ministerial rank of A. D. Protopopov and B. V. Stürmer, while devoting twice as much space to discussing British and French military tactics on the Western front. Further undermining the reader's faith in Myles' research is his habit of making indirect references to other English-language sources without noting them or listing them in the bibliography. Such shoddy research does little to support the author's views.

Equally distressing are the numerous errors which blemish the book's pages. These range from incorrect and inconsistent spellings (Virubova for Vyrubova, Rodye for Rode, Arc for Ark, Purichkevich for Purishkevich, djizn/djizan for zhizn), to contradictory information (Maria Rasputin aged 10 in 1907 (pp. 130-31), but aged 15 in 1914 (p. 219)), to omissions (the much used term starets missing from the glossary of foreign words).

Poorly researched and given to sensationalism, Myles' book offers nothing new for either a popular or scholarly audience. Hence, it cannot be recommended. It is indeed surprising that such a weak piece of work ever passed an editorial review.

Christopher Dobson's *Prince Felix Yusupov: The Man Who Murdered Rasputin* is an excellent example of a well written biography. Focussing on Rasputin's assassin, Dobson skillfully tells Iusupov's story with clarity and sympathy. While not overlooking his subject's faults, the author tells the story of a man who wanted to be remembered as something more than an assassin. Starting with Rasputin's murder, Dobson goes on to chronicle the many facets of Iusupov's life—exile, emigré life, financial insecurity, court cases and notoriety. Unfortunately, try as he might, Iusupov was never able to exorcise Rasputin's ghost or to gain the business success and anonymity he desired.

While based almost entirely on English-language sources, Dobson's book nonetheless shows a serious commitment to research. Matched with a smooth writing style, what emerges is probably the best biography we will ever have of Iusupov and a cautionary tale of the persistence of history and the insatiable public taste for sensationalism.

Grigorii Rasputin still remains an enigmatic historical figure. One can only hope that the current reexamination of the Russian and Soviet past will move us beyond the legend and will help set Rasputin in a much clearer historical perspective.

Mark Kulikowski

State University of New York, College at Oswego


In November and December 1917, the peoples of the old Russian Empire participated for the first (and last) time in a "four-tailed" election—one in which suffrage was universal, direct, equal, and secret. This election chose the delegates to the ill-fated Constituent Assembly which was to have established a new, legitimate government in the wake of the Romanovs' fall from power. Unfortunately, Lenin, who brooked no rivals to the Bolshevik-controlled Council of People's Commissars, forcibly dissolved the SR-dominated Assembly on 5/18 January 1918, the day of its first session.

Despite the ultimate failure of the Assembly, the election provides an unprecedented view of Russia and its colonized nationalities immediately after the Bolshevik Revolution. Regrettably, the election results have never been published in full; over a
lifetime, Oliver Radkey (best known for his studies of the Socialist Revolutionaries) has tried to piece together the scattered pieces of available information to present a more complete picture. This book, which presents the latest stages of this work, consists of three parts: (1) an unedited reprint of the Radkey's *Election to the Russian Constituent Assembly of 1917*, first published in 1950; (2) six essays which correct, revise, and expand the earlier work; and (3) a set of five tables which give the 1917 election results insofar as Radkey has been able to reconstruct them.

The revised tables provide the meat of this work. Table 1 gives a broad overview of the election results, which are presented in twelve columns. They have been compiled with great care; I was only able to find one insignificant (probably typographical) error. Either the Bolshevik vote in the Tomsk electoral district in Table 1 (51,455) ought to be one greater (51,456), or Radkey's totals for that row (Tomsk district) and column (the all-district Bolshevik vote) should each be one less. Because of the vast number of competing parties, Table 1 shows separate counts for the four major groups: the SRs, the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks, and the Kadets. The other parties, which are lumped together in categories ranging from "other socialists" to "Turkotatar," are examined in greater detail in the four remaining tables.

The tables reveal many of the problems that Lenin's government faced during the first ten years of its existence. In those areas where the Bolsheviks lost the 1917 election by wide margins, anti-Bolshevik forces had their greatest successes in the civil war of 1918-21. In Taurida Province, the last bastion of the Whites under Baron Wrangel, the Bolsheviks received only 12 percent of the vote. Likewise, in the peasant-dominated black-earth provinces, the Socialist Revolutionaries trounced their Bolshevik rivals; this electoral victory presaged the revolt of the Greens in 1920-21. The strong showing of the Georgian Mensheviks, the Armenian Dashnaks, and the Muslim parties in Transcaucasia similarly foretold the struggle for national independence which ended with the Red Army's invasion in 1921. On the other hand, the election also showed that Lenin and his allies had staunch support in the central industrial regions and in Moscow and Petrograd—the areas that remained firmly Bolshevik in the ensuing three-year war.

The election also revealed the localized strength of religious and national minorities. Old Believer parties garnered thousands of votes in the Perm', Altai, and Nizhni Novgorod electoral districts. In Kazan' district, the heart of the future Tatar Republic, a Chuvash list attracted over 200,000 voters. The Bashkirs of Orenburg and Ufa likewise demonstrated independence from their dominant Tatar brethren with tens of thousands of supporters. These results should stimulate further research into local history, especially now that many of these minorities are trying to recover their past.

Above all, the election proved the utter bankruptcy of the right which attracted fewer than a million votes over the vast empire. The vote testified to the thoroughly revolutionary nature of the country, which by November 1917 had left even the left Kadets far behind. In this revision of his earlier work, Radkey emphasizes this radicalization of the empire's population; the strong showing of the extremists, he argues, was no temporary aberration, but a real reflection of their support. Provincial studies support Radkey's view; Donald Raleigh, for example, holds that the October Revolution in Saratov Province was the triumph not only of the Bolsheviks but of all radical groups. The Bolsheviks ultimately proved more adept at exploiting this radicalism. Ronald Suny's study of Baku likewise stresses the radical nature of that city in 1917.

Radkey draws another, more controversial conclusion from the election results. The proliferation of independent peasant lists, many of which the SR-dominated elec-