las's ill-considered decision to compel the Uniates in the Ukraine and Belorussia to break their ties with Rome and affiliate with the Russian Orthodox church.

These problems, however, should not obscure the fact that Professor Lincoln has produced an admirable book written on the basis of a wide reading in the printed sources and archives. It is an ambitious work which greatly benefits from his earlier specialized studies of the Russian imperial bureaucracy. Also, Professor Lincoln writes in a pleasing and jargon-free style.

Robert L. Nichols
St. Olaf College

INTERNAL MIGRATION DURING MODERNIZATION IN LATE NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIA. By *Barbara A. Anderson*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980. xxv, 222 pp. $18.00.

Barbara Anderson's book is a statistical analysis which tests some hypotheses as to why and where people migrate during periods of modernization. The author contends (chapter 1) that the key to understanding why and where people migrate lies in the place of origin of the migrants. It is there that prospective migrants are affected by their environment and gain a perception of their possible future home. Both push and pull factors are considered from the potential migrant's point of view. Anderson argues that poverty and overcrowding do not, by themselves, induce people to leave their village and move to a city. Migration requires a "modern" state of mind, a willingness to challenge a traditional life-style and to take risks in a wider world: only then people will migrate, depending on their cultural pre-conditioning and level of advancement, to a more "modern" destination.

In the Russian Empire, her study area (chapter 2), Anderson identifies an incremental hierarchy of destinations for lifetime migrations. Least "modern" of the destinations was the rural frontier in Asiatic Russia; the Urals and the Donbas mining districts were somewhat more "advanced"; still more "advanced" were the other cities of European Russia; but the two most "modern" destinations were St. Petersburg and Moscow. Provinces of European Russia, except Finland, Poland, and the Northern Caucasus, were chosen as basic units for the analysis, and the data source was the detailed imperial census of 1897. As the birthplace of migrants, each province was evaluated for socioeconomic variables such as soil fertility (a surrogate for strong agrarian tradition), natural demographic increase (a measure of population pressure), literacy ("modernity"), proportion of native workers and servants (a surrogate for wage labor and hence "modernity"), and distance to specific destinations.

Unfortunately, ethnic composition of the population was not included among the socioeconomic variables, making it impossible for the study to compare migration patterns between, say, Russians and Ukrainians.

Analysis of out-migration to all destinations (chapter 3) revealed a strong positive relationship with high rates of literacy and a somewhat weaker positive relationship with the high proportion of population working in secondary industry. This provided credible support for Anderson's contention about "modernity." By contrast, out-migration showed a strong negative relationship with natural demographic increase, contradicting the arguments of many previous researchers that population pressure induces out-migration. Soil fertility showed a weak negative correlation with worker migrants, but strong positive correlation with non-worker (farmer) migrants, thus suggesting significant cultural differences among migrants who chose different destinations.

Migration to the two most modern centers, Moscow and St. Petersburg (chapter 4), was most closely related to a high rate of literacy. Indeed, more literate individuals selected Moscow and St. Petersburg as alternate destinations and found distance a lesser impediment to migration. Rural migrants, on the other hand, saw better chances for employment in closer industrial centers, including Moscow.

Migration rates to the agricultural frontier in Asiatic Russia (chapter 5) corresponded with proximity to the frontier and lower literacy. A positive relationship with soil fertility and a negative one with industrial workers were also significant. By using migration statistics (1885–1909) and by comparing two periods (1890–1894, 1905–1909), Anderson reveals a westward shift in the provinces where the migrants to Asiatic Russia originated. Since the shift was toward more agrarian provinces experiencing greater population pressure (i.e., the Ukraine), Anderson suggests that, over time, literacy loses and population pressure gains importance in the decision to migrate. Unfortunately, the data presented reveal nothing about the decision-making process or even the diffusion of decisions from innovators to the masses. They only describe the ecological characteristics of the provinces from which the migrants came.

Patterns on migration rate maps can, to a knowledgeable eye, hint at socioeconomic relations for further testing. For example, higher emigration to Siberia in 1890–1894 (map 5.1) came from provinces where Russian state peasants, who were individual farmers (former *odnodvorcy*), were more numerous; by 1905–1909 (map. 5.2) heavy emigration shifted to Belorussian and Ukrainian territories where individual land tenure (*podvornoje zemlevladenije*) prevailed and the Stolypin reform proceeded rapidly. Moreover, Belorussian and Russian peasants preferred to migrate to the forest zone of Siberia, whereas Ukrainian peasants, who in 1897 comprised one-fifth of all net migrants in Asiatic Russia, usually chose the warmer maritime zones or the steppes. Anderson, however, treated Asiatic Russia as an undifferentiated entity and thus could not comment on such cultural preferences.

Migration to destinations of intermediate modernity (chapter 6) was characterized by two distinct groups: those pursuing the grain farming frontier in southeastern Ukraine and the southern Urals, and those seeking employment in the mines and smelters of the Donbas and the Urals. A careful cross-cultural analysis, if attempted here, might have revealed a tendency for Ukrainian farmers to do the former and Russian peasants to pursue the latter.

Anderson's analysis of Jewish and Slavic migration to Odessa and Kiev (chapter 7) is risky, given that the migrants were not identified by language or religion. Although there was a significant positive correlation between the rates of migration to Odessa and the percentage of Jewish population in the source provinces, the real composition of the migrant groups was never recorded. References to restrictions on Jewish settlement in Kiev are useful, but data on the changing Jewish population of Odessa and Kiev would have given more credence to the argument. Moreover, since cities were predominantly Russian in 1897, an attempt to divide the Slavs into Belorussian, Ukrainian, and Russian components would have helped detect differences in urban migration and hence social mobility among the Slavs.

The author's conclusions about the migrants and their destinations (chapter 8) are made only in terms of the relationship between modernity and its major indicators — literacy and occupational structure. Cultural aspects of the population that have a bearing on the choice of destinations are not treated adequately.

Barbara Anderson has raised a number of important questions about modernity and migrations, and has found support for her hypotheses in the 1897 census. However, a cross-cultural analysis of migration patterns for the Russian Empire remains to be devised, described, and tested.

Ihor Stebelsky
University of Windsor

GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE SOVIET NATIONALITIES: NON-RUSSIAN PEOPLES OF THE USSR. Edited by *Stephan M. Horak*. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1982. 265 pp. $30.00.

The publication of this important reference work is a major event in the coming of age of the study of the 125 million non-Russian inhabitants of the Soviet Union. While it was beyond the capabilities of those who collaborated on this volume to provide an exhaustive bibliography, their work should take a place on the bookshelves of every serious student of the Soviet Union.

With the publication of Professor Horak's bibliography, those who recognize the importance of the national diversity of the Soviet Union — soon