



The Russian Revolution of 1917

Michael Karpovich

The Journal of Modern History, Vol. 2, No. 2. (Jun., 1930), pp. 258-280.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2801%28193006%292%3A2%3C258%3ATRRO1%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F>

The Journal of Modern History is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION OF 1917

THESE can hardly be a more striking testimony to the progress of historical writing in modern times than the enormous output of literature on the Russian revolution that has already accumulated. None of the previous revolutions was so eager to preserve for posterity its own records, and none had similarly developed technical means at its disposal. The recording started almost simultaneously with the revolution itself. Almost a hundred years had to pass from the beginning of the French revolution before *La révolution française* could be founded. The men of the Russian revolution were not willing to wait that long. In 1921, immediately after the end of the civil war in Russia, the "Istpart," a special historical committee of the Communist party, began to publish the *Proletarskaya revolyutsiya*. The study of the history of the revolution forms an important part in the system of political education in Soviet Russia. The cult of Lenin has for one of its manifestations a seemingly inexhaustible stream of books, pamphlets, and articles devoted to the dead leader: for the year 1925 alone the *Leniniana* was able to register 6,296 titles! The leaders of the Communist party, busy as they must be making history, still find time for writing, in fact display an exceptional eagerness to write, at times almost bordering on graphomania. On the other hand, a rapid succession of various stages of the revolutionary development must be held responsible for the large number of political exiles of all shades of opinion (from tsarist ministers to Trotsky) who have plenty of time to engage in the somewhat melancholy occupation of writing memoirs.

So far as the amount of the material is concerned, the historian of the Russian revolution is in a very favorable position indeed. The difficulties in his path become apparent, however, the moment one gets acquainted with the nature of this material. All the historical writing in Soviet Russia, as every other form of literary activity, is under the absolute control of a government which is known both for the efficiency of its propaganda and the strictness of its censorship. The books produced outside of Russia are too often written in the atmosphere of an intense hatred of the present Russian régime. To the general political bias of this or that group there might be added personal idiosyncrasies of the individual authors. There are memoirs disguised as histories, political pamphlets, and *apologiae pro vita sua* pretending to be memoirs, and diaries which display a suspiciously successful gift of prophetic vision on the part of the diarist. The historian must be on his guard and constantly look out for a trap.

The present survey does not pretend, of course, to supply anything like a complete bibliography of the Russian revolution, a task that is obviously impossible of fulfilling within the limits assigned. It aims only to give a brief account of the most important publications both in Russian and in other languages and to indicate where a more complete bibliography can be found. Chronologically, the survey does not go beyond the bolshevik coup d'état of November, 1917, so that it does not include the history of the Soviet rule in Russia. It was not so easy to determine where to begin. The revolution of March, 1917,¹ which overthrew the imperial government, was the culmination of a long process of political and social development, and it seemed hardly possible to omit the background altogether. On the other hand, to treat the "underlying causes" of the revolution would mean to include all the important literature on modern Russian history. The proper solution of the problem seemed to be to include books and articles on the "immediate origins" of the revolution only. The summer of 1915 was selected as the starting-point. It was at that moment that, under the impression of the crushing military defeat, the political discontent, which had been gradually accumulating during the first year of the war, again became loud and outspoken. The all too short honeymoon of patriotic co-operation gave place to a renewed struggle between the government and the opposition, and from that time the political crisis in Russia continued to increase in import and acuteness until the final breakdown of the old régime and the advent of the Provisional government. For the purposes of this article, therefore, "the Russian revolution of 1917" means a period of a little over two years, from June-July, 1915, to the beginning of November, 1917, included.

It might be useful to give, first of all, a few indications as to the bibliography of the subject. A very considerable amount of material can be found in the historical periodicals published both in and outside Russia. I have already mentioned the *Proletarskaya revolyutsiya* [The proletarian revolution], a monthly devoted to the history of the revolution or, more specifically, to the part played in the revolution by the Communist party. It contains memoirs of the active participants in the revolution, minutes of conferences of both central and local organizations of the party, and similar material of unequal historical value.² Of a somewhat similar nature is the *Krasnaya lyetopis* [The Red annals] published since 1922 by the Petrograd organization of the Communist party, while *Lyetopis revolyutsii* [The annals of the revolution] (since 1922)

¹ In the Russian literature the March and November revolutions are still being referred to as the February and October revolutions, respectively, according to the old Russian calendar that was in force in 1917.

² See in particular the several anniversary numbers, in commemoration of the fifth and tenth anniversary of the February and October revolutions, respectively. For an index of articles on the February and October revolutions published in *Proletarskaya revolyutsiya* in 1921-26, see No. 1, 1927.

covers the history of the revolution in Ukraine.³ The best known of all the historical magazines now published in Russia, the *Krasny arkhiv* [The Red archives], divides its attention between the history of the Russian diplomacy and that of Russia's internal development. As a rule, it does not publish any memoirs but concentrates on official documents, letters, and diaries of the statesmen of the old régime, etc. It has to its credit the publication of some of the most important documents concerning the revolution. Mention should be made also of the *Byloye* [The past], the publication of which was resumed in 1917 and then again discontinued in 1926, and of the *Golos minuvshogo* [The voice of the past], another historical magazine of prerevolutionary origin, which managed to survive until 1923, when its editors were exiled abroad.⁴

Of the historical periodicals started by the émigrés outside of Russia, by far the most important is the *Arkhib russkoy revolyutsii* [The archives of the Russian revolution], published since 1921 (nineteen issues so far). The editors of the *Golos minuvshogo* decided to continue their publication in exile under the suggestive name of *Na chuzhoy storonye* [In a foreign land]. Of this thirteen issues appeared in 1923–25. Since 1926 the magazine appears as *Golos minuvshogo na chuzhoy storonye*, a cumbersome combination of two former names which, I am afraid, has to be translated as "Voice of the past in a foreign land." Other historical publications were: the *Russkaya Lyetopis* [The Russian annals] (1921–24, six issues) and *Istoriik i sovremennik* [The historian and the contemporary] (1922–24, five issues), both evidently discontinued. Some valuable material on the revolutionary period can be found also in general periodicals founded by the émigrés such as the *Sovremenniye zapiski* [The contemporary annals], published since 1920,⁵ and *Volya Rossii* [The will of Russia], published since 1922.⁶

With regard to the periodical press published in Soviet Russia, an invaluable help is rendered by the *Zhurnalnaya lyetopis* [The register of the journals], which, beginning in 1926, offers a complete and systematic bibliography of all the articles that appear in all the periodicals of the country. A selected bibliography of both books and articles can be found in the *Bibliografichesky ezhegodnik* [The bibliographical annual], while the catalogue of the publications of the State Publishing House is a clas-

³ Index for 1922–25 in Nos. 5–6, 1925.

⁴ Index for 1913–22 (incomplete) in No. 1, 1923.

Among the literary magazines, appearing in Soviet Russia, *Krasnaya nov* [The Red virgin soil] and *Pechat i revolyutsiya* [The press and the revolution], both published since 1921, contain some material of historical interest. *Pechat i Revolyutsiya* has also an excellent bibliography.

⁵ Index for the first twenty-six issues in No. 26.

⁶ Index for 1922–26 in No. 2, 1927.

sified bibliography in itself.⁷ A special bibliography of the revolutionary period is S. L. Danishevsky's *Opyt bibliografiï oktyabrskoy revolyutsii* [An attempt at a bibliography of the October revolution].⁸ Finally, the Lenin Institute of Moscow is publishing the *Leniniana*, an exhaustive bibliography of the Russian literature on Lenin. The four volumes that have appeared so far cover the years 1924-27.

Among the publications dealing with the last years of the old régime in Russia, one of the first places ought to be assigned to the correspondence between the Emperor and the Empress. The first edition of *Pisma Imperatritsy Aleksandry Fedorovny k Imperatoru Nikolayu II* (2 vols., Berlin, 1922) [Letters of the Empress Alexandra Fedorovna to the Emperor Nicholas II] gives both the original English text and the Russian translation of the letters, but was based apparently on somewhat imperfect copies and abounds in minor inaccuracies.⁹ The English text was reprinted as *Letters of the Tsaritsa to the Tsar, 1914-1916*, with an introduction by Sir Bernard Pares (London, 1923).¹⁰ In 1923-27 the Gosizdat published in Russia the *Perepiska Nikolaya i Aleksandry Romanovykh* [The correspondence of Nicholas and Alexandra Romanov], Volumes III, IV, and V. The superiority of this edition, although it includes the Russian translation only, is obvious. It is based on the originals of the letters and bears all the marks of careful editing. It gives the letters of both correspondents in chronological order, beginning with April, 1914, and includes the correspondence of 1917 which is lacking in the Berlin edition. The notes and the index are excellent. Each volume has an introduction by M. N. Pokrovsky, but the value of these is greatly impaired by the author's violent partisanship. It was from this collection that the translation of the Tsar's letters was made for the English edition which appeared as *The Letters of the Tsar to the Tsaritsa*, edited by C. S. Vulliamy (London and New York, 1929). The historical importance of the correspondence is obvious. From this exchange of intimate letters, better than from any other source, we can obtain a real insight into the psychology of the unfortunate sovereigns, whose personalities played such a fatal part in the course of events in Russia. The correspondence permits us also to ascertain the real character and extent of Rasputin's influence. To what we learn from the correspondence, the diary of the

⁷ *Katalog izdaniy gosudarstvennogo izdatelstva, 1919-1925* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927). Several supplements have been published since.

⁸ Moscow and Leningrad, 1926. See also ten bibliographical surveys of the literature on the history of the Russian revolutionary movement published in the *Proletarskaya revolyutsiya*, beginning with Nos. 8-9, 1924, and ending with No. 10, 1925.

⁹ See a review by A. A. Sergeyev in *Krasnyy arkhiv*, Vol. III.

¹⁰ See also his analysis of the letters in *Foreign Affairs*, October, 1927.

Tsar ("Dnevnik Nikolaya Romanova," *Krasny arkhiv*, Volumes XX, XXI, XXII, XXVII)¹¹ adds but little.

The other important publication covering the same period is *Padeniye tsarskogo rezhima* [The fall of the tsarist régime], P. E. Shchegolev, editor (7 vols., Moscow and Leningrad, 1924-27). This is the stenographic record of the depositions made to the Extraordinary Commission, which was appointed in 1917 by the Provisional government to investigate the activities of the tsarist administration. Besides such outstanding representatives of the old régime as Stürmer, Protopopov, Beletsky, Khvostov, and others, some prominent public leaders were also questioned as witnesses. Rasputin's connections with the government were particularly looked into, but topics of a more general nature, such as the government's attitude toward the Duma, the press, the public organizations, and national minorities, were also investigated. A well-made selection of the most important depositions was published in French under the title of *La chute du régime tsariste*, with an introduction by V. Maklakov (Paris, 1927). The procedure in the Commission has been subject to criticism as reprehensible from the legal point of view and unfair,¹² but this criticism can hardly detract from the historical significance of the material that the Commission was able to collect. Of particular interest are the written depositions of Protopopov and Beletsky in the fourth volume of the publication.

To the same group as the *Perepiska* and *Padeniye tsarskogo rezhima* belong also a series of Soviet publications edited by V. P. Semennikov. These are: (1) *Nikolay II i velikiye knyazya* [Nicholas II and the grand dukes] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925), letters written to the Tsar by the members of the imperial family on the eve of the revolution;¹³ (2) *Dnevnik b. Velikogo Knyazya Andrey a Vladimirovicha* [The Diary of the ex-Grand Duke Andrew Vladimirovich] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925);¹⁴ (3) *Za kulisami tsarizma* [Behind the scenes of Tsarism] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925), documents from the personal archives of Badmayev, the somewhat mysterious Tibetan doctor who was associated with Rasputin; (4) *Politika Romanovykh nakanunye revolyutsii* [The policies of the Romanovs on the eve of the revolution] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1926) and (5) *Monarkhiya pered krusheniyem* [The

¹¹ German edition, *Das Tagebuch des letzten Zaren* (Berlin, 1923). French edition, *Journal intime de Nicolas II* (Paris, 1925). Both incomplete.

¹² See articles by A. F. Romanov and V. M. Rudnev in *Russkaya lyetopis*, Vol. II, and by S. V. Zavadsky in *Arkhir russkoy revolyutsii*, Vol. XI. Also Maklakov's introduction to *La chute du régime tsariste*.

¹³ French translation, *Lettres des grands-ducs à Nicolas II* (Paris, 1926). German translation, in *Russland auf dem Wege zur Katastrophe*, edited by Gunther Frantz (Berlin, 1926). Extracts in F. A. Golder, *Documents of Russian history, 1914-1917* (New York, 1927).

¹⁴ German translation, in *Russland auf dem Wege zur Katastrophe*.

monarchy before its fall], secret documents from the archives of the Emperor, dealing chiefly with the political situation in 1915-16.¹⁵

Of a widely different nature are several books of memoirs published outside Russia by persons who stood close to the imperial family. Among these one could mention: *Memoirs of Russia, 1916-1919* by Princess Paley, the widow of the Grand Duke Paul of Russia (London, 1924); *The life and tragedy of Alexandra Fedorovna, Empress of Russia* by Baroness Sophie Buxhoevden (London and New York, 1928); *The real Tsaritsa* by Madame Lili Dehn (London, 1922); and *Thirteen years at the Russian court* by Pierre Gilliard, the French tutor of the Tsar's children (London, 1922). Written in the commendable spirit of loyalty to the memory of the martyred sovereigns and giving many interesting personal details, these books either are lacking in political information or else contain statements which are refuted by evidence obtainable elsewhere. Even less reliable from the historical point of view is Anna Vyrubova's *Memoirs of the Russian Court* (New York, 1923).¹⁶ A substantially different story is told in the *Journal secret d'Anna Virubova, 1909-17* (Paris, 1928), but there are some doubts as to its authenticity (Madame Vyrubova has vigorously denounced it as a forgery). General A. A. Noskov's *Nicolas II inconnu* (Paris, 1920), based on personal observations of the Tsar at the headquarters, contains some information of a more general interest, while V. I. Gurko's *Tsar i Tsaritsa* (Paris, 1927)¹⁷ is an unusually successful attempt at a psychological interpretation.

Of the members of the imperial government during the last years of its existence only a few choose to publish their reminiscences, and even these are rather disappointing. S. D. Sazonov in his *Vospominaniya* [Reminiscences] (Paris, 1927), published in English as *Fateful years* (New York, 1928), deals chiefly with foreign affairs and devotes to the political crisis of 1915-16 three last chapters only. Of these a very considerable part is assigned to the Polish problem, a topic in which Mr. Sazonov was particularly interested. General V. A. Sukhomlinov's *Vospominaniya* [Reminiscences] (Berlin, 1924)¹⁸ is above all a personal *apologia*, accompanied by a vitriolic attack on the Grand Duke Nicholas. Of General A. Polivanov's memoirs only a part was published after his death, bringing the story to the fall of 1915.¹⁹ The books of Sazonov and

¹⁵ Some of the documents are translated in *Archives secrètes de l'Empereur Nicolas II* (Paris, 1928). Extracts are given in Golder's *Documents*. I have not seen *The Red archives: Russian state papers, 1910-1918*, edited by C. S. Vuliamy (London, 1929).

¹⁶ Originally published in Russian in *Russkaya lyetopis*, Vol. IV.

¹⁷ English translation, *The Tsar and Tsaritsa* (London, 1929).

¹⁸ German edition, *Erinnerungen* (Berlin, 1924).

¹⁹ *Memuary*, Vol. I, edited by A. M. Zayonchkovsky (Moscow, 1924). German translation in *Russland auf dem Wege zur Katastrophe*.

Polivanov, who both belonged to the "liberal" wing of the Goremykin cabinet, must be supplemented by the remarkable documents published by A. N. Yakhontov in the *Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Volume XVIII.²⁰ These are the minutes of the secret meetings of the council of ministers, held in July–September, 1915, at which all the burning questions of the hour were frankly discussed. Based on the personal notes of Mr. Yakhontov, who acted as the recording secretary of the meetings, the minutes reveal the complete picture of the division within the cabinet, the stubbornness of the reactionaries, and the appalling helplessness of the "liberals" who tried to save the situation by persuading the supreme power to adopt a more reasonable policy. Of the men who held secondary posts in the government General P. G. Komarov-Kurlov, assistant secretary of the interior under Protopopov, published his memoirs first in German, then in Russian.²¹ It is an ineffective attempt to whitewash the imperial government and to put the blame on the opposition. The only value of the memoirs is that they contain some interesting information on the extraordinary personality of Protopopov.

In Baron R. R. Rosen's *Forty years of diplomacy* (2 vols., London and New York, 1922) and A. Neklyudov's *Diplomatic Reminiscences before and during the World War, 1911–1917* (London, 1920) we have reminiscences of two liberally minded and well-informed Russian diplomats who viewed what was going on in Petersburg with grave apprehension. Neklyudov has an interesting story to tell about Protopopov's famous Stockholm interview with Warburg.

Most of the memoirs of the Russian military leaders of the period deal chiefly with the revolutionary days and will be reviewed later. General V. I. Gurko has a few chapters on the political situation in 1916 in his *Memoirs and impressions of war and revolution in Russia, 1914–1917* (London, 1918), and General A. A. Brusilov deals with it to some extent in his *Moi vospominaniya* [My reminiscences] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1929), published in French as *Mémoires du Général Broussilov: guerre 1914–1918* (Paris, 1929). A curious book is M. Lemke's *250 dney v tsarskoy stavke* [250 days at the Tsar's headquarters] (Petrograd, 1920). An "intelligent" of radical leanings and associations happened to be attached to the headquarters as a subaltern and made it his rule to write down secretly all that he heard and saw around him. The result was a bulky volume of 850 pages, containing some interesting information both on the military and the political situation of the period (September, 1915—July, 1916).

Passing to the representatives of the political opposition, one has to mention first of all the memoirs of M. V. Rodzyanko, the sincere and up-

²⁰ Extracts in Golder's *Documents*.

²¹ *Das Ende des russischen Kaisertums* (Berlin, 1920), and *Gibel imperatorskoy Rossii* (Berlin, 1923).

right president of the Duma, who in those years was passing through the painful process of changing from a convinced monarchist into a revolutionary in spite of himself. His "Krusheniye imperii" [The collapse of an empire], published in the *Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Volume XVII, was translated into English as *The reign of Rasputin* (London, 1927). The English title is a fitting one, as Rasputin became an obsession with Rodzyanko. In his interpretation the whole political crisis of the period resolves into something like a duel between the president of the Duma and "our friend" of the Empress' letters. The obvious one-sidedness of this interpretation does not prevent the memoirs of Rodzyanko from remaining a document of first-class historical importance.²² Of men who stood rather close to Rodzyanko in their political views and sympathies, the gifted nationalist member of the Duma, V. V. Shulgin, published his impressionistic "diary," covering the last years of the old régime and the beginning of the revolution, under the title of *Dni* [Days] (Belgrade, 1925).²³ Two other memoirs by members of the Duma are Prince S. Mansyrev's "Moi vospominaniya o gosudarstvennoy dumye" [My reminiscences of the state duma] in the *Istoriya i sovremennik*, Volumes II and III, and S. I. Shidlovsky's *Vospominaniya* [Reminiscences] (2 vols., Berlin, 1923). Both deal, among other things, with the activities of the Progressive bloc in the Duma. Valuable information on the bloc, as well as on the activities of other public bodies, may be found in *Burzhuziia nakanune fevral'skoy revolyutsii* [The bourgeoisie on the eve of the February revolution], edited by B. B. Grave (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927) and in A. Shlyapnikov's *Kanun semnadtsatogo goda* [The eve of 1917] (Moscow, 1920). The last-named book contains also some interesting data on the labor movement and the underground activities of the revolutionary parties during the war, an important topic which still is very much in need of a thorough investigation.

Among the foreign diplomats stationed during the prerevolutionary years at Petersburg, Maurice Paléologue and Sir George Buchanan stand out as the ablest, the most influential, and the best informed. Paléologue's well-known book, *La Russie des Tsars pendant la grande guerre* (3 vols., Paris, 1921-22),²⁴ is one of the most important contributions to the literature of the period. The literary excellence of this "diary" suggests a careful *post factum* revision, but this does not detract from its historical value. The French ambassador's intimate acquaintance with the higher strata of the Russian society, both on the governmental side and among the leaders of the constitutional opposition, put him in a stra-

²² Rodzyanko's memoirs must be compared with his deposition in *Padeniye tsarskogo rezhima*, Vol. VII.

²³ German translation, *Tage . . . Memoiren aus der russischen Revolution, 1905-1917* (Berlin, 1928).

²⁴ English translation, *An ambassador's memoirs* (3 vols., London, 1923-25).

tegical position from which he could watch the dénouement of the Russian drama with inside knowledge and understanding. Not so brilliant but equally authoritative is Sir George Buchanan's treatment of the same period in his *My mission to Russia and other diplomatic memories* (2 vols., London and Boston, 1923). Of particular value are his records of conversations with the Emperor on the internal situation of Russia.²⁵ In comparison with Paléologue and Buchanan, the reminiscences of the two American ambassadors are very disappointing. Perhaps to a very great extent this is due to the fact that throughout the prerevolutionary period they represented a neutral country and therefore were deprived of the possibility to establish a more intimate contact with the members of the Russian government and public leaders. Neither G. T. Marye's *Nearing the end in Imperial Russia* (Philadelphia, 1929) nor David R. Francis' *Russia from the American embassy* (New York, 1921) adds anything substantial to our knowledge of the period. In the latter book there are also many inaccuracies of which the apocryphal text of Milyukov's famous speech against Stürmer is, perhaps, the most outstanding example.²⁶ To complete the review of the writings of foreign diplomats one should mention C. Diamandi's "Ma mission en Russie," but the first and so far the only instalment of these memoirs, which appeared in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (February 15, 1929), is devoted entirely to diplomacy and, as a matter of fact, deals more with Rumania than with Russia.

In the very end of 1916 Russia was thrilled by the assassination of Rasputin, and this event may be considered, in a way, as the closing episode of the prerevolutionary period and the prelude to the revolution. Two of the active participants left highly dramatic accounts of the assassination which read like detective stories. These are V. M. Purishkevich's *Ubiystvo Rasputina* [The murder of Rasputin] (Paris, 1923; also Moscow, 1923) and Prince F. F. Yusupov's *Konets Rasputina* [The end of Rasputin] (Paris, 1927).²⁷ An indispensable commentary on both these accounts is V. Maklakov's article, "Nekotoriye dopolneniya k vos-

²⁵ Very interesting is the anonymous *Russian diary of an Englishman: Petrograd, 1915-17* (London, 1919), written obviously by a well-informed member of the British embassy staff. *The Emperor Nicholas II as I knew him* by Major-General Sir John Hanbury-Williams, chief of the British Mission in Russia, 1914-17 (London, 1922), contains some interesting military and personal details but very little political information. *With the Russian army, 1914-17*, by Major-General Sir Alfred Knox, British military attaché in Petrograd (2 vols., London, 1921), up to the revolution is chiefly military, but has in it some bits of political information, in particular on the attitude of the high command of the Russian army. See also *Mémoires de Russie* by Jules Legras, member of the French military mission in Russia (Paris, 1921).

²⁶ For the authentic text of the speech see Golder's *Documents*.

²⁷ French translation of Purishkevich's book, *Comment j'ai tué Raspoutine* (Paris, 1924). English translation of Yusupov's book, *Rasputin, his malignant influence and his assassination* (London, 1927).

pominaniyam Purishkevicha i Knyazyaya Yusupova ob ubiystvye Rasputina" [Some additions to the reminiscences of Purishkevich and Prince Yusupov of the murder of Rasputin], in *Sovremenniiye Zapiski*, Volume XXXIV.²⁸

I shall begin my survey of literature on the revolutionary period with a few books of reference. Extremely useful is the publication of the "Istpart" entitled *Revolyutsiya 1917 goda: khronika sobytiy* [The revolution of 1917: chronicle of events] (5 vols., Moscow and Leningrad, 1923-26).²⁹ This is a brief summary of the main events of the revolutionary period, arranged in a strictly chronological order and without any attempt at interpretation. In preparation of the chronicle both the periodical press of the time and the unpublished documentary material were used rather extensively. In so far as the choice and arrangement of the material show any point of view, it is, of course, that of the Communist party. The unfinished *Khronika fevral'skoy revolyutsii* [The chronicle of the February revolution] by D. O. Zaslavsky and V. A. Kantorovich (Petrograd, 1924) is a work of a different nature. It is a continuous narrative, and the authors do not hide their point of view, which is that of the menshevik Social Democrats. The first volume (the only one published) covers the period from February to May.

The series entitled *1917 god v dokumentakh i materialakh* [The year 1917 in documents and source material], appearing under the general editorship of M. N. Pokrovsky and Ya. A. Yakovlev, contain already a number of volumes, covering some of the most important phases of the situation. These are: (1) *Razlozheniye armii v 1917 godu* [The decomposition of the army in 1917] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925);³⁰ (2) *Petrogradsky soviet rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov: protokoly zasedaniy ispolnitelnogo komiteta* [The Petrograd soviet of workmen's and soldiers' delegates: minutes of the meetings of the executive committee] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925); (3) *Rabocheye dvizheniye v 1917 godu* [The labor movement in 1917] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925); (4) *Krestyanskoye dvizheniye v 1917 godu* [The peasant movement in 1917]

²⁸ General literature on Rasputin is of little historical value. *Svyatoy chort* [The holy devil] by the former monk Ilidor (Sergey Trufanov) (Moscow, 1917), remains a wild and unreliable story even after the drastic editing which was applied to the manuscript by S. P. Melgunov (see the editor's preface to the book). *Rasputin, der allmächtige Bauer* by Aron Simanovich, Rasputin's Jewish secretary (Berlin, 1928) is a none-too-convincing apology. Rene Fülöp-Miller's *Rasputin, the holy devil* (New York, 1928) is a highly interesting interpretation but quite obviously not a work of historical research.

²⁹ Vols. I and II (January-May) by N. Avdeyev, Vols. III and IV (June-September) by Vera Vladimirova, and Vol. V (October) by K. Ryabinsky.

³⁰ Cf. *Soldatskiya pisma 1917 goda* [Soldiers' letters of 1917], edited by O. N. Chaadayeva (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927).

(Moscow and Leningrad, 1927);³¹ and (5) *Vserossiyskoye sovyeshchaniye sovyetov rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov: stenografichesky otchet* [The all-Russian conference of the soviets of workmen's and soldiers' delegates: a stenographic report] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927).³² A. Shlyapnikov's *Semnadtsaty god* [The year 1917] (3 vols., Moscow and Leningrad, 1923-27) is also somewhat in the nature of a chronicle, although the author, who is one of the prominent members of the Communist party, does not abstain from expressing his personal attitude. The arrangement is very unsystematic, to say the least, and perhaps the chief value of the three volumes covering the period up to the beginning of April lies in the documents quoted in the text and in the appendixes.

Of all this material very little is available in translation. The more valuable, therefore, becomes Golder's collection of documents in the preparation of which some of the above-mentioned publications were used, as well as the Russian newspapers of the period. Golder's *Documents* may be supplemented by A. J. Sack's *The birth of the Russian democracy* (New York, 1918), where one can find statements and declarations of the Provisional government and the anti-bolshevik side of the soviets.

The confused story of the very first days of the February revolution is told in various documents and reminiscences. Highly interesting documents have been published in *Krasny arkhiv* on the situation at the Tsar's headquarters and the attitude of the high command toward the revolution.³³ Of those who were close to the emperor D. N. Dubensky and A. Mordvinov told their side of the story in *Russkaya lyetopis'*³⁴ and Yu. N. Danilov in *Arkhir russkoy revolyutsii*, Volume XIX.³⁵ Several accounts of the Tsar's abdication were conveniently published in one vol-

³¹ Cf. *1917 god v derevnye: vospominaniya krestyan* [The year 1917 in the villages: reminiscences of the peasants], edited by Ya. A. Yakovlev (Moscow and Leningrad, 1929). This is a collection somewhat similar to *Soldatskiya pisma* [Soldiers' letters]. In both cases the selection of the material was undoubtedly influenced by considerations of a political nature.

³² See also *Organizatsiya i stroitelstvo sovyetov rabochikh deputatov v 1917 godu: sbornik dokumentov* [Organization and structure of the soviets of workmen's delegates in 1917: collection of documents], edited by P. O. Gorin (Moscow, 1928).

³³ "Verkhovnoye komandovaniye v perviye dni revolyutsii" [The supreme command in the first days of the revolution], in Vol. V, and "Fevralskaya revolyutsiya 1917 goda" [The February revolution of 1917], in Vols. XXI and XXII.

³⁴ "Kak proizoshel perevorot v Rossii" [How the revolution happened in Russia], in Vol. III, and "Otryvki iz vospominaniy" [Fragments of memoirs], in Vols. V and VI.

³⁵ "Moi vospominaniya ob Imperatorye Nikolaye II i Vel. Kn. Mikhailye Aleksandrovichye" [My reminiscences of Emperor Nicholas II and Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich].

ume by P. E. Shchegolev under the title *Otrecheniye Nikolaya II: vos-pominaniya ochevidtsev i dokumenty* [The abdication of Nicholas II: reminiscences of the eye-witnesses and documents] (Leningrad, 1927).

On the Duma side, the first days of the revolution are dealt with in M. V. Rodzyanko's "Gosudarstvennaya дума i fevral'skaya 1917 goda revolyutsiya" [The state дума and the February revolution of 1917] in *Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Volume VI. This, however, is not so much a narrative of events as an apologetic discussion of the part played by the Duma in the revolution. In striking contrast with Rodzyanko's article, the corresponding chapter in Shulgin's *Dni* consists of a series of snapshots which, in their entirety, form an unforgettable picture of the extreme chaos and confusion that prevailed in those days in the Taurida Palace.³⁶ Similarly impressionistic is S. Mstislavsky's *Pyat dney: nachalo i konets fevral'skoy revolyutsii* [Five days: the beginning and the end of the February revolution] (2d ed., Berlin, Petrograd, and Moscow, 1922). There the same picture is viewed from a different angle, by a man of radical leanings and affiliations. A. A. Bublikov's *Russkaya revolyutsiya: vpechatleniya i mysli ochevidtsov i uchastnika* [The Russian revolution: impressions and reflections of an eye-witness and participant] (New York, 1918) and Yu. V. Lomonosov's *Memoirs of the Russian Revolution* (New York, 1919) deal with the efforts of the new government to prevent the possibility of a counter-revolution. Both authors have some very interesting things to tell, but because of their obvious personal bias many of their assertions must be taken with a grain of salt.³⁷

We may pass now to the memoirs covering the whole period of the existence of the Provisional government, beginning with the accounts given by the members of the government or those closely associated with it. P. N. Milyukov probably would object to his book being included in this group. *Istoriya vtoroy russkoy revolyutsii* [History of the second Russian revolution],³⁸ as the title itself indicates and as the author tells us in the preface, was planned as history, not as memoirs. And yet it is history in that limited sense only in which, for instance, Clarendon's *Great Rebellion* is history. Written by an active and influential participant in the revolution, almost immediately after the events it describes (the whole text was completed by August, 1918, and only slightly revised afterward), the book is above all a severe indictment of Milyukov's opponents in the Provisional government and particularly of Ker-

³⁶ Extracts in Golder's *Documents*.

³⁷ A selection of memoirs dealing with the February revolution is offered by S. A. Alexeyev in the first volume of his *Revolutsiya i grazhdanskaya vojna v opisaniyakh Byelogvardeytsev* [Revolution and civil war in the descriptions of the White Guards] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1926).

³⁸ Vol. I, in three separately published parts (Sofia, 1921-24), covers both the February and the October revolution. No continuation was published.

ensky. It was the representatives of the "revolutionary democracy," the Socialist wing of the February revolution, who by their blunders and many shortcomings paved the way for the ultimate triumph of bolshevism. As had to be expected, the book called forth many objections and reproofs.³⁹ Alexander Kerensky's "own story of the Russian revolution," originally published in English as *The catastrophe* (New York, 1927), is to a very great extent an answer to Milyukov's indictment. Kerensky's thesis is that it was precisely the two extremes, the right and the left, that frustrated the efforts of the democratic center to save the situation. By their betrayal of the revolution and their abandonment of the Provisional government, particularly in the Kornilov affair, the moderates actually delivered the country into the hands of the bolsheviks. Needless to say that, in spite of these mutual recriminations and the strong personal element that is present in both books, Milyukov's and Kerensky's accounts remain documents of great historical importance. Of the less influential members of the government N. D. Nabokov published his reminiscences, "Vremennoye Pravitelstvo" [The Provisional government], in *Arkhiiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Volume I. It contains very interesting, although rather biased, characterization of the various members of the government and gives a good idea of the difficulties which the latter had to face. Nabokov's attitude toward the "revolutionary democracy" and Kerensky, in particular, comes very close to that of Milyukov. P. N. Malyantovich, who at one time was minister of justice in the Provisional government, in his *Revolyutsiya i pravosudiye* [Revolution and justice]⁴⁰ deals chiefly with the courts during the revolution, while General P. A. Polovtsov, former commander of the Petrograd military district, in his *Dni zatmeniya* [The days of the eclipse] (Paris, n.d.) describes the difficulties he had in dealing with the soldiers and in trying to suppress the July uprising. His attitude toward the government is openly critical.

On the side of the "revolutionary democracy" we have two equally interesting although widely different books: *Vospominaniya 1914-19* [Reminiscences, 1914-19] (Berlin, 1920) by B. V. Stankevich, and *Zapiski o revolyutsii* [Memoirs of the revolution] (7 vols., Berlin, Petrograd and Moscow, 1922-23) by N. Sukhanov (Gimmer). Stankevich was a moderate socialist and during the revolution was first a member of the executive committee of the Soviet and then a commissary in the army. An obviously sincere and well-meaning man, he records the process of the gradual decomposition of the democratic régime in a spirit of fatal-

³⁹ See in particular M. Vishniak's review, in *Sovremenniy zapiski*, Vol. XXXI, and S. P. Melgunov's, in *Na chuzhoy storonye*, Vol. VII. See also M. N. Pokrovsky's *Protivoryechiya G-na Milyukova* [The contradictions of Mr. Milyukov] (Moscow, 1922), a criticism of the book from the Marxian point of view.

⁴⁰ No indications as to the place and date of publication.

istic resignation. Sukhanov belonged to that left wing of the "revolutionary democracy" which on its periphery merged almost imperceptibly into bolshevism. Member of the central committee of the Soviets from the very beginning of the revolution, he took an active part in all the outstanding events of the period. Loquacious and somewhat conceited, he indulges too much in interpretation and is not always accurate in relating facts, but just the same his book, as that of Stankevich, is valuable for the history of mutual relations between the two rival authorities—that of the Provisional government and that of the Soviets.

Perhaps one may include into this group of memoirs a book which is actually a posthumous collection of articles written and addresses delivered during the period. I am referring to G. V. Plekhanov's *God na rodinye: polnoye sobraniye statey i ryechey, 1917–18* [One year in the native land: complete collection of articles and addresses, 1917–18] (2 vols., Paris, 1921). The famous socialist leader returned to Russia shortly after the revolution after many years of exile only to find himself out of sympathy with the general trend of the revolutionary development. An ardent advocate of national unity and of a vigorous prosecution of the war, Plekhanov led an attack against the bolsheviks and later also against the Provisional government for its weakness and indecision. It was a pathetic attempt to conjure the elements by an appeal to reason.

The military leaders of the period, who at first expressed their readiness to co-operate with the new government, very soon became estranged from it because of a profound disagreement over the question of the discipline in the army. Their attitude toward the government, as expressed in their memoirs, is consequently highly critical, and their treatment of the events of the period is usually rather one-sided. By far the best of these books is General A. I. Denikin's *Ocherki russkoy smuty* [Sketches of the Russian turmoil] (5 vols., Paris, Berlin, 1921–26).⁴¹ Very well written, although somewhat verbose and too elaborate, it gives the point of view of a liberal-minded military man wounded in his patriotic feelings. A much less ambitious work is General A. S. Lukomsky's *Vospominaniya* [Reminiscences] (2 vols., Berlin, 1922),⁴² written in the style of official reports and without any display of personal feeling. Its most interesting parts are those dealing with the first days of the February revolution at the headquarters, and with the Kornilov affair. General P. N. Wrangel's *Zapiski* [Memoirs] were published as volumes V and VI of

⁴¹ Of the five volumes only the first and part of the second deal with the events of 1917, while the rest is devoted to the civil war. The first volume was published in English as *The Russian turmoil: memoirs military, social and political* (London, 1922).

⁴² Of the two volumes the first covers the year 1914–17 and the second the civil war. English translation published as *Memoirs of the Russian revolution* (London, 1922).

Byeloye dyelo [The White cause] (Berlin, 1928).⁴³ Of these only the first chapter deals with the events of 1917, the rest being devoted to the civil war. The author is concerned almost exclusively with the conditions at the front and adds very little to our knowledge of the general political situation. Very interesting are brief extracts from the diary of General M. V. Alexeyev, published in the first volume of *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo arkhiva v Prage* [Collections of the Russian historical archives in Prague] (Prague, 1929).⁴⁴ The effects of the revolution upon the navy are depicted in G. Graf's *Na Novikye: Baltiysky flot v voynu i revolyutsiyu* [On the Novik: the Baltic fleet during the war and the revolution] (Munich, 1922).⁴⁵ The author is a naval officer, very hostile toward the revolution. M. I. Smirnov's "Admiral Kolchak vo vremya revolyutsii" [Admiral Kolchak during the revolution] in *Istori i sovremennik*, Volume IV, although mainly personal, contains some information on the general situation in the Black Sea fleet.⁴⁶ The chief value of these memoirs of the military men lies in the fact that they enable us to get an insight into the psychology which led first to the Kornilov rising and then to the white movement against the bolsheviks.

For the era of the Provisional government we still have the testimony of the same foreign observers who left their description of the last years of the old régime: Paléologue (up to the middle of May), Buchanan, Knox, and Francis. This part of their testimony, however, is less valuable and less interesting. Deeply concerned over the question whether Russia would remain in the war, and out of touch with the broad currents of the revolutionary development, they were liable to give it a somewhat one-sided interpretation. Another prominent foreigner who visited Russia in those days was T. G. Masaryk. The Russian chapters of his *The making of a state: memoirs and observations, 1914-18* (New York, 1927) are, however, a disappointment. They deal chiefly with the fate of the Czech legionaries in Russia and contain very little information on the general situation. Besides, it is rather hard to accept the writer's sweeping condemnation of "no small part of the whole Russian people" as morally depraved, even though it comes from such an authoritative source.

The much-discussed Kornilov affair still remains to a great extent a

⁴³ English translation, *The memoirs of General Wrangel* (New York, 1930).

⁴⁴ See also memoirs of Gurko and Brusilov.

⁴⁵ English translation, *The Russian navy in war and revolution from 1914 up to 1918* (Munich, 1923). See also extracts from the diary of I. I. Rengarten, "Fevralskaya revolyutsiya v Baltiyskom flotye" [The February revolution in the Baltic fleet] and "Oktyabrskaya revolyutsiya v Baltiyskom flotye" [The October revolution in the Baltic fleet], in *Krasny Arkhiv*, Vols. XXXII and XXV, respectively.

⁴⁶ Cf. A. Platonov, *Chernomorsky flot v revolyutsii 1917 goda i Admiral Kolchak* [The Black Sea fleet during the revolution of 1917 and Admiral Kolchak] (Leningrad, 1925).

mystery, and, as Professor Golder says, "We are not even sure whether this was a plot or a misunderstanding." Kerensky insists that it was a plot and expounds his theory of a wide conspiracy against the Provisional government in a series of writings. Long before his volume of memoirs, he published *Dyelo Kornilova* [The Kornilov affair] (Moscow, 1918), which consists of the stenographic record of his depositions made to the investigating committee, with his own commentary. This was translated into English as *The prelude to bolshevism: The Kornilov rising* (New York, 1919). The English edition has an introduction giving a résumé of the events discussed in the book. In an appendix Kerensky replies to E. H. Wilcox's articles on "Kerensky and Kornilov" which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* (September, October, 1918). These articles were then incorporated by Mr. Wilcox into his *Russia's Ruin* (New York, 1919) together with a reply to Kerensky's criticism. The publication of *Dyelo Kornilova* brought Kerensky into controversy also with B. V. Savinkov, who replied to it by an article, "L'Affaire Korniloff," which appeared in *Mercure de France*, Volume CXXXII (April 1, 1919). This called forth "une réponse nécessaire" on the part of Kerensky, "L'affaire Korniloff," in *Mercure de France*, Volume CXXXIII (May 15, 1919).⁴⁷

Kornilov's side is presented by Denikin and Lukomsky, who both were his close associates. According to them, it was Kerensky who betrayed Kornilov. Milyukov, in his *Istoriya*, also puts the blame on Kerensky. An attempt to sum up the affair from the bolshevik point of view was made by Vera Vladimirova in *Kontr-revolutsiya v 1917 g.: Kornilovshchina* [Counter-revolution in 1917: the Kornilov movement] (Moscow, 1924).

Whether we agree with Milyukov or with Kerensky as to the origins of the Kornilov rising, there can be no doubt that the failure of this ill-fated movement actually played the part of a "prelude to bolshevism." From that moment the days of the Provisional government were numbered, and the influence of the bolsheviks began to grow by leaps and bounds. The party had been active long before that, and there is an abundant literature on its activities during the whole period from February to October. It would be impossible to review all or even any considerable part of the books, pamphlets, and articles that had been written on this phase of the situation. Moreover, it seems hardly necessary to attempt this task in view of the excellent bibliographies available (see bibliographical indications in the beginning of the present article). I

⁴⁷ Savinkov's article appeared also separately, in Russian, under the title *K dyelu Kornilova* (Paris, 1919). The Russian text of Kerensky's article may be found in his collection of articles, *Izdalyoka* [From afar] (Paris, 1922). See also another version of Savinkov's story published under the title "General Kornilov" in *Byloye* (No. 3, 1925).

shall confine myself, therefore, to the most important of those publications which may be considered as source material. There is a series of publications dealing with the activities of the Petrograd organization of the bolsheviks which at that time naturally was the most important one within the party. These are: (1) *Sbornik materialov i protokolov zasjedaniy Petrogradskogo komiteta RSDRP (B) za 1917 g.* [Collection of materials and minutes of the sessions of the Petrograd committee of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' party (Bolshevik) in 1917], edited by P. F. Kudelli (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927); (2) *Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya i vserossiyskaya konferentsiya RSDRP (B) v aprelye 1917 g.* [Petrograd all-town and all-Russian conference of the RSDWP (B) in April, 1917] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925); (3) *Vtoraya i tretaya Petrogradskiya obshchegorodskiya konferentsii bolshevikov v iyulye i oktyabrye 1917 g: Protokoly i materialy* [The second and the third Petrograd all-town conferences of the bolsheviks in July and October 1917: minutes and materials], edited by P. F. Kudelli (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927).

Other similar publications deal with the activities of the central party organizations. *Protokoly syezdov i Konferentsiy vsesoyuznoy kommunisticheskoy partii (B): Shestoy Syezd* [Minutes of the congresses and conferences of the All-Union Communist party (Bolshevik): The Sixth Congress], edited by A. S. Bubnov and others (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927) and *Protokoly tsentralnogo komiteta RSDRP (B): Avgust 1917 g.—Fevral 1918 g.* [Minutes of the central committee of the RSDWP (B): August, 1917—February, 1918] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1929) are particularly important because it was at those meetings that the strategy of the party in the most critical moments was decided upon.⁴⁸

Another valuable source of information on the activities of the bolshevik party during the first period of the revolution is the collected writings and addresses of the chief party leaders. In 1920–27 the Lenin Institute of Moscow published *Sobraniye sochineniy N. Lenina (V. Ulyanova)* in twenty volumes. Of these Volume XIII covers the years 1914–16 and Volume XIV (in two parts) the revolution of 1917. In the supplementary Volume XX (in two parts) there are published those writings of Lenin that have been recently discovered. In the English edition of *Collected works of V. I. Lenin* (New York and London), based on the Moscow publication, Volumes XVIII–XXI cover the same period including the material of the supplementary volume of the Russian edition. Of these Volume XX (in two parts), dealing with the revolution of 1917, was published in 1929, and the others are announced for publication in the spring of 1930. An indispensable supplement to the *Collected Works*

⁴⁸ If we are to believe Trotsky, however, the minutes were published with considerable omissions to save Stalin from embarrassment in his controversy with the opposition.

is the *Leninsky sbornik* [Lenin collections] of the Lenin Institute, of which ten volumes have so far appeared (Moscow, 1924-29). It contains some of Lenin's political correspondence, which is an excellent commentary on his official pronouncements. Volume III of L. Trotsky's *Sochineniya* [Works] (in two parts; Moscow, 1924) contains his articles and addresses, written and delivered in 1917. G. Zinov'ev's writings for the same period are to be found in Volume VII of his *Sochineniya* [Works] (in two parts; Leningrad, 1925). To the same group belong I. Stalin's *Na putyakh k oktyabryu: stati i ryechi, mart-oktyabr, 1917 g.* [On the way to October: articles and addresses, March-October, 1917] (Moscow, 1925) and N. Bukharin's *Na podstupakh k oktyabryu: stati i ryechi, may-dyekabr, 1917 g.* [On the approaches to October: articles and addresses, May-December, 1917] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1926).

The last days of the Provisional government and the bolshevik coup d'état are dealt with in a considerable number of books and articles of which only a few can be mentioned. P. N. Malyantovich, at that time minister of justice, describes the agony of the government in his *Revolutsiya i pravosudiye*.⁴⁹ The personal experiences of one of those cadets who turned out to be the last resort of the Provisional government are related in A. Sinegub's "Zashchita Zimnyego Dvortsya" [The defense of the Winter Palace] in *Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Volume IV.⁵⁰ On the bolshevik side we have numerous accounts of which *Myatezhniki* [The rebels] by P. E. Dybenko (Moscow, 1923) and *Kronstadt i Piter v 1917 g.* [Cronstadt and St. Petersburg in 1917] by F. F. Raskolnikov (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925) may be singled out as both picturesque and informative. John Reed's *Ten Days that Shook the World* (New York, 1919) is an extremely vivid, even if not always accurate, narrative of events, as seen through the eyes of an enthusiastic American radical, while Jacques Sadoul's *Notes sur la révolution bolchévique* (Paris, 1920) contain highly interesting records of the author's conversations with some of the bolshevik leaders in the very days of the upheaval.

The story of Kerensky's pathetic attempt to rally troops outside Petrograd is told in his "Gatchina," first published in *Sovremennkiye zapiski*, Volume X, and then included in his *Izdalyoka*.⁵¹ There is a substantial difference between Kerensky's version and that of General P. N. Krasnov, "Na vnutrennem frontye" [On the internal front], in *Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Volume I. F. Dan also differs from Kerensky in some

⁴⁹ See also his article, "V Zimnyem Dvortsye 25-26 Oktyabrya 1917 g." [In the Winter Palace, October 25-26, 1917], in *Byloye*, 1918, No. 12.

⁵⁰ Selections from memoirs of the anti-bolsheviks on the October revolution can be found in Vol. II of S. A. Alexeyev, *Revolutsiya i grazhdanskaya vojna v opisaniyakh byelogardevytsev*.

⁵¹ French version, "Effondrement: souvenirs sur le coup d'état bolchévique," *Revue hebdomadaire*, I (1920), Nos. 5 and 6.

particulars in his "K istorii poslyednykh dney Vremennogo Pravitelstva" [On the history of the last days of the Provisional government] in the Berlin *Lyetopis revolyutsii*, Volume I.⁵² All these accounts must be supplemented by documents published in *Krasny Arkhiv*, Volume IX, ("Vokrug Gatchiny" [Around Gatchina]). In the same publication will be found extremely important documents on the situation at headquarters and in the army during the October days.⁵³ A highly valuable book is Serge Oldenbourg's *Le coup d'état bolchéviste: 20 octobre—3 décembre 1917* (Paris, 1929). This is a selection of documents covering the main phases of the development and taken, in great many instances, from the contemporary newspapers. The arrangement is excellent, and there are very good notes.

In the long introduction to the third volume of his collected works, which he entitled "Uroki oktyabrya" [The lessons of October], Trotsky undertook to give an analysis of the policy of the bolshevik party during the period from February to October and the "technique" of the October coup d'état. Written at the time of an acute struggle within the Communist party (1924), this quasi-historical work was to serve Trotsky as a political weapon against his opponents. He emphasizes, therefore, the differences within the party with regard to the question as to when and how to seize power; he describes the indecision and vacillations of the right wing of the party, represented by men like Kamenev and Zinovyev; and he shows how on many occasions it was necessary for Lenin to drive his not too willing associates upon the road of direct revolutionary action. Between the lines of this skilfully written exposé one can read the assertion that Trotsky alone was Lenin's true disciple, in fact, that during the decisive October days it was he who saved the situation. Such a challenge could not remain unanswered. In a collection of articles and addresses which appeared under the title *Za Leninizm* [In behalf of Leninism] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1925) Stalin, Kamenev, Bukharin, and other party leaders tried to prove their loyalty to Lenin's dogma and to expose heresy in Trotsky's views, past and present. Trotsky came down upon his opponents in his recently published autobiography *Moya zhizn* [My life] (2 vols., Berlin, 1930),⁵⁴ written already in exile. This time his attack is even more outspoken and is directed primarily against Stalin, although he pours bitter sarcasm right and left, making exception for Lenin alone. The element of self-glorification is also stronger than in his previous writings. The chief significance of this "family quarrel"

⁵² Not to be confused with the Soviet publication of the same name.

⁵³ "Oktyabrskiy perevorot i Stavka" [The October revolution and headquarters], in Vols. VIII and IX, and "Oktyabr na frontye" [October at the Front], in Vols. XXIII and XXIV. Cf. "Stavka 25-26 oktyabrya 1917 g.," *Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Vol. VII.

⁵⁴ English edition, *My life: an attempt at an autobiography* (New York, 1930).

lies in the fact that it enables us, with the help of the documentary material that has been published during the last years, to obtain a more realistic picture of the October revolution. Instead of a wonderfully organized revolutionary machine, moving majestically and irresistibly toward an assured victory, we see a much-divided party, kept together by the indomitable will of a single man, who himself was not completely sure of victory, but who was willing and able to stake everything on what he thought to be an excellent gambling chance. We now know also that to a very great extent he won by default.

Some information on the whole period and on the October days in particular can be obtained also from the general histories of the Communist party and from biographies of Lenin. Perhaps the best party history is that under the editorship of Yem. Yaroslavsky, *Istoriya Vsesoyuznoy Kommunisticheskoy partii* [History of the All-Union Communist party] of which Volume IV, published in 1929, covers the year 1917. A shorter outline is by N. N. Popov, *Ocherk istorii Vsesoyuznoy Kommunisticheskoy partii* [Historical sketch of the All-Union Communist party] (6th ed., Moscow and Leningrad, 1928). For reference purposes the following are also very useful:

(1) *Vsesoyuznaya Kommunisticheskaya partiya (B) v resolyutsiyakh eya syezdov i konferentsiy, 1898–1926* [The All-Union Communist party (bolshevik) in the resolutions of its congresses and conferences, 1898–1926] (3d ed., Moscow and Leningrad, 1927) and (2) the autobiographies and authorized biographies of the active participants in the October revolution in Parts I–III of Volume XLI of the encyclopedia published in Moscow by the Granat Bibliographical Institute (*Entsiklopedichesky Slovar Russkogo Bibliograficheskogo Instituta Granat*).

Strange as it may seem in view of the tremendous output of literature on Lenin, no really good biography of the founder of bolshevism is as yet available. *Zhizn i rabota Lenina* [Life and work of Lenin] by Yem. Yaroslavsky (5th ed., Leningrad, 1926), *Lenin* by G. Zinovyev (2d ed., Leningrad, 1925) and *O Leninye: materialy dlya biografa* [On Lenin: materials for a biographer] by L. Trotsky (Moscow, 1924)⁵⁵ all belong rather to the field of hagiography than that of biography. M. Landau-Aldanov's *Lenine* (Paris, 1919)⁵⁶ is more a political essay and is perhaps too biased. *Lenin, 30 Jahre Russland* by Valeriu Marcu (Leipzig, 1927)⁵⁷ is a well-written "new style biography" but it has very little, if any, historical value.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ English translation, *Lenin* (New York, 1925).

⁵⁶ English translation, *Lenin* (New York, 1922).

⁵⁷ English translation, *Lenin: thirty years of Russia* (New York, 1928).

⁵⁸ A political biography of Lenin by Professor George Vernadsky is in preparation.

Such is the main "source material" available on the history of the Russian revolution of 1917. I omit entirely, for lack of space, numerous and sometimes very interesting accounts published during the revolutionary period by newspapermen and casual observers. In some of these the historian might find bits of precious information. Not very much can be said on the "secondary authorities." The first attempts to sum up the revolutionary development and to give it a historical interpretation cannot vie with the memoirs, collections of documents, and similar publications either in volume or in importance. All the Russian books of this second category are obviously, and perhaps inevitably, biased. The writers approach the revolution from the point of view of their own political beliefs and wishes. A Russian democrat, whether socialist or liberal, looks upon the February revolution as the culmination of Russia's historical development and treats the bolshevik phase of the revolution as a temporary deviation ("the communist counter-revolution," Kerensky calls it). In these circles one speaks of the "ideals of the February revolution" in the same vein in which Lafayette and his like spoke of "les principes de '89." To the conservatives and the reactionaries the February revolution is no less abhorrent than bolshevism. The latter was but an inevitable punishment for the original sin of the liberal Russian intelligentsia—her revolt against the historical tradition as expressed in the monarchy. For the bolsheviks, on the other hand, the events of February are nothing else but a prelude to the real revolution which took place in October and which opened an entirely new era in Russian history.

Milyukov's *Istoriya vtoroy russkoy revolyutsii* has been already treated elsewhere—as memoirs, not as history. Since the publication of this book he expressed his general views on the revolutionary development in a series of writings. There is more of a philosophical detachment in these later writings, but the fundamental conception remains essentially the same. In the first two chapters of his *Russia today and tomorrow* (New York, 1922) he attempts to answer two questions: "why the revolution could not be averted" and "why the bolsheviks got the upper hand." A more elaborate argument can be found in *Russlands Zusammenbruch* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1925–26) and in *Rossiya na perelomye* [Russia at the turning point] (2 vols., Paris, 1927). Very close to Milyukov's point of view, as expressed in his *Istoriya*, comes Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams (Mrs. Harold Williams) in her *From liberty to Brest-Litovsk: the first year of the Russian revolution* (London, 1919). *Russky opyt* (The Russian experience) by P. Ryss (Paris, 1921) is a "historical-psychological outline" of the Russian revolution, while M. Landau-Aldanov's *Deux révolutions* (Paris, 1921) is a comparison of the French and the Russian revolutions. For the point of view of the Russian monarchists one may refer, e.g., to the anonymous article, "Vremennoye Pravitelstvo: opyt

analiza" [The Provisional government: an attempt at an analysis], in *Russkaya lyetopis*, Volume I. Of the numerous bolshevik writings only a few are available in translations. L. Trotsky's *The history of the Russian revolution to Brest-Litovsk* (London, 1919), written in 1918 in Brest-Litovsk (!), is quite obviously a political pamphlet, not history.⁵⁹ *Histoire populaire de la révolution d'Octobre* by S. Piontkovsky (Paris, 1927)⁶⁰ is a conventional bolshevik account. Even more conventional is the semiofficial *Illustrated history of the Russian revolution* (2 vols., London and New York, 1928-29). Immeasurably more valuable is the publication of the Historical Seminar of the Institute of Red Professors, *Ocherki po istorii oktyabrskoy revolyutsii* [Studies in the history of the October revolution] (2 vols., Moscow and Leningrad, 1927). The first volume contains studies on the influence of the war on the Russian economics, the labor movement in Russia during the war, and the bolshevik party in the same period. In the second volume there are studies on the February revolution, the events of July, 1917, and the foreign policy of the Kerensky government. This is perhaps the first attempt in Soviet literature to treat the history of the revolution scientifically. The point of view remains, of course, Marxian and Communist.⁶¹

Books by foreign writers that would offer either historical synthesis or interpretation are also scarce. Lancelot Lawton's *The Russian revolution, 1917-1926* (New York, 1927) and James Mayor's *The Russian revolution* (New York, 1928), of which the first is by far the best, both devote a comparatively small part of the narrative to the events of 1917, treating the later development much more extensively. E. A. Walsh, in his *The fall of the Russian empire* (Boston, 1928), deals very effectively with the tragic fate of the imperial family, but is not so successful in his treatment of the general subject. The first volume of the *Geschichte der russischen Revolution* by Axel von Freytag-Loringhoven (Munich, 1919) is a well-written account (from a conservative point of view), but the author was not able to use all the material that has been published since. Dr. Karel Kramar's *Die russische Krisis* (Munich and Leipzig,

⁵⁹ The Russian text is published in Part II of Vol. III of his *Sochineniya*.

⁶⁰ Russian edition, *Oktyabr 1917 g.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927).

⁶¹ I shall mention here, for lack of a better place, the very valuable volumes in the Russian series of the *Economic and social history of the World War*, published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, under the general editorship of James T. Shotwell. See in particular *State control of industry in Russia during the war* by S. O. Zagorsky, *Russian public finances during the war* by Alexander M. Michelson and others, and *The war and the Russian government* by Paul P. Gronskey and Nicholas J. Astrov. These are all written by highly competent specialists from among the émigrés.

1925) is not history, but interpretation, from a point of view coming very close to that of the Russian conservatives.⁶²

I cannot think of any other book important enough to be mentioned in this part of the survey. Quite obviously, an adequate history of the Russian revolution of 1917 still remains to be written.

MICHAEL KARPOVICH

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

⁶² Of the following I know only from reviews: (1) *Geschichte der jüngsten russischen Revolution* by E. Hurwicz (Berlin, 1922); (2) *Der Zusammenbruch der Zarenmonarchie* by M. Smilg-Benario (Zurich, 1928); (3) *Von Kerensky zu Lenin: die Geschichte der zweiten russischen Revolution* by the same author (Vienna, 1929).