

THE UNCERTAIN CRUSADE: AMERICA AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION OF 1905. By *Arthur W. Thompson* and *Robert A. Hart*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970. vii, 180 pp. \$6.50.

Did American public opinion renege on an implied promise to aid the Russian revolutionaries of 1905–6? In this study, written by Professor Hart of the University of Massachusetts on the basis of research undertaken by the late Professor Thompson of the University of Florida, the author convincingly answers “yes.” While acknowledging that neither statesmen nor radicals should mistake fervor for policy, Hart nevertheless argues that the enthusiasm of Americans for the Russian Revolution of 1905 in its early stages was a tragically misleading commitment, “a promise that should not have been made.”

At the same time Hart leaves a larger and more puzzling question unanswered. How can one possibly explain the wild swing of American opinion from generous and romantic endorsement of the revolution to indifferent, even hostile, opposition to it, in the course of really only a few months, from the spring to the fall of 1905? Hart notes that a few editors explained their reversal of attitude as stemming from increased fear of Japan, a desire not to oppose Roosevelt’s policies, and a discovery that the revolution was socialistic, not democratic, in its aims and methods. He also reports Senator Beveridge’s wry (and probably astute) comment that Americans had become disenchanted with the revolution, either through boredom or through suspicion. Hart refers to TR’s desire to turn American opinion around and to the publicistic efforts of Witte in America. Finally, he mentions a growing reaction against the dangers of socialism at home and against revolutionary excesses, as well as the desire of some Americans to trade and lend money in Russia. Yet none of these explanations is fully elaborated or analyzed, and one is left to speculate that perhaps two adroit politicians, Witte and Roosevelt, together turned the trick.

A few minor drawbacks also need to be noted. Hart does not set his topic in the context of previous American attitudes toward Russia. His depiction of events in Russia is frequently weak or erroneous, a fault that could easily have been avoided by relying more on available English-language accounts of the period, or on knowledgeable colleagues. Finally, there is little or no use of such important works as an article by Thorson on American opinion and the Portsmouth peace conference, a study of TR by Harbaugh, Dennett’s *Roosevelt and the Russo-Japanese War*, and excellent recent monographs by Esthus and Trani on American-Russian-Japanese relations at the time.

JOHN M. THOMPSON  
*Indiana University*

THE COMMISSARIAT OF ENLIGHTENMENT: SOVIET ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATION AND THE ARTS UNDER LUNACHARSKY, OCTOBER 1917–1921. By *Sheila Fitzpatrick*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970. xxii, 380 pp. \$13.50.

Lunacharsky once asked, “Were we, as Communist propagandists, ever concerned with anything other than the enlightenment of the people?” In this volume we find that only Lenin, Lunacharsky, and the dedicated staff of the Commissariat of Enlightenment (Narkompros) fought to uphold their “old-fashioned preoccupation with enlightenment.” The “indifference of the Party and government organs, hos-

tility toward Narkompros, inertia of institutions, and above all the poverty of the Soviet Republic" dogged Lunacharsky and the Commissariat at every step and seriously curtailed their aspirations.

Sheila Fitzpatrick's book, an outgrowth of a Ph.D. thesis at Oxford University, is a meticulously documented and thorough account of the institutional aspects of Narkompros: its formulation of policies, internal workings, and relations with the party, the state, and the people from 1917 to 1921 (the author hopes to bring out a second volume for the period 1921–29). Educational theory and the practice of education are considered here only secondarily. There are, however, two fine chapters on Proletkult and the arts (both were included in Narkompros's functions during this period).

The author concentrates on key persons and their activities. The figures of Krupskaya, Pokrovsky, Preobrazhensky, and others directly involved in Narkompros's fate are well drawn. The two most important, Lenin and Lunacharsky, are less well presented. Lenin's views and activities in education are not fully discussed; and Lunacharsky's position on many issues, including university autonomy, party involvement in public education, and Proletkult, is often blurred or contradictory. Appended to the book is a most useful section of "biographical notes," which contains important information on over 130 persons involved with Narkompros during this period.

Perhaps the most valuable aspect of this volume, from a scholar's point of view, is that most of the information presented is based on materials in the Soviet archives on Narkompros (TsGAOR and TsGA-RSFSR), which include records of committee meetings and memoranda. Although it is sometimes in the form of an account of the rise or fall of this or that committee (which can be dull reading), this material is generally well used. Much light is shed on the decision-making process within Narkompros and its connecting organs.

This book will remain a "must" for those interested in the subjects it discusses and the period it deals with.

HOWARD R. HOLTER  
*California State College, Dominguez Hills*

GODY EMIGRATSII, 1919–1969: PARIZH–N'IU–IORK (VOSPOMINANIYA). By *Mark Vishniak*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1970. 281 pp. \$9.50.

The post-1917 Russian emigration has been both large in numbers and intellectually active. It has many cultural achievements to its credit, including university centers and serious scholarly journals edited in China, Europe, and North America, as well as a plethora of schools, libraries, educational centers, publishing houses, and newspapers which have dotted practically the whole world. It has given many truly gifted writers the opportunity to write and publish in their native language. The historians perhaps represent the largest contingent, yet the emigration has never produced its own historian. We do not have a single book, not even a booklet, in which an attempt has been made to record the story of the emigration that followed the Russian Revolution. Fortunately a large body of literature which will provide the future historian of the Russian emigration with excellent raw material is slowly accumulating.

Mark Vishniak, a prominent Socialist Revolutionary and a member of the