

Nevertheless these omissions or imperfections do not at all reduce the value of the work and of its central thesis, which sees in the three-course system not only a group of agricultural techniques but indeed a sociocultural complex no part of which can be independently isolated and transformed. In sum, it is a work much more ambitious (and meritorious) than its title would lead one to believe, but also a work to which one could not direct the attention of the hasty or superficial reader.

FR.-X. COQUIN
Paris

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY INTELLIGENTSIA. By *Philip Pomper*.
New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1970. vii, 216 pp. Paper.

If the subject were strictly the revolutionary intelligentsia, the first two-fifths of the book (about 78 pages, from the Decembrists to the revolutionaries of the 1860s) might have been shortened, and the last quarter (48 pages, the crucial four decades between 1881 and the 1917 Revolution) would have been expanded. Finally, the fate of the revolutionary intelligentsia after victory in 1917 might have earned an additional chapter rather than asides throughout the text and an unconvincing conclusion: a tragedy "profounder than that of any comparable historical movement in our era" (p. 196).

The subject is in fact the *road to* or *roots of* the revolutionary fate of the intelligentsia. The early history dominates. Nearly half of the book, the most informative half, is devoted to the *radical* intelligentsia (some of whom were revolutionary) in the reign of Alexander II. The discussion of Marxism is therefore sketchy (see the somewhat apologetic comment on p. 156). Next to nothing is said about Peter Struve's intellectual odyssey. The *Vekhi* group is missing altogether. A. V. Lunacharsky—a revolutionary *intelligent* and People's Commissar of Education (1917–29)—and a host of other twentieth-century revolutionary intellectuals are absent. Bukharin is mentioned only once, in connection with his "vast intellect" (p. 195). Thus the author largely retraces the path of Yarmolinsky and Venturi, adding a few steps in the direction of 1917 and the tragic years of Stalin's ascendancy, and employing a different "methodology."

Much of the interest and value of the book lies in its method. Men create, discover, and use ideologies "in a given historical context"; ideologies "reflect the diversity of human temperament and personality" (p. vi). The author lamentably was dissuaded from full exposition of his method. The result is too often an incomplete formulation of "sociopsychological" and "psychosociological" factors or "life styles." For example, "something deeper in their personalities" made Lenin and Trotsky "men of power" (p. 190); Chernyshevsky's "pathological self-subordination to his wife" is the most prominent example of the "profound self-ambivalence" that led populists to desire absorption by the masses (p. 102)—this despite the fact that the author understands that Chernyshevsky desired no such absorption and was actually an "evangelical nihilist" (p. 77) rather than a populist.

Opportunities abound, but little serious psychosociology is attempted. The oblique implication that homosexual affections linked Bakunin and Nechaev (p. 98) is too vague to help explain their puzzling association. Some important opportunities are missed—for example, the painful experience of the renegade *narodovolets*, Leo Tikhomirov, which is lavishly documented in his *Vospominaniia*.

The book is "designed for use in both survey and period courses" (back

cover). My students were troubled by an occasional opaqueness. Two passages still perplex me: "the populists staked their lives on an unrealistic vision of the peasant's socialist instincts and revolutionary passion" (p. 103); of the three varieties of populism, "only Bakuninism consistently emphasized the role of the peasant, and therefore Bakuninism is the truest form of revolutionary *narodnichestvo*, which should be distinguished from 'revolutionary populism'" (p. 111).

This book contains an excellent bibliographic essay and a good index.

ALAN KIMBALL
University of Oregon

THEORIES OF REVOLUTION: FROM MARX TO THE FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. By *Reidar Larsson*. Skrifter Utgivna av Statsvetenskapliga Föreningen i Uppsala, 53. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1970. 381 pp. Kr. 35.

This book does not make for easy reading. Its heavy style and idiosyncratic English may weary, and occasionally perplex, the reader. Moreover, its structure, though necessary for the author's purposes, is sometimes hard to follow, even with the assistance of an elaborate tabular outline at the end. Still, this is a serious work, has some significant points to make, and should be of real interest to those concerned with the evolution of Marxism in prerevolutionary Russia.

Essentially it is a systematic and analytical investigation of contending ideas within Russian Marxism from the 1880s to 1907. It limits itself to three critical issues: (1) the "objective" prerequisite conditions for the revolution, (2) the definition of and attitude toward the elite and the vanguard, and (3) the nature of the revolution itself and the revolutionary dictatorship. Within the frame provided by these issues the treatment is generally chronological, ranging from the Russian Blanquists, Kautsky (treated at considerable length and interestingly), the Iskra group and its opponents, to the participants in the polemics involving Lenin in the years 1903 to 1907.

What is offered, then, is neither intellectual biography nor the whole of any one man's thought but rather the logical structure and implications of his views, and their change through time, as they relate to the three central issues. There is always danger of dismemberment in such a procedure, but Larsson clearly has control over his questions and his procedure.

This is, of course, a well-worked field of inquiry, yet Larsson does advance some important new interpretations. In particular, he challenges the view of those who make the dispute among the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia a matter of "the dictates of theory" versus "the revolutionary will." While factors of will and temperament doubtless played a role, Larsson urges the importance of different conceptual premises or models. Central to his argument is the distinction he draws between Marx's "pattern" of 1848 as against that of 1850 with respect to the relation between the capitalist class and liberalism on the one hand and the old regime on the other. Perhaps too much weight is placed on this distinction, but it proves to be a fruitful device for marking out and identifying conflicting strands of Russian Marxism in later years.

Not the least interesting feature of the book is the footnotes indicating the author's differences in interpretation with other specialists in the field, such as Schapiro, Haimson, Keep, and Geyer.