

LES SOURCES DE L'HISTOIRE DE RUSSIE AUX ARCHIVES NATIONALES. By *Michel Lesure*. Études sur l'histoire, l'économie et la sociologie des pays Slaves, 15. Paris and The Hague: Mouton and École Pratique des Hautes Études, 1970. 502 pp. 53 Dglds., paper.

This valuable guide to materials in the Archives Nationales in Paris will be indispensable for many historians of Russia and useful for researchers in other fields as well. The bulk of the materials discussed or listed are for the period 1700–1917. The richest and best organized collections are from the Napoleonic era, but there are also significant pre-Petrine and postrevolutionary papers. Military, diplomatic, and commercial concerns bulk large; but in addition to, for example, the cartographic collections, one can learn about the tribulations of the *Veuve Clicquot* or of *Diaghilev* and *Stravinsky* and their friends. The guide refers to materials from a wide variety of sources, thus suggesting numerous unexplored possibilities for future investigation. Especially impressive are the very rich naval archives (which have often escaped other archivists' attention) and various private archives deposited in the Archives Nationales, such as those of *Albert Thomas* or *Caulaincourt*. *Lesure* has listed all existing catalogues, guides, and indexes which need to be consulted, and all major published works based on particular fonds. He indicates which sets of papers are completely analyzed in his catalogue and which have only been sampled. The two indexes (persons, and places and topics) are the key to the scattered materials and seem to be no less exact than the guide as a whole, though one might suppose *Baron de Pudberg* to be *General de Budberg* and *Boutingin* and *Butiagine* to be one and the same. *Lesure* acknowledges that within the confines of his book he could not deal adequately with every document, and has concentrated on the most promising collections and topics. This painstaking, meticulous work, together with the continuing series of articles in the *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* on other archival collections in France, puts many students of Russia heavily in his debt.

J. M. P. McERLEAN
York University

THE RUSSIAN FACTORY IN THE 19TH CENTURY. By *Mikhail I. Tugan-Baranovsky*. Translated from the 3rd Russian edition by *Arthur Levin* and *Claora S. Levin*. Supervised by *Gregory Grossman*. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin. Georgetown, Ont.: Irwin-Dorsey, 1970. xviii, 474 pp. \$8.75.

LABOR AND SOCIETY IN TSARIST RUSSIA: THE FACTORY WORKERS OF ST. PETERSBURG, 1855–1870. By *Reginald E. Zelnik*. Sponsored by the Russian Institute, Columbia University. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1971. ix, 450 pp. \$15.00.

Comparison of these two recent publications provides a useful characterization of current historical scholarship on Russian industrial development in the nineteenth century. No major synthesis of this subject has appeared in the three-quarters of a century since the first edition of *Tugan-Baranovsky's* classic. Soviet historians and economists, although most prolific in the production of monographs, articles, and anthologies dealing with specific industries and problems, have not provided such a synthesis, unless the more general economic histories by *Liashchenko* and *Khromov* can be defined as such. Outside of the Soviet Union, until recently, almost

nothing in any historical genre has been written on Russian industrial development before 1917. It was this dearth of scholarship that prompted the reviewer ten years ago to attempt an exploratory work of intermediate synthesis on the early nineteenth century. Recently, however (in addition to important interpretative articles by Gerschenkron, Kahan, and Portal), American and European scholars, making use of archives in the Soviet Union and Europe, have begun to publish studies of important aspects of nineteenth-century Russian industry. One thinks immediately of the works of Pintner and McKay; and, most recently, Reginald Zelnik's book has appeared.

But Tugan-Baranovsky's book, despite errors, still stands as the only major synthesis we have, and a first translation in English is fully justified, providing us with usable facts and interpretations above and beyond the historiographical status of the work as a landmark in the Marxist-*narodnik* debates. I will not here attempt a "review" of Tugan-Baranovsky. He has been reviewed and criticized at length during the course of the twentieth century, mainly by Soviet historians. Indeed, Zelnik offers sophisticated refutation of Tugan-Baranovsky's lapses into more rigid Marxist determinism (pp. 151-59, 307). One can, then, caution the reader that Tugan-Baranovsky's statements, particularly about the operation of class interests, are not always supported by the documents. The student can also be forewarned to look elsewhere for broader surveys of Russian economic development in the nineteenth century, of such subjects as railroads, technology, entrepreneurship, and state economic policy. Tugan-Baranovsky, properly so for an economist, is somewhat narrowly but intensively concerned with patterns of industrial growth and factory organization, wages, government regulation of industry, and the views of other economists. Nevertheless, *The Russian Factory* remains a major statement of the subject. One must also ask of the translation, beyond the question of justification, whether it has been executed truly and well. Necessarily on the basis of spot comparison of texts, I would affirm that the sense of the Russian has been accurately given, and that the rendition into English—the bane of many a translation—has been achieved with clarity and fluency. The translated version has been provided with a substantial glossary of Russian terms, but a rather thin index.

Zelnik's book is far more limited in scope. It deals with fifteen years of the Russian factory in St. Petersburg in the late 1850s and the 1860s. There is a reason for this highly specialized approach: Zelnik's work is one of the few on Russian history of European or American authorship that uses Soviet archives (see especially chaps. 6, 7, and 9). He also had at his disposal a rich fund of published sources. The possibility of so deeply probing a subject limited its expansiveness in time and place, although the time span selected and its cutoff point can be justified in terms of periodization: it was during these years that the burgeoning factory industry of St. Petersburg first created a substantial impoverished and demoralized laboring class. Although Russians recognized in the 1860s that they had a labor problem, it was not until the Nevsky strike of 1870 that they were shocked to learn that Russia was not to escape the worker unrest that afflicted Europe's industries. "God has not spared us," they cried (p. 341). Zelnik has indicated that his second volume will study a new phase of St. Petersburg labor history in the 1870s, characterized by populist-worker interaction. His aim is to "contribute to our ultimate understanding of the role of factory workers in the Russian Revolutionary movement, and of the social and political repercussions of industrialization as it was carried out in the context of the Russian autocratic system" (p. 4).

Zelnik's book is a kind of miniature in time and place of Tugan-Baranovsky's work. After presenting introductory material on the early nineteenth century (chaps. 1 and 2), it focuses on the factory in St. Petersburg in the crucial period of the Great Reforms. Separate chapters discuss (as did Tugan-Baranovsky) industrial growth, labor conditions, labor regulation, labor unrest, and the views of officials, industrialists, and publicists of the "labor question." Zelnik has mastered a vast quantity of rich materials and has handled with sophistication issues too numerous to summarize here. One strength of research pursued in the basic sources without the imposition of preconceived patterns is in the uniqueness of the subject matter revealed. Zelnik's people function within a Russian context of autocracy and nationalism rather than acting out predetermined roles as a European bourgeois ruling class and proletariat.

One thread that runs through the history is the widely held belief in the 1860s—a kind of industrial populism—that the Russian worker, by virtue of his ties with the commune, would escape the degradation of his European counterpart, and Russian society would avoid the resultant social disruption. This proved false; but most of the Russian workers were still essentially illiterate peasants, many of the industrialists were unlettered Muscovite merchants, and the majority of the officials treated both groups in the paternalistic tradition of the old agrarian despotism—responsive to the injustices inflicted on the workers by the factory owners, viewing each as a lower social class, and yet punishing workers for the slightest attempt to act on their own behalf, as a grave threat to public order. Thus, even as late as the Nevsky strike of 1870 the minimum sentences imposed on its leaders by the court (which also rebuked the employers) were viewed as "exceedingly light" by the tsar, and harshened by administrative order. Zelnik, through his extensive research, and a clear presentation, is able to portray these nuances effectively. One hopes for more such studies that will lessen our reliance on Soviet monographs, which, as Zelnik rightly asserts (p. 3), have been the main source of our broader works of synthesis. Contrary to his assertion, we still need several levels of synthesis, both for the Russian field and for the comparative dimension of European and Russian history, which has been particularly neglected. Tugan-Baranovsky may have erred and misinterpreted some of the sources, but in his attempt at both broad interpretative synthesis and comparative history much has stood the test of time.

WILLIAM L. BLACKWELL
New York University

CHERNYSHEVSKII: THE MAN AND THE JOURNALIST. By *William F. Woehrlin*. Russian Research Center Studies, 67. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971. x, 404 pp. \$12.50.

Between that gray *raznochinets* of clerical background N. G. Chernyshevsky and the autocratic government he opposed there existed a secret complicity which created the style of an epoch and left a permanent stamp on the "Russian Idea." Without government-sponsored martyrdom, Chernyshevsky could never have entered revolutionary heaven, haloed by liberals and radicals alike. Indeed, he probably never even would have written *What To Do?*—a novel which may be compared in its influence to *Pilgrim's Progress* and in its style to the speech of some of Zoshchenko's characters, a novel the title of which Lenin echoed in his most famous