

V. D. Esakov's story of Soviet science during the First Five-Year Plan is a valuable contribution to this growing literature despite several serious shortcomings. Esakov has concentrated his attention on three aspects of science in the period 1928–32: the organization of research for industries, the reconstruction of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and the establishment and expansion of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences. The discussion of the origins of industrial research is particularly useful, since very little has previously been published on this subject. Esakov has used archival sources in preparing his account, but he does not claim to have presented a definitive treatment.

From the standpoint of offering an enlightened interpretation, Esakov's work unfortunately is a serious step backward from the work in the late fifties and early sixties of Soviet scholars such as G. I. Fedkin, who asserted that in the early industrialization period grave "violations of socialist legality" occurred, including the repression of innocent scholars. Fedkin hoped to achieve a balance between a record of achievement and Stalinist repression; Esakov, on the contrary, portrays the record of governmental and party actions as being uniformly correct, and he alters the facts to meet political requirements. Perhaps the most flagrant example of factual distortion is his description of the elections to the Academy of Sciences in 1928 and 1929. Esakov does not mention the name of Bukharin, even though Bukharin received the largest number of nominations and was elected to full membership on January 12, 1929. Esakov tells us that forty-two candidates were presented for election that day (which is correct) and then lists forty-one names, omitting only Bukharin. All one has to do to see that an error exists is to count the names. And the fact that the mistake is no accident is shown by Esakov's refusal to mention Bukharin in the entire book, even though Bukharin was one of the most important figures in the events he describes.

LOREN GRAHAM
Columbia University

BURZHUAZNAIA FILOSOFIIA SShA XX VEKA. By *A. S. Bogomolov*.
Moscow: "Mysl'," 1974. 343 pp. 1.41 rubles.

Unlike many earlier Soviet studies of American thought, this is an informed account of the last hundred years of American philosophy. The author knows the important figures of American philosophy, past and present; he has gone to many of the original works he discusses; he understands what he has read; and he attains a creditable degree of objectivity in detailing the philosophical positions he has chosen to present.

There is, of course, ample opportunity to disagree with many of Bogomolov's interpretations and evaluations, and to chide him for omitting mention of some contemporary philosophers such as Brand Blanshard and Wilfrid Sellars. This work will neither replace nor supplement any of the standard histories of American philosophy, most of which he notes, quotes, and sometimes comments on. Nor will anyone familiar with the positions presented gain new insights into the philosophies summarized and discussed. Nonetheless, by carefully studying one of the thirty-three thousand copies of the book (an unusually large printing for such a work), a Soviet reader can learn something of the theories of knowledge, the logic, and the ontology of Royce, Peirce, James, and Dewey, who are treated and quoted at some length; he can find out who Santayana, Lovejoy, R. W. Sellars, and the

New Realists were; and he can get some idea of what W. V. Quine, Nelson Goodman, Ernest Nagel, Marvin Farber, and other contemporary figures are doing that is philosophically interesting.

Bogomolov gives us primarily an intellectual history, showing how one trend has given rise to another. His criticism is minimal and usually consists of a quotation from other Soviet writings or a brief exposition of the Marxist-Leninist position on the topic discussed. Absent is any attempt to show how the views of a James or a Whitehead or a Carnap reflect American socioeconomic conditions, though Bogomolov frequently ends a section with some general statement about such a relation. Such statements appear, however, as *pro forma*. He does not endorse Lewis Feuer's claim that American philosophy is dead, and he even expresses some sympathy for American naturalism.

Though not without its biases and defects, this book, beneath its rather shallow Marxist trappings, shows a welcome attempt at scholarly objectivity not characteristic of most comparable previous Soviet works on this topic.

RICHARD T. DE GEORGE
University of Kansas

THE NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA IN 30 VOLUMES. 15th edition. Chicago, London, Toronto, Geneva, Sydney, Tokyo, Manila, Seoul, Johannesburg: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1974. "Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic" (2:24-27). "Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic" (2:543-47). "Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic" (2:830-33). "Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic" (6:966-68). "Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic" (7:1132-35). "Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic" (10:407-11). "Kirgiz Soviet Socialist Republic" (10:487-90). "Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic" (10:706-8). "Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic" (10:1264-67). "Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic" (12:301-4). "Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic" (16:89-102). "Tadzhik Soviet Socialist Republic" (17:985-88). "Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic" (18:798-802). "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" (18:833-40). "Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic" (19:10-14).

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* has long enjoyed a reputation for high standards; in one respect, the recent new edition falls disappointingly short of the quality of previous editions. At a time of increased American interest in the USSR, it would seem particularly important that the principal American general source of reference contain accurate information about the Soviet Union. The fifteen articles included on the constituent republics of the USSR, written by Soviet scholars, and translated (sometimes rather poorly) into English, demonstrate a clear disregard by the editors of the *Britannica* of their own guidelines as expounded in the *Propaedia*: "Objectivity and neutrality: (a) Articles should be so written that they avoid expressions of bias or prejudice on any matter about which a respectable and reasonable difference of opinion exists. (b) Further, in all areas in which the scholarly world acknowledges significant and reputable differences of opinion, diverse views concerning such differences should be fairly presented, though the majority or accepted view may be so designated" (p. xv).

The use of Soviet experts for articles which touch on aspects of internal Soviet politics is bound to result in a rehash of the official point of view current at