

main contribution Marx made to historical theory. The biography of a major historical figure can only be understood in terms of the class struggles that shaped his or her life and that provided an audience for his or her ideas. Since Padover is non-Marxist and writes in a social vacuum, there is, of course, no way that he can explain Marx.

A secondary problem with the book is its bias. In his author's note (p. xvi), Padover tells us that *no one has yet written an objective account of Marx*, and that he will write one. This is a suspicious beginning because it is impossible to write a nonpartisan account of Marx. Padover's book is filled with biased statements. He tells the reader that Marx had a "demonic genius" (p. 1), a "lifelong antipathy for Jews privately" (p. 2, for which he presents no evidence whatsoever), and a tendency toward "untidiness," "improvidence," and "slothfulness" (p. 13). Marx's clothes may have been untidy, but is that relevant to his ideas? Padover seems to define Marx's "improvidence" by the fact that he chose the life of a revolutionary rather than that of a comfortable bourgeois lawyer.

There is nothing in the book to show that Marx was slothful. On the contrary, Marx did an enormous amount of work. Padover complains that Marx took too long to finish *Das Kapital* and speculates that Marx may have been afraid to publish it because of the criticism he anticipated. This is an amazing hypothesis when one considers everything else Marx wrote. Nor was the delay in publishing it attributable to slothfulness. Padover contradicts himself by showing in great detail that while Marx was working on *Das Kapital* he was made so miserable by poverty that it was often impossible to work, because (1) his wife and children were always ill from undernourishment and bad housing conditions, and he therefore had to nurse them, and (2) Marx himself was often too ill to work. Moreover, in those years Marx spent most of his time leading the First International against tremendous odds, a task that demanded a great deal of his energy. Padover, however, thinks the International was a waste of time, and Marx should have stuck to writing books the way Padover does.

All in all, a truly forgettable biography.

HOWARD SHERMAN

University of California, Riverside

RUSSIA IN REVOLUTION, 1900–1930. By *Harrison E. Salisbury*. Designed by *Jean-Claude Soares*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978. 287 pp. Illus. \$18.95.

Although this work appears under the signature of Harrison E. Salisbury, it gives the impression of having been produced by a committee. It is a popularization of the Russian Revolution, its background and consequences, with special emphasis on its effect on Russian art. The price is right, and the name Salisbury is a major selling point.

The book is lacking in ideas, even in popularized form, and contains a few factual errors, such as the assertion that Trotsky was the son of a manufacturer. Furthermore, unlike most of Salisbury's writings, it fails to present a consistent vision. It shifts from one eye-catching scene to another, from a Massie-like portrait (bereft of context) of the royal family to a picture of the downtrodden masses, then from the masses on the move (the enraged muzhik, rifle in hand and unafraid for the first time, throwing his weight against order and culture) to a somewhat complex portrait of Lenin seeking to direct and to some extent mute the fearful energy of the masses, then finally to the terrible offspring of the Revolution—Stalin, state worship, and the demonic growth of state power. These are standard images, but in this case they are not organically fused. Rather, they are stitched together by a highly professional (although occasionally mawkish) prose, skillful narrative construction, and a sentimental tone.

As a popularization this work is both slick and effective. The high point of the text is the depiction of the October Revolution, the drama and complexity of which is masterfully conveyed. The feature distinguishing this popularization from others and providing it with a potentially large market is the abundant amount of information about Russian art and artists. The work furnishes a historical background for an increasingly large public willing to buy books about Constructivist art.

The visual portion of the book is superb. The designer, Jean-Claude Soares, deserves congratulations for bringing to bear the full resources of modern publishing. He includes familiar and unfamiliar black-and-white prints, in which luminous blacks and sumptuous grays have been rendered from negatives that usually produce only muddy tones. Not only are the reproductions of paintings and posters well selected, but the colors are excellent as well.

Of what use is *Russia in Revolution* to the specialist in Soviet affairs? It will make an ideal gift for in-laws who insist they have no understanding of his work.

GEORGE M. ENTEEN
Pennsylvania State University

SAILORS IN REVOLT: THE RUSSIAN BALTIC FLEET IN 1917. By *Norman E. Saul*. Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1978. xiv, 312 pp. + 8 pp. plates.

MORIAKI V BOR'BE ZA SOVETSKUIU VLAST'. By *Samuil Semenovich Khesin*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1977. 174 pp. Illus. 65 kopecks.

Soviet and Western historians agree that, to a considerable extent, the Soviet government maintained control immediately after the Bolshevik seizure of power through the support of revolutionary-minded sailors from the Baltic Fleet. The process by which such sailors developed into advocates of Soviet power is the theme common to Saul's and Khesin's works, though the manner and depth of its treatment differ markedly.

In attempting to determine why the sailors of the Baltic Fleet constituted one of the most radical segments of the Russian population in 1917, Saul explores the relationship between the war and the Revolution, the nature of organizations and leadership at various levels within the fleet, and the influence of party programs on rank-and-file sailors, while noting the importance of factors peculiar to the fleet. One of Saul's major premises is that the Revolution was neither as spontaneous nor as inevitable as the extreme examples of previous treatments have asserted. Saul was unable to obtain access to the relevant Soviet archives, most notably TsGAVMF, which remains closed to Western scholars. However, he has used Finnish archives containing many original naval documents of the period and has carefully employed Soviet documentary collections, monographs, and articles, as well as Soviet and émigré memoirs. Regrettably, there exist few memoirs by anarchists, Left S.R.'s, and officers who stayed on to serve in the Red Navy from which the roles of these groups in 1917 can be determined.

Saul's exposition of the major events within the Baltic Fleet in 1917 is the best Western account yet to appear, but it suffers from two weaknesses. First, by providing too much coverage of events in Helsingfors (for which he could draw upon archival sources) and too little of local affairs in Kronstadt and Revel (for which he could not), Saul fails to follow through on his initial, correct assertion that the Revolution showed different characteristics at each of the major Baltic Fleet bases. The reader is told a great deal about what happened in Helsingfors, a day's journey from Petrograd, but little about what motivated the actions of the Kronstadters, who were based only twenty-five miles from the capital. The result is a distortion in perspective. Second,