

abandoned many of the most oppressive features of Stalinism. Khrushchev has been preaching coexistence and warning against war. Does not all this suggest a trend?

In some ways it does, and Deutscher's argument, stated forcefully and often provocatively, has much merit. It suffers, however, from almost complete one-sidedness. It is not a balanced account, weighing cautiously the factors for positive change, the retarding factors which defend old-fashioned dogmatism, and the possibility of the emergence of a new type of rational totalitarianism, less violent but still coercive, which engages efficiently in social manipulation even while improving the standard of living and increasing the hourly dose of socially organized leisure. Deutscher argues, in effect, that economic development must bring the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.), politically and intellectually, to the point where the West is today. Indeed, he discerns signs that the U.S.S.R. is pregnant with new ideas and will soon blossom out with intellectual creativity of historical proportions. But should not one raise the question of whether the means used to achieve economic development also affect the character of the developed society? Is not economic development on the basis of pluralism, with all its shortcomings, one way of consolidating social and intellectual pluralism? And does not perhaps the converse hold true? What is the role of the Communist party in providing "socialism" with its inbuilt capacity for rapid growth, that growth which Deutscher sees as a major change of the "socialist" system? Is the party dictatorship going to wane, and if so, then, will the social demands on the economic system perhaps alter the ratio between social sacrifice and economic priority?

These and many other questions come to mind when one reads Deutscher's account of the emerging pattern of freedom, of increasingly uninhibited intellectual pursuits—aided by the regime's concern for broad philosophical training of the students—a "balanced personality" as Mr. Deutscher calls it, of the peaceful Soviet pursuit for coexistence, and of Soviet fears of too rapid revolutionary trends in Asia,

Africa, and, one may even add, Cuba. Perhaps a trip to the U.S.S.R. would help.

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKY

Associate Professor  
Department of Public Law  
and Government  
Columbia University

ROBERT VINCENT DANIELS. *The Conscience of the Revolution: Communist Opposition in Soviet Russia*. (Russian Research Center Studies, 40.) Pp. xi, 526. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960. \$10.00.

Robert V. Daniels has written a definitive work on the history of events within the Communist party in the Soviet Union between 1917 and 1929. Basing his work on years of study of the debates of the party congresses and on other party documents and materials, including the recently available Trotsky Archive at the Houghton Library of Harvard University, the author has woven together the most extensive exposition appearing so far in print of the very complicated internecine party controversies which divided Soviet Russia for a dozen years. In the twenty years which have elapsed since the last fires of the opposition were quenched by Stalin in 1929, we have perhaps fallen into the thought pattern of dismissing the issues which then divided the Communist movement as part of the buried past. While this is generally true, the study of these issues gives us a new perception of the development of the Communist party in the Soviet Union and a more precise basis for evaluation of any new trends which might appear in the Communist movement within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) and the Soviet bloc. The author rightly believes that Communism is not a static concept once fitted into a fixed mold for perpetuity. In fact, he shows that the Communist ideal, as conceived by the early Soviet leaders, was recast into many new images.

The central theme of this book is that the Communist movement has a "dualistic" character. One was the "Leninist" with its emphasis on power and expediency; the other was the "Leftist" with its stress on principle and the ideal of the revolution.

Daniels' book is a study of the interaction, mainly in the twenties, between the two. A large part of this study is devoted to the party strife between the Lenin and Trotsky factions. Aside from his detailed story of party history, the author makes some valuable theoretical contributions on the use of the terms "left" and "right." He points out that there were five different factional positions: the "ultra-left," which was almost utopian; the "moderate left," which accented force; the "ultra-right," which included the Mensheviks; the "real 'Leninists,'" composed of those concerned not so much with the program as the dictatorial methods of executing the program; and the "moderate Right 'Leninists,'" who believed in cautious action. Daniels concerns himself with all of these factional positions, except the Mensheviks, whom he does not consider to be a factor in the dual character of the party struggle.

The author develops his story in the traditional chronological fashion, but his insights and massive documentation give this book special distinction. The penultimate chapter reflects the end of the party strife with the liquidation of many of the dramatis personae in the thirties. Daniels concludes his study with a chapter on why the opposition failed—mainly because of the force and accommodation of the Stalin side, begotten by Lenin. Valuable appendices of party chronologies, composition of party bodies, and graphic analyses of "left" and "right," plus sixty-eight pages of Bibliography and Notes, combine to make this book indispensable to the reader in Soviet political history.

WILLIAM B. BALLIS

Professor of Political Science  
University of Michigan

IAN GREY. *Peter the Great: Emperor of All Russia*. Pp. 505. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1960. \$7.50.

The interest in Peter the Great, one of the most dynamic tsars of Russia, is insatiable, and the writings on the Petrine era in that country keep mounting to this day. The important series, "Letters and Papers of Emperor Peter," which was initiated in 1889, and includes all kinds of archival documentary materials relevant to

the period of his reign, still continues. Eugene Schuyler's work, the only lengthy biography of Peter I in English, appeared in 1884. The fourth volume of V. O. Klyuchevsky, devoted to the illustrious emperor, has been translated by C. J. Hogarth, but the inimitable literary style of that great historian was lost; the English version is stilted, full of untranslated terms, and at times not free of errors. The recent abridged translation of the same volume by Lilians Archibald exhibits considerable improvement. Now we have the lengthy biography of Peter I by Ian Grey, a welcome addition to the historical literature of the time.

Ian Grey is a student of law and an amateur in the field of history. As a member of the British mission in the Soviet Union during the last war, Mr. Grey learned enough Russian to handle the original and secondary sources. Throughout his sojourn in the Soviet Union, he scrupulously collected materials, and has ably utilized them in his present study. He acknowledges his indebtedness to historians such as N. Ustryalov and S. M. Soloviev, a charitable gesture indeed, but he regards V. O. Klyuchevsky's work on Peter as "arbitrary, prejudiced, and misleading . . . as a guide." He recommends Soloviev's massive history as a more reliable study. The finality of this verdict may be regarded as equally arbitrary, prejudiced, misleading and, I may dare say, a bit impetuous. Regretfully, the author failed to consult or even to mention in his Bibliography P. N. Milyukov's superb work, *State Economy in Russia During the First Quarter of the Eighteenth Century and the Reforms of Peter the Great*, which constitutes an excellent complementary study to that of Klyuchevsky.

Mr. Grey boldly states that he refuses to extenuate the barbarities of Peter I. At the same time, he reminds the critics that the very age of Peter I was a barbarous one "when human life was disregarded, and nowhere more than in England, as the Bloody Assizes, the Glenco massacre, and, later, the convict system bear witness." The author adds further that he regards "Russia as part of Europe" and holds, with Catherine the Great, "that 'Russia is a European Power'" contrary to the tend-