

*Country and The Solitudes of Northern Tibet*, followed by a third, *From Kulja across the Tian Shan to Lob Nor*, in 1879.

The book contains no footnotes, although there is a select bibliography and indexes to Persons and Places and Animals and Plants. Two inadequate maps are included, as well as a selection of photographs taken mainly from *Ot Kiakhty na istoki Zheltoi reki* (St. Petersburg, 1888). The format of Rayfield's book suggests an orientation toward armchair travelers, not specialists. The author provides details on Przhevalsky's gentry background and on his attachment to the Smolensk countryside—how he learned to hunt and how he developed this sport into one of his life's consuming passions. The reader can follow Przhevalsky's military career, his informal studies in zoology and botany in Warsaw, and, finally, the completion of his studies at the General Staff Academy which eventually qualified him to lead expeditions. (The expeditions were undertaken in his role as a career military officer and with official support and instructions.) The book offers some insight into the political context of late nineteenth-century inner Asian exploration as a function of the unsettled border rivalries between China and Russia and of the potential focus of conflict over Tibet with the British in India.

Przhevalsky, who never did reach Lhasa, is perhaps best known for discovering the Central Asian wild horse. He mapped, hunted, collected zoological and botanical specimens, and generally dominated the indigenous nomadic peoples he encountered with his superior weapons (which he sometimes equated with a higher morality). Although it is possible to understand the author's embarrassment concerning his subject's lusty imperialism and aggressive racism, Rayfield's lack of serious attention to the area's ecological and anthropological complexities limits the academic value of this work. His failure to make judicious use of the past century's abundant international scholarship on this important area, in order to place Przhevalsky in context, also severely restricts its utility as a general source.

JOEL M. HALPERN

*University of Massachusetts, Amherst*

THE ROOTS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM: A SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY 1898–1907. By *David Lane*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975 [Assen, The Netherlands, 1969]. xvi, 240 pp. \$4.95, paper.

Professor Lane's well-known 1969 monograph has been reprinted in a paperback edition which contains no revisions. The justification for reviewing it here is the absence of a review of the 1969 edition in *Slavic Review*.

At its best (which means in part 1 [pp. 11–58]), the book is a successful attempt to reassess the social composition of the early Russian Social Democratic Party and its supporters and to demonstrate the inadequacy of the notion, still widespread in the mid-1960s, that Russian Marxism, bolshevism in particular, was an intelligentsia-based movement without significant worker support. Few scholars would defend this notion today, but it would be a mistake to underestimate its appeal at a time when titles such as *Three Who Made a Revolution* (1956) were well entrenched and the title *The Making of a Workers' Revolution* (1967) was still novel.

Lane's most impressive contribution, which is unlikely to be superseded unless and until Soviet authorities open up access to party archives, is his careful analysis of the characteristics—profession, *soslovie*, education, nationality, age—of S.D. Party members in the period 1898–1905. Most of the data on which he bases this part of his investigation are derived from volume 5 of the Soviet publication, *Deiateli revoliutsion-*

*nogo dvizheniia v Rossii: Bio-bibliograficheskii slovar'* (1927–33). The author further refines his results by relating them to such variables as position in the party (leadership versus rank and file) and, most important, allegiance to bolshevism or menshevism. He uses a cluster sampling method, in part out of necessity (volume 5 of *Deiateli* is terminated halfway through the fourth letter of the Russian alphabet), though his reason for confining himself to the first *two* letters is unclear. This procedure still leaves him with a sample of about 10 percent of the persons who belonged to the party (some 12,000) over these years, but the proportion falls markedly when the sample is reduced to those persons for whom there are data as to factional preference.

Lane's main conclusions may be summarized as follows: although Social Democrats came disproportionately from privileged *sosloviia*, most members stemmed from the urban and rural lower classes and included a high representation of industrial workers. The Mensheviks had a much lower proportion of peasants (*soslovie*) and factory hands (profession) than did the Bolsheviks, but both factions drew their rank-and-file members primarily from the lower orders. The membership of both factions was extremely well educated compared to the population as a whole, but with a larger proportion of Bolsheviks than Mensheviks concentrated at both extremes of the educational spectrum. Not surprisingly, the category for which the data reveal the sharpest contrast between the factions is nationality. As has long been known, the Mensheviks, thanks to the high proportion of Georgians and Jews in their ranks, were much less "Russian" than their rivals. Lane's contribution is to have pinned down the figures with greater precision than has been done before. Finally, he makes the important point that, in contrast to the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks had difficulty recruiting very young workers, a problem that evidently overlapped with their difficulty in recruiting workers who were recent migrants from the village.

The above summary of the conclusions that this reviewer found most interesting fails to do justice to the more detailed and refined analysis carried out by Lane, especially his brief but cogent discussion of the results of the elections to the Second Duma (1907), which he utilizes in order to explore the social composition of the party's broader constituency of unaffiliated supporters (chapter 2).

The remainder of the book, comprising over two-thirds of the text, is rather disappointing by comparison. It consists of seven chapters, each of which purports to summarize the "structure and activity" of Social Democracy, through 1905, in one region of the Russian Empire. The stories are familiar, at least for the regions where the movement was most important (St. Petersburg, Moscow, Baku), and the manner in which they are retold is not particularly interesting or inspired. At most, it could be said that the chapters on the more obscure areas (Tver, Omsk, and so forth) constitute a handy and convenient source of information. On the whole, Lane's accounts are written with balance and objectivity, and he makes judicious use of Soviet secondary sources from the 1920s and the post-Stalin period.

A final remark that I hope will not be seen as a quibble: Current controversies over the use of "he," "he or she," and the like aside, one cannot help but be struck by the consistency with which the author uses language that suggests that all Social Democrats were male, particularly in a study that purports to distinguish carefully among the social characteristics of the members. True, linguistic sensibilities have changed, but to list Vera Zasulich as one of "four men" over fifty years old in the Menshevik leadership (p. 35) seems excessive even by the standards of the 1960s.

REGINALD E. ZELNIK  
*University of California, Berkeley*