

in other Soviet states or branches of the party where deviations of a particular nature are being made concerning the meaning and roles of labor in the revolution. The appearance of both books within a year's time under the same general editorship and publication may indicate the importance and orthodoxy of this new point of view (or what some may regard as reiteration of the old).

It would be misleading, however, to regard these books as having merely or even principally an historiographical interest. The sophisticated reader versed in the theoretical bases of Marxism-Leninism will understand what the emphases and lack of them are and will still find much that is informative and interesting. Gaponenko's book, dealing as it does not only with the February but with the October Revolution, is somewhat more polemical than Kirianov's, and the latter author maintains a more reserved and objective tone. But both books are truly interdisciplinary in their methodology and orientation. Both deal with what to us are the varied disciplines of political science, sociology, and economics, and treat them as an integrated whole, with skill and mastery.

Gaponenko is particularly effective in presenting concretely the living conditions and mood of revolutionary Petrograd, and he has confirmed for us the importance of the factory committees, their Red Guards, and workers' control as a means of Bolshevik disruption of the Provisional Government. Although there is only one location from which he views the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, they receive a share of his attention, as they also do in Kirianov's book—and from the same location. The Anarchists, however, are in effect ignored by both writers, although their role in workers' control seems to have been a significant one. Such oversights, however, as already mentioned, are understandable enough and there is no need to carp at them. One can appreciate the clear presentation of the relations between workers, their organizations, industry, the soviets, the government, the war, the parties, Marxist-Leninist theory, and the events in which they were interwoven.

Kirianov's book treating the workers of southern Russia from 1914 to February 1917 deals with their number and composition, their way of life, party and legal organizations, and the proletarian movement. His presentation is rational and clear, and evidence for his facts is generous.

Gaponenko deals with the proletariat in Russia during 1917. He also includes a description of the extent, composition, and disposition of the working class and continues then to discuss its role in the February Revolution and in the months to October and the seizure of power. Gaponenko's excellent bibliography includes more than five pages of Lenin's works, but his citations from them, numerous as they are, are chosen with finesse and artistry and serve a valid purpose. His book should be of interest not only to those concerned with Soviet labor but also to those interested in the revolutionary days.

FREDERICK I. KAPLAN
Michigan State University

WITNESS TO REVOLUTION: LETTERS FROM RUSSIA, 1916-1919. By Edward T. Heald. Edited by James B. Gidney. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1972. xx, 367 pp. \$10.00.

Edward T. Heald was secretary of the Davenport, Iowa, branch of the YMCA when, in June 1916, he was asked to go to Russia to participate in the Y's extensive

program of relief work among prisoners of war. This book consists of letters and diary entries recording Heald's impressions from his arrival in Petrograd in September 1916 until his departure from Vladivostok in May 1919. It is an account of a rather conventional-minded man trying to do a difficult job amid tumultuous events which he nonetheless attempted to record faithfully. As Professor Gidney says in his preface: "Heald was in no sense a scholar. This is not intended as a denigration; indeed it is one of his advantages. He is not tendentious about many historical questions because he does not know they are questions. Extraordinarily good at reporting what he himself saw and experienced, he is not particularly good at relating it to larger issues and seems singularly incurious about some matters on which we are still arguing."

Thus it is not politics, but everyday life as it was affected by profound political transformations, which comes through to us. Heald had an eye for detail, which enabled him to capture well the terrible uncertainties that tormented so many Russians as they tried to make their way in circumstances that were at once familiar and bizarre. He was in Petrograd when the tsar abdicated, in Kiev when the Bolsheviks seized power, and in Siberia during most of 1918 and during 1919 until his departure. His Siberian travels brought him into contact with the redoubtable Czechoslovak Legion, Kolchak's armies (Kolchak, he wrote—displaying his political biases—was "not Czarist, not autocrat, not playing with Bolshevik leaders, but an able man who is trying to restore sufficient order so that the Russians can say what kind of a government they want"), the American expeditionary force at Vladivostok, and the Japanese; and he has left us vivid descriptions—and a number of photographs, the best of which are included in the book—of them all. His accounts contain no revelations. They add nothing of moment to the historical record. But they make fascinating reading, and as such they justify Professor Gidney's careful editorial labors.

RICHARD H. ULLMAN
Princeton University

ISTORIJA VNESHNEI POLITIKI SSSR, 1917–1970. Vol. 2: 1945–1970 GG.
Edited by *A. M. Aleksandrov* et al. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 519 pp. 2.41 rubles.

This work, together with a companion volume published in 1966 which covered the period up to the close of World War II, is intended by its editors and authors (all ranking Soviet diplomats or prominent publicists in the area of foreign relations) as an official apologia for the role of the USSR in international affairs. The authors stress three major themes. For them the postwar world is characterized by the supremacy of American monopoly capitalism, which has supplanted waning European imperialism as the chief exploiter of the masses and as the global policeman of reaction. The menace of American power is offset, in their view, by the emergence of the Soviet Union as a superpower and by the expansion of communism into a commonwealth of socialist nations which functions as a bulwark of peace. These latter developments have facilitated the third principal trend on the international scene, the rise of national-liberation movements in the underdeveloped countries, which, with the support of the socialist camp, are throwing off the yoke of colonial oppression. None of this is new to students of Soviet foreign policy rhetoric.