

article in *Canadian Slavic Studies*, 4, no. 2, pp. 300–326, for example) and even achieve a kind of consensus about the universal validity of certain sociopolitical, socioeconomic, or sociopsychological processes in the study of sectarianism. The book says nothing about the future of such studies, but there must be one. And if A. I. Klibanov can publish such a book as this—fragmentary and tantalizing though it is—we in the West should no longer be left in the position of asking ourselves, What will Klibanov tell us next year? We should be allowed to conduct field work with our Soviet colleagues. Until that day, this reviewer can only say: Encore!

ETHEL DUNN

*Highgate Road Social Science Research Station
Berkeley, California*

ISTORIIA I ORGANIZATSIIA ARKHIVNOGO DELA V SSSR (1917–1945 GG.). By V. V. Maksakov. Edited with an introduction by Iu. F. Kononov. Moscow: "Nauka," 1969. 431 pp. 1.87 rubles.

The impressive development of archives and of a sophisticated administrative apparatus to insure the control, preservation, and use of documentary records in the Soviet Union has generally not received the attention it deserves. This volume stands out as the most comprehensive account available of the formative period of the Soviet archival system, but disappointingly fails to assess adequately the significance of the Soviet achievement.

Maksakov deals with the subject chronologically, and in the first part of his book incorporates a slightly re-edited version of his earlier work, *Arkhivnoe delo v pervye gody sovetskoi vlasti* (Moscow, 1959). He covers such subjects as the formation and development of the State Archival Fond to include the entire national documentary legacy, the successive executive agencies for the administration of archives, the evolution of central and regional state repositories, the development of Communist Party archives, documentary publication projects, and aspects of archival training and national congresses. On all of these subjects the volume brings together much factual material, but it reads like an official text for the Moscow State Historical-Archival Institute, where the author taught for thirty years.

Associated throughout his life with the administration of Soviet archives and the training of archivists, V. V. Maksakov (1886–1964) was in a unique position to explore this topic. Yet this book, published posthumously under the editorship of Iu. F. Kononov, suggests an author too involved with the administration and factual complexities of his subject to offer many insights that would put the often confusing details into historical perspective. For example, Maksakov discusses at length Lenin's decree calling for archival centralization in 1918, but reveals much less about its intellectual origins than S. O. Shmidt does in his recent article in *Problemy arkhivovedeniia i istorii arkhivnykh uchrezhdenii* (Leningrad, 1970, pp. 19–35).

The author chronicles the many changes in archival nomenclature and organization in the years from 1917 to 1945, but he gives little analysis of the reasons for them. Too often Maksakov summarizes successive archival decrees or official pronouncements as if in a vacuum, without explaining their general purpose, the extent of their implementation, or their practical effects on previously existing institutions or administrative practices.

The 1945 cut-off point for the study appears somewhat artificial, because the major archival reorganization of 1941, the treatment of which is regrettably sketchy,

took effect only after World War II, and the immediate postwar changes that affected its implementation are not covered. The short conclusion which attempts to relate the situation in the early 1940s to subsequent developments appears to have been "tacked on."

The reference value of the study is impaired by its lack of adequate indexing (only personal names are indexed, although the book is notably weak in its treatment of the individuals involved in archival development). The lack of a bibliography is mitigated by extensive footnote references to the most important literature on the subject. Because of the complex and often confusing changes that took place during the period, the addition of several developmental or organizational charts would have made many parts of the text much easier to follow.

Despite the book's weaknesses, however, Western scholars have reason to be grateful for Maksakov's genuinely helpful if limited account, for it brings together an abundance of factual material about the early years of the archive system in which Maksakov himself played such a major role.

PATRICIA K. GRIMSTED
American University

HISTORIA LITWY. By *Jerzy Ochmański*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1967. 346 pp.

Jerzy Ochmański, the author of this twelve-chapter survey of Lithuanian history from ancient times to the twentieth century, is a contemporary Polish specialist of Lithuanian history with a superior command of the Lithuanian language. The significance of this is obvious: his insight into Lithuanian history is far superior to that of the majority of Polish scholars (especially émigrés) who are unfamiliar with original Lithuanian sources and moreover show a pronounced tendency to think of Lithuania as a Polish province without a distinct history and culture of its own. Professor Ochmański pays much attention to the social and intellectual forces in Lithuania which led to the national revival at the end of the nineteenth century. Noting that the first printed work in Lithuanian was a Protestant catechism and that the father of Lithuanian epic poetry was Kristijonas Donelaitis, a Lutheran minister, Ochmański emphasizes the significance of Protestantism in the evolution of Lithuanian national identity and civilization. One gets the feeling, and quite properly so, that Protestantism was a more important force than is generally conceded by the prominent Lithuanian Catholic historians, who usually minimize its impact.

Ochmański's book holds up extremely well in comparison with most modern Soviet Lithuanian historical works. On the whole, Soviet Lithuanian historians are subject to a rigid pro-Russian party line, which in many respects has resulted in serious distortions of twentieth-century Lithuanian history, particularly for the period from 1919 to 1940. Ochmański, writing in Poland, appears to feel less constrained to avoid emphasizing the cultural and social achievements of the Lithuanian republic through 1939. But he faces a dilemma as soon as he reaches the post-1939 period. His description of the Sovietization of Lithuania in 1940 seems deliberately vague. He refrains from discussing the provisions of the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939, which brought about the forceful Sovietization of the three Baltic states as well as the partitioning of Poland. While admitting rather generally that after 1939 Lithuania had been made to carry the burden of erroneous Stalinist policies, he makes no mention of the large-scale deportations of Lithuanians to