

Brower acknowledges that the number of students who emerged from this recruitment system as thoroughgoing revolutionaries was quite small, but the Russian authorities were intelligent enough to worry about even that seemingly insignificant number. They understood the impact which the complete defection of even a relatively small fraction of the nation's intellectual elite could have.

At one point Brower mentions the "striking parallels" between the American student movement of the 1960s and the Russian ferment of a century before. Although he decides to bypass this "tantalizing theme," one may hope that it will someday be investigated. Brower already has given us a very helpful treatment of the Russian half of the topic.

CHARLES A. MOSER
George Washington University

KRUPNAIA BURZHUAZIIA V POREFORMENNOI ROSSII: 1861–1900.

By V. Ia. Laverychev. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1974. 252 pp. 1.19 rubles.

After fifty years, Soviet scholarship has produced a work equal in importance to Pavel Berlin's classic *Russkaia burzhuaziia*. Other Soviet historians have written specialized works on banking, foreign trade, and monopoly capitalism, but Laverychev is the first to put the business class in the center of the narrative. He focuses on the aspirations and behavior of the industrial and commercial leaders themselves, and examines in more detail than did Berlin the economic and political developments of the decades before 1905. Laverychev has scoured the archives, read obscure trade publications, and unearthed rare secondary sources. Here is fascinating information on how the Russian manufacturers formed their companies and cartels, financed newspapers and journals, resisted the state's labor legislation, and pressured the government for tariff protection and access to foreign markets.

There are four chapters, structured around specific themes such as economic growth, cultural change and organizational development, public activity, and relations with the Ministry of Finance. Because each topic spans the entire forty-year period, the reader may lose a sense of the general chronology or miss important causal relationships. For example, Laverychev describes in three separate sections the industrialists' various efforts to defeat free-trade ideas in the late 1860s: the formation of the first Russian industrial society (pp. 95–96), the financing of the protectionist newspaper *Moskva* (pp. 117–22), and the tariff debate itself (pp. 176–81). This approach serves the author's own purpose only if it is to present a maximum of factual material on each topic without giving the comprehensive interpretation needed. Brief, almost off-hand citations from Lenin purport to explain, in Marxian terms, both the Russian industrialists' resentment of the state's bureaucratic tyranny and their refusal to throw their considerable financial resources behind the Russian liberal movement. But Laverychev's narrative leads the reader to question Lenin's mutually contradictory conceptions. Indeed, a close reading of the text suggests that noneconomic factors heavily influenced Russian industrial ideology before 1905. The persistence of traditional merchant faith in tsarism and the adoption of xenophobic and anti-liberal concepts from Slavophile and Pan-Slavic intellectuals, for example, appear to have been especially significant.

Much investigation still remains to be done on the political evolution of the Russian business leadership during the process of industrialization, but Laverychev has made a bold beginning. Here at last is an indispensable handbook for further research on an important but neglected corner of Russian social history.

THOMAS C. OWEN
Louisiana State University

THE JEWISH BUND IN RUSSIA: FROM ITS ORIGINS TO 1905. By
Henry J. Tobias. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972. xx, 409 pp.
\$16.50.

Anyone who studies Russian Social Democracy soon realizes that without an intimate knowledge of the history of the Bund, and its Yiddish literature, an essential part of the whole picture is missing. True, there are at least two other components of Russian Social Democracy, the Latvian and the Georgian Social Democratic organizations and their literature, necessary for the full story. But while the latter two organizations played an essentially local and geographically peripheral role, the Bund's role was absolutely central in the political geography of Russian Social Democracy in the period up to 1905. In fact, Tobias's book makes it quite clear that when the Revolution of 1905 dawned, the Bund was, in terms of party organizational strength and in the effectiveness with which it led masses of workers into strikes, ahead of all the other Social Democratic groups active in the empire.

However, to the same extent that a complete history of Russian Social Democracy can not be written without the help of the Bund's Yiddish literature, a complete history of the Bund can not be written only on the basis of Russian and Yiddish sources, with those of the Polish socialist movement excluded. Tobias has not dipped into the Polish sources, but then he does not claim to have written a definitive history of the Bund; on the contrary, he specifically denies having set such a goal for himself. His aim is to show how the first Jewish Social Democratic groups arose out of the interaction between intelligentsia and workers and how these isolated groups were welded together into a cohesive and highly organized political party, the Bund. In this context he discusses two broader problems. One is the relation of the Jewish proletariat to the Jewish society at large: the adoption of the Marxist solution by the Bund meant opting for class struggle *within* the Jewish community and, on a broader scale, lining up with non-Jews against Jews. Thus, years before the Bund became powerful enough to challenge Russian society at large during the Revolution of 1905, it had already successfully challenged some of the most sacred traditional values and loyalties of Jewish society, revolutionizing it from within. The second problem raised by Tobias is the relation of the Jewish proletariat to the non-Jewish proletariat, or the forging of proletarian unity. In Russia, the problem was forging one all-Russian Social Democratic Party. In terms of the Bund, it was a question of whether attempts at establishing a monopoly on the representation of Jewish workers and insistence on Jewish cultural autonomy were compatible with real overall proletarian unity.

Tobias offers a good mixture of details and broader brush strokes. He is at home within the whole Russian Social Democratic movement and thus can convincingly argue the fine points on which the Bund was closer to the Bolsheviks or the Mensheviks, and why. His generalizations are restrained and his conclu-