

evidence of proletarian isolation from, rather than hegemony over, other elements of the population and furthermore suggests that the proletariat itself was less than the unified mass Trotsky wished it to be. In fact Trotsky's thesis is ultimately flawed by his unwillingness to face up to these disturbing questions which bothered more sensitive participants of 1905. The linkages between the party and the soviet, between the proletariat and the peasantry, between the Russian Revolution and the European proletariat, between the "instinct of the masses" and "realistic wisdom" turned out not to be so inviolable and smooth as Trotsky assumed.

Nevertheless, the book clearly exhibits Trotsky's considerable talents as a powerful polemicist and a writer of boldness and imagination able to render the turbulent events of 1905 into eloquent prose.

DAVID A. DAVIES  
*University of Waterloo*

LEON TROTSKY: A BIBLIOGRAPHY. By *Louis Sinclair*. Hoover Bibliographical Series, no. 50. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1972. x, 1,089 pp. \$35.00, photo offset of typescript.

TROTSKY: A DOCUMENTARY. By *Francis Wyndham* and *David King*. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1972. Illus. 204 pp. \$12.50.

*Vae victis!* And in politics it is truer than in other realms of human endeavor. Even in the gentle tumble of American politics the losers quickly fade from memory as well as from recorded history. In the rough-and-tumble of revolutionary politics, the record and—more often than not—the very existence of those who lost out are simply erased. Stalin went one step further; he insisted on destroying not only the physical but the moral personality of his defeated opponents by requiring that they themselves condemn as criminal and immoral everything they ever did, said, or merely thought. Though Trotsky was not spared physical destruction, he escaped the torture of self-defamation, and it is perhaps to emend this deficiency that of late a new wave of anti-Trotsky propaganda has been pouring from the Soviet Union (for example, *Against Trotskyism: The Struggle of Lenin and the CPSU Against Trotskyism; A Collection of Documents* [Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972]) as well as from the pages of publications which follow Moscow's lead, such as the *World Marxist Review* and *Political Affairs*. On the other hand, we are witnessing in many countries, especially America, a revival of interest in the diverse socialist heritages (among them, Trotskyism), and several volumes of various writings of Trotsky have recently appeared. However, besides being a very good writer—a true master of the trenchant and felicitous phrase—Trotsky was also an exceptionally prolific one. He observed once that "revolutions are always verbose," and he did his best to uphold the tradition. In the process he scattered thousands of items—articles, proclamations, pamphlets, and books—across Russia as well as across the two continents and the dozen countries where he spent most of his adult life.

While the mighty of the Soviet Union had their writings neatly bound and catalogued, those banned or exiled had to wait for some dedicated scholar in a foreign country to take care of their literary heritage. Recently Anna Bourguina performed this task in an exemplary manner for the Mensheviks. Now Trotsky has found his man in Louis Sinclair, whose bibliography is obviously a labor of

love. In scope, Sinclair's volume is an ambitious undertaking. Part 1, which amounts to more than half of the book (693 pp.), lists all of Trotsky's writings chronologically (including such items as military orders of the day, etc.); part 2 includes a variety of information such as a concordance to books and periodicals, and lists of books and periodicals with locations; part 3 includes a list of pseudonyms, translations by languages, a subject index, and so forth. The sheer amount of labor invested in this volume is awesome, and virtually every student of the Russian Revolution broadly speaking will be able to draw some dividends. Yet as a whole the book is disappointing. The system of listing, reference, cross reference, and concordance, though ingenious in certain respects, is difficult to understand and not clearly or sufficiently explained in the preface and notes. There are also some puzzles. For example, what does "entrism" (in the subject index) mean? Or what is meant by the "Scandinavian" language, especially when Danish, Finnish, Norwegian, and Swedish are listed separately? The listings of location for various volumes often seem a frivolously useless exercise; for example, Trotsky's *Stalin*, available in thousands of college and small-town libraries, is duly listed as located in certain specific major libraries, and a recently issued paperback carries the location "personal collection." More disturbing are innumerable inaccurate or even totally misleading translations of Russian entries. Thus, to take as examples inaccuracies from one single page (p. 19), we have *voennoe polozhenie* translated as "military posture" instead of "martial law," *ob uchasti zhirondistov* as "on the fate of the Girondists" instead of "about the participation of the Girondists," and *zheltaia gazeta spekuliruet* as "a yellow newspaper gambles" instead of "a yellow newspaper speculates."

In my opinion, the main weakness of the book is that it has an overabundance of marginal and outright useless information which merely obscures what is really valuable and necessary. On the title page the Hoover Institution Press notes that this volume is "unabridged and unedited" in order to "make it available to scholars more promptly and economically." Considering the price, one wonders who has made the economies, and who the profits? Anyway, what has suffered here is quality—scholarly usefulness. Could not this volume have been reduced by half—that is, to about the length of the Bourguina bibliography on Menshevism, which has been universally praised and which the Hoover Institution is selling for less than half the price it charges for Sinclair's photo offset volume? Is it not perhaps a case of the publisher taking the easy, lazy way?

The second volume under review is a delight aesthetically as well as in content. Its purpose is to document in photographs (including some reproductions of archival material), posters, and cartoons the life of Trotsky. The pictures, some in color, are well reproduced, better than elsewhere, though of course a number were poor to begin with. Quite a few have not been published before or are little known. The scope is the entire span of Trotsky's life, but the period up to 1917 is represented by only thirteen pictures of him. The captions are brief but informative, and the authors, two British journalists well versed in Trotskyism, have made an effort to identify everyone in the pictures, which is very useful. (Unfortunately, an exception is a remarkably good picture of the 1917 Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies where only Trotsky is pointed out.) The text, which is about one-fifth of the book, is based on Trotsky's own and Isaac Deutscher's writings except for the period 1929–40, for which it draws heavily on personal recollections of Trotsky's entourage. It is a historically accurate and interesting

short biography which, like the pictures, emphasizes during the last decade the private life of Trotsky.

The book gives us a vivid and intimate picture of Trotsky's relations with his closest family and friends during the peregrinations from Turkey to France to Norway and, finally, to Mexico. We learn also about his emotional reactions to political developments—his anxieties, hopes, and moments of low morale, though never despair—and the volume as a whole substantially contributes to our understanding of Trotsky the man.

LADIS K. D. KRISTOF  
Portland State University

ANGLO-SOVIET RELATIONS, 1917–1921. Vol. 3: THE ANGLO-SOVIET ACCORD. By *Richard H. Ullman*. Published for the Center of International Studies. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972. xv, 509 pp. \$17.50, cloth. \$9.50, paper.

The publication of the third and final volume of Richard Ullman's study of Anglo-Soviet relations provides a welcome relief from the polemics which have marred historiography on this subject, such as are found in the pro-Soviet apologetics of William and Zelta Coates and the anti-British broadsides of Titus Komarnicki. *The Anglo-Soviet Accord* is of special interest to students of Eastern Europe because of the information it contains concerning British policy during the Soviet-Polish War of 1920. Ullman's use of extensive excerpts from the private papers of British officials and from Soviet diplomatic correspondence (the "intercepts") makes this book, like Arno Mayer's *Politics and Diplomacy of Peacemaking*, a gold mine of valuable "raw" source materials. Like Mayer's work, however, the "finished product" of interpretation may be subject to scholarly dispute. For instance, regarding the celebrated "error" in Lord Curzon's note which delineated Poland's eastern ethnic border (leaving Lwów on the Russian side), Ullman chalks it up to honest ignorance and "carelessness" on the part of Lloyd George's private secretary, Philip Kerr, whose name he feels the famous line should bear. This view is at odds with the recent revelations of the British scholar Norman Davies, who points out that the Foreign Office had many detailed maps of Galicia, thanks to the efforts of Lewis Namier. Davies maintains that the line was drawn neither carelessly nor erroneously, but reflected Namier's belief that it followed the "straight ethnographic divide between East and West Galicia." (See his *White Eagle, Red Star*, p. 170.)

One wishes that Ullman had delved more deeply into the origins of Curzon's note, to which he devotes only about two pages. But his chief aim in this volume is to evaluate the policies and diplomatic tactics of David Lloyd George. The Welsh Wizard desired a trade agreement with Soviet Russia because he believed that commerce had a sobering, civilizing influence. Ullman feels that it was naive to think that Russia's Communist leaders could be sobered up from their intoxication with world revolution through economic concessions. The term that he uses (mostly in the conclusion) to describe Lloyd George's policy is "appeasement"—an unfortunate choice of words, for it seems to suggest that the British prime minister gave the Bolsheviks whatever they demanded, in an effort to placate them. But