

## European Exile for Russian Westernizers: The *Logos* Circle

Alexander Dmitriev

### ABSTRACT

The present study deals with some significant changes imputable to the status of exile in the work of a group of Russian academic scholars, who had earlier negotiated a brilliant connection with exceptionally prominent German humanists and social scientists during their pre-war academic residence in German universities. Briefly stated, the case study of the *Logos* group shows that the shift from a nationally localized to a cosmopolitan (or at least "Westernized") scientific mode that students of the 1930s intellectual exile from Germany have increasingly emphasized (Ash & Söllner 1996) can by no means be generalized to other situations. If anything, the Russian example under review shows the opposite trend. This suggests the need for analytical models in the comparative study of exiles, which possess sufficient subtlety to identify complex historical constellations, rather than generalizations derived from grand theories of system change.

The lessons of inter-war Russian emigration are very important, not only for contemporary Russian intellectual history but also for the comparative study of exiles, and they are especially so in our case: how and why can exile and the context of intense political and ideological conflict transform the pro-European or indeed almost cosmopolitan attitudes originally held by a certain group of scholars in the humanities? From the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Russian social thought had modelled itself on, and developed against the background of, European science and thought in the humanities. What was special about the evolution of intellectual life in Russia during the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was that philosophical tendencies and world views – Ernst Mach's 'second positivism', the philosophical and religious heritage of Vladimir Soloviev and neo-Kantianism – were superimposed upon, and complexly combined with, the main political ideologies: Marxism, populism, liberalism and conservatism (which was of a relatively moderate variety in intellectual circles). On the whole, the Russian scholarly community tended towards left liberalism. Like the Russian *intelligentsi*, a distinct if not precisely delimited social formation, with porous boundaries – academic scholars, however oriented to their respective disciplines, espoused an ethics of social responsibility and

were convinced that they had to work for the good of their people (McClelland 1979).

The enlightenment ideology implicitly espoused by a majority of Russian academics at the time was closer to the radical world-view of French Republican intellectuals than to the 'Mandarin' ideal of the state as a guarantor of cultural values prevalent in the German universities (Ringer 1969).<sup>1</sup> Despite their status as civil servants employed by one of the departments of the imperial administration, the Russian academic intellectuals perceived their scholarly activities at the universities or in the system of the Academy of Sciences as aiming to serve the people and assist society's progress. The majority of Russian scientists supported the political ideals of Western constitutional democracy.

The intellectual contacts between Russia and the West were facilitated before 1917, most importantly, by Russian students enrolled at foreign universities and by post-graduates preparing for professorships at Russian universities and sent abroad on state scholarships. Apart from rather formalized contacts on the level of the Academies of Sciences and international congresses, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century the 'Republic of Scholars' existed as a relatively unified academic market, especially for East Europeans and Russians who for some reason were excluded from higher education in their home countries (Karady 1998, 2002). From the beginning of the century the Russian student diaspora at German universities grew constantly, including large proportions of those groups who had limited access to universities in the Russian Empire due to conscious Tsarist policy: women, Jews, Poles and members of radical parties (Peter 2001).

The next level (and segment) of this mostly West European academic market was the system of post-graduate training and defending doctoral theses (mostly in subjects and fields of research that were less developed in students' home universities); this also includes Russian professorial bursars sent abroad. Of the 10–15% of university graduates 'retained' at the universities to prepare for a professorship who were sent abroad before 1914, most went to Germany. German also remained the main language of scientific communication in Russia at the time. Until 1917, émigré revolutionaries or liberals acted as a kind of laboratory of political thought (as in Herzen's case) in the domain of *intelligentsi*, while philosophy and especially the social sciences were tightly linked with the

---

<sup>1</sup> The distinction between *intelligentsi* and academic scholars is worked out in German debates arising not only out of the situation described by Ringer but also out of the dispute between proponents of *Bildung* and *Wissenschaft* as the goal of higher education, with the question of *Weltanschauung* as a synecdoche of the differences. Cf. Loader & Kettler 2001 and Kettler & Lauer 2005. The concept of *intelligentsi*, however, was imported from Russia, notably by Masaryk (1919).

European (French and above all German) academic community. The mingling of *intelligentsi* and academic scholars – and their characteristic habits of mind was fairly promiscuous among the Russians in Western Europe, especially among the students. Yet the scientific prestige of those universities and the inner integrity of the sciences in those sites, including especially the humanities, were of utmost importance, especially as viewed from the Russian academic scene.

It would be entirely wrong, however, to perceive pre-war Russian science as entirely dependent on German science or being clearly situated on its margins. It was the *relatively* peripheral status of the Russian scientific community that made Russian scholars perceive the ‘Western’ system of universities and academies in the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as a unified whole; the national peculiarities of the British, French and German scholarly communities were of secondary importance to them. Thus Russian scholars viewed the European ‘Republic of knowledge’ as more international than it was, which explains their surprise and dismay at the hostility between German and French colleagues, for example, which marked the scene when they returned to Western Europe in the 1920s, but now as émigrés. The shift in status and perspective had other consequences as well.

The present study deals with some significant changes imputable to the status of exile in the work of a group of Russian academic scholars, who had earlier negotiated a brilliant connection with exceptionally prominent German humanists and social scientists during their pre-war academic residence in German universities. Briefly stated, the case study of the *Logos* group shows that the shift from a nationally localized to a cosmopolitan (or at least “Westernized”) scientific mode that students of the 1930s intellectual exile from Germany have increasingly emphasized (Ash & Söllner 1996) can by no means be generalized to other situations. If anything, the Russian example under review shows the opposite trend. This suggests the need for analytical models in the comparative study of exiles, which possess sufficient subtlety to identify complex historical constellations, rather than generalizations derived from grand theories of system change.

### ***Logos* in pre-war Germany and Russia**

Of special significance for the contacts between Russian and German scholars in the humanities on the eve of the First World War, was the international philosophical journal *Logos* published in Tübingen and Saint-Petersburg from 1910 by the Germans, Richard Kroner and Georg Mehlis, as well as by the Russians, Fedor Stepun (1884–1965), Sergey Hessen (1887–1950) and Boris Jakovenko (1884–1948), arising out of an earlier joint philosophical circle in Heidelberg (Kramme 1995). The three Russian editors, recently graduated from German universities, were fairly representative of the transitory Russian intellectual diaspora.

Jakovenko's father belonged to the modest Ukrainian gentry and was not only a former revolutionary activist but also the author of popular biographies; Stepun was born in the family of a land agent of German origin, and Hessen's father, Joseph Hessen was well-known Jewish lawyer and editor, as well being among the founders of the reformist Kadet party. The first product of this Russian-German philosophical cooperation, even before *Logos*, was a joint collection of articles published by the young scholars, entitled *Vom Messias* (1909) (Treiber 1995). This neo-Romantic book, which resonated with the sense of cultural crisis pervasive in German writings of the time, included an article by Kroner entitled 'A Page from the Journal of Our Time' and monographic articles by Mehlis on Comte, by Hessen on Herzen and by Stepun on the noted Russian religious thinker, Vladimir Soloviev (Belkin 2000: 44–59). Before 1914, then, *Logos* appeared in two versions and languages: the German edition was published by J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) and the Russian one by the Symbolist publishing house *Musaget*, then by M.O. Wolf's book-trading company. In total, eight issues of the journal appeared in Russian (including three double issues). Apart from occasional pieces by the editors, the Russian version carried key articles translated from the German one, as well as original contributions by Russian thinkers, with the result being the publication of such philosophical or cultural celebrities as Georg Simmel, Heinrich Rickert, Edmund Husserl, Karl Vossler, Nikolay Lossky, Petr Struve, Vyacheslav Ivanov and others (Bezrodny 1992).

The Russian co-founders of the journal were far from united in their philosophical loyalties: Stepun felt most attracted to the heritage of German Romanticism and the historico-philosophical approach of Windelband, Hessen and Jakovenko followed the leading neo-Kantian thinkers, Rickert at Heidelberg for the former and Hermann Cohen at Marburg, for the latter. Despite the prominence of Husserl in German philosophy at the time and his prominent appearance in the very first issue of *Logos*, none of the Russian editors were drawn to phenomenology. Having no institutional links with Russian universities or institutes of the Academy of Sciences, the Russian *Logos* in the 1910s stood out for the rigorous intellectual demands it made, which were also evident in the criteria applied to submissions, as well as for its pronounced penchant for Western (predominately German) scientific philosophy, with special emphasis on epistemology (Stepun 1947). In aspiration, it represented the very antithesis of the ideologized *intelligentsi* styles of thought, whether Marxist, populist, reformist liberal or religiously conservative.

Especially the attempt to build a critical philosophy that would be autonomous from the 'axioms of religious experience,' in keeping with the 'scientific' [*wissenschaftlich*] objectives common to all the *Logos*

editors, met with staunch resistance among the Moscow-based Religious-Philosophical Vladimir Soloviev Memorial Society, whose influential members had rallied around the *Put'* publishing house, subsidized by the arts patron, Margarita Morozova. The militant neo-Slavophile Vladimir Ern rejected the attempt to 'discipline' Russian thought through a 'meonic' rationalism that was alien to it, and presented the Eastern Christian Logos as the true moving force of culture ('A Few Words about *Logos* and the Pretensions to Scientificity in Russian Philosophy,' 1910). Expanding his thesis in an argument with Semen Frank, another follower of Soloviev, Ern clearly stressed the primacy of the religious source of culture, the Absolute, over its 'profane' objectivations, including cultural values (Ern 1991).<sup>2</sup> Ern's ideologized point of view, also shared by some of his companions-in-arms at *Put'*, was rather the exception in the scholarly humanities community. As noted, most university teachers supported universal academic standards and patterned their behaviour on the European scholarly community.

Although the German *Logos* continued to appear until the "coordination" of German philosophy after 1933, the Russian *Logos* was closed down at the outbreak of the First World War for being too closely linked to German thought. Overall, the war was an important milestone in the development of science, especially in terms of its institutional framework and international co-operation. It put the ideals of disinterested and neutral scientific research beyond all national, class and other borders – ideas originally at home in the positivist world-view of the *belle époque*, but adapted as well to the anti-positivist "internationalism" of the *Logos* group and others – to a cruel test. Above all, the war transformed the link between scientific research, on the one hand, and political and social development, on the other; and this also changed the role of the nation-state in the evolution of science as an institution.

More specifically, the First World War ideologized the competition among different schools and national tendencies (vom Brocke 1988; Dmitriev 2002). This is illustrated by Ern's programmatic article 'From Kant to Krupp', a paper given at a meeting of the Moscow Religious-Philosophical Society in 1915. In it Ern derived the emergence of German militarism from the rationalism of modern German philosophy, starting with Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. While the 'Slavophiles' highlighted the rejection of rationalism in their attack on German humanities culture,

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that in personal relations and private correspondence, Ern and the thinkers of the *Put'* circle expressed their respect for the *Logos* editors' (especially Jakowenko's) consistency, honesty and disinterested search for truth (Gollerbach 2000: 355–6).

the ‘Westernizers’ and liberals turned rather to the French and Anglo-Saxon tradition during the war, embracing a wide range of ideas from traditional positivism to Bergson’s vitalistic ‘spiritualism.’ Thus Boris Jakovenko became keenly interested in contemporary American philosophy, especially pragmatism, as is evident in his letter at 1915 from Italy to Russian phenomenologist and Husserl’s disciple Gustav Spet (Spet 1992: 250f). Hessen, in a work published in 1916 and entitled *The Idea of the Nation*, retains his scholarly and abstract manner as he contrasts a truly defensive patriotism for the sake of the victory of the creative spirit with both self-complacent chauvinism and escapist cosmopolitanism (Hessen 1999).<sup>3</sup>

One of the main outcomes of World War I was a change in the composition of the world’s leading scientific powers and the end of the unique and practically leading position of German science, which had been the result of an impressive ‘spurt’ in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Schroeder-Gudehus 1990). After the First World War the international aspects of scientific co-operation on the level of pure research came to depend more and more on *organized* systems of co-operation and their regulation by the state. The ‘patriots’ internationalism’ of the university-based (and predominantly European) ‘Republic of scholars’ of the pre-war period gave way to a state-regulated interaction of researchers who were defined in the first place as representatives of their nations, disciplines and national scientific schools.

### **The Russian *Logos* Group in Exile**

The striking thing is that while the Russian *Logos* group had tried to advance a secular philosophical and epistemologically stringent program before 1914, the members began to incline towards ethical idealism and Christian rationalism in exile. This appears to reverse the direction that Alfons Söllner and others have observed in the case of the German intellectual emigration after 1933. In the circumstances of the 1920s and 1930s, there seemed to be a need to constitute a coherent and accepted presence of the “Russian idea.” Notwithstanding their indisputable ideological influence and consonance with main tendencies of Western thinking, this was achieved neither by the erstwhile ‘legal Marxists,’ such as Pyotr Struve, Semyon Frank, Sergei Bulgakov or Nikolai

---

<sup>3</sup> After February 1917, the political activities of the former editors of the Russian *Logos* manifest themselves mostly on the moderate left wing of the spectrum. Stepun was a official representative of Provisional government in the army, and Hessen took part in social-patriotic group around the journal, *Unity*, which was headed by the father of Russian Marxism Georgy Plekhanov. Jakowenko chose exile already in 1913 because of his closeness to the Socialist Revolutionary Party and its leader Savinkow, and he lived in Italy until 1924.

Berdyayev, as these writers themselves as well as many subsequent commentators have noted, nor by the alternative variant of Russian thinking expressed by the alternative designedly European way of the *Logos*' admirers.

In this context, the Russian exile community in Germany was especially significant for the life of the Russian *Logos* editors, because German philosophy provided the main context for their activities. After the revolution and the civil war, however, the now émigré Russian scholars found their former modernist (liberal or socialist) attitudes to have been strongly shaken or even compromised. The émigré community's harsh and uncompromising anti-Bolshevism engendered a highly distanced and negative attitude towards the Russian revolution in all its phases and to the socialist tendencies, which were perceived to have contributed to the formation and survival of the hateful regime in Russia. The rightward evolution of figures like Struve, Novgorodtsev and, in many ways, Frank, who had been moderate liberals in their politics, bears an eloquent testimony to this fact.<sup>4</sup>

One would have thought that this popularity of 'unshakable' conservative and traditionalist values in the émigré community would draw this emerging frame of mind closer to the anti-Versaille and anti-republican attitudes prevalent in much of the German academic world during the Weimar Republic (Döring 1975; Jansen 1992).<sup>5</sup> But this similarity didn't become a basis for rebuilding stable intellectual ties on pre-war foundations (Koenen & Kopelev 1998). Now that they were no longer representing a whole country (as before 1914) but only its diaspora in Germany and Europe, the Russian thinkers developed a much greater awareness of their affiliation with the context of the Russian national tradition. In many ways, this was a result of the general context of the institutional development of the humanities in Europe in the 1920s, and its increasing orientation to state policies. The Germans were not interested in the émigrés. The political union of the 'pariahs of Versailles' – Soviet Russia and Weimar Germany – that began with the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922, was complemented by a close co-operation between scholarly circles who not long ago had whole-heartedly supported a policy of mutual war till final victory. Most German scholars were interested in being on good terms above all with Soviet

---

<sup>4</sup> The evolution of Berdyayev, who had been close to the others named, was more complex in comparison, leading from the prophecy of the new 'middle ages' during the mid-1920s to the recognition of the immediate relevance of the social question for the modern world and the necessity for a positive rethinking of the social shock to philosophical-religious thinking during the 1930s–1940s (Boobbyer 1995).

<sup>5</sup> See the case of Iwan Iljin, philosopher of law and director of Russian Scientific Institute in Berlin: Tsygankow (2001).

colleagues, not with the small academic exile community and, correspondingly, few opportunities were provided for the intellectual segment of Russian emigration (Voigt 1995).

This circumstance defined the organisational framework of émigré scholars' work in Germany (Williams 1972: 272f). Giving a lecture about Russian history to émigré Russian students or a public talk – in German and for a German audience – on contemporary Russian political or economic issues, addressing a convention of Russian scholars abroad or participating in a seminar organised by 'one's own party' or religious group, writing an article for an émigré journal or reviewing yet another book on Russia (or discussing a work by Soviet colleagues in a German scholarly journal) – such were the main forms in which the Russian humanities existed and developed in German exile (Schlögel 1999: 305ff.). In consequence of this restrictive opportunity structure, they preserved and reproduced a knowledge that remained shut off from methodological (rather than thematic) innovation and, most importantly, from critical self-problematization. Such ad hoc reproduction and improvization is the characteristic hallmarks of intellectuals' work, as distinct from the critical scientific discipline adhering to their earlier scholarly project. There were, to be sure, other ways in which some émigrés could enter the European intellectual context, as by participating as equals in foreign circles or colloquia (Berdyayev in Jacques Maritain's or Gabriel Marcel's circle in Paris in the 1930s), by taking part in the multinational cultural life of inter-war Prague (the Prague Linguistic Circle around Mathesius and Jakobson), or teaching a general subject to non-Russian students (the sociologist Pitirim Sorokin at Harvard). Compared to the 'restrictive' German situation of the second half of the 1920s and early 1930s, these forms offered greater opportunities for a dialogue between the émigré Russian and local cognitive traditions. The question of what defined the specifically 'Russian' character of these other kinds of new intellectual projects, however, remained unsettled (Tioman 1995; Reichelt 1999). The question of national identity could not be laid to rest.

This represented a serious shift for the *Logos* group, for which "international" had been a decisive self-characterization. Jakovenko, it should be said, considered the national form to be only a contingent moment in the development of philosophical knowledge, and he remained highly critical of Russian philosophy for being insufficiently rigorous, professional and systematic – see his *Studies of Russian Philosophy* (Jakovenko 1922). But then, he was away from Germany and the Russian exile there. In his Italian years, Jakovenko took active part in the intellectual life of the country, worked as co-editor in Italian version of *Logos*, published a lot of articles in some periodicals as expert on Russian matters (Garzonio 1999; Renna 2004). He also translated Croce's

book (*Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale*) for Russian publication (1920). Jakovenko (after return from Mussolini's Italy in 1924) and Hessen (until his final Warsaw period from 1935) moved to in Prague, where they collaborated and taught at special higher-educational institutions for Russian exiled youth (Gonč 2000). These educational organizations was established in framework of so-called Russian action at the initiative of Tomas Masaryk, who was not only President of the Czechoslovak Republic but also author of a widely read book on the Russian intelligentsi (Masaryk 1919; Chinyaeva 2001; Andreyev 2004). Hessen's main subject became theoretical pedagogy (Styczynski 2004), while Jakovenko turned to the history of philosophy in Russia, especially the history of Hegelianism. With the publication of a summary statement of his own system of philosophy – “transcendental pluralism” (Jakovenko 1928), Jakovenko suggested that he had remained the same rationalist and even dogmatic thinker in the 1930s as in his earlier period in Russia (Magid 1999). The change in the *Logos* group was not unanimous or straightforward, and they did not abandon their earlier hopes without a struggle.

#### **A Russian *Logos*-in-Exile Experiment**

An important attempt by these émigré philosophers to resume their dialogue with the German intellectual tradition was made in 1925, when they published under exclusively Russian auspices a new issue of their *Logos*, revisiting the project launched by Russian and German doctoral students in Germany fifteen years earlier. In addition to work by the Russian *Logos* group, it included articles by two older Lithuanian philosophers (with similar Russian-German backgrounds) Vassily Sezeman [Wassili Sesemann] (1884–1963) and Nikolay Lossky, both of whom had already published earlier in *Logos*. There was a contribution as well by one of the founding German patrons, Heinrich Rickert.

The renewed *Logos* saw it as its objectives to make sense of the experience of the Russian revolution and to expand upon the dialogue/argument with the main religious-philosophical tradition of Russian pre-revolutionary and émigré thought. The distinctive proposal of the *Logos* group in 1925 was the need to base philosophy on the post-revolutionary situation. The initiators of the new *Logos* took a surprisingly positive view of the social upheaval they had experienced, rather than interpreting it in terms of retribution, disaster and ‘an experience of collapse’ (the point of view espoused by most émigré thinkers). The Berlin circle of religious philosophers accordingly took a negative view of Jakovenko's undertaking. Berdyaev told Struve as much in a letter written in late 1922 to dissuade the latter from contributing to the renewed *Logos*: ‘As a matter of principle we cannot join them. The platform of Jakovenko's journal will be a mental acceptance of the revolution, as expressed in F.A. Stepun's recent lecture

in Berlin. Moreover, the journal intends to be at odds with the traditions of Russian religious philosophy. Now that our journal has appeared, Jakovenko's journal is becoming less relevant ... Il'yin and Frank have already turned Jakovenko down. We need to concentrate our ideological forces' (Struve 2000: 174).

The introductory note to *Logos* concludes with a programmatic thesis:

The Russian revolution is not only a tremendous destructive force, but also a source of new life and new creativity. As an event of an unprecedented scale it gives every one of us a novel sense of existence. And it is in the sense of existence, in an intense ontological sense of self that we see the foundations and guarantee of that flowering and deepening of all of Russian culture and Russian philosophical creativity which the renewed *Logos* intends to serve to the best of its ability (*Logos* 1925: 18).

In the same text the editors admit that the former Russian *Logos* had displayed 'school-boyish and apprentice-like traits' and that the 'hegemony of theoretical knowledge' that had been peculiar to it

... narrowed down the problem of cognition to the reality that is immediately given, whereas the forms of knowledge remain but a segment, only the first part of that ideal domain ... which also embraces ethical and aesthetic values, legal and economic substances, religious experience – in short, all those "ornaments of the Deity" which are also the authentic supra-individual content of the human soul and are constitutive of its individuality.<sup>6</sup>

In terms of contents, the articles published in that issue, on the whole, showed no significant theoretical advance over the earlier *Logos*. There are no discussion of social philosophy or essentially new approaches to epistemology. Moreover, the *Logos* editors had clearly drawn closer to their former adversaries among the religious philosophers. Thus Jakovenko's article 'The Might of Philosophy' vividly illustrates his turn from a fervent defence of the scientific nature of philosophy to an assertion of its function as *Weltanschauung*, its relations with a culture aiming to grasp the Existent (Jakovenko 2002: 265–80). The *Logos* authors' later position bore distinct marks of a turn from epistemology to ontology (Nikolay Lossky pointed this out in his *History of Russian*

---

<sup>6</sup> This volume of *Logos* also contained two book reviews by Ukrainian and Russian philosopher Dmitro Chizhevsky (one of them on Richard Kroner's book *Vom Kant bis Hegel. Bd I. Von der Vernunft Kritik zur Naturphilosophie Tübingen, 1921*). Dmitro Chizhevsky (1894–1977) was moderate social-democrat activist in his youth in Kiev before 1920, then in exile he became the brilliant historian of Russian and Ukrainian philosophy and literature. He was collaborator of Roman Jakobson in Prague Linguistic circle and one of the founding fathers of Slavic studies in Germany after 1945 (Bojko-Blochyn 1998).

*Philosophy*), not in a Heideggerian spirit but in the sense of Lossky's religiously-coloured ideas of the 'concrete subject', overcoming abstraction etc (Lossky 1951: 412–3). For a variety of reasons, the Russian *Logos* publication experiment could not be sustained.

A symptomatic subsequent undertaking by Jakovenko was the 1929 launching, in Bonn, of an international German-language journal called *Der russische Gedanke* (*Russian Thought*) devoted to Russian philosophy, literary criticism and culture. Besides drawing on the circle of *Logos* authors, it carried articles by the Germans Hermann Glockner and Hans Prager, the Italian Ettore Lo Gatto, as well as Berdyaev, Frank, Nikolay Arsen'ev, the Eurasianists Leo Karsavin, Nikolay Alekseev, Dmitry Svyatopolk-Mirsky, Alexander Kozhevnikov (later famous as Alexandre Kojève) and others (in total, five volumes appeared in 1929–34). Despite the participation of German authors, this journal, unlike the pre-war *Logos*, never became an organ of interaction between Russian and German thinkers. *Der russische Gedanke* remained a secondary forum for the discussion of strictly Russian intellectual preoccupations and conflicts (Plotnikov 1999).

### ***Logos* and Generation**

The generational clash between young emigrant scholars of the post-war and post-revolutionary age cohort, on the one hand, and the generations of their teachers, with their European-level education, systems of personal contacts and foreign language publications, on the other hand, inevitably acquired an ideological tinge. While in the victorious European countries, younger scholars in the mid-1920s were on the whole more internationalist than their war-veteran 'fathers', a significant part of the younger generation of Russian academic intellectuals in exile in the early 1930s, on the contrary, tended towards isolationism and right-wing radicalism – against the established and overly liberal elder academic generation.

Eurasianism was a paradigmatic current of émigré thought in this sense. Like the former Vekhi-group and the left liberals affiliated with *Logos*, the Eurasianists attempted to consider the lessons of the First World War and the October Revolution, but they reached quite different conclusions. The Eurasianists – the linguist prince Nikolay Trubetskoy, the geographer Peter Savitskiy, and the musicologist Peter Suvchinsky, concluded that the base for the ideal social system for Russia would be constituted by the principle of the (Russian-Orthodox) church. This 'ideocracy', as they called it, stood in stark contrast to the corrupted and selfish regimes of Western democracy that dominated their time. From the *Logos* standpoint, Stepun, who had been an opponent of Eurasianism from very beginning, conceived their doctrine as the manifestation of more general crisis of the liberal world-view.

While the philosophical position of the authors of *Logos* in the 1920s was not a disowning of their former credo, however modified by a turn to religious philosophy, their social and political evolution was much more intriguing and innovative. Between 1914 and 1929, the authoritative Paris-based émigré journal *Sovremennye Zapiski* (*Contemporary Notes*) published a number of articles by Sergey Hessen (who was then living in Prague) in which he tried to provide a new – legal – substantiation of socialism and to present a programme for genuinely overcoming capitalism rather than externally negating it, as in Communist etatism (Walicki 1992). Among contemporary social theoreticians he was especially interested in guild socialism and the works of Cole and de Man, and he was close to the German circle of right socialist linked to the journal *Neue Blätter für Sozialismus* (Paul Tillich, Adolf Löwe, Emil Lederer) (Hessen 1999: 147–542).

The *Logos* circle's best-known philosopher and political commentator was Fedor Stepun, whose exceptional integration into the German academic community was eased by his German origins, so that he taught sociology at the Dresden Polytechnic from 1926 until his politically-motivated dismissal in 1937 (Treiber 1999). Throughout the 1920s, he published – also in the *Contemporary Notes* – a series of articles entitled 'Thoughts about Russia', in which he presented his 'post-revolutionary', rather than restorationist, project of democratic and religious-socialist transformation and revival of the future Russia (Hufen 2001: 165–96). Stepun also wrote on German events in the Paris-based journal *Novy grad* (*The New City*), one of the most interesting ideological undertakings of the inter-war Russian emigration (Stepun 2000: 425–54, 865–919). Contributors to that journal included Berdyaev and Stepun, the former socialist revolutionary Fondaminsky and the talented historian Georgy Fedotov (Raeff 1985), and it was very significant for developing an interpretation of the new reality that arose in Russia during the revolution. Like the 1925 *Logos*, it attempted to respond to the socio-political challenges of modernity and to conceive Russian problems in broad European framework of "crisis of world spirit." Aside from Berdyaev, the historian and philosopher Georgij Fedotov played a crucial role as one of the journal's most important contributors. Wherever they published, the former *Logos* collaborators attempted to speak for and to Russia, while their social and philosophical thought was close to such diverse European thinkers of that period as José Ortega-y-Gasset, Karl Mannheim and Simone Weill, who saw themselves as mediating between the roles of intellectuals and academics, who were open to more or less unorthodox religious thought, and who defined their primary tasks as a diagnosis of the presumed crisis of their times.

### Conclusion. The Distinctiveness of the Russian Intellectual Exile

It is, in part, the very abruptness of the Russian socio-cultural upheaval, which literally threw numerous leading intellectuals and university teachers out of the country, that accounts for their need to preserve their *group* identity as *Russian* scholars. By contrast, the fate of Hungarian scholars who found themselves abroad after the revolutionary events of 1918–9, provides an example of a national identity ‘left in the past’ for the sake of *individual* entry into a foreign national context (Congdon 1973, 1991). These émigrés’ further careers turned out to be the more successful the less they were linked to specifically Hungarian problems, as can be seen by comparing the cases of Karl Mannheim (b. 1893) and Karl Polanyi (1886) with those of Oszkár Jászi (b. 1875) and Pál Szende (b. 1979), a contrast partly due no doubt to generational differences and to the respective positions of the two pairs before emigration.

More generally, however, the survival of the project of a ‘diasporic,’ outward-looking science (especially in the humanities) appears possible only when the exile is relatively short – about a decade and a half, as in the case of the German émigrés after 1933 (Raef 1990). Historical realities did not grant such an opportunity to inter-war Russian thought. Under the conditions they encountered, even the most Europeanized philosophical programme begins to acquire national-particularist features. The former cultural or scientific and epistemological universalism gives way to idealist or openly religious universalism. On the other hand, the continuing aspiration for internationalism is now embodied on an ideological rather than an academic level. This was what made it possible for the political self-definition of the Westernizers to evolve leftwards in exile during the inter-war period, in contrast to most Russian émigré thinkers.

### REFERENCES

- Andreyev, Savicky 2004. *Russia Abroad. Prague and the Russian Diaspora, 1918–1938* (Ed. by Catherine Andreyev and Ivan Savicky). New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Ash, M., and Söllner, A. (eds) 1996. *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Emigre, German-Speaking Scientists after 1933*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Belkin, Dmitrij 2000. *Die Rezeption V. S. Solov'evs in Deutschland*. Tübingen: [Univ., Diss.]  
(<http://w210.ub.uni-tuebingen.de/dbt/volltexte/2000/126>)

- Bezrodnyi, M.V. 1992. *Iz istorii russkogo neokantianstva (zhurnal "Logos" i ego redaktery)*, Litsa: Biograficheskii al'manakh. 1. M.; Sankt-Peterbrug: Feniks: Atheneum.
- Bojko-Blochyn, J. 1998. *Dmytro Ivanovich Chyzhevsky*. Heidelberg: Carj Winter. Universitatsverlag.
- Boobbyer, Philipp 1995. *S.L. Frank. The Life and Work of a Russian Philosopher 1877–1950*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Brocke, B. vom 1985. Wissenschaft und Militarismus. Der Aufruf 'An die Kulturwelt!' und der Zusammenbruch der internationalen Gelehrtenrepublik im Ersten Weltkrieg. In W.M. Calder (ed.), *Willamowitz nach 50 Jahren*, pp. 649–71, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Chinyaeva, Elena 2001. *Russians outside Russia: The Emigre Community in Czechoslovakia, 1918–1938*. Veröffentlichungendes Collegium Carolinum, Bd. 89. Munchen: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Congdon, Lee 1973. The moralist as social thinker: Oszkár Jászi in Hungary, 1900–1919. In W. Laqueur and G.L. Mosse (eds), *Historians in Politics*, pp. 73–115. London: Sage Publications.
- Congdon, Lee 1991. *Exile and Social Thought. Hungarian Intellectuals in Germany and Austria, 1919–1933*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dmitriev, A. 2002. La mobilisation intellectuelle: communauté scientifique internationale et première Guerre Mondiale. *Cahiers du Monde Russe, Soviétique et Post-Soviétique* 4: 617–44.
- Döring, Herbert 1975. *Der Weimarer Kreis. Studien zum politischen Bewußtsein verfassungstreuer Hochschullehrer in der Weimarer Republik*. Meisenheim: Hein.
- Ern, V.F. 1991. *Ern Sochineniia*. Moscow: Pravda.
- Garzonio, S. 1999. Garzonio S. "K izuceniju russkogo Zarubezja v Italii," "Materialy k istorii *La Russia* i *La Russia Nuova*." In Fleishman Lazar (ed.), *Studies in Modern Russian and Polish Culture and Bibliography. Essays in Honor of W.Zalewski*, pp. 77–101. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gollerbakh, E.E. 2000. *V poiskakh nezrimogo grada. Religiozno-filosofskaia grupa "Put'" (1910–1919) v poiskakh novoi russkoi identichnosti*. Sankt-Petersburg: Aleteia.
- Gonč, Vladimír. 2000. *Sergius Hessen a Československo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Hessen, S.I. 1999. *Izbrannye sochineniia*. Moscow: Rosspen.
- Hufen, Christian. 2001. *Fedor Stepun: Ein politischer Intellektueller aus Rußland in Europa. Die Jahre 1884–1945*. Berlin: Lukas.

- Jakovenko, Boris V. 1922. *Ocherki russkoi filosofii*. Berlin: Russkoe Universal'noe Izd-vo.
- Jakovenko, Boris V. 1928. *Vom wesen des pluralismus: ein beitrage zur klärung und lösung des philosophischen fundamentalproblems*. Bonn: F. Cohen.
- Jakovenko, Boris V. 2000. *Moshch' filosofii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.
- Jansen, Christian 1992. *Professoren und Politik: politisches Denken und Handeln der Heidelberger Hochschullehrer 1914–1935*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Karady, V. 1998. *La republique des lettres des temps modernes. L'internationalisation des marchés universitaires occidentaux avant la Grande Guerre*. Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales. N 121-122.
- Karady, V. 2002. *La migration internationale d'étudiants en Europe, 1890–1940*. Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales. N 145. Décembre.
- Kettler, David and Lauer, Gerhard 2005. *Exile, Science, Bildung. The Contested Legacies of German Exile Intellectuals*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Koenen, G., and Kopelev, L. (eds) 1998. *Deutschland und russische Revolution 1917–1924*. München: Fink Verlag.
- Kramme, Rüdiger 1995. Philosophische Kultur als Programm: Die Konstituierungsphase des LOGOS. In Hubert Treiber (ed.), *Heidelberg im Schnittpunkt intellektueller Kreise: Zur Topographie der "geistigen Geselligkeit" eines "Weltdorfes"; 1885–1950*, pp. 119–49. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Loader, Colin, and Kettler, David 2001. *Karl Mannheim's Sociology as Political Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Logos. 1925. *Mezhdunarodnyi ezhegodnik po filosofii kul'tury, izdavaemyi pod redaktsiei S.I. Gessena, F.A. Stepuna i B.V. Iakovenko*. Kn.1. Praga: Plamia.
- Lossky, N.O. 1951. *History of Russian Philosophy*. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.
- McClelland, James 1979. *Autocrats and Academics: Education, Culture and Society in Tsarist Russia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Magid, S. 1999. Philosoph Jakovenko (Podgotovitelnye materialy). In *Duovni proudy ruské a ukrajinské emigrace v Československé republice 1919–1939*, pp. 259–311. Praha: Méně známé aspekty Běloševská.
- Masaryk, T. G. 1919. *The spirit of Russia*. London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.; New York: The Macmillan company.
- Peter, Hartmut Rüdiger (ed.) 2001. *Schnorrer, Verschwörer, Bombenwerfer? Studenten aus dem Russischen Reich an deutschen Hochschulen vor dem 1. Weltkrieg*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

- Plotnikov, N. 1999. Evropeiskaia tribuna russkoi filosofii: Der russische Gedanke (1929–1938). In M.A. Kolerova (ed.), *Issledovaniia po istorii russkoi mysli. Ezhegodnik*, pp. 331–58.
- Raëff, Mark. 1985. Novyj Grad and Germany: a chapter in the intellectual history of the Russian emigration. In Auerbach Inge, Hillgruber Andreas, Schramm, Gottfried (eds), *Felder und Vorfelder russischer Geschichte: Studien zu Ehren von Peter Schreibert*, pp. 255–64. Freiburg: Rombach.
- Raëff, Mark. 1990. *Russia Abroad: A Cultural History of the Russian Emigration, 1919–1939*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Reichel, Stefan G. 1999. *Nikolaj A. Berdjaev in Deutschland 1920–1950: Eine rezeptionshistorische Studie*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Renna, Catia 2004. Boris Jakovenko e la cultura filosofica europea: una ricostruzione biografica. *eSamizdat* (II) 3: 97–105.  
([http://www.esamizdat.it/renna\\_art\\_eS\\_2004\\_\(II\)\\_3.pdf](http://www.esamizdat.it/renna_art_eS_2004_(II)_3.pdf)), [viewed in March 9, 2006].
- Ringer, Fritz K. 1969. *The Decline of the German Mandarins; the German Academic Community, 1890–1933*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Schlögel, K. 1999. *Chronik russischen Lebens in Deutschland 1918–1941*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Schroeder-Gudehus, B. 1990. Internationale Wissenschaftsbeziehungen und auswärtige Kulturpolitik 1919–1933. Vom Boykott und Gegenboykott zu ihrer Wiederaufnahme. In Rudolf Vierhaus and Bernhard vom Brocke (eds), *Forschung im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Gesellschaft: Geschichte und Struktur der Kaiser-Wilhelm/Max-Planck-Gesellschaft*, pp. 858–85. Stuttgart: Duetsche Verlag-Anstalt.
- Spet, G. 1992. Pis'ma k Gustavu Shpetu G.I. Chelpanova, L.I. Shestova, B.V. Jakovenko, R.O. Jakobsona i dr. *Logos* 3: 243–63.
- Stepun, Fedor 1947. *Vergangenes und Unvergängliches aus meinem Leben. 1. Teil. 1884–1914*. München: Kösel Verlag.
- Stepun F.A. 2000. *Sochineniia*. Moscow: Rosspen.
- Struve N.A.M. 2000. *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii: Materialy i dokumenty. 1923–1939*. Russkii put'; Parizh: YMCA.
- Styczynski, Marek 2004. Sergei Hessen: Neo-Kantian. *Studies in East European Thought* 56(1): 55–71.
- Tioman, J. 1995. *The Magic of a Common Language. Jakobson, Mathesius, Trubetzkoy and the Prague Linguistic Circle*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Treiber, Hubert. 1995. Fedor Steppuhn in Heidelberg (1903–1955). Über Freundschafts – und Spätbürgertreffen in einer deutschen Kleinstadt.

In *Heidelberg im Schnittpunkt intellektueller Kreise. Zur Topographie der «geistigen Geselligkeit» eines «Weltdorfes»*. 1850–1950. Opladen: Wesdeutscher Verlag.

Treiber, H. 1999. Stepun zur Heraufkunft des Dritten Reiches anlässlich der Reichspräsidentenwahl 1932. Soziologie zwischen szientifischer und literarischer Orientierung. *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 81: 199–225.

Tsygankov, D. 2001. Beruf, Verbannung, Schicksal: Iwan Iljin und Deutschland. *Archiv fuer Rechts-und Sozialphilosophie* 87(1): 44–60.

Voigt G. Otto Hoetsch 1995. Karl Stahlin und die Grundung der Russischen wissenschaftlichen Instituts. In B. von K. Schlögel (ed.), *Russische Emigration in Deutschland. Leben in europaische*, pp. 274–77. Berlin: Bürgerkrieg.

Walicki, A. 1992. *Legal Philosophies of Russian Liberalism*. Oxford.

Willams, R. 1972. *Culture in Exile. Russian Emigres in Germany, 1881–1941*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.