's distinctions between utopia and ideology. Instead, Cieszkowski represents a serious attempt, bolstered by an ultimate faith in Providence, to find a "third force . . . that of radical but non-revolutionary reform." (Ideology, p. 299)

Between Ideology and Utopia combines impressive research with skillful argumentation. Liebich also writes with engagement and clarity. This very readable style is reflected as well in his translations in Selected Writings of Prolegomena, Of Credit and Circulation, Condition of Rural Workers, Prophetic Words of a Pole, and Our Father. Liebich's lengthy introduction to the Selected Writings restates his fundamental arguments in the monograph but sacrifices some of the rich detail. Both books will be read with profit and enjoyment by European intellectual historians and by Polish historians alike.
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Professor Naimark's fine history of the first Polish Marxist party, Proletariat, is a significant addition to the scholarly literature of European and Polish socialism. It surpasses previous English-language works; and, because of the author's extensive archival research and balanced presentation, this study will greatly interest historians in Poland and the Soviet Union.

The opening chapters delineate the socio-economic conditions that prepared the way for the emergence of Proletariat. There are brief discussions of Polish utopian socialism and the ineffectiveness of tsarist Russification policies after the January Insurrection and an extensive presentation of the industrialization of Congress Poland within the framework of a Polish working class, whose living conditions were, relatively speaking, higher than those of their Russian counterparts. It is clear that political as well as "objective" socio-economic factors prepared the ground for socialism in Congress Poland.

The most original background chapter discusses the impact of Warsaw Positivism on the origins of Polish Marxism, a topic almost completely ignored by Polish scholars. The positivists, in the aftermath of the January Insurrection, rejected armed conspiratorial activity as inappropriate at that time, criticized the nation's past, and spoke of creating a strong national organism encompassing every social class through science, education and commercial-industrial development, all of which they expected to democratize Poland's rural-gentry society. Essentially an intelligentsia and middle-class phenomenon, Warsaw Positivism's critical view of the national past, its faith in science, and its progressive and liberal ideas about Poland's future were points that it shared in common with the idealistic socialists. Several Polish socialists acknowledged a partial intellectual debt to Warsaw Positivism, and the positivist press, while opposing socialism and hoping to discredit it, performed a valuable propaganda service in opening its pages to socialist writers. Furthermore, this same press first recognized the existence and conditions of Warsaw's urban working class. Although Warsaw Positivism occupied the opposite side of the political spectrum, it did help to prepare the way for socialism.

Professor Naimark's assessment of Warsaw Positivism is sound, and he effectively compares and contrasts the two conflicting ideological currents. However, strong exception can be taken with his statement that the positivists, on the "national question," were "far less concerned with denying the attributes of Polish nationhood than with vilifying all forms of Polish idealism and ushering in an age of national realism." The positivists
strongly criticized Polish romanticism as inappropriate for the post-1863 era, but they respected the works of Mickiewicz as appropriate for an era now in the past. They harshly and appropriately questioned former policies, but that was not vilification except in the eyes of those who had embraced Polish messianism as an article of faith.

Socialism was one of the forces that both undermined Warsaw Positivism as a dominant current in Polish politics and reactivated political life in Congress Poland. Using police records, letters, memoirs, and the socialist press, the author relates the history of Proletariat, the first modern Polish political party, in great detail. His work explores the attraction of Polish youth from the kresy to socialism in Russian schools in the 1870s, the arrival of the gifted Ludwik Waryński in Warsaw in 1876 and the first socialist circles in Congress Kingdom, the ideological development of Polish socialism in exile in Galicia and Geneva; the formation of Proletariat (1882) with its Marxist ideological platform and plan of action, and the destruction of the Party by tsarist authorities (1883-85). Professor Naimark ably contends that Proletariat, despite its close and controversial association with Russian socialists, particularly with Narodnaia Volya, was a genuinely Polish socialist movement and not a mere offshoot of Russian socialism.

The early Polish Marxists in the Brussels Program, at the Geneva Conference commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the November Insurrection, and in the “Confidential Agreement” signed with Narodnaia Volya chose to overlook Marx’s championship of Poland’s independence and rejected the national struggle for independence, unequivocally committing themselves both to internationalism as a loftier idea than Polish patriotism (which was at least as severe in tone, if not more so, than the Warsaw Positivists’ critique of Polish romantic politics) split the Polish socialist movement into two currents and earned for the Polish Marxists the continuing suspicion of Polish society. As the author shows, the Brussels Program did not exclude the possibility of a resurrected Poland while the “Confidential Agreement” recognized, because of local conditions, the individuality and autonomy of both movements. The “Confidential Agreement” was a unique moment in Russian-Polish revolutionary relations that must be appreciated for its own merits and within its own context; this the author does. Proletariat, however, never came to grips with Polish national sentiment, thereby missing an opportunity to combine the social and the national struggles and forfeiting the support of a significant segment of the intelligentsia.

Evaluating Proletariat’s place in history is a complex matter. Proletariat did not fail because of its position on the question of Polish nationalism, but because it was an unequal opponent in the unequal struggle against tsardom. Hence, an alliance with Russian socialists might have been a realistic response to the political realities of the 1880s, although the choice of the ally can be questioned. Proletariat, however, not only underestimated the strength of Narodnaia Volya, but also of Polish national sentiment, thereby weakening the attraction of Marxism in Poland.

On the more positive side, Proletariat did help to imprint a socialist class consciousness upon the Polish workers’ movement in Congress Poland and to bring the Polish worker into the arena of national politics before the peasantry. Proletariat also helped to activate political life in Congress Poland in the 1880s, awakening the Polish intelligentsia’s political conscience. Here, Polish socialism played a major role, and one certainly unintended by the members of Proletariat, in stimulating modern Polish nationalism; for socialism in the 1880s was often the entry vehicle for the radical intelligentsia (e.g., Piłsudski and Balicki) into the political struggle. Polish socialism in the 1880s was instrumental in laying the foundation for modern Polish political parties, but in the following decades the struggle for independence would overshadow social issues. It is questionable, however, whether the struggle for social justice went into total eclipse, as the author seems to imply; rather, it merged with the national struggle with the formation of the Polska Partia Socjalistyczna, the dominant force in Polish socialism until 1945.