

of war in 1914, one might well ask in what measure the tensions within the Entente contributed to the pervasive feeling that war could no longer be avoided and that political solutions could no longer work in July 1914. This reviewer would also have liked to see a more systematic analysis of the new, "nationalist," Russian entrepreneurial groups that played such an important part in the events discussed.

DANIEL T. ORLOVSKY
Harvard University

THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT IN RUSSIA, 1900–1905. By *Shmuel Galai*. Soviet and East European Studies Series. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1973. x, 325 pp. \$22.50.

Mr. Galai's monograph is a comprehensive history of Russian liberalism from the late 1870s to 1905. It is distinguished by an impressive attention to detail, and fully exhausts the published sources available to a Western historian. Probably the most laudable quality of the work is its exacting precision in the use of sources; contradictory testimony is weighed judiciously, and a number of minor errors in previous secondary works are uncovered. It thus now stands as the fullest and most reliable narrative on the subject.

Yet the work is not entirely satisfactory in two important respects. First, it does not present fresh data or information, and specialists will find little new in the volume. The author was unable to use Soviet archives and therefore had to draw upon the same sources used extensively by previous students (George Fischer, Victor Leontovitsch, Nathan Smith, and others). Although this volume is more detailed than earlier treatments, it is misleading to declare that "little has been known until now about the origins, composition, organizational framework, and significance of the liberalism of this [liberation] movement" (p. 1). Furthermore, though Galai fully utilized the printed sources, he did not use some pertinent archival collections in the West (for example, the Petrunkevich Collection at Yale University). Finally, the volume is surprisingly dated. In revising his 1967 dissertation, the author made substantial use of only two subsequent works (the volumes appearing in 1970 by Richard Pipes and E. D. Chermensky); neither text nor bibliography indicates familiarity with pertinent dissertations (for example, those by Charles Timberlake and Judith Zimmerman) or published works (Gregory Freeze, M. S. Simonova, and Iu. B. Soloviev).

Second, particularly since the author does not introduce new source materials, it is regrettable that the volume does not present major new insights or revise our conceptions of the liberal movement. Indeed, the work appears in a kind of historiographical vacuum, with little regard to broader interpretative issues; thus the familiar thesis of "two types" of liberals is uncritically absorbed into the conceptual framework of the volume. Nor does the work suggest a new approach to liberalism, either methodologically or conceptually; instead, it remains on the level of exacting but straightforward political narrative.

Notwithstanding these strictures, the book is still a useful contribution to the subject. It is a critical, meticulous study of the published sources and provides a reliable survey of political liberalism in postreform Russia.

GREGORY L. FREEZE
Brandeis University