industries, and large factories grew simultaneously. Peasants came and went; they could join old style enterprises and not be transformed into the new breed of industrial worker.

The cities of the Russian Empire under discussion were not "melting pots." Ethnic, national, and political tensions in the cities shook the foundations of the antiquated Empire even as the increasingly independent municipal governments wrestled—often very effectively—with mounting demands on city services.

By concentrating on the common theme of urban conflict, the authors impart to the book a sense of wholeness—a substantial accomplishment in any collective enterprise. The disparate statistical tables, however, weaken the unity because they do not always analyze the same categories of data. The reader consequently cannot make a quick comparison of, say, population groups of St. Petersburg and Kiev.

Another drawback is the absence of uniformity in the maps for each city; some have scales, legends, and fairly good representations of street grids, but others do not. Missing, too, is an introductory assessment of the legislative framework within which urban change took place in late Imperial Russia. Every author mentions briefly the Imperial Municipal Reform of 1870, but nowhere is there an analysis of this major legislation.

Charles A. Ruud

University of Western Ontario


Railwaymen, and the All-Russian Railroad Union, played a critical role in the 1905 Revolution. Henry Reichman uses abundant published and archival sources to tell us how railwaymen lived and worked, and what happened on the railways during 1905. His account far surpasses Pushkareva's for that year and will now be standard. Even more impressive is Reichman's willingness to confront the complexity of his subjects. There is an unmistakable quality of scholarly honesty to the book: Reichman's analysis, part of which I think is wrong, can be measured against the carefully drawn picture of diverse social groups and railway lines that he himself provides.

As Reichman shows, blue collar workers employed by the railroads had nothing much in common with white collar employees, and the most important of the blues—craftsmen in the many depots and repair shops—were physically as well as professionally and socially isolated from administrative and clerical personnel. Reichman suggests that engine-drivers provided a tenuous link between blues and whites because they were by the early twentieth century increasingly recruited from among skilled craftsmen but enjoyed the earnings of middle-level management and had supervisory responsibilities themselves. But that link was tenuous indeed, and drivers were as likely to find themselves in conflict with craftsmen as not. In any case, in the aftermath of Bloody Sunday shop workers played no very significant part in the January strikes and advanced no political demands. By February workers were striking more often, but white collar employees had seized the initiative on the railroads and advanced political demands. The establishment of the railroad union and articulation of a radical political program in April was a white-collar enterprise, and in Reichman's view the union remained thereafter basically white collar. What contact the union had with craftsmen was provided by Social Democrats, whose own following in the shops was not at first very large; and the SD's relations with the union were problematical. This white-collar union nevertheless adopted the tactic of a general strike—rather off-handedly, Reichman believes—at mid-year. When in October
the union leadership, poorly connected with local branches but receiving a major assist from radical engine drivers on the Moscow-Kazan line, called for a general strike, the reaction was electrifying. Although it took two appeals to precipitate the strike, the union leadership had sensed better than the leaders of any of the revolutionary parties—Reichman does not seem quite willing to admit this—that the moment to strike had arrived.

It was during and after the October strike that the shop workers began to move to the fore, and as they did so the inherent difficulties involved in holding together the disparate groups employed by the railroads came to the surface. Reichman reports that railroad strike committees outside Moscow resented the union leadership's call to end the strike. Here he sees conflict between white-collar willingness to accept the political change embodied in the October Manifesto and to negotiate for changes in railroad management, and blue-collar desires that the October victory bring them some concrete gains. Shop and depot workers, galvanized into organizing by the October strike, in many cases rejected the white collar leadership of the railroad union, preferring to follow SD's (and in some cases SR's) into proletarian unions. At the same time, part of the union's white collar constituency—engineers, stationmasters, middle-level managers and the like—backed away from radicalism. On the other hand, clerks and telegraph operators remained quite radical; and they were sufficiently low on the social scale that depot workers had little difficulty collaborating with them. No complete break even between privileged whites and blue collar labor occurred; and, when in response to government provocation and rank and file militance in Moscow the union called for a general strike in early December, many engineers and other management personnel took part.

Reichman traces the development of the railroad union, its intermittent conflict and cooperation with the SD's, and the evolving relationship between blue and white collar labor on the different lines with care; his judgments are subtle and judicious. On the other hand, the conceptual framework within which he places his story seems skewed. As he sees it, the white collar railroad union pushed for professional mobilization for purposes that were at root reformist. Blue collar labor, following the Bolsheviks' lead, eventually rejected professional unions in favor of class unions and class solidarity; they reached out, through the revolutionaries and the soviets, to fellow proletarians while moving away from professional colleagues on the railroads. It is indeed possible to trace rising class consciousness among railway as other workers in 1905, but to consider the railway union a professional union is to confuse a label with reality. Reichman himself demonstrates conclusively that depot workers, telegraphers, clerks and engineers had, professionally, nothing at all in common; these were different professions with a common employer. Only a non-professional—a political—union could link them, which was precisely why the SD's sought to prise shop workers away from the railroad union. On the other hand, Bolsheviks at the time thought, and Reichman concurs, that workers expressed their class antagonism to white collar employees by establishing non-political, professional unions. However one might make sense of conflicting aspirations, the simple dichotomy of profession vs. class that Reichman employs rests awkwardly on his data.

The economic aspirations of shop and depot workers are clear, and as Reichman says there was good reason for workers to respond to the SD's class rhetoric. About the white collars there is no such clarity. When it comes to the many varieties of white collar employees, Reichman tantalizes us. We learn more from him about white collar railroaders than we know about almost any other white collar group involved in the revolution, but white collar motives remain elusive. Reichman suggests that staff faced difficult working conditions, professional stagnation, declining real income, or some combination thereof, but those conditions might be used to explain reactionary as well as revolutionary politics. Why should telegraph operators, whom medical reports revealed to be