

tility toward Narkompros, inertia of institutions, and above all the poverty of the Soviet Republic" dogged Lunacharsky and the Commissariat at every step and seriously curtailed their aspirations.

Sheila Fitzpatrick's book, an outgrowth of a Ph.D. thesis at Oxford University, is a meticulously documented and thorough account of the institutional aspects of Narkompros: its formulation of policies, internal workings, and relations with the party, the state, and the people from 1917 to 1921 (the author hopes to bring out a second volume for the period 1921–29). Educational theory and the practice of education are considered here only secondarily. There are, however, two fine chapters on Proletkult and the arts (both were included in Narkompros's functions during this period).

The author concentrates on key persons and their activities. The figures of Krupskaya, Pokrovsky, Preobrazhensky, and others directly involved in Narkompros's fate are well drawn. The two most important, Lenin and Lunacharsky, are less well presented. Lenin's views and activities in education are not fully discussed; and Lunacharsky's position on many issues, including university autonomy, party involvement in public education, and Proletkult, is often blurred or contradictory. Appended to the book is a most useful section of "biographical notes," which contains important information on over 130 persons involved with Narkompros during this period.

Perhaps the most valuable aspect of this volume, from a scholar's point of view, is that most of the information presented is based on materials in the Soviet archives on Narkompros (TsGAOR and TsGA-RSFSR), which include records of committee meetings and memoranda. Although it is sometimes in the form of an account of the rise or fall of this or that committee (which can be dull reading), this material is generally well used. Much light is shed on the decision-making process within Narkompros and its connecting organs.

This book will remain a "must" for those interested in the subjects it discusses and the period it deals with.

HOWARD R. HOLTER
California State College, Dominguez Hills

GODY EMIGRATSII, 1919–1969: PARIZH–N'IU–IORK (VOSPOMINANIYA). By *Mark Vishniak*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1970. 281 pp. \$9.50.

The post-1917 Russian emigration has been both large in numbers and intellectually active. It has many cultural achievements to its credit, including university centers and serious scholarly journals edited in China, Europe, and North America, as well as a plethora of schools, libraries, educational centers, publishing houses, and newspapers which have dotted practically the whole world. It has given many truly gifted writers the opportunity to write and publish in their native language. The historians perhaps represent the largest contingent, yet the emigration has never produced its own historian. We do not have a single book, not even a booklet, in which an attempt has been made to record the story of the emigration that followed the Russian Revolution. Fortunately a large body of literature which will provide the future historian of the Russian emigration with excellent raw material is slowly accumulating.

Mark Vishniak, a prominent Socialist Revolutionary and a member of the

Constituent Assembly in 1918, has now spent more than fifty years in emigration, which he has filled with untiring political and publicistic activity. His prolific writings have undoubtedly influenced public opinion here and abroad, especially during his long association with *Time* magazine. He has also given us several historical books, two of which are memoirs. The present volume is also memoiristic, though only marginally autobiographical. What the author by his own admission offers us here is a *mélange* of *petite histoire* and various observations and comments about men and events. He makes no pretense of writing an objective, scholarly history. However, this should not deter the potential reader—provided, of course, he has the time and patience to plow through the miscellaneous factual bits and pieces, little stories, and marginal observations which to him may mean nothing or even seem trivial, but for which historians and biographers are likely to be very grateful. For instance, in emphasizing that since his early years he has always identified himself as a Russian Jew, Vishniak repeatedly discusses the question of his relationship to the Russian and the Jewish nationalities, and in the process conveys in a most convincing way why he never could or would divorce the Jewishness from the Russianness within himself. No formal history can provide us with the same depth of understanding and feeling for events as a volume written by one who has experienced them and knows how to convey his experience intelligibly and interestingly. In addition, the author's style and prose are smooth and lively. Nobody will regret having embarked upon the reading of this attractively published volume.

LADIS K. D. KRISTOF
Portland State University

FRUNZE: THE SOVIET CLAUSEWITZ, 1885–1925. By *Walter Darnell Jacobs*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969. xii, 231 pp. 30.60 Dutch guilders, paper.

Professor Jacobs tries, with some success, to right the balance between the relative neglect of Western scholarship in analyzing Frunze's role in formulating a military doctrine for the Red Army and the "overkill" of the subject in the Soviet Union. Western scholarship, however, has not ignored Frunze quite as much as Jacobs implies in his preface. D. Fedotoff White, a quarter of a century ago, devoted a good part of his *Growth of the Red Army* to Frunze, and John Erickson, a decade ago, dealt extensively with Frunze's role in the formulation of military doctrine (*The Soviet High Command*).

Jacobs, after a brief biographical sketch of Frunze (sixteen pages), gets down to the main business of his book—Frunze as the creator of the "unified military doctrine," that is, a proletarian military doctrine. He was opposed vehemently by Trotsky, and much of the book is devoted to the debate that ensued. In Jacobs's opinion Frunze won, and when he replaced Trotsky as commissar of war in 1925, he was able to impose his doctrine upon the Red Army. His other contributions to Soviet military theory, such as the role of technology, regular versus militia troops, and the erosion of the line separating the front and rear in modern wars, are also analyzed, but much more briefly. The two Frunze articles in the appendixes, strangely enough, do not stress the "unified military doctrine" but rather Frunze's advocacy of "the militarization in time of peace of the entire civil apparatus" (p. 171).