

(and there are many more that could have been cited) is not so much to offend against the truth as to be insufficient to it. If all this, as one must assume, is the price of trying to say too much in too small a space, then Mrs. Jelavich, a fine historian when working with a sharper focus in a more manageable field, would have done better to forgo the effort and to let the earlier account of Russia's nineteenth-century diplomacy—fortified as it is by her other valuable researches—stand on its own merits.

GEORGE F. KENNAN

Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Washington, D.C.

RUSSIE-URSS, 1870-1970. By *Michel Laran*. Collection "Un siècle d'histoire."
Paris: Masson et Cie, 1973. 336 pp. + 15 pp. maps. 50 F., paper.

This is part of the Masson series of semipopular surveys in French, dealing with various countries in the century from 1870 to 1970. Professor Laran is affiliated with the Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales and the University of Paris. The book contains a great deal of information on all aspects of Russia, and much of it is balanced and reliable. There are useful source selections and biographical sketches. The end-of-chapter bibliographies list not only French works but also many in English and Russian (though not in German).

Unfortunately, there are many weaknesses. One is the author's occasional tendency to assume more knowledge on his readers' part than seems warranted for a work that is aimed at so broad an audience as this one obviously is. For instance, Laran covers Katyn by saying merely that "relations between the USSR and the London Polish government had been suspended after the discovery of the mass graves of Katyn in April 1943," and leaves it unspecified who did what to whom, or why it was important. Similarly, some readers will have to turn elsewhere to find out why and in what sense Sholokhov's *Quiet Don* was received "with suspicion," or what happened between the USSR and Hungary in the "events of October-November 1956."

A more serious flaw from the standpoint of the nonspecialist is Laran's penchant for simple explanations, without caveats, of matters that remain highly debatable for many, if not most, historians. His versions of the Kornilov affair, or Stalin and the "Military Revolutionary Center" of October 1917, or Stalin's intentions in signing the pact with Hitler, to cite a few examples, are presented with the same air of certitude as is the most routine and indisputable fact.

Although many developments are recounted with admirable clarity—the Great Purge is one—some aspects of the story are inadequate. For example, the book's slighting of the Comintern and related Soviet activities abroad in the 1920s and 1930s will make it hard for some readers to understand why the Western powers did not rush to ally themselves with Stalin against Hitler. Among the twenty-odd other topics I felt were misleadingly treated are the pre-1917 judicial system, the role of foreigners in pre-1917 Russian industry, the Stolypin reforms, Stalin's nationality policy, the roles of the Czechs and of the Allied intervention in the Civil War, the use of forced labor in the 1930s, the initial Soviet response to Hitler's invasion, and the Vlasov movement. Personal opinions do, of course, differ on such topics, but many of them are the subjects of scholarly works which Laran seems not to have incorporated in his survey. This impression is reinforced by some surprising omissions from the bibliographic listings.

Since the book does have merit despite its faults, it is regrettable that the publisher has not seen fit to include any sort of index.

RALPH T. FISHER JR.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

ROSHIA KOGYOSHI KENKYU: NODO KAIHO NO REKISHITEKI ZENTEI NO KAIMEI. English title: THE RUSSIAN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, 1800–1860. By *Tatsuo Arima*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1973. ii, 335 pp.

A comparison of Arima's monograph and William L. Blackwell's *Beginnings of Russian Industrialization, 1800–1860* (1968) illustrates the differences between the Japanese and the Western historians in their approach to Russian economic history. While Blackwell's conceptual framework is derived from the theory of modernization developed by recent Western economic historians, Arima follows orthodox Marxist methodology and interpretations. As the Japanese subtitle, *Toward the Understanding of the Historical Prerequisite of the Emancipation of the Serfs*, indicates, Arima's main concern is to analyze those changes in the mode of production under serfdom that led the tsarist regime to embark on capitalist development in 1861. He focuses on the emergence of capitalist production in the textile, paper, and sugar-refining industries, touching briefly on the trade and tariff policies of the tsarist government. Two major branches of industry—mining and metallurgy—are excluded from his analysis. He pays no or little attention to such problems as the industrialization debate, administrative machinery for industrialization, transportation, technology, education, and urbanization—the problems which Blackwell discusses at length.

Arima's approach represents the predominant current of recent Japanese scholarship on Russian history, which has been heavily influenced by Marxism. For the past twenty years the Japanese Marxist historians of Russia have emancipated themselves from their uncritical acceptance of Soviet historiography and have succeeded in producing unique interpretations in numerous areas of research. Although they rejected the theory of modernization developed in the West, it prompted them to re-examine their theoretical framework in the light of available evidence. Wada Haruki, the most influential among them, in his pioneering article in 1961, criticized the Soviet historians' interpretation that the basic cause for the emancipation lay in the internal political and economic development. Instead, he emphasized the importance of the international impact, caused by the defeat in the Crimean War, in forcing the tsarist government to abandon serfdom and to decide on the introduction of capitalism for its survival. Central in Wada's interpretation, subsequently shared by Kikuchi Masanori in his monograph on the emancipation (1964), is the denial of the existence of capitalist production before 1861.

Arima's study is a critique of this interpretation. Tracing the decline of the seigniorial factories based on servile labor, the development of large mechanized factories, the rise of industrial capitalists, and the formation of the capitalistic labor force, the author argues that capitalist production had already matured prior to the 1860s. Yet he also disagrees with S. G. Strumilin's interpretation. Strumilin's contention that the industrial revolution in Russia had taken place before 1860 applies, in Arima's opinion, too mechanically the model of the British