

generally provided better services for workers than did the landowners, peasant communes, or proprietors who operated the smaller mines. Indeed, when the Congress of Mining Industrialists of South Russia (S^{ezd} Gornopromyshlennikov Iuga Rossii) adopted housing specifications in the wake of the disastrous cholera epidemic of 1892, a year before the government mandated such improvements, this was a move of the larger and wealthier firms against the smaller.

Indeed, here John Hughes, to whom the book is dedicated in conjunction with his workers, emerges as virtually the only real “industrialist” who had an early vision of establishing a permanent and settled community of coal and steel producers. As Friedgut notes, however, even Hughes’ vision was not one in which workers would become participatory citizens, but rather one in which they would be satisfied enough to settle permanently in Iuzovka. The extent to which Hughes’ firm and the settlement he founded offered better amenities than other comparably sized foreign and Russian firms remains an open question. Several other large firms provided hospitals and family housing in their first years of operation. Interestingly, Friedgut does not challenge the assumption of tsarist government and society that workers’ welfare was the employers’ responsibility, a responsibility shared by neither the local nor the central government. In fact, although large Donbass employers provided inadequate welfare services for their workers, they were the only ones who provided any services at all, and arguably they did not provide fewer services than did their counterparts in other industrialized countries at the same time.

Susan P. McCaffray, University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Sochor, Zenovia. *Revolution and Culture: The Bogdanov-Lenin Controversy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988. 258 pp. \$24.95.

This book provides a thoughtful and sensitive account of the differences between Lenin and Bogdanov on such topics as the cultural prerequisites for socialist revolution, the tension between political radicalization and cultural conservatism, and the contrast between political hegemony (Lenin) and cultural hegemony (Bogdanov). Sochor has read widely and with discrimination in Bogdanov’s large corpus and has been able to consult certain materials in *Proletcult* archives. She has also had the cooperation of Bogdanov’s son, A. A. Malinovsky.

This study is strong in its social-science dimensions, for example, the discussions of modernization, legitimation, and “delegitimation.” It is less strong in dealing with the history of ideas. For example, Sochor makes no effort to trace the origins of Bogdanov’s early and copious use of such quite un-Marxian terms as “value,” “valuation,” “reevaluation,” “culture,” and “creativity.” The lexicon of value and creativity is foreign to Marx, Engels, Plekhanov, and Lenin. It was introduced, under strong Nietzschean influence, by such “Nietzschean Marxists” as Lunacharsky and Bogdanov himself. Marx, of course, used the term *Wert*, but only to designate *economic* value (in its various forms: “use-value,” “exchange value,” “surplus value”); Nietzsche used the same term to refer to *cultural* value—artistic, philosophic, scientific. Russian translators around the turn of the century were quite right when they rendered Marx’s *Wert* by *stoimost’* and Nietzsche’s *Wert* by *tsennost’* (and his related terms *Wertung* and *Umwertung* by *otsenka* and *pereotsenka*). It is thus misleading when Sochor suggests that Lenin spoke of values in a general, non-economic sense (pp. 161, 164, 173, 174, 205, 229). But she is absolutely right in stressing that Bogdanov frequently spoke of value, valuation, and reevaluation (that is, of *tsennost’*, *otsenka*, and *pereotsenka*) (cf. pp. 50, 126, 187, 190, 196, 208, 231, 232).

Sochor makes a certain effort to distinguish between *political* culture (defined by Lucian Pye as “A set of attitudes, beliefs, and sentiments which give order and meaning to a political process and which provide the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behavior in the political system” [quoted p. 51]) and culture in the broader *anthropological* sense (roughly, “the set of shared values, attitudes, and beliefs which govern the behavior of members of a given social group”). But she does not make this wider sense fully explicit and she fails to make it clear that Bogdanov, like Nietzsche, was mainly concerned with culture (and cultural creativity) in a *third* sense of the term, namely “high culture” (roughly, “the most creative or consummate manifestations, in a given society, of literature, music, dance, the plastic arts, philosophy, and ‘pure’ [i.e., non-applied] science”). Bogdanov, like Nietzsche, would include *religion* within the scope of high culture only in a “secularized” or “humanized” form; Bogdanov’s “god-building” (*bogostroitel'stvo*) had roots, inter alia in Nietzsche’s thought.

The “culture” to which Bogdanov, as a founder and leading advocate of *Proletkult*, devoted his passionate energies was, it seems to me, not primarily culture in the anthropologist’s broad sense nor yet political culture, but high culture. Just as Nietzsche had celebrated the creation of the high culture of the present and urged the creation of even higher future cultures, Bogdanov celebrated the first stages of the creation of a high proletarian culture now and urged the creation of ever higher proletarian cultures in the future, especially (like Nietzsche) in the most remote world-historical future.

The cottage industry of *bogdanovedenie* has in recent years—both in the Soviet Union and in the West—focussed on Bogdanov’s *tektologiia* or “general theory of organization,” a striking anticipation of current general systems theory. Sochor’s reduction of this important but limited aspect of Bogdanov’s thought to a relatively subordinate place strikes me as judicious.

The author’s generally clear and vigorous style is marred by certain annoying inversions, for example, “wondered both Lenin and Bogdanov” (p. 33), “contends at least one critic” (p. 214). But her book can be recommended as an informed and sometimes enlightening discussion of a key figure in the history of Russian Marxism who is only now beginning to come into his own.

George L. Kline, Bryn Mawr College

Dumova, N. G. *Kadetskaia Partiia v period pervoi mirovoi voiny i Fevral'skoi revoliutsii*. Moscow: Nauka, 1988. 247 pp.

N. G. Dumova’s detailed study of the career of the Russian Constitutional-Democratic Party between mid-1914 and the eve of the October Revolution is an uneasy and ambivalent amalgam of what would be regarded in the West as the outgoing and incoming conventions of Soviet historical scholarship over the watershed decade of the 1980s.

In historiographical terms, Dumova is admirably up to date, integrating the most recent Soviet and Western published research into a study which still defers to the methodological supremacy of primary sources. At the same time, the volume demonstrates an archaic set of values most graphically illustrated in the “Sources and Literature” section, where the priority listing reads Lenin’s *Complete Works*; Soviet-published collections of primary sources; Soviet archival material; memoirs of participants and Soviet secondary works (undifferentiated); contemporary press; and non-Soviet accounts. The study starts and finishes with a clutch of quotations from Lenin, whose lapidary judgments are still cited far more often than the topic warrants, while highly selective extracts are regularly employed to “clinch” otherwise dubious arguments. Soviet historians are accorded hardly less respect, their works solemnly raised to historiographical parity with the memoirs of participants with an arbitrariness which