

of the dissident groups, "Seiatel" ("The Sower"), has introduced its declaration of aims with the statement "Our goal is the creation of a Social Democratic party in Russia" (*Seiatel'*, no. 1, September 1971) perhaps represents a beginning of Akselrod's vindication as a political figure.

I noticed a few minor inaccuracies in this otherwise excellent book: not P. A. Garvy but B. O. Bogdanov belonged, together with K. A. Gvozdev, to the leadership of the Labor Group of the Central War Industry Committee (p. 260); the Menshevik party was active in the USSR at least until the end of the 1920s and not to the middle of 1922 (p. 374); M. P. Dragomanov was a well-defined and not a "somewhat enigmatic figure among Russian émigrés" (p. 53); dissensions were not a specific characteristic of the Menshevik party (p. 273)—the Mensheviks used to disagree among themselves probably not less but hardly more than the members of the socialist parties in and outside Russia did.

BORIS SAPIR

International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam

KRUSHENIE ESEROVSKIKH PRAVITEL'STV. By *V. V. Garmiza*. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1970. 294 pp. 1.07 rubles.

This is a history of the S.R.-dominated anti-Soviet governments which were established in various parts of Russia in the aftermath of the October Revolution. Substantial individual chapters are devoted to the "Committee of Members of the Constituent Assembly (Komuch)," "The S.R. Governments in Siberia," "The S.R.'s and the Interventionists in Arkhangelsk," "The Socioeconomic Policies of the S.R.'s," and "The Ufa State Conference and the Directory." Concluding chapters treat "The Workers Movement and Bolshevik Underground in the S.R.-White Guardist Rear," "The Struggle of the Peasants against the S.R.'s," and "The Destruction of Komuch: The Liberation of the Volga Region."

In his general approach to these problems, Garmiza does not break new ground. At the start he states that "study of the historical experiences of the nature and destruction of the [S.R.] governments brings to light the deception of the laboring classes by the old and new standard-bearers of capitalism and so will strike a blow at contemporary imperialist ideology with its false declarations about the democratic character of bourgeois government." Inevitably the aspirations, and even more the practices, of the S.R. governments, the authority of each particular S.R. regime in the eyes of the local population, the alleged subservience of the S.R.'s to capitalist interests and the extent of the party's dependence on foreign powers, the involvement of the S.R.'s in and the scope of White terror, and so forth, are subject to distortion. Still, this is the first systematic, comparative study of all of the S.R. governments taken together; Garmiza makes extensive use of central and local archives, the contemporary Soviet and White press, and hard-to-obtain early memoir accounts representing both the Soviet and anti-Soviet side. The book provides great detail and some fresh insights into such problems as the often complex internal politics and operations of Komuch and the important Ufa State Conference. Therefore, its underlying bias notwithstanding, it should be of genuine interest and value to the specialist.

ALEXANDER RABINOWITZ
Indiana University