

Fisher, *The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919–1923: The Operations of the American Relief Administration*, New York, 1927, p. 398. A later account of this operation is Mr. Weissman's regrettably unpublished "The American Relief Administration in Russia: A Case Study in Interaction Between Opposing Political Systems," Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1968.) The CPSU later revised history, as it has frequently done, and described the ARA as an organization of spies and its relief work as insignificant.

Miss Margulies, in her last chapter, "Continuity and Change, 1924–1965," notes a certain continuity of objectives, as well as of form and method, in the Soviet Union's treatment of foreigners. Although from time to time there have been changes in policies toward foreigners, she believes that fundamental changes are unlikely as long as the USSR remains a closed society. Filene observes retrospectively that diplomatic recognition in 1933 was "an endorsement by the United States" not of the devil but "a humble acknowledgement that two missionaries inhabited the world and that the conflict of their doctrines would not be settled by the swift expiration or surrender of the Soviet" (p. 284). Although reason has not had much effect on the severity of this conflict of doctrines, there seems to be some recognition that both societies have many problems in common (some of which cannot be controlled by either society alone). Both have problems of maintaining or enlarging executive authority over economic and intellectual activities ostensibly in the name of true democracy. Both also have problems of polycentrism, problems of trying to develop technology while preserving an environment essential for human survival, and above all problems concerning the security of life on this planet against destruction by the weaponry in the hands of the missionaries of both sects of democracy—American and Soviet.

A pilgrim of sorts to Russia long ago believes he sees some signs of a political ecumenicalism being forced on the two great centers of doctrine and power by the dreadful efficiency of those implements which they devised for security, but which have become a threat to survival.

HAROLD H. FISHER
Stanford University

RUSSES ET UKRAINIENS. By *Roger Portal*. Paris: Flammarion, 1970. 142 pp. Paper.

ON THE CURRENT SITUATION IN THE UKRAINE. By *Serhii Mazlakh* and *Vasyl' Shakhrai*. Edited and translated by *Peter J. Potichnyj*. Introduction by *Michael M. Luther*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1970. xxxiv, 220 pp. \$8.95.

TWO YEARS IN SOVIET UKRAINE: A CANADIAN'S PERSONAL ACCOUNT OF RUSSIAN OPPRESSION AND THE GROWING OPPOSITION. By *John Kolasky*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1970. xii, 264 pp. \$6.95, cloth. \$3.95, paper.

The brief survey by Professor Roger Portal, holder of the chair of the history and civilization of the Slavs at the Sorbonne, is in the *Questions d'histoire* series edited by Marc Ferro and follows a specific format. In eight chapters the author seeks to outline the principal stages in Ukrainian history and in the development of Ukrainian-Russian relations. A separate section consists of excerpts from documentary sources, including the terms of the Pereiaslav Treaty, excerpts from the *Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People*, the Program of the Revolutionary

Ukrainian Party, the Central Rada's declaration of Ukrainian independence, and statements by Stalin, Skrypnyk, and Bukharin at the Twelfth Party Congress held in Moscow in 1923. A third section deals with important questions of interpretation that are controversial. The work includes a chronology and a useful bibliography.

Professor Portal discusses many matters and events briefly. He notes that Rus' had no political unity and that only Herzen among the Russian liberals was sympathetic to the Ukrainians. He offers a balanced treatment of the Pereiaslav Treaty and discusses Mazepa without bias. He notes that between four and five million Ukrainians perished in World War II (pp. 85 and 112). He strives for "objectivity" in matters of interpretation by alternately presenting Soviet (Russian) and Ukrainian nationalist viewpoints, and at times assumes a middle position. Thus on the question of the emergence of the language division between Ukrainian and Russian, he dates it as occurring in the thirteenth century. Although the author is very sympathetic to the Ukrainian cause in his treatment of the tsarist period, this sympathy wanes in his discussion of the Soviet period. Yet the work under review does provide a partial corrective to the author's *Les Slaves, peuples et nations* (1965).

As the author approaches contemporary issues and Soviet policy toward the Ukrainians he often seeks refuge in conditional clauses and manifests a certain diffidence. He makes artificial distinctions, such as when he states, "The Ukraine is much less menaced by Soviet centralism and by a concerted policy of Russification than it is by the power of expansion of the federal center" (pp. 128–29). Unfortunately, this passage is fairly typical of the style and clarity of the part of the volume that deals with the Soviet period. The author takes Soviet federalism at face value and tends to justify Soviet nationality policy in terms of economic development. Portal has written a useful volume (especially to the French public), but it is unfortunate that he was unable to use the two other works reviewed here.

The work of Serhii Mazlakh and Vasyl' Shakhrai, published originally in Ukrainian in Saratov in 1919 under the title *Do Khvyli*, was a bibliographical rarity and unavailable until 1967, when it was reprinted by the Prolog Research Association in New York. It is still banned in the Soviet Union. The translation by Peter Potichnyj now makes this unusual and significant work available to a broader public. The book is significant because it is undoubtedly the first theoretical formulation of national communism. The authors write in a polemical style under the impact of the Ukrainian separation from Russia and the defeat suffered by the Bolsheviks in 1918. The work was written in haste in order to try to prevent a recurrence of the 1918 failure. The authors employ irony and wit and numerous literary references along with a certain earthiness. The text frequently refers to events and personalities of 1918–19, and the excellent introduction by Michael Luther and the editor's explanatory notes are of great aid to the uninitiated reader.

The authors desired an independent, separate, and equal Ukraine, and saw this goal as compatible with Marxism. Indeed, they offer a Marxist interpretation of Ukrainian developments. They are particularly critical of the Katerynoslav Group of Ukrainian Bolsheviks and refer sardonically to the "Katerynoslav seminary" in criticism of the doctrinaire manner in which these Russian or Russified Bolsheviks (led by E. Kvirng and Ia. Iakovlev-Epshtein) misperceived events. They ridicule Christian Rakovsky for his glib and superficial statements on Ukrainian matters based on little experience and on even less knowledge. Yet

Rakovsky had been cast in the role of “expert” by Lenin. The work culminates in the final chapter entitled “Questions for Comrade Lenin,” in which Lenin is asked pointedly why his policies did not correspond with what he had written earlier on the nationality question. Lenin did not respond, although if he had taken the authors’ advice, the Bolshevik second Ukrainian campaign (1919) might have succeeded. The authors ask how Lenin’s self-determination differed from that of Woodrow Wilson, who also favored self-determination but supported advocates of the restoration of the “one and indivisible” Russian Empire. The authors state flatly that the Communist Party of the Ukraine was really a Russian party and that it consisted largely of persons who refused to learn the language of the people whom they wished to “self-determine.”

Shakhrai wrote under the influence of the traumatic experience of having been a member of the abortive first Ukrainian Soviet government. The book is important not only as a historical source but also because in certain ways the “current situation” of 1918–19 remains current. Although Shakhrai was killed by Denikinists later in 1919 and Mazlakh perished in the Stalinist purges, they predicted, “If the Ukrainian national question is not settled now, during the revolutionary era, if it is handed on to posterity, like rust it will corrode the socio-economic and cultural-political development of the Ukraine and its neighbors” (pp. 149–50). There is much to ponder in reading this important contemporary document of the revolution.

Four and one-half decades after Shakhrai and Mazlakh, a Canadian Communist of Ukrainian origin, John Kolasky, experienced a comparable trauma and total disillusionment. Kolasky, a secondary school teacher, was a student at the Kiev Higher Party School of the Communist Party of the Ukraine from 1963 to 1965. Myths and illusions acquired as a Communist Party member in Canada were shattered as a result of his two-year encounter with Soviet Ukrainian reality. An earlier work, *Education in Soviet Ukraine* (1968), examined Soviet nationality policy in terms of official Soviet statistics, and demonstrated the use of a wide range of discriminatory practices against the Ukrainian language. The present work is more than the memoir of a disillusioned Communist or a tourist’s report. It is a remarkable account based on close personal observation and on lesser-known Soviet published sources. Kolasky knew his way about, had personal contacts with many Soviet citizens, and proved to be a perceptive observer. He attended meetings and visited out-of-the-way places, and the book abounds with experiences, encounters, and exchanges presented in a highly vivid way.

Kolasky offers a revealing account of living conditions and of the inefficiencies, shortages, waste, and general incompetence that characterize much of Soviet bureaucracy. One of the best chapters is “The Russians and Shevchenko,” which conveys the incredible antipathy for the Ukrainian poet manifested with impunity by members of the Russian minority. Kolasky recounts the circumstances of the desecration of the Shevchenko monument in Kiev by a Russian female medical faculty member. He was present at the two unauthorized Ukrainian demonstrations that occurred before the monument in 1964 and 1965 and that led to repressions.

Kolasky does not hesitate to name names. He discusses the unconscionable role of Russians in the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture who are said to strangle that culture, the limited editions of Ukrainian books, the paucity of Ukrainian films, the difficulty in obtaining recordings of Ukrainian songs and subscriptions to publications, and the numerous acts of bigotry and discrimination by Russians that he witnessed. Such events as the 1964 Kiev library fire and the destruction

of the Shevchenko stained-glass window at Kiev University are also discussed. It is a grim and disturbing account.

JOHN S. RESHETAR, JR.
University of Washington

ASPECTS OF RELIGION IN THE SOVIET UNION, 1917–1967. Edited by *Richard H. Marshall, Jr., Thomas E. Bird, and Andrew Q. Blane*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971. xv, 489 pp. \$19.75.

The study of religion in the USSR, not long ago the wallflower of the Soviet studies sisterhood, has recently been attracting many serious and resourceful suitors. The best sign to date of both the quantity and the quality of their attentions is the present volume, in which they pool their interdisciplinary talents to produce a highly informative and useful survey of developments concerning religion throughout the first half-century of Soviet rule.

Very fittingly the book is dedicated to Paul B. Anderson, and dedicated in something better than the usual curt manner. A thirty-page section of the book is devoted to Anderson, containing first a brief appreciation of his extensive service both to the study of religion and to religion itself during the entire Soviet period, next an interesting autobiographical sketch by Anderson covering the period, and finally a bibliography of his published writings.

The heart of the book consists of essays by seventeen scholars covering virtually every major aspect of the subject and every major religious group in the USSR (Orthodox, Moslems, Jews, Baptists, Catholics) as well as national churches (Georgian, Armenian) and even minor groups such as the Mennonites and the animistic Siberian tribes. There is also good exploration of themes not frequently treated, such as Joan Delaney's essay on Soviet antireligious organizations and George Kline's on religious motifs in Soviet poetry and fiction. Some repetition is unavoidable in a volume of this sort: Khrushchev's vigorous antireligious campaign of 1959–64, for example, receives treatment in a number of the essays, in addition to being the subject of a separate essay by Donald A. Lowrie and William C. Fletcher. But this is not a serious fault; in fact it facilitates the use of the book for reference by making the chapters on the various religious groups relatively independent.

Two other features should also be mentioned as giving the book special worth: an appendix containing the text of all the major laws pertaining to religion in the USSR, and a selected bibliography of English-language books on religion in the Soviet Union.

All in all, if some disaster should require the Library of Congress (or the Lenin Library, for that matter) to part with all but one of its books on religion in the USSR, this is the book it should keep.

JAMES P. SCANLAN
The Ohio State University

ICON AND SWASTIKA: THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH UNDER NAZI AND SOVIET CONTROL. By *Harvey Fireside*. Russian Research Center Studies, 62. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971. xx, 242 pp. \$8.00.

Dr. Fireside has lifted the veil from what has been the least-known period in the recent history of the Russian Orthodox Church—its life under the Nazi occupation