

thorough grasp of subject and sources; and outstanding features of her book are her command of the massive literature (over one thousand titles) and her use of unpublished materials. She draws on Soviet archives for documents which throw light, in particular, on the history of the bibliography of proscribed literature, and she gives many references to work which has remained partly or wholly unpublished. She covers the entire field, from the bibliography of current output (with a detailed study of *Knizhnaia letopis'* and its precursors), general and selective bibliographies, bibliographies of periodicals, of book reviews, of proscribed and children's literature (both excellent), and subject bibliographies (humanities and sciences). Her account of bibliographical organizations and her sketches of the activities of the bibliographical giants who campaigned and polemicized on the Russian earth in those days (e.g., Bodnarsky, Derunov, Lisovsky, Loviagin, Mezier, Rubakin, Toropov, and Vengerov) are lovingly and judiciously done.

Mashkova's approach is nothing if not *partiinyi*, but it is also scholarly, and one knows where one stands. She is not easy to fault, but her almost complete exclusion of published library catalogues—which she might perhaps justify on “formal” grounds—is at least arguable: many important catalogues were issued during the period, and in certain fields (e.g., official publications and military science) they are some of the most effective guides that we possess. The book has a reliable index of names, but the absence of an index of titles is difficult to excuse. However, these are clearly-delimited lacunae, and Mashkova's book is one which nonbibliographers concerned with the printed sources for the period 1900–1917 would be well advised not to dismiss with a *bibliographiae non leguntur*—or some less orotund gibe.

J. S. G. SIMMONS
All Souls College, Oxford

VLADIMIR AKIMOV ON THE DILEMMAS OF RUSSIAN MARXISM, 1895–1903: THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY; A SHORT HISTORY OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT IN RUSSIA. Two texts in translation, edited and introduced by *Jonathan Frankel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. x, 390 pp. \$10.00.

For once a book offers more than its title may suggest. This volume contains two major tracts of Vladimir Akimov (Makhnovets), who was probably the most interesting and certainly the most attractive figure of the *Rabochee delo* group and of so-called Economism. It would be hard to find fault with the painstaking translation and erudite annotation—obviously a labor of love—that went into this edition of two rare and valuable major documents now made available to students of the Russian revolutionary movement and of European socialism. This in itself is no mean achievement. But Dr. Frankel has done more than that. While rescuing Akimov from undeserved oblivion and unraveling the hitherto intractable mystery of Economism, he has also tried to put both into the historical context of Russian social democracy. In the process he has produced an excellent introductory essay called “The Polarization of Russian Marxism (1883–1903).” That lengthy essay (pp. 3–98) is a masterpiece in its own right and may well be regarded as the best introduction to Russian Marxist theory and debate.

Akimov's tract *The Second Congress of Russian Social Democracy* contains much of what he was prevented from saying at the Second Congress of the RSDRP

in 1903, in defense of his Economism and of the Union of Russian Social Democrats Abroad. His is a serious, perceptive, and sometimes prophetic critique of *Iskra's* program by way of comparison with the programs of the socialist parties of Central and Western Europe. Akimov's views were all the more interesting, for he—unlike Martov and Axelrod—was not committed to Marxist orthodoxy or implicated in *Iskra's* imperialism. He hammered away, without compunction, at *Iskra's* endorsement of the linked theories of pauperization, elitism, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and with particular relish and perception at Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?*

Akimov's *Short History of the Social Democratic Movement* is a scrupulous and richly documented comparative study of the Russian labor movement as it evolved in Vilno, St. Petersburg, and Kiev. It is the first major history of Russian social democracy. Its chief distinction is that it seems more reliable than Bolshevik and even than Menshevik accounts, and unlike both is more concerned with developments at the grass-roots level of workers' activities than with party committees and factional squabbles.

Frankel begins his introductory essay with a clear rejection of the widely held view that sees in Leninism a throwback to populism, specifically to Bakunin and Tkachev. He urges that Lenin, the impatient maximalist, and Akimov, the minimalist and gradualist, were early and passionate disciples of Plekhanov. According to Frankel both Lenin and Akimov had their ideological roots in Plekhanov's theory of two stages, or of two revolutions. That theory was a tour de force, the means by which Plekhanov tried (and failed) to reconcile economic determinism with socialist impatience and thus resolve the basic dilemma of Marxist socialists who are condemned to make a revolution in a backward country. By the turn of the century Plekhanov's ingenious dialectical reconciliation of opposites was wearing thin, while his disciples began to emancipate themselves from their master's tutelage. At this point Lenin fastened on the impatient, voluntarist, elitist, and Jacobin elements in Plekhanov's thought, while Akimov and the Economists held to and developed its deterministic, gradualist, and democratic elements. In short, then, both Lenin and Akimov were products of the polarization—if not decomposition—of that Plekhanovite synthesis which did not work.

Frankel's thesis is original and makes good sense. He may, however, have been carried too far when he sees Lenin in the years 1902–5 already opting “for a ‘maximalist’ interpretation of Marxist thought—a full-blooded socialist régime as an immediate goal” (p. 3). This is a debatable proposition, while Frankel's argument and evidence in its support (pp. 66–73) remain inconclusive. This reviewer would agree that by 1904–5 Lenin had already departed from Plekhanov's scheme of two revolutions, but only insofar as Lenin had thrown overboard the taboo on power which Plekhanov's scheme had postulated for the first, bourgeois, revolution. Lenin instead urged seizure of power and establishment of a radical-democratic popular front government. It is difficult to find evidence suggesting that Lenin was even then making ready to plunge Russia headlong into socialism, unless there was also a revolution in the West. For that lucky contingency he would even have found allies in the Mensheviks.

This criticism, however, does not affect Frankel's main argument and certainly does not detract from his achievement. His *Akimov* is a fine work of scholarship and a major contribution to the study of Russian Marxism.

ISRAEL GETZLER

La Trobe University, Melbourne