

RELIGIOZNOE SEKTANTSTVO I SOVREMENNOST' (SOTSIOLOGICHESKIE I ISTORICHESKIE OCHERKI). By *A. I. Klibanov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1969. 272 pp. 1.62 rubles.

Klibanov's latest book is divided into two parts, preceded by an introduction and a lengthy discussion of the Soviet literature on the sectarian question. There are also two appendixes (describing sectarian attitudes toward the international scene and socialist reconstruction from letters and appeals in the 1920s) and four indexes (names, geographical and biblical terms, and sectarian and religious organizations).

The first half of the book has to do with "the present state of religious sectarianism." No serious student should make the mistake of thinking he has seen this material before, even though it contains material from previously published work, both by Klibanov and by other authors. The section on the Soviet literature, for example, appears at first glance to be a reprint of an article from *Voprosy nauchnogo ateizma*, vol. 4 (see the translation in *Soviet Sociology*, 8, no. 3-4, pp. 239-79). It is not. Whereas the former has a laudatory assessment of F. M. Putintsev's study of sectarians (as befits a fiftieth anniversary review), the present book suggests that the contemporary Soviet reader can tell that Putintsev's work, which set the style for a generation of scholarship, is dated (pp. 30-31). Klibanov's assessment thus raises an important methodological question. Granted, it is incorrect to place all sectarians in the camp of counterrevolution, just as it is incorrect to say that all sectarians were revolutionaries. Does this mean that all work done, so to speak, in Putintsev's style will have to be redone? This question is answered only obliquely by the mass of statistical and demographic data in Klibanov's book.

The burden of Klibanov's argument in this first section is that there are now sociopsychological rather than socioeconomic reasons for being a sectarian. In this connection, it is significant that he says that the prison sentences handed out to sectarians for antisocial behavior are the object of study by the Soviet sociologists (p. 52). This reviewer has read in detail or scanned the major works on sectarianism that have appeared since 1955 (Klibanov says there are 199, but he is forced to list journalistic articles and brief communications along with the scholarly monographs). All too few of these take account of the effect of legal sanctions against sectarian activity. Klibanov's own attitude toward sectarian response to this pressure, it must be said, lacks the objectivity one expects from him (p. 109). He must know, far better than most researchers, that present-day attitudes are the result of centuries of history. In the past, a person joined a sect as an act of sociopolitical protest. Klibanov's data on Voronezh Oblast indicate that this may still be true. Nationalism, family history, and opportunities for social mobility are still quite important factors, as they were under tsarism.

Thus another vital question is, What is the significance of sociopsychological factors for membership in a sect? Klibanov's sections on sectarian psychology and social alienation (pp. 134-78) are based on personal observation and must rank among the finest works on this topic, even though they could as easily have been written in the last century. Klibanov breaks off with much still unsaid and devotes the remainder of his book to historical chapters—materials in the Chertkov archives, sectarians and the Soviet armed forces in 1918-21, sectarians and the famine of 1921, sectarians and NEP, and sectarianism and the socialist reconstruction of the countryside (see the translation in *Soviet Sociology*, 8, no. 3-4, pp. 383-411).

There is much in this book that is interesting; old facts are seen in new perspectives. Some of us can fit bits and pieces of Klibanov's research into our own (see my

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,