

1892). The period is also known for the successful realization of the government policy "Russia for the Russians" (p. 97). Zaionchkovsky suggests that the "political reaction of the 1880s and the beginning of the 1890s became one of the reasons for the revolutionary events during 1905–1907" (p. 436).

The general failure of government policy in this period the author ascribes to the contradictions of autocratic Russia's "modernization," the growth of administrative *proizvol*, divisiveness within the government, and the "growth of a massive workers' movement and its unification with social democracy" (p. 261). Zaionchkovsky presents his case effectively on all these points except the last. Even if there was "unification" of the workers with any ideological group, it could hardly have been with social democracy, which at the time was still in embryo. Except for this instance, the author discusses Marxist class analysis only in commonplace references, such as the "gentry interests" and their support of the government. He even restricts the Soviet-Communist jargon used to very modest proportions.

The book has some obvious faults. The author's analysis of the censorship of press, publications, and the libraries is essentially a reworking of previously published studies. As a result, nothing is mentioned of the malicious activity of the "Black Ministry," which strictly checked religious writings and publications, and frequently intercepted and opened the mail. Similarly Zaionchkovsky includes only a sketchy analysis of the *zemstvo* counterreform, and is satisfied to refer the reader to the detailed study of his student, L. G. Zakharova. More serious is the author's failure to analyze the intellectual content of political activity during the reign. Thus Zaionchkovsky does not discuss seriously the ideological evolution of the reactionary "quartet," nor does he analyze his use of the "holy trinity" slogan of Uvarov or assign to it some meaning beyond common textbook generalities (p. 309). Finally, the book should have been supplied with an errata sheet—for example, the second sentence on page 105 makes sense only after *kak* is added: "Tak [kak] ia naznachaiu."

None of these comments should be taken as seriously detracting from the book's overall worth. Professor Zaionchkovsky introduces a wealth of new information, and his study must be considered an outstanding pioneer work.

VIRGIL DEWAIN MEDLIN

Oklahoma City University and the University of Oklahoma

THE POLISH QUESTION IN THE RUSSIAN STATE DUMA. By *Edward Chmielewski*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970. vi, 188 pp. \$7.50.

This book is a study of an important problem in both Polish and Russian history. It is a novel study from the standpoint of the historical perspective it offers while also dealing with the topic in its entirety. The author examines in detail the stenographic reports not only of the four Dumas but also of the State Council (his title is incomplete in this connection), and he makes broad use of contemporary newspaper accounts, memoirs written by participants and witnesses, and the existing literature, both Russian and Polish, on different aspects of the problem. It is a conscientious work and a worthy contribution.

For the informed reader, however, there are notable disappointments. First, the introduction on "Russo-Polish Relations in the Nineteenth Century" (nineteen pages) is too sketchy. One would especially like to know more about the different

trends in Polish public opinion concerning relations with Russia on the eve of 1905. Here one touches on the weakest point in the author's conception: Dmowski's ideology, important as it was, did not dominate the Polish picture, especially at that time. Also too brief is the chapter "The Revolution of 1905 and the Polish Question." One misses an analysis in depth of different Russian attitudes toward the Polish Question—especially their ideological background.

The chapter entitled "The Poles in the First and Second Dumas" is necessarily short because of the brief existence of these Dumas. In this chapter (p. 34) the author automatically espouses the misunderstanding created in the minds of the Polish deputies at that time concerning the omission of the term "Kingdom of Poland" in the provisions published on April 23, 1906. Their reaction was hasty and reflected the confusion of the Duma beginnings. There was no omission of the term, for it was kept in the *full* text of the Fundamental Laws (art. 26). What was published on April 23 was only the *new* provisions, to be added to the old ones.

The Third Duma lasted much longer, and is discussed in the long chapter "The Polish Koło and Nationality Questions in the Third Duma." The treatment here is detailed and close to the stenographic reports. Questions and speeches have been followed up one after another, in certain cases almost verbatim. It is difficult at times to unravel this presentation in a chronological order, because again no background has been offered for the problems treated. They are all considered of equal importance. One accepts with thanks the restated material, but would also like to have more evaluation.

Among the problems of major concern to the Poles under Russian rule in this period, three were of greatest importance: "The Western Zemstvos," "The Separation of Chełm," and "Urban Self-Government in Poland." Such are the titles of the next three chapters. These are especially pertinent and lucid chapters—the best in the book. Perhaps the only qualification of this judgment concerns the chapter on the zemstvos. It is a pity the author did not pursue the story to its very end, for the Western Zemstvos became a *fait accompli* with the March 12, 1911 (O.S.) decree.

The last two chapters are "The Fourth Duma and the Polish Question in the Years 1912–1914" and "The Fate of Polish Nationalism Within the Russian Empire," which draws conclusions for the whole study. Here again one is struck by a disproportion of attention. Much of the book is devoted to the Third Duma (pp. 44–160). This is understandable in view of its duration and the importance of the problems it dealt with. But why have the frequently uninspiring "questions" in the Third Duma been given such a detailed treatment (pp. 44–81) while the whole chapter on the Fourth Duma has only eight pages (pp. 161–69)? On the other hand, the Fourth Duma continued its activities through the war years until March 1917. Thus the story is not complete. Here the book is definitely deficient in scope.

The conclusions are sensible on the whole. The Duma, the author says, "did not change substantially" Russia's "policies toward its Polish subjects" (p. 171). This is true. But since the last two Dumas could hardly be considered centers of Russian liberalism (certainly not before the summer of 1915!), it does not seem that the lack of "viability of Russian liberalism" was demonstrated by this failure. The political ideology of the Polish representation in the last two Dumas was based not on an alliance with Russian liberalism but on an adjustment to the nonliberal elements in the Duma. And these elements were influenced, to quote again the author (on Dmowski), "by Darwinian concepts of biological nationalism, sacred national egoism, and political realism" (p. 20). Like Dmowski himself! Could it be

that Dmowski's political ideas and tactics have a share of the responsibility for the failure of the Duma experience regarding the Polish problem in the Russian Empire between 1905 and 1914?

MARC SZEFTEL
University of Washington

CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE PALE: THE FORMATIVE YEARS OF THE JEWISH WORKERS' MOVEMENT IN TSARIST RUSSIA. By *Ezra Mendelsohn*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970. xi, 180 pp. \$8.50.

Specialists on Russian Social Democracy have long been aware of its close relationship with the Jewish movement of Belorussia-Lithuania. However, thus far the Jewish movement has been examined exclusively through the prism of Russian sources and perspectives. The rich literature in Yiddish remained unused. Now with Mendelsohn's compact, informative book the internal history of the Jewish labor movement suddenly comes alive and takes on sharp new contours. The first chapter on the legal status, demography, and social-occupational stratification of Jews in tsarist Russia is in itself a valuable new contribution. Though the story of the shift from propaganda circles to economic agitation is well known, Mendelsohn provides a wealth of concrete details on techniques and associational forms which the Russian sources can scarcely convey. The author's use of his sources is so complete and circumspect that his portrayals will hardly be open to challenge, even though they often diverge from accepted notions. He brings out quite vividly and justly that the by-product of the movement (unintended at first) was a Yiddish-language culture distinct from both the traditional rabbinical culture and the Russian culture of assimilated socialist intellectuals. Mendelsohn accurately dissects the hostility toward socialist intellectuals generated by the transition to mass agitation in Yiddish—on the one hand, by the older worker elite who aspired to the Russian culture of the intellectuals and felt betrayed, and on the other, by the new worker cadres who were thoroughly at home in the Yiddish-speaking ghetto and resented the interference of their middle-class mentors.

Mendelsohn is eminently successful in achieving what he sets out to do, but it should be clearly understood that he consciously restricts himself to the artisan milieu and scarcely touches on the organizational history of the Bund or broader related aspects of Jewish and Russian history. The passing over of countless Jewish Social Democrats and even artisan workers to the Russian movement by migration to such centers as Ekaterinoslav, Kharkov, Kiev, and Odessa (a reflection of the original assimilationist, antinationalist bias of the movement) is not treated at all, nor is the later evolution of the movement toward nationalism, which in the process awakened working-class Zionist sentiment. Mendelsohn should have at least apprised his readers of such relationships in general terms, in view of the absence of any decent general work which can supply this context.

Despite Mendelsohn's thoroughness, a few omissions are surprising. Though the Kremer-Martov pamphlet *On Agitation* is quoted briefly, its historical importance is not acknowledged, and in the excellent chapter on the Yiddish underground press the first such organ, *Di Arbayershtimme*, and its energetic worker-founder Moisei Dushkan are not given their due. However, Mendelsohn did not