

demographic framework in the spirit of Gilbert Rozman and the work Chauncy D. Harris has published elsewhere seems to be a clear priority; clarifying the changes in municipal performance during the first two decades of this century is another fruitful subject; investigating the urban collapse of 1917–20, when Russian cities lost over 20 percent of their population, may be increasingly feasible. William L. Blackwell prefaces his conclusion, which fills in many gaps and provides an overview of the issues and is by far the most readable piece of the series, by saying that the compendium is but “a beginning” (p. 242).

BORIS PUSHKAREV  
New York

PATTERNS OF URBAN GROWTH IN THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By *Thomas Stanley Fedor*. Research Paper no. 163. Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Geography, 1975. xxvi, 245 pp. Tables. Illus. \$6.00 (\$5.00, series subscription), paper.

This is a realistic study of urban growth in the Russian Empire during the nineteenth century. The author attempts to evaluate the urban data from the *revizii* and other civil administrative authorities, as well as to investigate the problems of delimiting urban settlements, and displays appropriate skepticism about the accuracy of the data. Even though a definitive appraisal of the data is impossible, he should be commended for his efforts, because all too frequently data are accepted without reservation or the slightest effort to evaluate them. The author then measures aggregate and regional urban growth for the overall period from 1810 to 1910 and for various intervals during the nineteenth century, largely delimited by the availability of data.

The chief purpose of the book is to establish the relationships between urban and economic growth in general and urban and industrial growth in particular. These objectives are accomplished in a very broad manner, without the use of mathematical statistics, which probably is a realistic use of the available urban, work force, and economic data if one is concerned mainly with changes over time. A more detailed investigation of data from the 1897 Census, however, would have added depth to the analysis of the processes involved. Urbanization in the nineteenth century is also briefly investigated. In the nineteenth century, there appears not to have been a significant relationship between urban growth or urbanization and industrialization in Russia, largely because most of the industrial employment was in rural areas. The last chapter is devoted to an explanation of this phenomenon. Although the interpretation in this chapter is interesting and valid, the author could also have investigated the expected relationships in countries in a similar stage of economic development. It is true that there are particularistic reasons for the absence of a relationship between urban growth and industrialization in Russia, but an understanding of the universal experience—that is, the available theory—would have contributed to the explanation of these processes, in that a relationship between these processes is generally not to be expected in the early stages of economic development.

This study is a significant contribution to our knowledge of urban processes in Russia in the nineteenth century. It should be of interest not only to students of nineteenth-century Russia, but also to those concerned with early urban development.

ROBERT A. LEWIS  
Columbia University