

of the relatively slow growth of the densely settled, old farming areas of European Russia and the early migrational outflow to Novorossia, which shifted in the nineteenth century to an easterly movement toward the Lower Volga, Ural borderlands, and Siberia.

Among the shortcomings of this work are the absence of maps (which could have facilitated the analysis of the voluminous information), the lack of explicit demographic components of change, and the failure to apply numerical methods to the data. These weaknesses are minor compared to the contribution this work has made to the study of the historical population geography of Russia.

ROBERT N. TAAFFE  
*Indiana University*

URAL I ZAPADNAIA SIBIR' V KONTSE XVI-NACHALE XVIII VEKA.

By *A. A. Preobrazhensky*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 392 pp. 1.81 rubles.

The title does not accurately reflect the substance of this book, for as the author confesses in the conclusion, the work does not pretend to be a systematic study of the history of the Urals and Western Siberia in this period. Instead Preobrazhensky presents a series of six essays, uneven in size and scope, with themes as varied as the attachment of Western Siberia to Muscovy in the sixteenth century, the migration of peoples to the Urals and Western Siberia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the search for "fugitives" in the Urals in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, and the class struggle in the Urals and Western Siberia in the same period.

The main emphasis of the book is the lengthy fifth essay on the genesis of capitalism in the Urals and Western Siberia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Preobrazhensky reiterates the thesis rejected at the June 1965 Soviet historical conference that the seventeenth century saw a "new period" in Russia in which the genesis of capitalism occurred. The conference has been discussed by Samuel Baron in "The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism in Russia: A Major Soviet Historical Controversy" (*American Historical Review*, June 1972, pp. 715-29). Preobrazhensky continues to reject the committee report of the conference and cites Lenin at length (pp. 214-25), as in 1965, to substantiate his viewpoint. Though the reviewer finds the interpretation of interest mainly as evidence that the 1965 debate continues, the author's claim to have obtained new archival materials is of greater interest to the Western reader. However, the author's "new" evidence in regard to private manufacturing on the eastern frontier is disappointing. His study examines the metallurgical plants of the Tumashev brothers in the seventeenth century and F. Molodoy in the early eighteenth century by reworking evidence used in his earlier work on this subject. The reviewer does not find that the author's archival sources refute criticisms of fellow Soviet historians such as N. I. Pavlenko in *Istoriia metallurgii v Rossii XVIII v.* (1962), who doubted that one isolated example of the Molodoy plant indicates the tie between peasant industry and manufacturing in the Urals in the seventeenth century, or in more recent criticism by E. I. Zaozerskaia that the author inflated the production figures of the Tumashev plant. Preobrazhensky had best return to the archives for further examples of the "new" phenomena in early capitalism in seventeenth-century Russia.

Preobrazhensky's discussion of the relations between the Russians and the

native tribes is not convincing, including his generalization that "lack of numbers and dispersedness of the aboriginal peoples in a huge, sparsely settled territory reduced friction with the Russian settlers to a minimum" (p. 167). His further statement that both Russian settlers and the native tribes were oppressed by the state adds little to our understanding of this problem (pp. 168–69). Even when the author refers to the mutually enriching contact between the two groups, he lists obvious tensions such as religious differences, the propaganda of Islam, and the abuse of power by government officials at all ranks. The author's sweeping generalizations do not add to our understanding of complex historical problems—for example, his simplistic contrast of civilized West European states, which killed off their aboriginal populations (or forced them into reservations), with barbaric Asiatic Russian tsarism, which tried not to apply forceful methods in dealing with natives (p. 171).

The sixth essay deals with class struggle in the Urals and Western Siberia. One of the most interesting features of this essay is that Preobrazhensky's interpretation leads him to grapple with both positive and negative aspects of the intervention of the tsarist state on the eastern frontier. He briefly touches on the theme of the extension of the Raskol to the Urals and Western Siberia based mainly on the tsarist works by I. Ia. Syrtsov and D. I. Sapozhnikov. Characteristically, Preobrazhensky assumes a connection between the rebellion of Stenka Razin and the rising in the Solovetsky Monastery but offers no documentary proof for connecting these two events (p. 363).

The value of Preobrazhensky's book lies in his scattered discussions of the archival sources in regional archives and museums in the Urals and Western Siberia (as yet unavailable for research by Western scholars) and in the evidence he presents for the critical role of the state in the eastern frontier in the seventeenth century. The work contains useful archival materials on the migration of *guliashchie liudi* (itinerants) from the White Sea region into the Urals and Siberia. The book serves as a reminder to Western historians that far more research needs to be done on the adjustments the tsarist state made to peculiar local and regional circumstances.

The work would be greatly enhanced by maps and a bibliography.

GARY HANSON  
*University of Saskatchewan*

PROBLEMY SOTSIAL'NO-EKONOMICHESKOI ISTORII ROSSII: SBORNIK STATEI. Edited by *L. M. Ivanov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 373 pp. 1.71 rubles.

This is a Festschrift honoring Academician Nikolai Mikhailovich Druzhinin on his eighty-fifth birthday. Known best for his monumental work on the Kiselev agrarian reforms, Druzhinin is now projecting a book of similar scope dealing with the peasant during the period of the Great Reforms. This is discussed in an introduction by the editor, L. M. Ivanov, to which is appended a bibliography of the dozens of articles and reviews which the prolific and energetic Druzhinin published while in his eighties.

Most of the articles in the book deal with the subject that has most interested this eminent Soviet scholar: the history of the Russian people. First of all, there are several studies of the peasant, ranging in time from the fourteenth to the