

*Zapiski*, Miliutin's *O nedvizhimykh imushchestvakh dukhovenstva*, and others—which would have deepened his study. The book has a short introduction by E. Magerovsky.

This volume seems to be concerned with clarifying the role of Arsenii as a possible saint—with negative conclusions. Though limited in audience because it is in Russian, the book is nonetheless a much-needed and objective work.

ELLIOT BENOWITZ  
Portland State University

PEASANT UPRISINGS IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE, RUSSIA, AND CHINA. By *Roland Mousnier*. Translated by *Brian Pearce*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1970. xx, 358 pp. \$10.00.

THE EUROPEAN PEASANTRY: THE FINAL PHASE. By *S. H. Franklin*. London: Methuen & Co., 1969. xvi, 256 pp. \$8.00.

The only link between the two books joined in this review is that both deal with the ancient class of the peasantry; otherwise they are very distant in subject and scope. Franklin's is a sociological study of the state and prospect of European peasantry, East and West; Mousnier's is a historical story of seventeenth-century peasant revolts in France, Russia, and China. Perhaps the two books share one more aspect—both are works of real scholarship, yet both, for different reasons, tend to leave the mind unsatisfied.

In Mousnier's case the reason is obvious enough. The author's reputation vouches for the quality of his material and his handling of it, but it is difficult to identify either unity of subject or of conclusions in this book. In the mid-seventeenth century "revolts flared up all round the world" (p. xix), but "the period 1640–1660 had no monopoly on disturbances. It was both preceded and followed by long periods of riot and upheaval" (p. xviii). Moreover, in "western Europe the peasant revolts were not isolated and cannot be understood without taking account of the activities of the towns and the help rendered by other social groups" (p. xix). Having thus indicated how disjointed the subject is bound to be, in time and space and in substance, Mousnier chooses to look at peasant revolts in three selected countries, "because their social structures are very different" (p. xix).

The three countries in fact were three different worlds, when communications were at best adventurous, and there was nothing like a political or social philosophy to spread from one to the others. Indeed, even within them social life was largely localized. One general conclusion the author allows himself is that these revolts were "reactions against the state" (p. 348), against growing centralization and spreading bureaucracy; hence the troubles began in the towns and not on peasant initiative. In France, to succeed, "the peasants would have had to unite . . . and march on Paris, but they do not seem to have thought of doing this" (p. 339). Life was local, and so was the trouble; any suggestion of uniformity would be misleading. The grievances which peasants everywhere had in common were the burden of taxes and other imposts, periodically made worse by natural calamities, such as epidemics and the failure of crops, and, generally, the abuses of officials. Hence as a frequent common feature the peasants simply demanded a return to and respect for traditional "customs": "these crises of anger did not make revolutionaries of them" (p. 342). Beyond these local reactions, the author believes it

difficult to know what lesson can be drawn historically and sociologically. And it is difficult to see, therefore, what service the book is meant to give to the student or general reader.

Franklin's book is of an almost opposite kind—a solid theoretical and factual excursion into the state of the European peasantry, with some fairly emphatic conclusions. "In the post-war era," he begins, "the question of the future, or the fate, of peasant farming in Europe has been placed in a context quite different to the one within which the issue had been debated in Europe during the inter-war period. . . . It is with this reassessment . . . that the book is largely concerned" (p. xii). The fact that in the eastern half agriculture has in part been collectivized complicates but does not quite split the issue. Franklin, too, for the most part treats the subject geographically; he deals in some detail with federal Germany, France, Italy's Mezzogiorno, and (briefly) the European Economic Community (EEC); and in the Communist half with Yugoslavia and Poland. For each of these the study looks at four fundamental topics: "the socio-economic structure of the peasantry," "the regional context," "the economic performance of the peasantry both in an absolute and relative sense," and "the formulation and implementation . . . of agrarian policies which reflect the influence of these three factors" (p. xiv). "The analysis of peasant social structures is never an easy matter," he says, "mainly because the basic statistics one uses for this purpose refer to agrarian structures and not socio-economic structures. . . . In the post-war world the degree of correspondence between the agrarian and socio-economic structures has been diminishing as the socio-economic differentiation of the peasantry has taken place" (pp. xiv–xv).

The whole of Europe has now reached the stage where the peasant economy is losing its pre-eminence. In the West, capitalist farming tends to displace or infiltrate into the more traditional peasant economy; in the East, the peasant economy has been condemned to extinction by decree. Examining the trend with a wealth of firsthand material, with ample statistics and diagrams, Franklin concludes that the survival of peasant farming is not assured, mainly for two reasons. The first one is the lack of capital needed to remain competitive—though in dealing with the German Green Plan he notes that the various federal expenditures "are dwarfed by those undertaken by the farmers themselves to improve their incomes and productivity" (p. 30). Second, by the 1960s industrial expansion had brought security and high income to the vast majority of the populations, and so left little justification for a peasant economy. "In the developed world," he says, "a society structured around leisure now appears to be a not too distant prospect"; therefore, "the need to confuse the provision of food with the need to create work will no longer exist, and the peasant enterprise and economy will have reached a point where their historical and social purpose will have quite disappeared" (p. 234).

Perhaps. But this "total" vision—the last sentence in the book—is not sustained by the writer's own text. When E. Kardelj says that the peasants are "a remnant from the past," bound to disappear through "economic and social development," Franklin comments that "on the basis of Western experience" that view "is rather too sanguine if not actually delusive" (p. 229). Indeed, on an earlier page he quotes with approval T. Shanin's view that its power of adaptation in a crisis has given the peasant economy a security unknown to other forms; thus the author's assumption that industrial development has now replaced that basic security ignores its repeated crises and periods of grave unemployment.

With all the care of its local analysis, the book neglects some vital general aspects. With the new anxiety about conservation there are increasing fears that intensive mechanized agriculture based on artificial fertilizers is using up the very life of the soil—a calamity which could not happen under peasant farming. There is the open evidence that although greatly successful in the industrial sector, the Soviet and other Communist regimes in spite of forceful methods have failed to achieve economic ascendancy in agriculture. It also seems plain that throughout the vast “third world,” in Africa and in Asia, no other society is possible. And this makes it all the more curious that an able and fairly thorough study, which often refers to “peasant society,” completely ignores the great peasant movement of the interwar period, the strong peasant parties throughout Central and Eastern Europe, and their many able leaders. For it is well known that all these were interested not in political power as such but in an alternative society to the industrial West, and to that end had worked out in both theory and practice an impressive sociological foundation for it.

DAVID MITRANY  
*Oxford, England*

KREST'IANSKAIA VOINA V ROSSII V 1773–1775 GODAKH: VOSTANIE PUGACHEVA, vol. 3. By *V. V. Mavrodin* et al. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1970. 488 pp. 12 plates and map. 2.97 rubles.

More than fifteen years and some 1,600 pages later, Professor V. V. Mavrodin and his colleagues have—with this volume—completed their study of the Pugachev Revolt. Their massive labor of love purports to be addressed to a general audience. Yet the power of the ruble apparently indicates otherwise; for volume 3, which embodies the work of eighteen contributors, was issued in a printing of only 1,500 copies as compared with 2,100 and 2,000 for its predecessors, published in 1961 and 1966 respectively. Since I have evaluated the earlier volumes elsewhere, I shall focus upon the latest installment and, in the process, appraise the entire enterprise.

Volume 3 presupposes knowledge of volume 2. Both the numbering of the chapters and the structure of presentation continue the chronological-topical scheme elaborated there. Thus volume 3 opens with a concluding treatment of the first phase of the revolt (September 1773–March 1774), followed by four chapters devoted to its second phase (March–July 1774), six chapters on the third and final phase (July 1774–1775), and five chapters on special topics. Mavrodin's conclusion sums up the whole work. An appendix reprints an article about the fate of Pugachev's family.

All three tomes—especially the third—appear destined for consultation primarily by specialists. Readers unfamiliar with the subject will boggle at the disjointed method of presentation as well as the avalanche of detail. Even scholars versed in the history of the revolt—*pugachevtsy* as they are sometimes dubbed—may puzzle over the layout of volume 3. They will be disappointed at the few fresh formulations ventured, and depressed by the volume's uneven quality. Indeed, the demands of joint authorship evidently dictated that each territory involved in the rebellion, however fleetingly, be accorded equal attention. Hence M. D. Kurmacheva has forty-two pages to study the revolt in the Nizhny Novgorod region, a corner of which Pugachev's main force traversed in only six days; whereas L. S. Prokofieva