NUMBER 170

LEONARD BERTRAM SCHAPIRO (1908-1983)

AN INTELLECTUAL MEMOIR

By Peter Reddaway

Fellow
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

This memoir is an expanded version of a talk given at a meeting of tribute to Leonard Schapiro held at the Wilson Center on December 9, 1983.

Leonard Bertram Schapiro[1]
1908-1983

Leonard Bertram Schapiro, son of Max and Leah Schapiro, was born in Glasgow on April 22, 1908. When he died in London in 1983 the Western world lost an erudite scholar, a cultivated citizen and a gentleman of modesty, generosity, and integrity.

Schapiro's family was of Russian-Jewish background. His mother was one of thirteen children born to a rabbi and his wife, who had come to Glasgow from Poland in the 1860s or 1870s. His father Max was the son of a wealthy businessman who owned forests and a timber mill outside Riga. Max was sent to the University of Glasgow, where he took a degree in economics and commerce, and settled in Scotland to learn the timber business.

In 1912 Max Schapiro moved his family to Riga, so that he could take over his father's business. By the time Leonard was six he was, thanks to his German paternal grandmother, fluent in German, the dominant language of Riga. But he still regarded English as his native tongue, and Scotland as home.

He later recalled a train journey from Glasgow to Riga on the eve of the Great War, during which a German official entered the carriage, and, seeing his nanny chafing his feet, exclaimed: 'Cold feet, cold

---

1. In writing this memoir, which is both personal and "collective" in nature, I have quoted liberally from speeches given at the L.S.E. Memorial Meeting for Leonard Schapiro on 23 January, 1984, by Ralf Dehrendorf, Maurice Cranston, Julius Gould, Leon Lipson, Helène Carrère d'Encausse, Dominic Lieven and Michael Bourdeaux. I have also quoted, or received assistance from Harry Rigby, Shlomo Avineri, Hugh Seton-Watson and Robert Tucker. To all these friends of Leonard's I am profoundly grateful. My special thanks go to Leonard's widow Roma, who provided not only elusive material, but also penetrating comments on my first draft.

feet! Soon all Englishmen will have cold feet!' The young boy was not alarmed - merely pleased at being recognised as an Englishman.

In the summer of 1915, when the Germans were advancing on Riga, the Schapiros moved to Petrograd. Max got a job in railway administration. Although Leonard's natural language soon became Russian - he spoke English only to his mother and nanny - he continued to think of himself as an Englishman, to the disapproval of some of his Russian relations. A book of Russian quotations given him by a cousin carries a dedication, followed by the words: "Do not be ashamed to be a Russian."

As he grew up in Petrograd, he became an avid reader. He liked English writers best (Dickens, Scott, Charles Reade, Bulwer-Lytton) and the American Fenimore Cooper - all of whom he read in Russian. His mother had a large library of Victorian novels in English, and these he read too.

"The February Revolution of 1917", to quote his own taped reminiscences, "brought with it a tremendous sense of an historical happening: a marvellous event had taken place, with the centuries-old tyranny overthrown. This was communicated even to a nine-year old boy.

"I was not really aware, with the Bolshevik revolution of October 1917, that something different had happened that marked any kind of boundary... although one's life soon changed."

Of the three years between now and his family leaving Russia for good in late 1920, Schapiro wrote in his last book:

> My family did not fall into the category of enemies of the regime, nor did they enjoy any priorities of privilege. Life was exceedingly hard. Diet was near starvation level; in the winter we suffered from freezing conditions for lack of fuel; break-downs in public services were a normal occurrence. Stories of terror and brutality abounded. Yet my recollection, no doubt influenced by the adults around me, is one of enthusiasm and excitement. Life was new, hopeful, it was moving forward to some great future.

In spite of hardships and the brutality of the regime, the spirit of euphoria evoked by the fall of the monarchy in March 1917 was not yet dead.

Schapiro recounted particular episodes to friends. The family flat was searched by parties of armed workers looking for arms. One of his cousins was involved in a terrorist act and was shot. He felt intense alarm one day when his father was arrested. But it was a case of mistaken identity and his father was released and reunited with the family within hours.

School functioned intermittently. Often there was no water or electricity, so he was taught at home by tutors. He developed a great love of painting and discovered he had some talent. His pleasantest memories were of frequent visits to the Hermitage, various art galleries and the opera.

When Schapiro was 12, the newly independent Latvia signed a treaty with Soviet Russia, and the Schapiros became entitled to repatriation to Latvia. They travelled in cattle wagons, the journey, which normally took twelve hours, lasting eight days. Leonard's main recollection was not of the discomfort, but of his excitement. Once they reached Latvia, he recalled feeling, "it would be possible to get to Scotland. So far as I was concerned, Latvia was incidental. One of my most vivid memories is of our arrival at the border. This was Europe! I remember the exhilaration of having left behind the Soviet Union and becoming part of the civilized world..."

Schapiro's family settled in Britain. Here the young Leonard went first to St. Paul's school, then to University College, London, where he read law. He never returned to Russia. In 1932 he was called to the Bar at Gray's Inn, and practised on the London and Western circuits. With the outbreak of war, his fluency in Russian,

German, French, and Italian soon, in 1940, took him to work in the BBC's Monitoring Service at Caversham. Two years later he moved to the General Staff at the War Office, and in 1945-46 he served in the Intelligence Division of the German Control Command, attaining the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

Although Schapiro returned to the Bar on demobilization, only leaving it in 1955, he now became an active scholar in his spare time. Stimulated by his war-time experiences, he studied Soviet behavior in relation to international law, and also, simultaneously, the roots of that behavior in the ideology and political history of Soviet communism. The fruits of the first endeavor were a considerable number of articles and reviews published between 1948 and 1953, notably in The Yearbook of World Affairs, the International Law Quarterly (where he used the signature L.B.S.) and The British Yearbook of International Law.[2]

* * * * *

In his tribute to Schapiro, the American specialist on Soviet law Leon Lipson of Yale reviewed these writings. He concluded that Schapiro's view was "that International Law should move ahead, but could not move very far ahead of state practice, and that progress in adjusting international relations by means of law would be jeopardised by activity of states whose rulers based their own titles on ideological, dogmatic, exclusive, intrusive, and imperialistic foundations - meaning particularly the USSR."

---

[2] Precise references for most of the writings mentioned in this memoir can be found in T. H. Rigby, A. H. Brown and P. B. Reddaway, eds., Authority, Power and Policy in the USSR: Essays Dedicated to Leonard Schapiro (Macmillan, 1980), pp. 5-8.

Of special note were Schapiro's articles in the Yearbook on World Affairs on aspects of Soviet theory and practice in Public International Law. In these,

> Schapiro considered, respectively, the Soviet approach to International Law, Soviet participation in international organisations, and Soviet post-war treaties. Together they make us regret the loss of that projected book-length monograph of which, it is not difficult to conjecture, the three published articles were to figure as chapters. In the article...of broadest theoretical interest, the one that treats of the Soviet approach to International Law, Schapiro wondered whether there was not radical incompatibility between a polity based on those foundations claimed for the Soviet Union by its publicists, and the requirements of an international legal order. After canvassing the historical interplay of conflicting Soviet theories and relating them—too concisely, alas--to Soviet political and bureaucratic struggles of the respective times, Schapiro narrowed his concluding observations by judiciously clarifying reduction. His answer to the question of radical incompatibility did not rest on the current Soviet theories of the basis of International Law, whether it be consent of States or selective adoption and repudiation of pre-Soviet or non-Soviet norms of International Law, because he dismissed them as being largely Party propaganda. Nor did he think that insuperable obstacles were posed by differences of view on property rights, for he thought that the International Legal Order could accommodate even an internal social order like the Soviet one, if only the Soviet state fulfilled its duties to its neighbours. Schapiro identified the two major difficulties in another quarter. He pointed to Soviet resistance, first to the judicial settlement of international disputes (by judicial I think he meant, more loosely, resolution by third parties on principles governed by law rather than by politics), and...second, to effective international protection of human rights. These difficulties in turn he referred to other features: Soviet emphasis on unlimited sovereignty of the State, and the political philosophy that preached domination of majority or collective rights over minority or individual rights.
>
> Not a bad beginning for 1948. Much has changed since then. The Soviet Union has gained friends, clients, satellites, enemies, customers, interests and problems. But the international legal picture is still deeply coloured by the two obstacles Schapiro stressed and the two attitudes to which he attributed them.

* * * * *

The fruits of Schapiro's second main endeavour in the post-war years appeared in 1955 as The Origin of the Communist Autocracy: Political Opposition in the Soviet State. First Phase: 1917-1922.

This book had been finished in 1951, but politically motivated opposition to its findings on the revelant committee of Chatham House, which had commissioned it, delayed publication for four years. The publisher to profit from Chatham House's lapse was the American house of Frederick Praeger.

This episode illustrates what Maurice Cranston sees as a key reason why Schapiro changed professions: "There was a strong sense of duty which impelled Leonard to become a Sovietologist. It troubled him deeply that the West had so many illusions about the Soviet Union."

The Origin of the Communist Autocracy (which appeared in a second edition in 1977) is an outstanding, pioneering work of scholarship, which received wide and deserved acclaim. In Schapiro's own words, it is "the story of how a group of determined men seized power for themselves in Russia in 1917 and kept others from sharing it; and of the consequences which ensued both for themselves and for their political rivals when it became evident that they enjoyed but little popular support." The book deployed for the first time a wide range of Schapiro's talents: his profound understanding of Russian history and culture; his ability to make abstruse ideological controversies between Marxists intelligible to the general reader, without distorting them; his insight into the relation between ideology and political practice; his sure sense of perspective on rapidly changing Russian and world developments; his meticulous regard for facts; and his readiness, at appropriate moments, to make the sort of broad comparative and moral judgments which illuminate the best scholarship.

* * * * *

It was also in 1955 that Schapiro became a full-time academic, joining the Government Department of the London School of Economics and Political Science as a lecturer. Earlier, from 1950 to 1953, he had done some part-time lecturing at the LSE on international law. He took naturally to teaching, his barrister's training in public speaking and spontaneous dialogue standing him in good stead, and his change of profession being more gradual than sudden.

Among Schapiro's referees in 1955, Ralf Dahrendorf tells us, was "one of the great historians of our time." This man wrote about him: "He is very clear-headed and intellectually exceptionally honest, learned, scrupulous, thorough, and most lucid in exposition: a genuine scholar, in the best sense of the word, at once erudite and with a natural capacity for ordering his thoughts."

Encouraged by the success of his first book, Schapiro now applied his talents as a researcher to the whole history of Bolshevism over three-quarters of a century. In 1960 he brought out The Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This 600-page work, though not as tightly organic as his first one, was bold in scope and triumphantly successful in its aims. It quickly established for him a worldwide reputation as one of the two leading scholars in the field, fully on a par with Merle Fainsod of Harvard. The book was, simultaneously: a systematic history of a political party; an analytical interpretation of a novel system of government; and also, in large measure, a history of the Soviet state since 1917. If his central goal--a deep understanding of the nature of Soviet communism--were to be achieved, Schapiro saw, rightly, that these three undertakings could not be separated; they were interdependent.

For after 1917, in Schapiro's words, "the history of the party can no longer be envisaged as something separate from the history of the country as a whole, but becomes increasingly identified with it."

Schapiro did not skimp on the origins of the party and its development prior to 1917. More than a quarter of the book is devoted to a balanced, analytical, and expertly researched account of these matters, an account which illuminates much of what follows, after the Bolshevik seizure of power. This central strand of the narrative is maintained to the end: "My aim throughout," he wrote, "has been to trace the development of the party--to show its ideas, its objectives, its successes and failures, its relations with the population, the effects which all these and other factors had upon the party machinery and upon the changes in the social and human composition of its membership."

However, the study had to be broader, for "Lenin's government had ...the unique quality that it brought into being what were ostensibly independent political institutions--soviets, courts, trade unions and the like--but ensured from the first that each and every one of these institutions should function only under the control of a single political party, of which the members were linked by an ideology and by strict discipline." Demonstrating this key point about party government naturally required discussion of the "ostensibly independent" institutions too.

The Stalin period likewise compelled Schapiro to use a broad canvas, if for somewhat different reasons. As a calculating despot, Stalin did not risk his own authority being rivalled by that of the party. So he assaulted and emasculated this body, thereby severely undermining party government of the Leninist type. As Schapiro wrote (in 1959),

> So much of what happened to, and in, the party during Stalin's lifetime was in such large measure due to the personal characteristics of this one powerful man, that what I believe to be the essential features of this form of party government were at times eclipsed or obscured. The events of the last six years [i.e., since Stalin's death] have, at any rate, given us some indication of those features which seem to belong to the essential quality of the party and are part of its tradition--the fact that it is above the law, for example--and of those which are apparently more bound up with the idiosyncrasies of a particular man--for example, the use of mass terror.

This passage also indicates where Schapiro stood on a matter of keen controversy among students of Soviet history, namely, the degree of continuity or discontinuity between Lenin's rule and Stalin's. Schapiro held that Lenin had certainly created many of the necessary conditions for Stalinism--the party's absolute monopoly of political power, the ban on factions within the party, the party's infiltration of the key social, political and economic institutions, the establishment of a powerful secret police under the party's control, the legitimation of Soviet rule by flexible use of the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, and so on. But it required the unique personality of Stalin to add further ingredients to the brew and thus create Stalinism.

Subsequently Schapiro modified somewhat his position on this whole issue. In his brilliant epilogue to the second edition of The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1970), he formulated his views like this: "Some, including the present author, have argued that the foundations for the machine erected by Stalin for his tyranny were already laid by Lenin. There is much force in this argument, and much evidence to support it. But it may also be true that Lenin was struck down at a time when his work was still unfinished."

Not surprisingly, Schapiro was much concerned with the decisive, pivotal figure of Lenin, without whom there might, quite possibly,

never have been a Bolshevik revolution. In the collection of essays Lenin: the Man, the Theorist, the Leader: A Reappraisal (1967), which he and I edited, he put the above thoughts in another way. While the consequences of Lenin's decisions at the 10th party congress of 1921 were, he held, disastrous for the country, "it is also true that he (Lenin) probably never foresaw, let alone intended them; and it is virtually certain that, had he lived, he would have followed a very different course from Stalin."

In the final pages of his last, posthumously published book, 1917: The Russian Revolutions and the Origins of Present-Day Communism (1984), Schapiro returned again to this vexed subject. After laying out the evidence in a clear, judicious "balance-sheet," he concluded with these lapidary propositions: "Stalinism was not a necessary consequence of Leninism, but it was nevertheless a possible result. There was nothing inevitable about the emergence of a man of Stalin's character: yet if once it happened, the tools were ready to his hand."

This short book, incidentally, written mainly for undergraduates, gave Schapiro the chance to present in brief form his considered, final views on a number of subjects: the gradual decline of the empire, its sudden collapse, the dithering of the Provisional Government, the Bolshevik seizure and consolidation of power, the civil war, and Lenin's last, uncharacteristic writings prior to his death.

* * * * *

The above discussion makes clear that the whiff of historical determinism which tends to emanate from the writings of E. H. Carr and others is wholly absent in Schapiro. On occasion he addressed such matters directly, as in his preface to Theodore Dan's The Origins of

Bolshevism. "The victory of Bolshevism in 1917," he wrote,

> was perhaps only 'inevitable' in the sense that, assuming all the actors in the drama...behaved as they did, it became possible in October 1917 for Lenin to achieve his object of overthrowing the democratic regime which came into being in February 1917. The Mensheviks could, after all, have followed the advice of Plekhanov and Potresov and made it more possible for the Provisional Government to establish a stable regime, which could have taken Russia out of the war without the ensuing collapse. The Provisional Government, in turn, could have shown more foresight in realizing the importance of ending the war, establishing its own legitimacy, and disarming the Bolsheviks and their private army--and so on and so forth. There is nothing 'inevitable' in history except the fact that human beings behave in the manner which accords with their traditions, habits and preconceived prejudices.

In The Communist Party of the Soviet Union Schapiro makes a lightly veiled criticism of determinists when he refers to the sort of historian who believes in surveying the broad trends of Soviet development sub specie aeternitatis:

> The little difficulties and occasional roughness then fall into 'historical proportion'. What appeared to lesser minds at the time to have been due to such vulgar considerations as one man's personal ambition, or fear of popular revolt, is now seen to have unfolded as part of a continuous process of evolution which was moulded by ineluctable economic and historical forces. One fallacy of this approach seems to me to be the assumption which it necessarily makes that because things happened in a certain way, therefore they had to happen in this way, irrespectively of the political actions of men. For example, it may well be the case that some form of industrial revolution had to take place in the Soviet Union for a whole variety of reasons in combination, which no party or government could have resisted. But I see no valid reason for assuming that it had to take place at the time and in the manner which Stalin determined, other than the reason that Stalin so determined it and was able to put his determination into effect.

* * * * *

In 1965 Schapiro published The Government and Politics of the Soviet Union, a logical sequel to his book on the party. Issued as one of a series of textbooks, it quickly ran through many editions. However, the short length imposed by the series somewhat cramped Schapiro's style, and it is less enjoyable to read than his other books. His usually elegant

prose is constrained by the necessity to write in a scholarly but highly condensed way about a wide range of institutions. Nonetheless, it is a valuable work of interpretation and reference.

As Schapiro progressed in his research over the years, he naturally became expert on many specific subjects to which he could not do full justice in his major books on Soviet politics. The solution was a stream of "spin-off" articles and chapters. Among these the following deserve mention: his contributions on relations between the party and the military to Basil Liddell Hart's The Soviet Army (1956); an article on Soviet legal reforms in Soviet Survey (1959); an analysis of the new party programme of 1961 in a collection of essays on the programme which he edited, The USSR and the Future (1963); a chapter on official party historiography in John Keep's Contemporary History in the Soviet Mirror (1964); his chapter on "The Chinese Ally from the Soviet Point of View" in a collection of essays on Sino-Soviet relations edited by Kurt London (1962); his contribution to The Soviet Worker (1981), a collection of essays he edited with Joseph Godson; and his pioneering articles on the General Department (Survey, 1975) and the International Department (International Journal, Toronto, 1976-77) of the Communist Party's Central Committee Secretariat. In the latter he demonstrated the importance of the Central Committee apparatus in the area of foreign policy, and the consequent error of assigning an overdominant role to the "frontmen" in this field, Gromyko and his colleagues in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In one of his last articles on Soviet politics, "After Brezhnev: the Limits of Prediction" (Survey, 1982), written a few months before the party leader's death, Schapiro showed his customary wisdom, but in the unaccustomed role of prophet. He pointed out, first, why Andropov was

the best-placed candidate to succeed Brezhnev. And he also made a longer-term prediction, which, two years later, in the Chernenko era, seems amply justified:

> The experience of the recent past suggests that there is a strong likelihood that the Politburo, after Brezhnev has gone and the dust of the succession struggle has settled, will contain a strong contingent of members who favour conservatism, consensus, stagnation, tolerance of inefficiency and corruption at home, the continued growth of military might, and a policy of maximum expansion abroad, within the limits imposed by the desire to avoid nuclear collision with the Western powers.

* * * * *

From an early stage, we should now emphasize, Schapiro's range of research was considerably wider than the above paragraphs suggest. T. H. Rigby puts it well when he says: "Schapiro's writings reflect three main lines of enquiry, in which he figures respectively as political historian, political scientist and theorist, and historian of ideas. They all show, however, an inner unity of vision and concept, and different lines often intersect in the same work."

As a student of political ideas, Schapiro not surprisingly believed that human minds can have a marked influence on the course of history. This was especially true in a country like Russia, where the number of political actors--even when those in power and those in opposition are added together--has always been remarkably small.

A second and closely related feature of Russia in the nineteenth century was the oppressive dominance over polity, Church, society and economy of a conservative, deeply entrenched Autocracy. When, however, this Autocracy finally committed itself to entering the Great Power league, with the serious military, diplomatic and imperial competition which this involved, then political change became inevitable. Would the change involve reform or revolution?

This central question of the last decades of Tsarism directed Schapiro's attention, logically enough, to the political thought of sober reformists and serious revolutionaries. The former were moderate liberals or liberal conservatives, whose views were, on occasion, considered by the Tsar and his advisers. The latter were mostly revolutionary social-democrats, both Menshevik and Bolshevik. The questions thus became: Would the moderate critics be able to nudge the Autocracy towards pluralism and constitutionalism, as the Great Reforms of the 1860s suggested they might? Or would the Tsar yield too little, too late, and thus open the gates to Revolution? If the latter, then which group of revolutionaries would have the ideas and leaders best suited to triumph over its rivals? And would rule by this group interact with Russia's social, economic and political backwardness to produce, almost inexorably, a new form of autocracy?

These questions stimulated Schapiro repeatedly throughout his scholarly career. On the reformist side his first publication was a study of how a group of previously Marxist intellectuals--among them Berdyayev and Struve--were shaken by the experience of the violent if largely abortive "revolution" of 1905 into rejecting "the mystique of revolution" and expressing in the collection of essays Landmarks their critical support for the Autocracy (Slavonic and East European Review, 1955-56). He then presented his view that a dividing line between reformists and revolutionaries lay in their attitudes to law. If an individual believed that greater legal justice was an important social and political goal, that the laws should be better defined and, through continuous reform, brought into a coherent pattern, and that legal procedures should be tightened up to prevent arbitrary abuses, then he

was almost certainly a reformist. If, on the other hand, he regarded the law both as an instrument of autocratic rule (to be manipulated if possible, of course, to the advantage of the government's opponents) and as a future anachronism, then he was probably a revolutionary. Developing such thoughts in his essay "The Pre-Revolutionary Intelligentsia and the Legal Order" (in R. Pipes, ed., The Russian Intelligentsia, 1961), Schapiro focused primarily on the writings of the liberal conservative jurist Boris Chicherin, whose approach he much admired.

However, the reformist to whom Schapiro devoted the most attention over the years was the writer Ivan Turgenev. Turgenev was a moderate liberal who lived from 1818 to 1881. Schapiro was the first scholar to analyze closely Turgenev's political writings as a young civil servant, and to show how perceptive and balanced they were. But his interest extended more widely than this. Without, to my knowledge, proclaiming the fact, even in private, he clearly had a strong personal affinity for Turgenev. The writer was a highly cultivated European intellectual, equally at home in France, Germany, England, or Russia, widely read, fluent in languages, a lover of both nature and the arts. But his cosmopolitanism did not render him rootless. He spent much of his life in Russia, where he practised his liberal values as best he could, and usually--especially after the Emancipation of the serfs in 1861--resisted the pressures of radical colleagues to support their causes. He was quietly patriotic, gently rational, and generously compassionate. By force of example, in his life and works, he warned against allowing emotion and frustration to overpower intellect and conscience, and thus undermine integrity.

Schapiro's development of these themes appears first in his introduction to his sensitive translation of Turgenev's story Spring Torrents (1972), but above all in his immaculately produced, full-length biography, Turgenev: His Life and Times (1978). This labour of love, which he deliberately wrote in a traditional format, incorporated the fruits of much new research by him and others, and has a richness of historical and intellectual texture which only a handful of scholars could even have attempted. The result is an elegant intellectual biography, which, while making no claim to present a profound literary analysis of Turgenev's oeuvre, does, with refined judgments and proportions, portray his life, his thinking and his epoch.

Knowing Schapiro as I did over two decades, I may perhaps add here a personal impression: Schapiro could not help feeling, I think, that if he had been born in 1818 into circumstances like Turgenev's, he would have lived a rather comparable life, and would not, overall, have regretted it.

Schapiro's dabbling in literary translation was, we may note in passing, once explained by him to Sir Walter Adams, the director of the LSE in the late 1960s and early 1970s. "He told me," Adams wrote, "that he did this as a pastime, and much of the work was done in aeroplanes, when he found the process of translation both a relief and a sufficient occupation to keep him happy during the gruesome process of flying."

* * * * *

The close attention Schapiro paid to the prerevolutionary Russian Marxists has already been mentioned. While he wrote more about Lenin and the Bolsheviks than about other trends within Russian Marxism, he did not neglect the latter, as he showed in his carefully nuanced treatment of the whole subject in Varieties of Marxism (1977), edited by Shlomo Avineri. Understandably, he tended to write with more warmth about Marxists who had autonomous consciences and clear humanitarian as well as political priorities. Among these were a few Bolsheviks like Bukharin. The fact that such people often, sooner or later, became victims of political maneuvers, or were even executed, only increased his sympathy for them. But he did not sentimentalize them. Sometimes, indeed, as in his previously mentioned preface to The Origins of Bolshevism by the Menshevik leader Theodore Dan, he firmly criticized their views, if always with exemplary courtesy. In general, he had no difficulty, as an historian, in understanding how nonreligious intellectuals in late Tsarist Russia could easily embrace Marxism as a political creed. Less easy for him to comprehend was the same phenomenon in the Western world of the latter part of the twentieth century.

Marx the thinker, we should note, evoked much more respect in Schapiro than did political Marxism. As Maurice Cranston has said, "He was a close student of Marx, and since he had a good knowledge of German and of German philosophy, he applied himself to the work of Marx with a perseverance and determination which would put many of our Marxists to shame. I think it always surprised him that anyone who could appreciate the merits of Marx as a serious thinker could be taken in by the shoddy works of Lenin, let alone Stalin."

Schapiro's main work in which he ranged across a wide spectrum of thinkers was his Rationalism and Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Russian Political Thought (1967). The book originated as a series of lectures given at Yale. As Hugh Seton-Watson has written in a tribute to Schapiro (Encounter, April 1984),

> The catchy rhyme of the title is rather misleading: the opposite pole to "rationalism" (or the craving for Western political blueprints) in Leonard Schapiro's treatment was not so much "nationalism" --or even narodnost'--as the mentality of autocracy and its servants, who would sweep away the written law whenever it suited them, confident as they were that they understood better than any scribbling lawyers what was best for Russians. In this, the minds of Nicholas II and Lenin worked the same way. Leonard's book pays tribute to three men who understood this problem, and sought to reconcile tradition and liberty within a framework of respect for law, but who have been treated, by those historians whose only criterion is success, as contemptible liberals or reactionaries: Granovsky, B. N. Chicherin, and especially the zemstvo leader, Shipov.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks were, let it be said, a rather special case. Superficially their programme was rational (in Schapiro's sense), but their methods, and in some ways their ideology, were "national," i.e., had roots in Russian history. This singular combination of characteristics helps to explain their eventual success in seizing and holding onto power.

One of the weaknesses of most Russian liberals, though not of Turgenev, was to follow the populists in idealizing the Russian narod. This word, meaning "the people," designated in effect the peasantry, the social class comprising well over 80% of the population. Schapiro demonstrated this idealization, as reflected in the political thought of the first Provisional Government in 1917, in an essay published in Pipes's book Revolutionary Russia (1968). He traced the roots of the problem to the abstract but powerful sense of guilt felt by the Russian intelligentsia towards the narod. This stemmed from the perceived accumulation of "debts" incurred as a result of the intelligentsia's morally unjustified

acquisition of education and relative wealth and privilege—at the expense of the narod. In 1917 it led to the new government's near-paralysis in the area of policy-making, a paralysis justified by the view that nothing of substance should be changed until countrywide elections could be held and the narod could then, at last, express its will and start redeeming the debts owed to it. Within eight months, this immobilisme on the key issues of the day was, of course, to prove fatal both to the government and to the short-lived flowering of Russian freedom.

* * * * *

It was not until 1961 that Schapiro published (in the Slavonic and East European Review) an article on a Jewish topic. This was another spin-off from his study of the history of Russian radicalism, and examined the role of Jews in the revolutionary movement. In the next few years the increased harassment of Soviet Jews under Khrushchev quickened his interest in Jewish matters. Although a grandfather and an uncle of his had been rabbis, this interest had apparently hitherto been slight. In any event, in the 1960s he served on the board of the Wiener Library, and in 1965 he made his first visit to Israel. At that time, Shlomo Avineri recalls, he was decidedly sceptical about Zionism.

Over the next few years, however, as he came to know Israel better, this scepticism gradually softened, and eventually it disappeared. The rise of the PLO and its terrorism, backed by various forms of Soviet support, brought home to him Israel's vulnerability. Simultaneously came the sudden emergence of a Soviet Jewish emigration movement in 1968-69, leading to a new exodus to Israel from 1971. This demonstrated to him both the continuing power of Zionism as an idea, and the depth of the alienation from Soviet rule of many of the USSR's three million Jews.

With his sympathy aroused and his expertise at interpreting Soviet policy self-evident, Schapiro quickly began to play a role in London's Institute of Jewish Affairs. Among other things, he became chairman of the editorial board of its scholarly journal Soviet Jewish Affairs, and he also presided over various conferences of experts. He found it congenial that the institute, sponsored by the World Jewish Congress, was concerned not just with Zionism but also with the welfare of all Jews, wherever they might be, and was keen to study their position in collaboration with a wide range of scholars and observers.

Predictably, then, Schapiro was the obvious person to write introductions to the collection of papers edited by Lionel Kochan, The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917 (1970), and to the Prison Diaries (1975) of the Leningrad Zionist and dissident Eduard Kuznetsov, who had been arrested in 1970 for planning to hijack an aeroplane with a group of fellow Jews.

Among Schapiro's writings on Jewish themes there is also, Julius Gould tells us, a short article entitled "Who is a Jew?" In this, all the simple answers to the question were, one by one, rejected by Schapiro as inadequate; instead, he turned to a quotation from St. Augustine's discussion of the nature of time: "What then is time?," St. Augustine enquired. "If no-one asks me, I know; if I wish to explain to one that asketh, I know not." The question "Who is a Jew?," Schapiro wrote, evoked in him the same response.

* * * * *

The emergence in the USSR in the 1960s of emigration movements and dissident groups seeking greater freedom in a wide variety of fields, aroused Schapiro's academic interest and human concern. He actively encouraged, for example, my own research on dissent issues, and sometimes wrote on them himself. Notable is his article on Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in which he defended the writer against hysterical charges of anti-Semitism (The Russian Review, 1974). He also fostered the work of Michael Bourdeaux on religious persecution and Church-State relations. Bourdeaux, an Anglican priest, relates how in 1969 Schapiro became one of the founders of his independent Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism, later known as Keston College. "I can't count," Bourdeaux says, "the number of times I listened to his advice over the next fourteen years (throughout which he served on the council). Never once did I hear him offer a word of advice that was not measured, to the point, and, in its quiet way, usually galvanizing all of us into action."

In 1982 Schapiro reviewed what he regarded as the impressive achievements of Keston College's academic journal Religion in Communist Lands over the first ten years of its publication. It gave him additional pleasure to praise the journal (in its anniversary issue), because its editor thoughout that decade, Xenia Howard-Johnston, was both a former student and a personal friend.

Schapiro's last contribution to the college was, in Bourdeaux's words, "to deliver a deeply impressive speech on religious liberty to the annual general meeting, just over two weeks before his death. He held, in a very quiet voice, an audience of two hundred people spellbound."

* * * * *

In the late 1960s Schapiro felt a desire to systematize his more general views about politics and government, in other words to theorize. This urge had been present for some years, as shown for example by his introduction to R. N. Carew Hunt's The Theory and Practice of Communism (1963). Now he wrote, with John Lewis, a study of "The Roles of the Monolithic Party under the Totalitarian Leader"; this appeared in Party Leadership and Revolution in China (1970), edited by Lewis. Then he examined the related subject of opposition, again comparatively, in the book Political Opposition in One-Party States (1972), which he edited with help from his colleague and friend Ellen de Kadt. And finally he rounded off these years of theorizing with his book Totalitarianism (1972) in which he compared, for the most part, the USSR, Nazi Germany, and fascist Italy. He found the term "totalitarianism" to be useful and justified in relation to these states. The regimes, though diverse in many ways, contained enough common and specific features to distinguish them from traditional authoritarian systems. Among these features he put more emphasis than previous scholars on the subordination of the legal system to the political regime. As regards the USSR, Schapiro had demonstrated this in some detail in his other writings, where salient themes included, to quote Professor Lipson's summary, "the frequent failure of the Soviet legal apparatus to adhere to even those restraints that were professed in Soviet legal enactments," and "the facility with which forms of law were abused or circumvented in order to carry out policies that infringed on human rights."

Schapiro had a gift for the lapidary phrase. This showed to good effect in his generalizations. His preface to Dan's book contains a

characteristic example. "Revolution," he wrote, "is pitiless, shapeless, and nearly always seems to provide a cure which is worse than the disease."

* * * * *

In all, over 35 years, Schapiro wrote seven books, edited four, translated one, contributed introductions to about ten, and published at least sixty articles or chapters in books and journals. Beyond this he wrote, in all probability, a couple of hundred book reviews, plus the occasional article for a newspaper.

As a book reviewer, Schapiro contributed to a wide range of publications, including, quite often, leftish ones like The New Statesman. He was generous in his praise, even of authors whose views diverged widely from his own, and gently tactful in his criticism. Very seldom did his tone become polemical. Once, though, I recall, he was so incensed by a reviewer's attack on an eminent contributor to a book he had edited that he abandoned his usual tact and ended his reply with the insulting Russian proverb "Paper will stand anything!" (bumaga vsë terpit!). On his death, the editors of the New York Review of Books and similar publications praised him in their columns for his erudition and his elegant prose. He was also sorely missed by the publishers for whom he read manuscripts as a consultant.

* * * * *

Let us turn now to some overall assessments of Schapiro's work. In the Festschrift in his honour, Harry Rigby stressed the importance of Schapiro's Russian upbringing. He then continued:

> And yet how English, too, are the qualities, convictions and standards infusing Schapiro's work: the suspicion of vague abstractions, the distrust of panaceas, the respect for hard

> facts, common sense and practical judgement, the high store set on tolerance, fairness and diversity, the insistence on law as a necessary if not sufficient condition of justice and as protection against the twin evils of arbitrariness and anarchy, the abhorrence of irresponsible power.

Rigby also comments on Schapiro's scholarly technique:

> As a political scientist Schapiro is a methodological conservative, whose mode and language of analysis owe much to his wide reading in history, law and normative political theory, while taking little from the mainstream political science of recent decades, much of which he would perhaps see as a misguided attempt to import from the natural sciences a type of conceptual rigour and zakonomernost' offering little for understanding the affairs of men.

(Zakonomernost' is a Russian word meaning, roughly, "accordance with the laws of historical development.") Nonetheless, Rigby continues,

> ....he has shown what superb results can still be attained through the traditional virtues of careful and exhaustive study of the facts, precision of thought and language, objectivity of analysis which by no means excludes the exercise of moral judgment, and the marriage of common sense with Verstehen in the Weberian sense.

A good example of Schapiro's exercise of moral judgment has been eloquently described by Leon Lipson:

> Among the gravest of the grave charges he laid at the door of the Soviet regime was that of treason to the heritage of Russian democratic thought, that heritage to which it laid exclusive and patronizing claim. He could not abide the didactic triumphalism, the weirdly distorted rationalism, the falsification of the record, the self-righteous cruelty that ended or blighted so many lives as pretended sacrifices on the altar of science or of reason. Though he was tolerant about many things, including what he called 'tolerated law' in the Soviet Union, he had no tolerance for the heartlessly naive calculations by which some who called themselves progressives justified destruction and official murder as the price of progress. In the first place he didn't think it was progress, and in the second place he reprobated the equation because he thought that the governors had no right to put the two kinds of things on the same scales. He was dismayed by a polity that even sixty years after its revolution, wasted thousands of good peole and frightened millions of others away from coming to their aid. Evil saddened Schapiro, but he detested hypocrisy.

* * * * *

One might well ask how scholarly work of this sort struck the Soviet authorities. The answer, which may evoke surprise, is accurately reflected in this report by Maurice Cranston: "I have more than once been told by a Soviet functionary that Leonard Schapiro was a political scientist who had to be treated with respect. They couldn't afford to ignore him. It wasn't enough to suppress Leonard's books, they had to be refuted."

The seriousness with which the Kremlin approached this task was shown by the fact that Schapiro's Communist Party of the Soviet Union was translated in Moscow and issued as a secret, internal publication to certain members of the political elite. In the late 1960s a Muscovite friend of mine managed to borrow a numbered copy of this edition, on condition that he return it within 24 hours. At the cost of a night's sleep he read every page.

The favourite, and least derogatory epithet which the Soviet propagandists used for Schapiro was--"the not unknown (nebezyzvestnyi) British historian." This formulation betrayed the grudging respect referred to by Cranston. Sometimes, however, the anti-Semitism which often appears in the Soviet media with greater or lesser disguise debased the attacks on him. Then Schapiro would be described--inter alia and inaccurately--as "the son of a Kaunas rabbi"--as though the disrepute of such parentage must be obvious to all.

* * * * *

What now of Schapiro's daily involvements with the L.S.E.? Here we should mention first that his scholarship naturally cast some reflected glory on that institution. But he also served the School in many other ways, as Ralf Dahrendorf, its director from 1974 to 1984, stressed in his

remarks at the Memorial Meeting held in the School on 23 January 1984. Having mentioned that Schapiro became a Reader in 1958 and Professor of Political Science with special reference to Russia in 1963, Dahrendorf continued: "The School owes Leonard Schapiro more than he ever owed the School, despite the many nice things he said about it. It gave us great pleasure to add our own Honorary Fellowship to that of his original College, University College, and to the Fellowship of the British Academy, to which he was elected in 1971." Dahrendorf recalled that as he got to know Schapiro, "I came to value and cherish his measured judgment, his unfailing awareness and interest in things, his extraordinary capacity to grow and yet to remain with his feet firmly on the ground, his humanity."

Maurice Cranston noted that thanks to Schapiro's leadership, Soviet studies at L.S.E. "are remarkably well established. He built up that section of the School on the solid basis of a commitment to scholarship of the kind he himself practised. His collaborators, his assistants, his successors, his students, learned from him that political science should remain a science even in the areas where prejudices and passions are most intense and misinformation most rampant."

Several speakers told of Schapiro's skill as a teacher. Julius Gould, for example, related how he chaired a talk by Schapiro to a student audience only two weeks before he died: "He remained a teacher to the end, often reminding us that each new generation is an easy prey to old moral fantasies and political delusions."

And Dominic Lieven, an L.S.E. colleague in Schapiro's last years, recalled the importance for students of the weekly lectures he continued to give after his retirement in 1975, right up to his death: "Not all undergraduates shared Leonard's opinions. All respected his scholarship,

his intense concern for the truth, and his ability to cover huge subjects with a conciseness that was never superficial. They saw in Leonard not only a famous scholar, and an approachable and kindly professor, but also the embodiment of a generation for whom 1917 was a living memory, a generation which is now leaving us."

Lieven also recounted how, soon after his arrival at L.S.E., students began seeking his advice on possible interpretations of Schapiro's written comments on their papers. This led to painstaking conferences poring over his legendary handwriting, followed if necessary by appeals to his kind-hearted secretary, Ann Kennedy, whose compassion derived in part from her many years of struggling with the same problem herself, and whom he would thank in prefaces for her "great skill and patience." "Ultimately, if all else failed, anxious students would be sent to ask for Leonard's own interpretation, to be greeted with his invariable courtesy and his famous lop-sided smile."

The fact that he had no children was a source of sadness to Schapiro. To some extent his students were a substitute.

For the graduate students the highlight of the week was often Schapiro's seminar on problems of the communist world. Over the 18 years that I assisted him in this undertaking (in later years George Schöpflin was a third organizer) some 450 specialists read papers to it. Most of these scholars were visitors, about half of them coming from abroad--from Russia and the U.S.A., East and West Europe, Canada, India, Australia, Israel, and Japan. Despite Schapiro's civilized chairmanship the discussions could become heated. Especially was this the case when the "Polish mafia"--scholars of Polish origin among the many outsiders from the London

area who attended--were aroused, whether in a unison of protest against the speaker, or in mutual recrimination within their own ranks. Prominent among these lively contributors were Leopold Labedz and Lukas Hirszowicz.

But my own favourite memories of the seminar concern two meetings addressed by remarkable men of the older generation. At the age of 80 the famous Russian pioneer of constructivist art, Naum Gabo, entranced the group by recreating the early 1920s in a talk on "Culture and Revolution." And Karl Wittfogel, when approaching 90, brought smiles to every face when he unselfconsciously referred to Schapiro--who had recently passed 70--as "young Leonard here." Schapiro enjoyed the joke more than anyone. His eyes twinkled warmly, his beetling eyebrows bobbed up and down, the wrinkles that furrowed his face rippled away, and more than ever he became, in Lieven's phrase, a gift for a modern Rowlandson. The wrinkles had deepened in 1966, when a severe heart attack aged him in appearance, though not, miraculously, in mind or spirit. From that time on, he bore a variety of physical ailments with an art and a fortitude which prevented many people from noticing them, and quickly resumed his record of never missing a day's work.

Research students, too, had much for which to thank Schapiro. Apart from providing the usual services of a supervisor, he took more than average pains to help them find decent jobs. Then, as for other colleagues too, he read drafts of their books, and made thoughtful, constructive comments. Finally, he reviewed the books on publication.

Beyond all this, though, staff and students at L.S.E. will be grateful to Leonard for generations to come, as they exploit the riches of the Library's "Schapiro Collection." This consists of the books on

Soviet history and politics which he amassed throughout his life and then generously donated to the School after he retired.

Not surprisingly, Schapiro is thanked in countless prefaces for his help, and equally predictably his colleagues were keen to express their gratitude and admiration in a Festschrift. This duly appeared in 1980 under the title Authority, Power and Policy in the USSR: Essays Dedicated to Leonard Schapiro. The main problem for the editors--Harry Rigby, Archie Brown, and myself--was, of course, how to cut down to manageable proportions the huge list of worthy and eager potential contributors. The solution was twofold: first, to restrict the subject matter to Soviet politics, and thus give the volume some thematic coherence; and second, in view of Schapiro's devotion and close ties to L.S.E., to invite only scholars who had been his students or colleagues at the School. The outcome was a group of contributors who, while of varying political and methodological inclinations, were, to quote the editors, united in their "respect for, and aspiration to emulate, Leonard Schapiro's combination of meticulous scholarship with an interest in large and basic questions about the workings and nature of the Soviet political system and interpretation of its history." The success of the book--emphasized by the publication of a second edition in 1983--was due in no small part to the introduction and concluding remarks supplied by Harry Rigby in addition to his own chapter. These linked the chapters both to each other and to Schapiro's own work, thus lending the volume a suitable measure of unity.

Another monument to Schapiro will be a graduate studentship named in his honour. This is being established at the L.S.E. on the basis of an appeal for funds to his friends, colleagues, and former students.

* * * * *

Schapiro was honoured not only in Britain, and not only by academics. In 1967, for example, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences elected him an honorary member. A little earlier he was guest of honour and main speaker at the annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. And in 1980 he was invested by the Queen as a Companion of the British Empire.

In matters involving hard work rather than personal recognition it might perhaps be thought that Schapiro was better at giving than at receiving. There may be some truth in this: he made, for example, relatively little use of research assistants. On the other hand he paid generous tribute in his prefaces to people who had helped him. Notable among such helpers was Isabel de Madariaga, daughter of the exiled Spanish writer and a well-known historian of eighteenth century Russia, whom he married in 1943. Similarly thanked, after that marriage was dissolved in 1976, was Roma Thewes, a professional editor whom he married the same year and whose warmth sustained him to the end, as his physical powers declined but his scholarly output did not.

* * * * *

So far, we have paid little attention to matters outside Schapiro's writing and teaching. Readers may be surprised to learn that he still had some time and energy left after all he did in those areas. Let us now quote, then, what Schapiro wrote about his American friend Philip Mosely (1905-72), in order to note, however, that it applies equally well to Leonard himself:

> Like most busy and usefully occupied men, Mosely always seemed to have time to spare when it was a matter of public service, or helping someone who needed aid. His wisdom, his wide experience, his quick intelligence, his tact, and above all his unfailing good-humoured common sense naturally led to many demands on his time for

advice, for service on committees, for participation in projects or conferences, as contributor, chairman, or editor of proceedings.

These words, printed in the Festschrift for Mosely edited by Schapiro's and Mosely's mutual friend Robert Byrnes (1976), convey precisely what so many colleagues saw in Schapiro too. They come, we should mention, from a moving essay of the sort that Schapiro also wrote about his friends Max Hayward and Victor Frank in collections of their writings published after their deaths. He was too private a person to want to publicize his inner feelings about these people in their lifetimes, which is probably why he never wrote about other close friends such as George Katkov and Michael Oakeshott.

Schapiro's commitments to Keston College and the Institute of Jewish Affairs have already been mentioned. On top of these, he was chairman of the editorial board of Government and Opposition from its founding in 1966 until his death, and also, from 1970 on, of the council of the Institute for the Study of Conflict. He served, too, on the Research Council of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C. In addition, he was the General Editor of the book series "Key Concepts in Political Science," published by Pall Mall Press and later by Macmillan. This series was described by his publisher friend Derick Mirfin in The Times on the basis of firsthand experience:

> Launched in the late 1960s under his inspiration and direction, it broke new ground in clarifying and analysing for the student major themes in the study of politics, and was gratefully welcomed in academic centres in Britain and overseas, especially in the United States.
>
> No series editor had a deeper concern for the interests of his authors, or a more skilled ability in bringing out the best in them--a quality demanding tactful firmness and judgment, and very hard work in reading and advising on their written material.

Beyond all these onerous tasks, Schapiro also found time to give advice to government and academic bodies at special meetings and

conferences, and was often asked to take the chair. Sometimes, too, he expressed opinions on topics of the day through the mass media, giving a radio talk or interview, or writing a letter to an editor. On these occasions he tried to apply the lessons he had learned from a careful study of Soviet communism. His message would often be: Don't think you can use conventional techniques of diplomacy when dealing with a regime openly nurtured in the spirit of "Who will crush whom?" (kto-kogo?); beware of deception; look beyond superficial impressions at the underlying realities of political and military power; and so on.

It is interesting to note here that Schapiro was never active in party politics. Not until he reached old age did he even join a political party, although he once told me that he had always cast his vote for the one he eventually joined, the Conservatives. This lack of strong party commitment did not stem from any prickly individualism of the sort to which academics are prone: he believed strongly in the importance of institutions, and sat through many a tedious committee meeting to prove it. No, it probably came more from a feeling that his expertise on the USSR could be helpful to his country and the western world, and he should not, therefore, by associating himself publicly with one particular party, inhibit some groups from taking his views seriously.

The last of Schapiro's regular public activities that I shall mention was wholly different from the others, and derived from his training as a lawyer. For many years he was an unpaid legal adviser to the National Council for One-Parent Families (its original name was, I believe, "The Society for the Unmarried Mother and her Child"). Then,

in 1976, he became its vice-president. He performed this charitable work quietly, and few of his colleagues even knew about it.

* * * * *

In his private pursuits Schapiro was a passionate lover of art and music and the countryside. The only sort of professional meetings he would sometimes miss were those held in the evening: nothing could interfere with his concert-going. He was specially fond of, among other things, early English music, and church music in particular. As for art, Helène Carrère d'Encausse tells of meeting him in the 1960s in Venice at some conferences on the early history of Bolshevism. She discovered that he "knew Venice as perfectly as he knew Lenin." He could recount the history "of the smallest piazzas, of the most remote churches, of every bridge. He knew where Vivaldi was born, where he played the organ, in which church Tintoretto painted part of the ceiling." One day she went with him to the Accademia, where he "turned out to be an outstanding expert on Bellini's painting, running from one gallery to another in order to rediscover again and again his beloved paintings, commenting on and explaining them to me.... After Bellini, I followed Leonard Schapiro to San Giorgio degli Schiavoni. In this small church I got an unforgettable lecture on Carpaccio."

Having had a similar experience with Leonard myself, in a church in Brussels, I can confirm the thrust of Carrère d'Encausse's report. He was also a devotee of English architecture and of English painting of the 18th and early 19th centuries.

Finally, regarding the most private of all matters for Schapiro, religion, we may turn to the testimony of Michael Bourdeaux. This is

what he recounts:

> Leonard asked me to come and see him early in 1982, and for the first time he openly talked to me of his faith. He told me that he had never embraced formally the tenets of any organised religion,...but that nevertheless he felt himself to be a man of faith. This was much more, he said, than just respect for the Jewish and the Christian traditions. It was a personal belief in the power of God and the certain knowledge that his own life was in God's hands. Although not ill at the time we spoke, Leonard was prepared for death, he said; but he asked me if I could help to bring together at his funeral his nearest and dearest of both faiths in a simple act of harmony and conformity to those beliefs which he held.

* * * * *

Leonard Schapiro died in London on 2 November 1983, a day and a half after suffering a stroke, and without regaining consciousness. He was 75. On 7 November Michael Bourdeaux was able to carry out his request.

* * * * *

This memoir has had quite a lot to say about Schapiro the erudite scholar and the cultivated citizen, but less about my third characterization of him as "a gentleman of modesty, generosity and integrity." One explanation for these personal qualities, to which we turn in conclusion, is the fact that he combined in himself some of the best traits of the Russian and the Briton. Dominic Lieven recalls an early meeting with him in a favourite haunt:

> The venue was the Reform Club, but the conversation was all about the Russian intelligentsia. As we moved from Shipov to Chicherin and thence to Martov and to Dan, one part of Leonard seemed very close to these Russian <u>intelligenty</u> of the past. Yet Leonard...also seemed in complete harmony with the traditions of Gray, of Melbourne, of Durham, and of the other great liberal worthies under whose portraits we were sitting.

Maurice Cranston puts his finger on another aspect of Schapiro's personality, his characteristic blend of generosity and realism:

> He was a model of a wise man. I always found his company very reassuring. I don't think his opinion of the human race was any more flattering than that of Thomas Hobbes, but he always took the most positive view of actual individuals. He was the first to notice and admire any admirable quality any person might possess. He always liked to speak well of people and he did.

Schapiro's generosity was genuine, because uncalculating. I remember, in 1961, being intrigued by an anonymous review of Adam Ulam's The Unfinished Revolution in The Economist. As an enthusaistic undergraduate, I wrote to the reviewer, care of The Economist, asking where I could obtain the book, which was not available locally. A week later, back came a reply from Leonard Schapiro, explaining that it had been published only in the U.S.A., but he would be happy to lend me--an unknown student at Cambridge whom he had never met--his own copy, which he enclosed. This was only the first of Leonard's innumerable kindnesses towards me over the next 22 years.

But generosity without integrity is little worth. On this crucial subject Julius Gould has said of Leonard:

> There is no-one to whom I could more readily turn in time of difficulty and secure wise counsel, encouragement and moral support. Where Leonard gave you his word, his word was his bond; he would not give it to you otherwise.... He would never slip his moorings and sail silently in the opposite direction.

This was my experience of Leonard, too, and that of dozens of his colleagues and friends. It is the key to what Russians would call his "tselnost'." This evocative word usually refers to someone's personality, and means, simultaneously, wholeness, roundedness, harmoniousness, integrity.

To have these qualities, and to be, as we have seen, a gentleman, a citizen, and a scholar, all in ample measure--this was Leonard Schapiro's

achievement. It is certain to live on in a variety of transparent and mysterious ways.