In the middle of the nineteenth century, the Russian empire made a dramatic advance on the Pacific by annexing the vast regions of the Amur and Ussuri rivers. Although this remote realm was a virtual *terra incognita* for the Russian educated public, the acquisition of an “Asian Mississippi” attracted great attention nonetheless and, indeed, even stirred the dreams of Russia’s most outstanding visionaries – among them Alexander Herzen, who confidently proclaimed the annexation on Siberia’s Manchurian frontier to be “civilization’s most important step forward.” Within a decade of its acquisition, however, the dreams were gone and the Amur region largely abandoned and forgotten. In an innovative examination of Russia’s perceptions of the new territories in the Far East, Mark Bassin sets the Amur enigma squarely in the context of the *Zeitgeist* in Russia at the time. His argument is that the grand vision of Russia on the shores of the Pacific was intimately related to a number of major preoccupations of the day, including social reform, the search of *samopoznanie* or national self-understanding, Russia’s relationship to the West, and the belief in a mission of universal salvation.

Written with an equally firm footing in the disciplines of historical geography and intellectual history, *Imperial Visions* demonstrates the fundamental importance of geographical imagination for the *mentalité* of imperial Russia. The work offers a truly novel perspective on the complex and ambivalent ideological relationship between Russian nationalism, geographical identity, and imperial expansion.
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I came to know Dr. Mark Bassin well during his graduate studies at the University of California in Berkeley. I remember how shortly after we met he asked me to speak Russian with him as much as possible. To be sure, he already read fluently and could use a variety of Russian sources. But he also wanted to speak the language correctly and to be as close to the Russian tongue and Russian culture as possible. So we spoke Russian, and still do when we meet. Bassin's request made it easier for me to follow over the years his progress in Russian to a very high degree of proficiency. I think that the translations from Russian in the present book, including poetry, are excellent. Apparently Bassin learned German in the same fundamental manner. The larger point is that Bassin as a scholar is the opposite of parochial. A young American who has already lived, studied, taught, conducted research, or engaged in some combination of these activities in England, Canada, Russia, and Germany, he is naturally part of the entire Western intellectual world, without fear or favor. In reference to the present work and to his treatment of Russia in general, Bassin is entirely free of the sense of unfathomable difference, mystery, or strangeness which continues to spoil so much Western scholarship on Russia.

Mark Bassin is both a geographer and an intellectual historian, and he is very well aware of his special position and allegiance to both disciplines. Without presuming to judge Bassin as a geographer, except to state that I have no criticisms to offer in that connection, I do think that he, and the present volume in particular, have much to contribute to intellectual history. One asset is the richness of detail and an apposite discussion of many individuals very little known in scholarly literature, figures who are smoothly integrated with Peter the Great or Dostoevskii. It can be argued that the book is most valuable for its fragments. Yet these fragments also form a connected and clear narrative with a beginning, a middle, and an end. Especially praiseworthy is the author's focus on the nature and structure of ideas, which keeps the surging flow of disparate details together and constitutes the skeleton, so to speak, of the book. (That focus, characteristic of effective intellectual historians, is
present in all of Bassin’s writings – for example in his treatment of Eurasianism, which in other hands has recently become a hopelessly vague and even self-contradictory term.)

*Imperial Visions: Nationalist Imagination and Geographical Expansion in the Russian Far East, 1840–1865* can be read, and read correctly, as a story of a romantic vision destroyed by a better acquaintance with reality. The Amur river and area, which for ages had been outside the bounds of Russian history, rather suddenly began to attract Russian attention in the nineteenth century – in the 1830s, 1840s, and culminating in the 1850s. The “Siberian Mississippi” seemed to offer enormous possibilities of development, and even to promise a new epoch for Russia. The Russian version of such romantic visions was shared, interestingly enough, by certain non-Russians, including some overwhelming American enthusiasm. Yet before long the vision lost its luster and in fact disappeared. Even the Trans-Siberian railroad, when it was finally built before the end of the century, cut across Chinese territory rather than follow the Amur river: dream could not be turned into reality. Besides, I might add, a more pragmatic and positivistic intellectual orientation largely replaced romanticism.

Still, this blunt and essentially correct estimate of what happened is not complete. The dream of the Amur was destroyed not only by such “objective” factors as the shallowness of the river, the frighteningly adverse climate, the small number of inhabitants, and the almost total lack of any kind of infrastructure in the entire enormous area, but also, as the book indicates, by competing visions – whether that of the Pan-Slavs, pointing to Europe, or other visions pointing to Asia, but to Central Asia rather than the Far East. Reality could defeat dreams, but not stop people dreaming. And even destroyed visions could reappear in a mutated form. In a few fascinating pages in his “Conclusion” Bassin writes of the great communist project of the 1970s and 1980s, that of the BAM or the Baikal–Amur Mainline railway, which was built to run some 125–185 miles north of the Trans-Siberian and was, again, to open up an enormous territory for development and progress. “In precisely that same way that visions of the mid-nineteenth century proved to be so empty and misleading, so the great promise of the BAM railway gave way eventually to utter failure” (p. 281). What next?

Nicholas V. Riasanovsky
University of California, Berkeley
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