

and he demanded more information about actual conditions in Russia. Ambler's contribution to the history of conservative Russian journalism might have been even more useful if she had brought her history up to 1912.

DANIEL BALMUTH
Skidmore College

TSARIZM I RABOCHII VOPROS V ROSSII (1861–1917 gg.). By *V. Ia. Laverychev*. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1972. 340 pp. 1.62 rubles.

This is another major contribution by Professor Laverychev to our knowledge of social, economic, and political relations in urban prerevolutionary Russia. Drawing heavily on archival sources, it throws much light on the process of policy formation within the tsarist bureaucracy. Labor policies are treated mainly as a product of ongoing conflict between the Ministry of Finance (and, after 1905, the Ministry of Trade and Industry) and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, although the division between the two camps was not, it is noted, consistently maintained. The nature and evolution of entrepreneurial reactions to the workers' movement are also explored. Here the author's demonstration of the differing attitudes to be found among the employers marks a noteworthy step in the recent trend among Soviet historians away from earlier simplistic approaches to class conflict. While stressing the predominant reluctance of factory owners to make concessions to their workers, he also points to the presence of some among them who early recognized the necessity for limited reforms.

In a somewhat different category is Laverychev's effort to dispel what he considers to be the exaggerated importance attached to entrepreneurial resistance by Tugan-Baranovsky and Balabanov as a cause of the failure of the first governmental efforts to introduce factory legislation in the 1880s. But whether he means that the industrialists' opposition to reform has been exaggerated, or rather that their influence on the government was minimal, is unclear. He does clearly depict the way in which governmental pressures for concessions to the workers, together with official mistrust of employers' organizations, contributed to the growing political disaffection of some industrialists, particularly in the Moscow area. As a good Leninist, however, he concludes that all efforts to alleviate labor's unrest were doomed to failure, for the autocracy could never abandon its "custodial" approach toward the workers and accede to entrepreneurial and labor demands for the introduction of "bourgeois" reforms requiring the acceptance of civil liberties and the institution of a limited monarchy.

Particularly noteworthy is the new material that is presented concerning the Fedorov Commission on labor reform in 1906. It is Laverychev's judgment that this commission, rather than that headed by Kokovtsov a year earlier, marked the climax of official liberalism toward labor during the first revolution. The description of Witte's relations with Pobedonostsev during his tenure as minister of finance is of interest in view of his later confession before the State Council (not mentioned in this volume) of his failure to provide strong support for labor reform. On the other hand, the author's treatment of the uncertain course of labor legislation through the Third Duma, and the part played by the industrialists in that process, is disappointing. A more thorough discussion of the extent to which political liberalism among the Moscow factory owners during the later years was, or was not, re-

flected in a more generous response to their workers' needs would have been welcome. Regrettably there is no bibliography, although the introduction and its footnotes contain useful information.

To say that more questions are raised than are answered in this thoughtful and often stimulating book is not to denigrate its scholarly contribution, which is substantial. Indispensable for the specialist, it will also have great interest for all who are concerned with the political and social forces at work during this critical period in Russia's history.

RUTH A. ROOSA
 Briarcliff College

GERMANSKIE KAPITALY V ROSSII: ELEKTROINDUSTRIIA I ELEKTRICHESKII TRANSPORT. By *V. S. Diakin*. Leningrad: "Nauka," 1971. 288 pp. 1.26 rubles.

Although it has long been common knowledge that German capital accounted for the bulk of all investment in the Russian electrical industry until at least 1914, previous investigators have studied this subject only within the context of some larger problem, such as foreign capital, German capital, or imperialism. This monograph thus fills a hole in the wall of Soviet historiography on Russian economic development under capitalism. And since this well-made brick fits snugly into place, it tells us a good deal about how the wall is being built.

Diakin agrees with the general opinion that few if any Russian industries were as totally dominated by foreign owners or as highly monopolized as the electrical construction industry. The two leading firms in Russia, Siemens-Halske and A.E.G. (Allgemeine Elektrizitäts Gesellschaft), were always effectively directed from Berlin and always stood far above any Russian or Belgian competitors. Diakin does try to show, however, that even in this industry there were clear and growing limits to foreign domination. Especially in the industrial surge before World War I, Russian banks and entrepreneurial groups won a larger place for themselves in the electrical industry—reorganizing old firms, founding new ones, and jockeying for advantage between various foreign financial combinations.

Russian groups, like that of P. O. Gukasov or the Russo-Asiatic Bank, constantly played up their national character in the competition with their German rivals—for example, in their successful struggle to secure concessions for the generation of hydroelectric power for St. Petersburg (the Imatra Company). This tendency toward a more national and less dependent Russian electrical industry accelerated in 1914. Diakin's principal conclusion thus reinforces the position of Gindin, Bovykin, and others who have succeeded in discrediting an earlier Soviet interpretation of Vanag and Ronin, who argued simplistically that Russia was totally subservient to foreign finance capital in the era of imperialism. Having reached somewhat similar conclusions in my own research, I am quite willing to be persuaded by Diakin on this point.

The fascination of this work lies less in this rather obvious conclusion, however, than in the author's methodology and sources. Like some other recent Soviet works in economic history, Diakin's study is based on painstaking investigation of the existing business records of the companies involved. This allows him to attain an admirable completeness for an entire industry—a completeness which West