

best brief, critical discussions in any language of sources for the study of Russian and European diplomacy during the period immediately preceding World War I. P. A. Zaionchkovsky's chapter, "Zakonodatel'nye akty i materialy oftsial'nogo deloproizvodstva XIX v. kak istoricheskii istochnik," is perhaps the most informative and useful essay in this volume. For American and European graduate students who intend to use published tsarist official materials or to work in Soviet archives on problems of nineteenth-century bureaucratic history, Zaionchkovsky's chapter is a must; it will save them much time and effort in locating research materials and in learning basic facts about the operation of the tsarist bureaucracy. Finally, of great value for the investigation of Russian political, social, and economic history are the chapters on the use of statistical sources (chap. 1), the records of court investigations and trials (chaps. 7-9), the periodical press (chaps. 11 and 12), and memoirs, diaries, and personal correspondence (chaps. 14 and 15).

This manual should be of particular interest to teachers of seminars on Russian economic, social, diplomatic, and institutional history as well as to advanced students intending to work in Soviet archives. But it is an old-fashioned, unexciting work. It refers solemnly to "Marxist" and "Soviet historical science" and contains no suggestion of new methods and approaches to the study of history. Its bibliography is inadequate and does not even list all the monographs, journals, and sources mentioned in the text. There is no index.

EDWARD C. THADEN
University of Illinois, Chicago

THE WRITING OF HISTORY IN THE SOVIET UNION. By *Anatole G. Mazour*. Hoover Institution Publications, 87. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1971. xvi, 383 pp. \$17.50.

As a supplement to his well-known *Modern Russian Historiography* (New York, 1958), Professor Mazour now offers a survey of Soviet historical writing on some major themes and topics in Russian history. Publications have been so abundant, especially in recent years, that no single Western scholar, however omniscient, could be expected to provide a comprehensive coverage. Quite justifiably, therefore, this work claims to be no more than a selection, yet it contains references to more than two thousand Soviet books and articles. Almost everyone with an interest in the field will be able to learn something from this volume. It may also stimulate further experiments in this genre of scholarship, which is less familiar in the Anglo-Saxon world than it is in continental Europe. The *Literaturbericht*, a critical survey of writings on a particular period or topic, occupies a position midway between a bibliography and a historiographical essay, and is an invaluable tool to the researcher.

However admirable Mazour's courage in tackling this daunting task, it must be acknowledged that the result is somewhat uneven. The best portions, which read as if they were written for some earlier occasion, are those devoted to a detailed examination of Soviet writings on the Civil War, particularly those published in the 1920s, many of which will be unknown even to specialists. Mazour also provides a gripping description of the catastrophic impact of the Stalin cult on this branch of Soviet historiography and assesses the progress made in overcoming it since 1956. On the latter point he is perhaps oversanguine, for even the military

historians, who enjoy more latitude than most, have still to wrestle with the ghost of Trotsky. It is not true, as is twice stated here (pp. 269, 273), that Lenin's military correspondence was banned under Stalin: much of it first appeared in 1942, in volume 34 of *Leninskii sbornik*. A more fundamental point is that present-day Soviet historians of this era are obliged to engage in a "Lenin cult" almost as fallacious as that of Stalin, and may write nothing which might cast doubt on the myth of party infallibility.

On such matters the author's approach has serious deficiencies. He never mentions the word "myth," and shows little understanding of the political realities governing Soviet academic life. The crucial concept of "partisanship" (*partiinosť*) is all but ignored, and the philosophical assumptions behind the system of ideological controls are presented in a naïve and misleading way. It is not "Party membership" (p. 11) but the *activities* of the party (indeed, of "all progressive mankind") which are deemed by orthodox Marxist-Leninists to be in accord with the "objective regularities" of historical evolution. Mazour criticizes the numerous documentary collections on the October Revolution for "lack of unity in purpose" (p. 279), whereas to most observers their unity of purpose will seem their most salient characteristic: they are all too obviously designed to bolster a largely mythical image of the Revolution, according to which the Bolsheviks alone were truly revolutionary and rooted in the masses. It is to this end that the historical record is, where necessary, shamelessly doctored, and strict rules (not mentioned here) laid down to govern the selection of historical documents for publication.

Frequently the author extols Soviet historians for their "outstanding" or "original" work without making it clear how these achievements relate to their use of a methodology which he elsewhere explicitly or implicitly criticizes. This basic ambivalence undermines the credibility of his judgments on individual writers or their works, which sometimes seem to be based on inadequate familiarity with their content. Thus B. F. Porshnev is said to have interpreted "soundly" Russia's position in the early modern European state system (p. 88), although the work to which the reader is referred appeared in 1948, when the chauvinistic excesses of the *Zhdanovshchina* were at their height. M. M. Bogoslovsky's biographical study of Peter I and his times is more than a "collection of materials," as its modest title might suggest (p. 92). An article by I. I. Mints in the party's historical journal is acclaimed as "an interesting effort to trace the origin of the Soviet as a political form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. His conclusion was that this idea was conceived by Lenin in 1906-7 and developed further during the First World War" (pp. 280-81). In fact Mints's argument is conventional, stereotyped, and of marginal interest at best. References to such minor or ephemeral works could have been omitted in favor of fuller treatment of standard authorities, among which there are some notable absentees (e.g., M. M. Shtrange's work on the eighteenth-century "democratic intelligentsia" or the studies by E. N. Gorodetsky and M. P. Iroshnikov on the early Soviet state).

It must be added that the arrangement of the volume is often confused. Works on the recent history of the national republics are listed in a section supposedly devoted to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and those on medieval ecclesiastical heresies are placed between two sections on the nineteenth century. The references are not always properly coordinated with the text, and there are far too many errors of fact (for some of which the unidentified editor should no doubt share the blame). Despite these serious defects Mazour's work draws attention to the range

of subjects treated by Soviet historians, and for this reason will find its place on many library shelves.

JOHN KEEP
University of Toronto

LEADERS OF THE COMMUNIST WORLD. Edited by *Rodger Swearingen*.
New York: Free Press. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971. xv, 632 pp. \$17.95.

"Geronticon," the caption assigned to a review of the *Biographic Dictionary of Chinese Communism* (*Times Literary Supplement*, January 28, 1972, p. 90), would serve as well as a subtitle for the volume under review. In 1969, the editor states, the average age of Communist world leaders was sixty-three: Ho Chi Minh, seventy-nine; eight over seventy; only three under fifty—Castro the youngest (*enfant terrible?*) at forty-three (p. xii). Barely a handful of the Chinese leaders belong to the generation born after 1916 (*TLS*). It is not surprising that the Chinese remarked on the youthfulness of the Nixon-led mission to Peking. But what useful conclusions can be drawn from the age factor? That the Communist-capitalist conflict can be explained by the generation gap? That a correlation obtains between revolutionary activity and longevity? That the summoning of the present Communist leaders to their maker will bring to positions of power those who did not experience the revolutionary struggle and will consequently pursue more tractable lines of policy?

The editor draws additional comparisons—class, education, marital and family status, foreign experience, and position on the Moscow-Peking dispute—but commends the individual biographies to the reader for the purpose of comparison and generalization. This is fair enough, but the sample of leaders, the unavailability of certain kinds of information, and the varying treatment of the principals make the drawing of generalizations problematical. Comparisons on the basis of vital statistics present little problem, but some conceptual apparatus seems indispensable for an understanding of the gentlemen who made, or want to make, a revolution. One recalls, for example, the work of Harold D. Lasswell or, more recently, E. Victor Wolfenstein's intriguing effort to develop a set of psychopolitical propositions about revolutionary involvement and leadership in his studies of Lenin, Trotsky, and Gandhi (*The Revolutionary Personality*, Princeton, 1967). The present volume states, for example: "Love in the simple human sense has exercised no moderating influence in Castro's life. . . . The women in his immediate entourage . . . are principally coworkers. Physical love has been just that" (p. 464). Such observations may be suggestive (and even titillating), but when they are without benefit of an analytic framework, they are telling neither for the subject nor for comparative purposes.

In general, the biographies serve as useful and interesting capsule histories of the individual Communist parties and, taken together, as a vignette of international communism. In choosing the "thirty-four" subjects for coverage (I count thirty-three), the editor has made a defensible selection—excluding the "greats" on whom much biographical information exists (Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin), and including certain deceased but influential persons (Togliatti, Ho Chi Minh, et al.), the top leaders of the ruling parties (Lin Piao, "Mao's man," lost this status at some point between the writing and the publication of the volume), and select living leaders from important non-Communist countries. The criteria of selection result in omis-