

POLITYKA WEWNĘTRZNA CARATU I RUCHY SPOŁECZNE W ROSJI NA POCZĄTKU XX WIEKU. By *Ludwik Bazylow*. Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1966. 427 pp. 80 zł.

This book is essentially an outline of the internal history of Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century, with special emphasis on the role of the revolutionary movement. It covers from the first part of the rule of Nicholas II up to "Bloody Sunday."

After an extensive and quite skillful examination of the sources, the author devotes one chapter to each of the following topics: a general examination of Russia's domestic situation on the eve of the twentieth century, the agrarian problem, the populist movement, the working-class movement with special emphasis on the Bolshevik Party, the ferment among the students and the liberal opposition, and "police socialism" and the ministry of von Plehve. The monograph ends with a brief but vivid and dramatic survey of the opening phases of the Revolution of 1905 in the form of two chapters: "Spring in Autumn" and "Gapon."

The book is provided with an extensive bibliography in several languages, including many books and articles in English. Among the works missing is Cyril E. Black's *Dynamics of Modernization* (1966). The author is familiar with English-language monographs and quotes them quite often, a phenomenon not common in East European historical works. But the main value of the book is that it is based on source material seldom available to Western historians—the police archives and documents of various tsarist ministries.

Another positive feature is the author's attempt at objectivity toward "class enemies" as well as "bourgeois" historians. Repeatedly he praises various minor achievements not only of the "Zemstvos," or the Liberals, but even of the tsarist bureaucracy. These outbursts of generosity do not prevent the author from invoking Lenin as the ultimate source of wisdom and the supreme judge of all issues. But he does it less often than authors of most works of this kind. One could quote, in this respect, a well-known French saying: "Il est bien dans son genre, mais son genre n'est pas bien." On the whole, one should say that, under the circumstances, it is a good, fairly objective book, interesting more for a handful of unknown details than for breaking new ground.

M. K. DZIEWANOWSKI
Boston University

ISTORIJA RUSSKOI BIBLIOGRAFIJ NACHALA XX VEKA (DO OKTIABRIA 1917 GODA). By *M. V. Mashkova*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Kniga," 1969. 492 pp. 1 ruble, 86 kopeks.

Russian bibliographers show a well-developed sense of the past. Indeed, their historiographical enthusiasms know no frontiers—as witness K. R. Simon's excellent and regrettably little-known history of "foreign" bibliography (1965). However, a domestic gap has remained between N. V. Zdobnov's history of Russian bibliography to 1900 (1955) and the numerous surveys of developments since 1917.

The gap from 1900 to October 1917 is short but by no means negligible: the period included important developments in political, literary, and intellectual life, and it marked the climacteric of "bourgeois" Russia; moreover, it is one which is in certain respects poorly covered by formal bibliographies. M. V. Mashkova's book is therefore devoted to a significant and virgin field. Her own bibliographical work and her previous excursions into the history of the discipline mean that she has a

thorough grasp of subject and sources; and outstanding features of her book are her command of the massive literature (over one thousand titles) and her use of unpublished materials. She draws on Soviet archives for documents which throw light, in particular, on the history of the bibliography of proscribed literature, and she gives many references to work which has remained partly or wholly unpublished. She covers the entire field, from the bibliography of current output (with a detailed study of *Knizhnaia letopis'* and its precursors), general and selective bibliographies, bibliographies of periodicals, of book reviews, of proscribed and children's literature (both excellent), and subject bibliographies (humanities and sciences). Her account of bibliographical organizations and her sketches of the activities of the bibliographical giants who campaigned and polemicized on the Russian earth in those days (e.g., Bodnarsky, Derunov, Lisovsky, Loviagin, Mezier, Rubakin, Toropov, and Vengerov) are lovingly and judiciously done.

Mashkova's approach is nothing if not *partiinyi*, but it is also scholarly, and one knows where one stands. She is not easy to fault, but her almost complete exclusion of published library catalogues—which she might perhaps justify on “formal” grounds—is at least arguable: many important catalogues were issued during the period, and in certain fields (e.g., official publications and military science) they are some of the most effective guides that we possess. The book has a reliable index of names, but the absence of an index of titles is difficult to excuse. However, these are clearly-delimited lacunae, and Mashkova's book is one which nonbibliographers concerned with the printed sources for the period 1900–1917 would be well advised not to dismiss with a *bibliographiae non leguntur*—or some less orotund gibe.

J. S. G. SIMMONS
All Souls College, Oxford

VLADIMIR AKIMOV ON THE DILEMMAS OF RUSSIAN MARXISM, 1895–1903: THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY; A SHORT HISTORY OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT IN RUSSIA. Two texts in translation, edited and introduced by *Jonathan Frankel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. x, 390 pp. \$10.00.

For once a book offers more than its title may suggest. This volume contains two major tracts of Vladimir Akimov (Makhnovets), who was probably the most interesting and certainly the most attractive figure of the *Rabochee delo* group and of so-called Economism. It would be hard to find fault with the painstaking translation and erudite annotation—obviously a labor of love—that went into this edition of two rare and valuable major documents now made available to students of the Russian revolutionary movement and of European socialism. This in itself is no mean achievement. But Dr. Frankel has done more than that. While rescuing Akimov from undeserved oblivion and unraveling the hitherto intractable mystery of Economism, he has also tried to put both into the historical context of Russian social democracy. In the process he has produced an excellent introductory essay called “The Polarization of Russian Marxism (1883–1903).” That lengthy essay (pp. 3–98) is a masterpiece in its own right and may well be regarded as the best introduction to Russian Marxist theory and debate.

Akimov's tract *The Second Congress of Russian Social Democracy* contains much of what he was prevented from saying at the Second Congress of the RSDRP