

his essays will find the widest possible audience in Russia as well as in Ukraine, thus contributing to a fuller, more nuanced understanding of the historical relations between the two nations.

*Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies*  
*University of Victoria*

SERHY YEKELCHYK

Cinnella, Ettore. *L'altro Marx*. Della Porta Editori, Pisa and Cagliari, 2014. xiii + 181 pp. Notes. Index. €15.00 (paperback).

MARX's vision of history and revolution is much less monolithic than generally believed. So concludes Ettore Cinnella's well-researched and captivating book, which focuses on Marx's attitude to Russia and his relations with Russian revolutionaries. By thoroughly analysing Marx's notebooks and correspondence with Russian scholars, the author suggests that the German thinker, in the last decade of his life, changed his views significantly: the discovery of the Russian world and its village communes led him to question the general laws of capitalist development he had outlined in his *Das Kapital*.

In order to demonstrate the extent of 'the intellectual metamorphosis of the late Marx' (p. xii), Cinnella examines the entire course of his engagement with the Russian question. At the beginning, and for a long time afterward, Marx's outlook on Russia was affected by the hostility towards tsarist imperialism which marked the liberal and democratic culture of the nineteenth century. Marx's Russophobia is evident in the *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century*, published in 1856–57 by the London weekly, *Free Press*. However, Cinnella points out that in Western Europe at that time little was known of Russia's internal situation. Marx therefore wrote the *Revelations* without sufficient information on the country whose threatening rise he intended to illustrate historically. By detailing only the general lines of Russian history from the Norman invasion to the age of Peter the Great, he offered 'prosaic and superficial' (p. 9) arguments.

A radical change in Marx's attitude to Russia took place after he made contact, from the late 1860s onwards, with Populist revolutionaries. Of these, Nikolai F. Danielson stands out, an economist whose influence on Marx's intellectual development was remarkable, as Cinnella's extensive exploration of their relationship shows. Danielson, who was an admirer of Marx and played a key role in promoting and completing the 1872 Russian translation of the first book of *Das Kapital*, entertained an intense correspondence with his German master. Moreover, he supplied Marx, who started to learn Russian in 1869, with abundant bibliographical material and information on the socio-economic history of Russia. Without Danielson, Cinnella argues, Marx 'could not have gained a wide and firm knowledge of contemporary Russia' (p. 105).

Growing interest in the developments taking place in Russian society after the abolition of serfdom led Marx to focus increasing attention on the

surviving village commune, the *obshchina*. In his eyes, the strong vitality of the peasant commune showed that Russia did not tend to follow the Western path. Therefore, doubts began to arise in Marx's mind as to the universal validity of the economic law of motion of modern society that he had fully expressed in the first book of *Das Kapital*. But, according to Cinnella, another important aspect also has to be considered in order to explain Marx's increasing attraction to events in Russia: in the second half of the 1870s, his and Engels' expectations of a forthcoming socialist revolution in Western Europe had weakened. As a consequence, they turned their hopes towards the Russian revolutionary movement, establishing direct contacts with members of underground groups engaged in the struggle against the tsarist autocracy. In particular, Marx and Engels supported the terrorist organization, 'Narodnaia Volia'. As Cinnella shows, they were sincere admirers of 'Narodnaia Volia' and supported its strategy of terror, in the belief that it 'was the only one able to direct the enormous revolutionary energies latent in tsarist Russia towards a victorious outcome' (p. 130).

Thus Marx's attitude to Russia changed considerably within a few years. The former 'gendarme of Europe' had replaced the West as the propulsive centre of the revolutionary movement. Concerning the fate of the *obshchina*, Marx claimed that it might be the seed of a new socialist order in Russia. This is reflected in a series of relevant documents carefully analysed by Cinnella: first, Marx's letter (never sent), written in French at the end of November 1877 to the editorial board of the Russian journal, *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, in which he warned that Russia should not miss the finest chance that history had ever offered to a nation to avoid all the fatal vicissitudes of the capitalist regime; and, above all, Marx's letter of March 1881 to Vera I. Zasulich, in which he argued that the peasant commune was the fulcrum of social regeneration in Russia. According to Cinnella, such documents show that the author of *Das Kapital* had, in the last years of his life, become an open advocate of the Russian Populist view.

London

N. D'ELIA

Nielsen, Christian Axboe. *Making Yugoslavs: Identity in King Aleksandar's Yugoslavia*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, ON, Buffalo, NY and London, 2014. xii + 388 pp. Map. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$34.95 (paperback).

CHRISTIAN AXBOE NIELSEN's book is about the 'other' Yugoslav dictator, not Josip Broz 'Tito', but his significant predecessor, King Aleksandar the First, monarch of Yugoslavia from 1921–34 and the country's absolute ruler from 1929–34. Although his time as a fully-fledged dictator was brief (by the standards set by dictators at the time and since), Aleksandar's authoritarianism ran much deeper and longer than its formal dictatorial expression. The monarch was