

action against the refugees" (p. 168). The sophisticated and subtle analysis of the Western position will probably remain the definitive treatment for a long time.

Yet this book falls short of being a definitive treatment of the whole subject, because the Soviet position and the Soviet tactics are not differentiated satisfactorily. Soviet sources have not been adequately used. The text belies the author's claim (p. xvii) that he relied on *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, for by my count they are cited only three times. Michel Tatu's *Power in the Kremlin* inexplicably does not even appear in the bibliography. If the author had assumed that the Soviet goals in the Berlin crisis ranged from a minimum to a maximum, and that different elements in the Soviet political elite were prepared to take different degrees of risk, he would not ask on page 185 why Khrushchev relented, but rather why in 1961 the Soviet Union accepted the minimum goal of stemming the emigration from East Germany. Schick rather surprisingly omits the well-known Kennedy interview with Stewart Alsop and the Gilpatric statement which officially revised the interpretation of the missile gap that Kennedy had campaigned on the year before. This must have contributed to Soviet caution in 1961 and, as Schick convincingly demonstrates, made the emplacement of missiles in Cuba seem like a necessary condition for a bolder Soviet strategy in Berlin in 1962.

Schick has given us a definitive treatment of the Western side in the Berlin crisis; the definitive study of the Soviet side remains to be written.

HERBERT S. DINERSTEIN
Johns Hopkins University

ISTOCHNIKOVEDENIE ISTORII SSSR XIX-NACHALA XX V. Edited by
I. A. Fedosov et al. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1970.
469 pp. 1.37 rubles.

In the USSR *istochnikovedenie*, or the methodology and critical study of sources, is a well-established auxiliary historical discipline. Its methods and techniques were already developed before 1917. Soviet historians and archivists have applied these methods and techniques to new areas of economic and social history and made them accessible to a large number of history and library science students. *Istochnikovedenie* is a required course for students specializing in history at Soviet universities, pedagogical institutes, and schools for archivists. Since 1940 a number of handbooks have been published for such students, the most recent of which is the present volume. It is the only general introduction to the study of Russian historical sources for the entire period 1800–1917.

The subject matter of the sources discussed in this manual falls into seven general categories: (1) social and economic history, (2) institutional and legislative history, (3) foreign policy, (4) the liberation movement, (5) the periodical press, (6) memoirs, diaries, and personal correspondence, and (7) the works of Lenin. The authors' collective includes seventeen individuals, who have contributed to this volume seventeen chapters and a bibliography. Each general category is divided chronologically into separate chapters. Seven of these chapters concern the "period of imperialism," 1890–1917, and they tend unmistakably to be less critical and more tendentious than the remaining ten chapters for the period 1800–1890. However, the chapter on diplomatic history during the "period of imperialism" is very good. Written by V. I. Bovykin and I. I. Astafiev, it provides one of the

best brief, critical discussions in any language of sources for the study of Russian and European diplomacy during the period immediately preceding World War I. P. A. Zaionchkovsky's chapter, "Zakonodatel'nye akty i materialy oftsial'nogo deloproizvodstva XIX v. kak istoricheskii istochnik," is perhaps the most informative and useful essay in this volume. For American and European graduate students who intend to use published tsarist official materials or to work in Soviet archives on problems of nineteenth-century bureaucratic history, Zaionchkovsky's chapter is a must; it will save them much time and effort in locating research materials and in learning basic facts about the operation of the tsarist bureaucracy. Finally, of great value for the investigation of Russian political, social, and economic history are the chapters on the use of statistical sources (chap. 1), the records of court investigations and trials (chaps. 7-9), the periodical press (chaps. 11 and 12), and memoirs, diaries, and personal correspondence (chaps. 14 and 15).

This manual should be of particular interest to teachers of seminars on Russian economic, social, diplomatic, and institutional history as well as to advanced students intending to work in Soviet archives. But it is an old-fashioned, unexciting work. It refers solemnly to "Marxist" and "Soviet historical science" and contains no suggestion of new methods and approaches to the study of history. Its bibliography is inadequate and does not even list all the monographs, journals, and sources mentioned in the text. There is no index.

EDWARD C. THADEN
University of Illinois, Chicago

THE WRITING OF HISTORY IN THE SOVIET UNION. By *Anatole G. Mazour*. Hoover Institution Publications, 87. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1971. xvi, 383 pp. \$17.50.

As a supplement to his well-known *Modern Russian Historiography* (New York, 1958), Professor Mazour now offers a survey of Soviet historical writing on some major themes and topics in Russian history. Publications have been so abundant, especially in recent years, that no single Western scholar, however omniscient, could be expected to provide a comprehensive coverage. Quite justifiably, therefore, this work claims to be no more than a selection, yet it contains references to more than two thousand Soviet books and articles. Almost everyone with an interest in the field will be able to learn something from this volume. It may also stimulate further experiments in this genre of scholarship, which is less familiar in the Anglo-Saxon world than it is in continental Europe. The *Literaturbericht*, a critical survey of writings on a particular period or topic, occupies a position midway between a bibliography and a historiographical essay, and is an invaluable tool to the researcher.

However admirable Mazour's courage in tackling this daunting task, it must be acknowledged that the result is somewhat uneven. The best portions, which read as if they were written for some earlier occasion, are those devoted to a detailed examination of Soviet writings on the Civil War, particularly those published in the 1920s, many of which will be unknown even to specialists. Mazour also provides a gripping description of the catastrophic impact of the Stalin cult on this branch of Soviet historiography and assesses the progress made in overcoming it since 1956. On the latter point he is perhaps oversanguine, for even the military