

the substantial results of developments achieved in the last two decades before World War I, Gerschenkron believes that then were achieved the highest rates of development ever noticed in the whole world, did not allow the Soviet Union to secure satisfactory living conditions for all its inhabitants.

As it was to be expected income differentials favour those whose efforts are considered by those in charge as more important from the general point of view. As those supplying services and those producing agricultural commodities are at the bottom of the income ladder it is not astonishing that services are so poor in the Soviet Union and that the latter has developed into a great importer of foodstuffs whilst before 1914 Russia was Europe's granary.

The author does not hide that the lowest income is rubles 60 (\$79) but insists on additions whenever the job is considered useful for the whole country or whenever it is carried out in areas whose development is a target of the country's policy. He also insists on the services which are rendered there without pay whilst forgetting that the same applies in many cases in the West. The author believes, but is not able to prove it, that the income differentials are bigger in the West than in the Soviet Union. He also states that marxism does not insist on full equality of incomes because this discourages efforts to improve output both quantitatively and qualitatively. The reader of this book does not get a hint if the author has ever been in the Soviet Union and it follows that very often he is not persuasive as he ought to be if he had visited the Soviet Union with open eyes. Let me end by mentioning the author's insistence that some prices in the Soviet Union have been somewhat reduced without, however, any improvement of the chances of diversification independently of the scarcity of housing.

University of Thessaloniki

D. J. DELIVANTIS

Wassilij Alexeev and Theofanis G. Stavrou, *The Great Revival, the Russian Church under German Occupation*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Burgess Publishing Company, 1976/77. pp. xvi + 229.

This new book about the Russian Orthodox Church during the dark days of World War II is a welcome addition to the scant literature available on the subject. The work stands in sharp contrast to Soviet Studies on the role of the Church during the War and in contrast to the scabrous displays that one finds in "museums of atheism", located in former church buildings in Novgorod, Kiev, and Leningrad. From the official Soviet point of view the Church treacherously welcomed the Nazi invasion, fully conscious of the sinister implications of Nazi ideology, and joined with the invader to stab the people in the back. Alexeev and Stavrou lay that myth aside as they systematically unfold evidence that, despite scorching persecution visited upon the Church in the 1920s and 1930s, a deep residue of faith persisted and that any force that would have alleviated the suffering of believers would have been welcome. The people suffered equally under Communists and Nazis. Both despotic ideologies were forced to recognize the persistence of faith in Orthodoxy and eventually to allow it to surface so they could use it against each other. Whichever of them had showed favor to the Church would have had the support of the people. In the end, both were forced to permit the Church to revive.

The Great Revival also helps to counter a long established anti-Orthodox prejudice among scholars in the West. The image of the Church depicted in Richard Pipes' *Russia Under The Old Regime* as a decadent and dying institution since the 19th century loses its credibility in the face of this work. It is a step in the direction of a badly needed reassessment of the Church

over the whole of the period since the Petrine Reform of the 18th century. The inaccurate or unsympathetic picture of the Orthodox Church, painted by both pre- and post-revolutionary authors in Russia and by most Western scholars of both eras is one of the heavy burdens that must be lifted before the real role of the Church can be assessed, together with the enduring impact it has had upon public life in Russia. Alexeev and Stavrou join such authors as William C. Fletcher (*The Russian Orthodox Church Underground, 1917-1970*) and Harvey Fireside (*Icon and Swastika*) in the task of shedding new light on the subject.

The Great Revival has its key value in the great number of personal interviews conducted over a period of twenty years in the United States and in Europe with refugees and other personalities involved in the fate of the Church during World War II and since. Their testimonies are skillfully supplemented and verified by captured German and Soviet sources which describe the same personalities and events from official perspective. The result is a two dimensional portrait, personal and official, of the drama of reopening churches, reinstituting liturgical horaria, and bringing the mysteries of the Church back to a spiritually starved people.

The book closes with an update on the continuity to the present time of the impact of the revival of the 1940s. Despite a crackdown on the Church launched by Nikita Khrushchev in 1959, the spiritual yearning persists today, as can be witnessed through the writings of such men as Solzhenitsyn, the protests of worshippers against closure of churches that reach the Western press, or the confidential communication to visitors from the outside by persons in government ministries or such prestigious institutions as the Soviet Academy of Sciences that they themselves are secret believers or that they are oppressed by the spiritual vacuum that currently pervades all facets of the earthly paradise created by the heirs of Lenin.

The College of St. Catherine
St. Paul, Minnesota

JAMES W. CUNNINGHAM

Dwight E. Lee, *Europe's Crucial Years: The Diplomatic Background of World War I, 1902-1914*, Hanover, New Hampshire, University Press of New England, 1974, pp. xiv + 482.

For all its long and varied history the Balkan Peninsula has fallen from popular awareness. Today the Third World and Middle East capture the headlines while the Balkans lie relatively forgotten. Yet it was the area in which forces came together to produce what was probably the most decisive event of the twentieth century, the First World War. In every part of the globe we face problems that can be traced either directly to that cataclysm or to its by-products and it began, as we know, in the Balkans. This war continues to haunt the minds and lives of its survivors and well as the concerns of historians. What led to this extraordinary event in which so much was lost with so little lasting gain? And what was there at Sarajevo that could prompt such incomprehensible bloodshed on so massive a scale? This debate began almost as soon as the war and we have seen "war guilt" challenged by "revisionism", and then "anti-revisionism" while scholarship came to the fore as the immediacy of the event passed, tempers cooled, and archives were opened.

Dwight E. Lee has spent four decades dealing with this topic and now, with the publication of *Europe's Crucial Years*, he presents his conclusions. Covering the years 1902-1914 he fills the gap left by Langer's *The Diplomacy of Imperialism* and brings us to the fatal moment when the lamps began to go out. Focusing on the diplomatic events of these years, he establishes the global roots of the event and takes us from Manchuria to Morocco, Mukden to Agadir, but always returns us to the Balkans. His initial question is why conditions in July