

cover). My students were troubled by an occasional opaqueness. Two passages still perplex me: "the populists staked their lives on an unrealistic vision of the peasant's socialist instincts and revolutionary passion" (p. 103); of the three varieties of populism, "only Bakuninism consistently emphasized the role of the peasant, and therefore Bakuninism is the truest form of revolutionary *narodnichestvo*, which should be distinguished from 'revolutionary populism'" (p. 111).

This book contains an excellent bibliographic essay and a good index.

ALAN KIMBALL  
University of Oregon

**THEORIES OF REVOLUTION: FROM MARX TO THE FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.** By *Reidar Larsson*. Skrifter Utgivna av Statsvetenskapliga Föreningen i Uppsala, 53. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1970. 381 pp. Kr. 35.

This book does not make for easy reading. Its heavy style and idiosyncratic English may weary, and occasionally perplex, the reader. Moreover, its structure, though necessary for the author's purposes, is sometimes hard to follow, even with the assistance of an elaborate tabular outline at the end. Still, this is a serious work, has some significant points to make, and should be of real interest to those concerned with the evolution of Marxism in prerevolutionary Russia.

Essentially it is a systematic and analytical investigation of contending ideas within Russian Marxism from the 1880s to 1907. It limits itself to three critical issues: (1) the "objective" prerequisite conditions for the revolution, (2) the definition of and attitude toward the elite and the vanguard, and (3) the nature of the revolution itself and the revolutionary dictatorship. Within the frame provided by these issues the treatment is generally chronological, ranging from the Russian Blanquists, Kautsky (treated at considerable length and interestingly), the Iskra group and its opponents, to the participants in the polemics involving Lenin in the years 1903 to 1907.

What is offered, then, is neither intellectual biography nor the whole of any one man's thought but rather the logical structure and implications of his views, and their change through time, as they relate to the three central issues. There is always danger of dismemberment in such a procedure, but Larsson clearly has control over his questions and his procedure.

This is, of course, a well-worked field of inquiry, yet Larsson does advance some important new interpretations. In particular, he challenges the view of those who make the dispute among the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia a matter of "the dictates of theory" versus "the revolutionary will." While factors of will and temperament doubtless played a role, Larsson urges the importance of different conceptual premises or models. Central to his argument is the distinction he draws between Marx's "pattern" of 1848 as against that of 1850 with respect to the relation between the capitalist class and liberalism on the one hand and the old regime on the other. Perhaps too much weight is placed on this distinction, but it proves to be a fruitful device for marking out and identifying conflicting strands of Russian Marxism in later years.

Not the least interesting feature of the book is the footnotes indicating the author's differences in interpretation with other specialists in the field, such as Schapiro, Haimson, Keep, and Geyer.

His final conclusion: "Although it can be established that the vacillation of the Russian Marxists between different viewpoints followed a rather definite and recurrent pattern, the impression of instability remains. It is still a fact that changes of opinion followed each other in rapid succession and were, to all appearances, incalculable. . . . What is the reason for this instability and incalculability? There is at least one explanation which appears to be more probable than speculations about the 'temperament' of the theorists. The explanation could be that the social reality which the Russian Marxists studied was in itself difficult to interpret and highly capricious" (pp. 358–59).

HENRY L. ROBERTS  
*Dartmouth College*

EMPIRE AND REVOLUTION: A RADICAL INTERPRETATION OF CONTEMPORARY HISTORY. By *David Horowitz*. New York: Random House, 1969. 274 pp. \$7.50.

Mr. Horowitz contends that socialist revolution is the only possible solution to "the continuing world-wide oppression of class, nation and race, the incalculable waste and untold misery, the unending destruction and preparation for destruction and the permanent threat to democratic order that characterize the rule of capitalism" (p. 258). He supports this claim by examining American efforts to halt the spread of communism, which he dates from President Wilson's decision to intervene in the Russian Civil War, by describing American exploitation of the Third World and even of its capitalist allies, and by devoting a very few pages to domestic affairs in the USSR and the United States. Horowitz assigns full responsibility for the cold war to the United States, even accepting the argument of Gar Alperovitz that President Truman used the atomic bomb on Japan in order to exert diplomatic pressure on the USSR.

This book performs two useful services: it presents in one short and readable volume the entire mythology of the revisionist historians of the "New Left," and it demonstrates the intellectual poverty on which that mythology rests. Horowitz never calculates the cost of socialist revolution in human lives, never mentions such unpleasant issues as the treatment of Jews in the USSR, of Tibetans by China, or of intellectuals in every Communist state, and never even tries to prove that life under contemporary socialism is in any way superior to life under capitalism. Rather than examine the significance of the Kronstadt Rebellion or the Tambov Revolt, Horowitz merely notes that the rule forbidding factions within the Bolshevik Party "was introduced as an expedient measure in a perilous situation at the end of the civil war" (p. 154). Rather than describe the Great Purges, Horowitz simply remarks that "the most repressive phase of the Russian development coincided with an external threat in the form of the rise of fascism" (p. 198). Although a Marxist, Horowitz displays none of Marx's concern for detailed knowledge, drawn from primary sources. Although heavily indebted to Trotsky, Horowitz lacks Trotsky's flashes of insight on the Bolshevik Party and the Stalinist regime.

A short review cannot attempt to correct all the errors of fact, interpretation, and omission which the reader will encounter in this work. Perhaps most irritating, however, to a student of Marxist ideology is the claim that a certain "misrepresentation of Marxism identifies it with a theory of history in which social development is seen as proceeding inexorably through discrete stages, from primitive communism