

versely inhospitable natural and human environment, the young scholar never ceased to observe and record during three years of solitary peregrinations. His labor has yielded an encyclopedic compilation of notes on Kamchatka's mountains and rivers, fauna and flora, climate, aboriginal inhabitants, and a history of the Russian conquest, depredations, and subsequent revolts. In addition, there are descriptions of the Kurile Islands, the Okhotsk seaboard, and the Aleutian chain.

Very little escaped Krasheninnikov's inquiring eyes. His curiosity embraced the life cycles of salmon, the hallucinogenic properties of mushrooms, the sexual mores of Kamchadal widows, and the demonology of volcanoes. But he transcended the mere amassment of data by exercising an astute, even poetic, appreciation of the tragicomic human condition. Few readers can forget his eloquently laconic account of how Aleuts would paddle fragile *baidarki* through rough seas in order to warn Russians in their relatively large ships about the dangers of capsizing (one of these ships did subsequently capsize). Only rarely do Krasheninnikov's sympathies lapse, as when he betrays an aversion to Chinese women ("among the lowest class of people") or when he evokes the less savory details of Kamchadal cuisine (potage of decayed fish). His narrative of the Kamchatka Rebellion of 1731 (a fierce but abortive native challenge to Russian rule) constitutes an invaluable chronicle replete with instructive glimpses into the almost casual brutalities of frontier politics.

Mrs. Crownhart-Vaughan's translation is superb—faithful to the original without sacrificing readability. She has enriched the text with copious maps, illustrations, explanatory notes, and a concise introductory essay. The index is general but serviceable.

Long known only to specialists or antiquarians, Krasheninnikov has at last found an eminently worthy introduction to a wider audience. The Oregon Historical Society is to be commended for setting such high standards in the first volume of what promises to be a distinguished series on the greater Pacific Northwest.

JOHN J. STEPHAN
University of Hawaii

KAPITALISMENS GENESIS: ET PERIODISERINGSPROBLEM I SOVJETISK HISTORIESKRIVNING. By *Niels Erik Rosenfeldt*. Københavns Universitet, Institut for Økonomisk Historie, publication no. 3. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gads Forlag, 1971. 176 pp. 34.50 DKr., paper.

The rewriting of Russian history goes on in both East and West, but in the Soviet Union the party—the self-proclaimed incarnation of proletarian class-consciousness and class will—provides guidelines that can be ignored only at one's peril. This lucid study by a Danish scholar, Niels Rosenfeldt, provides an excellent summary of problems in Soviet historical scholarship since the Revolution and an in-depth study of the question of "periodization," particularly the debate over the origins of capitalism in Russia. The running debate between 1947 and 1951 was essentially spawned by Stalin himself, who made it clear that Soviet historians should take on the mantle of militant Bolshevik propagandists. Creeping "bourgeois objectivism" and "cosmopolitanism" were more dangerous than even Pokrovsky's "vulgar Marxism." It was time also to pay greater attention to the active role of the "superstructure" as well

as the critical importance of the "conscious" political act in contrast to the phenomenon of "spontaneity" in revolutions.

In the search for a firmer scheme of periodization, priority was given to the origins of capitalism in Russia. From the Marxist point of view the mandate was to find the dividing line between the characteristically forced labor of feudal times and the wage labor of the newer capitalist era. From the nationalistic point of view the mandate was to find capital accumulation and capitalist forms and processes that were indigenous, and not Western imports, and to find them earlier in Russian history than heretofore. This led to a sophisticated analysis of past social structures, a search for evidence of classes and class conflicts, a look at manufactures and labor, and evaluations of the various phenomena associated with the superstructure—ideology, art, politics, the state structure. Bakanov, Bak, Druzhinin, Sidorov, Iakovlev, Smirnov, Borisov, Rubinshtein, Strumilin, and many others had their day in court. Arguments from history, economics, statistics, sociology, and logic were compounded nearly endlessly. Considerable consensus ultimately emerged that the mid-eighteenth century contained all the important elements of an incipient capitalistic *uklad*, with Druzhinin and A. Borisov favoring the 1760s. Others, such as S. G. Strumilin, argued cogently for an earlier period, at least to the era of Peter the Great.

Rosenfeldt's analysis of the arguments in the great debate and his clear delineation of criteria used by Soviet scholars in evaluating historical data provide an excellent insight into the art, science, and politics of historical studies in the USSR. It is a pity the book was not published in a more widely read West European language.

ALBIN T. ANDERSON
University of Nebraska

DZIEJE ROSJI, 1533–1801. By *Zbigniew Wójcik*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1971. 396 pp. 85 zł.

This volume attempts to survey the history of Russia from Ivan the Terrible to Alexander I. Obviously a work of under four hundred pages encompassing two hundred sixty-eight years of turbulent events can neither be exhaustive nor abound in startling revelations. Each of the fifteen chapters (grouped into four parts), however, is well written, each has been well researched, each covers a wide range of topics dealing with foreign and domestic policies, and each contains a fair amount of useful information (factual and interpretative).

As might be expected of a work of this scope, one is bound to find both strengths and shortcomings, depending on one's knowledge and preference. The strongest feature of the volume is its clarity, especially to be noted in Wójcik's analysis of Russia's relations with Poland, in his treatment of the Cossack movement, and in his examination of the motives behind the Russian drive to the west and south. This is not surprising. Wójcik is very familiar with these complex problems, having earlier written a monograph on events leading to the Treaty of Andrusovo, another on post-Andrusovo developments, and a third on the Cossacks.

Wójcik's treatment of Russian expansion to the east is something else. This is clearly reflected in the amount of space allotted and in the literature cited. He has omitted, for example, the works by Golder, Kerner, Fisher, Lantzeff, and Gibson. This omission is regrettable because these works are considered basic; it is