would help clarify some of the contradictions he finds in Darlington between retrograde policies and scholarly advancement in this period. In his treatment of secondary education, James Muckle takes a different tack, looking at autobiographical works by former pupils to see what they add to Darlington on the internal life of Russia's secondary schools. Michael Pushkin looks at the universities, particularly government reforms, the social composition of students and the student protests that rocked higher education at the time Darlington visited Russia. Darlington's analysis of the roots of student protest is remarkably perceptive. Like de Madariaga, Pushkin attempts to place the inspector's findings within the context of recent scholarship. Finally, John Morison gives a solid survey of technical and commercial education. He points out that Darlington underestimated the progress made here before 1861, but admits that the Report remains the best account of this topic in English. Alston's conclusion is an eloquent attempt to place Darlington and his work in its proper place in the development of Russian studies and in the international context of Darlington's own times.

Scott J. Seregny
Indiana University, Indianapolis


This is an extremely interesting book, though at the end one feels it is more an act of homage by Professor Haimson to some extraordinary people than a major independent contribution to its subject. For very nearly thirty years, beginning in 1960, Haimson has been carrying on the Inter-University Project on the History of the Menshevik Movement, which has resulted in a number of important studies, including a splendid collection in English, also edited by Haimson, *The Mensheviks from the Revolution of 1917 to the Second World War*. As he points out in his introduction here, the impetus for the Project was the imminent disappearance of the movement by virtue of the disappearance of its membership; the Mensheviks had not been able to recruit successfully since shortly after the revolution and civil war and, consequently, by the 1960s the participants had all become very old indeed. Dusk had come for Menshevism, and its owl of Minerva took to wing.

On the face of it, the Mensheviks were condemned by history: overwhelmed by the Bolsheviks in 1917, confounded theoretically by the rise both of Stalinism and fascism, rejected by those to whom they appealed
from the various waves of emigration, the sense of their movement might seem a protracted act of futility, even folly. But such a view is erroneous, both on a personal level and historically. The Mensheviks were the pioneers in the esoteric study of "Kremlinology," the approximate identification of names with significant interests, a method to make sense of a political system which tried to reveal nothing; they, and only they, could show the possibility of such analysis because of their initial personal knowledge of the factors involved and precisely because of their residual Marxism. Even under Gorbachev, as personalist politics seem to give way in part to openly interest politics, the analytic tools of "Kremlinology" created by them remain indispensable. And personally, if these interviews, and universal concurreal, are to be believed, the Menshevik elders were of transcendent lucidity, good sense and rationality, even if they were unable to alter society to their heart's desire. What more can "Marxism," as a doctrine derived from Marx, legitimately or properly claim?

These conversations, with Lydia Dan, Boris Nicolaevsky and George Denike, represent to Haimson the three political generations of classical Menshevism; that dating from the original split in the Russian Social Democracy in 1903, that drawn to the Mensheviks by the events of the revolution of 1905, and the one drawn in by World War I and the revolutions of 1917. In the introduction, which contains an enlightening discussion of some problems of oral history, Haimson describes how he found his interlocutors much more lucid, spontaneous, forthcoming, informative and genuinely engaged with memory when discussing their earlier lives than later periods. This arose not simply because of the tendency of the very old to retain earlier memories more vividly than later ones. The stench of constant defeat (and the consequent factionalism) forced them in the 1960s to rely more on formulae than on living recollection for things after 1917. ("Youngsters" such as Boris Sapir have to fill that in for them—supplemented by the phenomenal publications of the Mensheviks: what they did even more than to talk was to write.) Hence the focus, and the title, of this book, for it concentrates on how they became Russian revolutionaries and Mensheviks, their families, youth, development and early participation in the movement, facts which at the end of their lives were more distinct to them than the subsequent fate of their party.

Significantly enough, all three of these Old Mensheviks are very respectful towards the personality and integrity of Lenin. They may have been the first modern anti-Communists, but Lenin belonged to their tradition, whatever his errors (so did Trotsky, but never Stalin). In Lydia Dan's case it was because she had, after all, known and worked with Lenin, as a member of the phenomenal Tsederbaum clan; she was the sister of Martov who had virtually created Menshevism as the antithesis of Bolshevism, and she was wife to Dan who dominated the movement after emigration abroad. Nicolaevsky was generally too scrupulous an historian