

KIRCHE UND REVOLUTION IN RUSSLAND: PATRIARCH TICHON UND DER SOWJETSTAAT. By *Roman Rössler*. Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas, vol. 7. Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1969. x, 263 pp. DM 34.

The problem of relations between the restored Moscow patriarchate and the Soviet state during the early years of the Bolshevik rule has attracted a number of studies, most notably those of Matthew Spinka, W. C. Emhardt, A. Starodworski, K. Zaitsev, J. S. Curtiss, Mikhail Polsky, V. P. Vinogradov, S. V. Troitsky, G. Grabbe, and Johannes Chrysostomus. Though there are still a few important gaps remaining in the treatment of this period (we need in particular an unbiased account of the Living Church and the entire Renovatianist movement), little new evidence could be added on relations between Patriarch Tikhon and the regime, at least until the opening of the relevant Soviet archives.

Dr. Rössler's book contributes no new information on the subject—admittedly so—but rather carefully re-examines in the light of available data the changing course of relations between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Soviet state from their initial hostile confrontation in 1917–18 to Tikhon's death and his so-called "Testament" of April 7, 1925, which called for a *modus vivendi* between the church and the state on the basis of their separation, canonical unity of the church, and its political loyalty to the Soviet government. The author probes into the motives behind the reorientation of the church's political position, and meticulously analyzes Tikhon's pronouncements on this matter and in particular his posthumously published appeal of April 7, 1925. In contrast to the several émigré writers who have regarded the document as a complete or partial fabrication of the GPU, Rössler considers the April 1925 appeal a "logical and necessary step" toward ensuring the survival of the church in the new political environment. The author finds Tikhon's last appeal consistent with his statements and actions since 1923, if not 1919, and foreshadowing Metropolitan Sergei's loyalty declaration of July 29, 1927.

Although Rössler is quite convincing in his discussion of the crucial 1923–25 period in Tikhon's relations with the Soviet authorities, it seems that he exaggerates the differences between political platforms adopted by the Renovatianists and Tikhon, and underemphasizes the tactical and bargaining nature of the patriarch's last pronouncement.

BOHDAN R. BOCIURKIW
Carleton University

FAITH ON TRIAL IN RUSSIA. By *Michael Bourdeaux*. New York and London: Harper & Row, 1971. 192 pp. \$5.95.

In 1960 the governing council of the Baptist Church in the USSR imposed a highly restrictive set of regulations on the Soviet Baptist congregations. Seeing this action as a surrender to the civil government and a betrayal of the faith, hundreds of congregations rebelled: under the vigorous leadership of the Action Group (*Initsiativniki*), these congregations went into schism and mounted a campaign of active opposition to the antireligious policies of the Soviet state. Despite the most severe repressive measures directed against the schismatics by the state, and despite the fact that the offending regulations have since been substantially modified, the schism goes on: it is the most dramatic development in the religious life of post-Stalin Russia and a major element in the emerging human rights movement in the USSR.

Michael Bourdeaux makes two noteworthy contributions to public knowledge of the Baptist schism in the present volume. First, he updates the earlier account contained in his *Religious Ferment in Russia* (1968). Since that time a great number of Baptist protest documents have reached the West, and Bourdeaux makes effective use of them in portraying both the extent of the reform movement and the brutality of the Soviet reaction to it. A smuggled transcript of the trial of Action Group leaders Georgii Vins and Gennadii Kriuchkov is especially revealing. Second, Bourdeaux makes the whole story of the movement available to the general public by presenting it in a deliberately popular style. Such an approach has its costs in the sacrifice of depth and detail, but it is to be welcomed as potentially a most valuable extension of the scholar's service to society.

Unfortunately Bourdeaux's popularization fails to live up to its full potential, for the reason that it is employed so obviously in the service of special pleading. This is a deeply committed book; its bias is proclaimed by everything from the jacket description ("the heroic story of the brave Protestants who are fighting for religious freedom in the Soviet Union") to the concluding announcement of a public appeal on behalf of an organization headed by Bourdeaux which has as one of its aims to provide a sounding board for "Christians living under communism." For many readers the intensity of Bourdeaux's dedication to the Baptists and their cause will diminish his authority. This is regrettable, but it can hardly be avoided when the genuinely shocking facts of the dissidents' lot—facts which speak eloquently for themselves—are embroidered with unnecessarily simplistic assurances of the supreme moral virtue of the Christians and the bloodthirsty villainy of the Communists.

JAMES P. SCANLAN
The Ohio State University

SEASONAL INFLUENCES IN SOVIET INDUSTRY. By *Raymond Hutchings*. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1971. xiii, 321 pp. \$13.00.

This is the first full-length study of seasonality in Soviet industry, combined with some comments concerning seasonality in other sectors of the economy. The period covered is from 1924 through 1967, but useful data for subbranches of industry are only available from 1958 on.

Hutchings analyzes the pattern and degree of seasonality of a large number of industrial subbranches, although unfortunately the quarterly data which are available do not fully correspond to the relevant seasons. Having examined long-term trends in seasonal fluctuation, he then compares seasonality in a single republic (Uzbekistan) with that of the Soviet Union as a whole. Here he gets the expected result that seasonality is greater in a geographic subunit of a country than in the country as a whole. Next he proceeds to examine causes of seasonality and of changes in seasonal patterns over time, as well as the interconnections between seasonal patterns in different subbranches. As might be expected, the geography of the Soviet Union and the degree and structure of its industrial development in any year seem to have a much greater effect upon seasonality than does the nature of the planning system.

The author compares Soviet with Canadian seasonality on the ground that Canada is the most comparable country. Using his own index for the degree of