

ovsky), Oriental studies in Russia (Richard N. Frye), and the organizational vicissitudes of Soviet orientology (Wayne S. Vucinich).

The general question of the rationale of the various contributions to this volume is raised by the first three articles. Together they comprise one-third of its contents. Whatever their merits otherwise, they are not effectively related to the problem of Russian influence, and they constitute far too lengthy a prelude to the major topic. The seven case studies are essays based on existing monographic works (frequently the authors' own) rather than products of new research. Still, since much of the monographic literature is in Russian or more exotic languages, these essays provide convenient digests of scholarship otherwise difficult of access. Too often, unfortunately, they seem little more than that. (Mancall's interesting thesis on the structure of Sino-Russian contact is a striking exception.) Larger issues, such as the distinction between Soviet and Russian influences, continuity and change, or the net value of Soviet rule, are raised, but not systematically pursued. This failure detracts from the coherence of the volume as a whole.

As these articles make clear, the somewhat Europocentric concept of "Asia" embraces a tremendous diversity of cultures, and the Russian impact from place to place is equally diverse in character. Can the diversities be usefully juxtaposed? In fact, the degree of complementarity which these essays do exhibit suggests the value of a comparative approach. The studies of Georgia and Armenia shed light on each other, as do those of the various Muslim minorities. And the particular aspects of Russian influences in all these cases are further highlighted by contrast with the small and primitive Siberian ethnic groups, or with China and Japan, which never came under Russian control. Still, the complementarities seem to be outweighed by the overall impression of incommensurability.

This is unfortunate, for there are approaches which would lend greater coherence to the examination of Russia's impact on Asia. In an age of the emergence of national identities (in some cases stimulated by Soviet policy), Russia has appeared as the prophet of a new universal truth, champion of an international cause, and claimant to supranational loyalties. Russia has played a unique role in the development of nationalism, internationalism, and social revolution around her Asian perimeter, and these developments indeed provide a common framework for considering the Russian influence on China and Georgia, on Uzbeks and Aleuts. One might have hoped that the conference which yielded this volume would also have generated some such community of focus among the authors of these articles—perhaps even a substantial introduction to pull their findings together.

DON C. PRICE
University of California, Davis

UKRAINIAN-JAPANESE RELATIONS, 1903–1945: HISTORICAL SURVEY AND OBSERVATIONS. By *John V. Sweet*. New York: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1973. xi, 371 pp. \$8.00.

John V. Sweet (Ivan Svit) was the editor of the Ukrainian weekly *Man'dzhurskii Vistnik* in Harbin from 1932 to 1937; he was also secretary of the Ukrainian Club in that city and a representative of the Union of Ukrainian Emigrants in Manchuria. His book is not so much a history of Ukrainian-Japanese relations from 1903 to 1945 as a journalistic memoir of the life and political activities of Ukrainian

nationalists in Manchuria in the 1930s. Like some Russian émigrés, the Ukrainians were virulently anti-Communist and were willing to collaborate with the Japanese military in Manchukuo against the USSR. But while most White Russians were too patriotic to support Japanese efforts to separate the Russian Far East from the rest of Russia or the Soviet Union, the Ukrainians championed the “liberation” of Siberia. They thought well of a man like Ataman Semenov, who held out self-government to Ukrainians in the Russian Far East, while most Russian émigrés (not to mention the Soviets) regarded him as a scoundrel.

To the student of Russo-Japanese relations the book is most interesting for the light it sheds on Japanese attempts to exploit minority problems in Russia and the USSR. There are such tidbits as the revelation that during the Russo-Japanese War an American senator, Dr. Russell of Hawaii, who had been educated in Kiev, started an anti-Russian publication in Japan to subvert Russian prisoners of war.

The fragmentation of national history into minority history is misleading in the study of international relations. Sweet asserts that Iosif Goshkevich, Russia's first diplomatic representative in Japan, was a Ukrainian; V. Guzanov in his book *Odissei s Beloi Rusi* (Minsk, 1969) contends that Goshkevich was Belorussian. Whoever may be right, can we really describe Goshkevich's contacts with the Japanese as an example of Ukrainian-Japanese or Belorussian-Japanese relations? Would this not be tantamount to depicting the reception of Kodayu by Catherine the Great as an episode in German-Japanese relations, or the negotiations between Karakhan and Yoshizawa as an aspect of Tatar-Japanese relations? I wonder, furthermore, whether the publication of this book in New York in Ukrainian is worth the price—its restriction to a very limited readership. On the other hand, who but a Ukrainian nationalist would take pride in its content?

GEORGE ALEXANDER LENSEN
Florida State University

BRIDE OF THE REVOLUTION: KRUPSKAYA AND LENIN. By *Robert H. McNeal*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972. ix, 326 pp. \$10.00.

Nadezhda Krupskaya's life was so closely interwoven with Lenin's that it is not easy to appreciate her own personality and outlook. We think of her as having totally subordinated herself to her husband's goals and activities, as is suggested by the adjectives that have stuck with her over the years—“dedicated, single-minded, self-effacing, self-denying,” and, as she appears in numerous photographs with Soviet children in the later period, “dowdy and grandmotherly.”

In this book her portrait emerges fundamentally unchanged, though filled in and rounded out. Since this is the first substantial work on Krupskaya in English, it will be of interest to the specialist, though it is clearly intended also for a general audience, including the growing number of women who, in trying to define new roles for themselves, have been examining the lives of prominent women in history. The author has worked intelligently from Russian-language materials published in the Soviet Union, supplemented by a few of Trotsky's writings, the archive of the Paris office of the Okhrana, and the sparse studies of Krupskaya in the languages of Western Europe.

Whether we would find in Soviet archives closed to Western scholars