

native tribes is not convincing, including his generalization that "lack of numbers and dispersedness of the aboriginal peoples in a huge, sparsely settled territory reduced friction with the Russian settlers to a minimum" (p. 167). His further statement that both Russian settlers and the native tribes were oppressed by the state adds little to our understanding of this problem (pp. 168–69). Even when the author refers to the mutually enriching contact between the two groups, he lists obvious tensions such as religious differences, the propaganda of Islam, and the abuse of power by government officials at all ranks. The author's sweeping generalizations do not add to our understanding of complex historical problems—for example, his simplistic contrast of civilized West European states, which killed off their aboriginal populations (or forced them into reservations), with barbaric Asiatic Russian tsarism, which tried not to apply forceful methods in dealing with natives (p. 171).

The sixth essay deals with class struggle in the Urals and Western Siberia. One of the most interesting features of this essay is that Preobrazhensky's interpretation leads him to grapple with both positive and negative aspects of the intervention of the tsarist state on the eastern frontier. He briefly touches on the theme of the extension of the Raskol to the Urals and Western Siberia based mainly on the tsarist works by I. Ia. Syrtsov and D. I. Sapozhnikov. Characteristically, Preobrazhensky assumes a connection between the rebellion of Stenka Razin and the rising in the Solovetsky Monastery but offers no documentary proof for connecting these two events (p. 363).

The value of Preobrazhensky's book lies in his scattered discussions of the archival sources in regional archives and museums in the Urals and Western Siberia (as yet unavailable for research by Western scholars) and in the evidence he presents for the critical role of the state in the eastern frontier in the seventeenth century. The work contains useful archival materials on the migration of *guliashchie liudi* (itinerants) from the White Sea region into the Urals and Siberia. The book serves as a reminder to Western historians that far more research needs to be done on the adjustments the tsarist state made to peculiar local and regional circumstances.

The work would be greatly enhanced by maps and a bibliography.

GARY HANSON  
*University of Saskatchewan*

PROBLEMY SOTSIAL'NO-EKONOMICHESKOI ISTORII ROSSII:  
SBORNIK STATEI. Edited by *L. M. Ivanov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 373  
pp. 1.71 rubles.

This is a Festschrift honoring Academician Nikolai Mikhailovich Druzhinin on his eighty-fifth birthday. Known best for his monumental work on the Kiselev agrarian reforms, Druzhinin is now projecting a book of similar scope dealing with the peasant during the period of the Great Reforms. This is discussed in an introduction by the editor, L. M. Ivanov, to which is appended a bibliography of the dozens of articles and reviews which the prolific and energetic Druzhinin published while in his eighties.

Most of the articles in the book deal with the subject that has most interested this eminent Soviet scholar: the history of the Russian people. First of all, there are several studies of the peasant, ranging in time from the fourteenth to the

twentieth century, which can only be itemized in the space allotted here: various kinds of land tenure, craft enterprises, capitalism in peasant agriculture, the commune in its last years, state agrarian policy, recent Soviet historiography on the peasant question in the early twentieth century, among other topics.

Although the main focus of the collection is agrarian history, this reviewer found interesting and worthy of note the several articles that deal with factory labor and urban social history, particularly those of the well-known Soviet historians P. G. Ryndziunsky, M. K. Rozhkova, and L. M. Ivanov, the editor. Ryndziunsky, a leading urban historian, has provided a revealing account of the process of emancipation, not on the estates, but in the industrial center of Ivanovo, Russia's "Manchester." Its owner, Count Sheremetiev, is the villain of the piece, fleecing the poorer peasants of their real and personal property. The case Ryndziunsky selects for study is hardly typical, but is an enlightening account of the involved struggles and negotiations of the emancipation process in one famous locality. So it was in part that the Sheremetievs, mortgaged to the hilt in the early nineteenth century, came out of the emancipation rather better off. Ryndziunsky tells us how they did it at the expense of the poorer peasants, as well as the millionaire serfs.

Rozhkova, another accomplished Soviet historian of the nineteenth-century economy, studies rural factories in the most highly industrialized district of Moscow Province in the 1860s and 1870s (Bogorodsky). Despite the very large size of some of these factories, she comes to two interesting conclusions: (1) the number of home workers continued to be very large, side by side with very big factories, and (2) there was a larger percentage of hereditary or second generation workers in the rural factories than in the cities.

Of particular value to the newly emerging schools of Russian urban history in the USSR and the United States is Ivanov's description, based on the 1897 census and other published statistics, of the changing social structure of Russia's modernizing cities in the last years of the old regime. Ivanov particularly focuses on the significant in-migration at this time of both nobles and peasants, and their absorption into a more modern urban socioeconomic order.

WILLIAM L. BLACKWELL  
New York University

RUSSIAN HISTORY ATLAS. By *Martin Gilbert*. Cartographic consultant, *Arthur Banks*. New York: Macmillan, 1972. 146 maps + 34 pp. \$4.95.

This atlas has the admirable aim of telling the history of Russia almost solely through maps. The text is limited to brief notes in boxes inserted on each map. The book's main virtue is that it gives a large number of maps for a low price. The maps are uncluttered and easy to read. Some of them are not commonly encountered in other atlases of Russian history. There is a good index.

The limitations of the work are serious, however. Some of them stem from the same basic decisions that made possible the reasonable price. The restriction to black and white meant that the maps had to be simple if they were to be readable. They have been kept simple by the use of imprecise, schematic cartography and by the omission of a great deal of important information.

The bibliography of works consulted is fairly long, but fails to include several of the most relevant general historical atlases and—even more inexplicably—omits such direct rivals as the atlases of Adams-Matley-McCagg, Chew, Goodall, and