

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

the moment, which in many cases enjoys only a tenuous connection with what we in the West consider objective fact. The peculiar style of the prose and the organization of the content, the usual overdone statistical paean to an ever-rising standard of living wrought through the beneficence of Soviet power, at times render portions of these articles worthy contributions to *Soviet Life* or any similar organ. Since Macmillan is in the process of publishing an English translation of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia*, which will provide the American reader with a cornucopia of the most recent official Soviet views on almost any topic imaginable, the use of the *Britannica* as a vehicle for a similar exposition becomes even more questionable.

The greater portions of the articles are devoted to geography, flora, and fauna. With these presentations no argument can be made. It is rather the areas of history, social organization, economics, and culture which are replete with dubious statements or insinuations. Much of this is the result of the unawareness on the part of the editors of the *Britannica* of differing Soviet and Western definitions of such key terms as "democracy" and "elections." Unqualified statements about communal ownership of the means of production, about elections to organs of political representation, or about the size and activity of trade unions invariably produce a distorted picture of the true state of affairs. At times, this is coupled with subtle disinformation. Various designations of the Communist Party: "the guiding political organization," "the leading political organization," "the most important political organization," "the dominant political group," "the major political party," or the organization by which "political life in the republic is largely determined," all may imply the existence of other political organizations as well. Only the article on the Georgian SSR makes the statement, unintelligible to those unfamiliar with Soviet political institutions, that "all the elections for the organs of power and justice take place according to a single system."

The articles on the non-Russian republics suffer more particular shortcomings than the lengthy article on the RSFSR. Only five of the fourteen articles (Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Ukraine) were written by residents of their respective republics. Of these only the authors of three (Estonia, Georgia, and Lithuania) are unmistakably members of the respective republican majority nationality.

It is not surprising that much that is debatable in the area of Soviet nationality questions is presented uncritically solely from an official point of view. In accordance with long-established Soviet practice, there is an effort to downplay the linguistic affinities between certain republican nationalities and neighbors beyond the Soviet frontiers. The most striking case is the claim in the article on the Azerbaijan SSR that "many experts agree that the languages of these peoples [Medes, Albanians, and Caspians] formed the basis of modern Azerbaijanian, its Turkish elements being the result of later borrowings." For similar political reasons there naturally cannot be any hint that Moldavian is considered by many non-Soviet experts to be a dialect of Rumanian. The article on the Moldavian SSR carries no general description of the Moldavian language. Even the wartime Rumanian occupation is metamorphosed into the "Nazi aggression and occupation."

The sections on history are particularly deficient. Most of the articles avoid pre-Soviet history altogether. In some cases, this is compensated for by other articles by non-Soviet scholars under a number of different headings, such as "Russia, History of," "The Baltic States, History of the," or "Urartu and Armenia, History

of." Although these do in a sense balance some of the lack of coverage of the past of non-Russian areas in the USSR, some areas such as the Ukraine, Georgia, or Azerbaijan receive very little historical coverage. The pre-Soviet histories of the Central Asian peoples are covered in the article "Turkistan, History of," to which there is not even a cross reference in the separate articles on the Central Asian republics.

Peculiar slants occur also in references to cultural history. None of the descriptions of the cultural heritage of the Central Asian peoples makes any mention of connections with the Islamic world. The only reference to Islam is its identification as the religion of the believing minority of the Tadzhik population.

Another result of the uncritical presentation of Soviet articles on the national republics is a whole host of linguistic fallacies and inconsistencies. While the distortions of fact are virtually an unavoidable result of the use of Soviet authors, linguistic sloppiness is clearly the fault of the *Britannica* editorial staff. The national languages of the constituent republics are not reflected in most of the articles, all of which show unmistakable signs of being translations from the Russian. There is no uniformity of treatment of geographical or personal names, or of literary titles. Some are rendered in English, but many are left untranslated in Russian posing as the originals. The twelfth-century Georgian poet Shota Rustaveli would have been most surprised that he demonstrated the Georgian "national genius" by writing *Vityaz v tigrovoy shkure*. The Ukrainian name for its Soviet republic is not "Sovetskaya Ukraina" as in Russian but rather "Radian-skaia Ukraina." Had Ivan Franko been writing in Russian, he would have written *Borislav Smeyetsa*; the appropriate Ukrainian is *Borislav usmikkaetsia*.

A certain amount of orthographical variance in Latinized spellings of transliterations from the Russian in relation to languages which are not written in a Latin alphabet can be expected because of varied systems of transliteration. But these should be consistent. Why, for instance, is the capital of Armenia spelled Yerevan when the Belorussian SSR is not spelled Byelorussian SSR? In dealing with the Baltic republics whose languages are written in the Latin alphabet, the various uncorrected transliterations by way of Russian produce veritable orthographical eyeshores to anyone familiar with these languages. The only merit of such transliterations is an approximation of pronunciation. But if that be a virtue, one could suggest, among others, improvements in rendering the capital of France as "Pahree," Zurich as "Tsyurikh," or Marseilles as "Mahrsay."

While the articles on the Estonian and Latvian SSR's do not seem to be great offenders in this regard, the linguistic and orthographic legerdemain becomes most remarkable in the articles on the Lithuanian SSR. Some geographic names are neither Lithuanian nor Russian, such as *Zheymay-Myarkis* Plain or the *Zhemay* Upland. The rest of the geographical and personal names are given in Russian transliteration only as if they were the Lithuanian originals. Mr. Mieželaitis might be offended to see himself listed as *Mezhelaytis* and to discover that he wrote *Chelovek* instead of *Žmogus*. Juozas (not Yuozas) Baltušis wrote *Parduotos vasaros* (*Sold Summers*) instead of *Prodannye gody*. *Krov i pepel* should be *Kraujas ir pelenos*, and its author's name should be spelled Justinas Marcinkevičius instead of the tortuous Yustinas Martsinkyavichyus. The Lithuanian folk songs are *dainos* rather than *dayny*, and the composer-painter who died in 1911 was M. K. Ciurlionis rather than Chyurlionis.

On the basis of the foregoing, which by far does not represent an inclusive

list of errors, inconsistencies, infelicities, and highly debatable statements, it can only be concluded that the fifteen *Britannica* articles on the republics of the USSR are not a reliable source of information on the USSR. The editors state in their *Propaedia*: "No matter how clearly the new *Britannica* manifests its other qualities, it will fail to the extent that inaccuracy renders its contents undependable" (p. xiv). This should suggest that the policy of unqualified use of Soviet sources in future editions needs re-evaluation.

ROMUALD J. MISIUNAS  
*Williams College*

PAMIĘTNIKI (1919–1928). By *Bolesław Limanowski*. Edited by *Janusz Durko*.  
Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1973. 380 pp. 50 zł.

Bolesław Limanowski was born in Livonia on the same day the first Polish socialist organization—the Polish People—was formed on British soil (October 25, 1835). He became one of the most prominent representatives of Polish social democratic thought—harking back to the tradition of Polish struggles for independence. When he died, almost a centenarian, on February 1, 1935, he left an eclectic ideological legacy combining patriotism, keen social consciousness, feminism, commitment to parliamentarism, and championship of minority nationality rights.

This book, a diary of events which Limanowski recorded between his eighty-fourth and ninety-third years, is a sequel to his memoirs published in three volumes between 1937 and 1961 (covering the period from 1835 to 1919). The memoirs and diary are based on a manuscript now kept in the Manuscript Section of the Polish National Library in Warsaw, which I saw in the original—along with the typescript of the diary—courtesy of the editor, while I was doing doctoral research in Poland in 1968.

The editor, who is director of the Party Central Archives, had to contend with sometimes illegible handwriting (due to the advanced age of the author), the obscurity of some of the items, and chronological gaps (due to illness or lack of leisure). He omitted those entries which he judged to be insignificant. However, the published version includes purely personal items as well as comments on public affairs. It contains references to the previously published volumes, and should be read as part of the whole. Also, because the entries (which are based on information in the daily press and other contemporary sources, as well as on the author's personal experience) tend to be quite succinct, some background knowledge is necessary.

Notwithstanding his great age, in the period 1919–28 Limanowski was active as a historian and political commentator. Twice elected to the Polish Senate on the PPS (Polish Socialist Party) ticket, he distinguished himself as a fearless champion of minority nationalities who fought for justice for political prisoners and defended parliamentary democracy. His membership in Polish organizations such as the Association of the Amateurs of Air Navigation, the Leonardo da Vinci Society, the Human and Civil Rights Defense League, TUR (Association of the Workers' University), and TSL (Association of Peasant Schools) reflects his broad interests. He had a remarkably wide circle of friends and acquaintances, and he read a great deal of fiction and nonfiction by both Polish and foreign authors.