

The last third of the book is devoted to agriculture, industry, and commerce, and is a mine of information, conveyed largely by tables and columns of data. More for reference and study than for reading, the later chapters give new data on Kherson and Ekaterinoslav cloth manufacturing and the trade on the Black Sea during the Continental Blockade, largely ignored in Zlotnikov's monograph. There is less on credit facilities than one would have expected from this thorough scholar.

Scholars have long noted the similarities between this formerly sparsely populated region which grew so rapidly in wealth and population and the booming West in the United States. Haxthausen noted the growth "as if by magic" of populous cities. But scholars have not agreed on the causes of the growth. Haxthausen attributed much of it to German industriousness, love of order, and civilization. Russian historians variously gave credit to good administration, communal landholding, and the enterprise of serfowner entrepreneurs. Druzhinina shows convincingly that the government's need for rapid settlement of the territory, the better to defend it against Turkish revanchards, caused an abandonment of its traditional policy of nobility monopoly of land ownership. Catherine II had already set the pattern in 1764 with an *ukaz* that offered crown land to all free classes. Since many did not belong to the nobility, they could not own serfs and had to enter contracts with fugitive serfs, foreign colonists, *desiatinshchiki*, and so forth. Fugitive serfs and Cossacks seeking to avoid enserfment formed a huge reserve of labor, and the government thwarted serfowners from the central provinces in their efforts to reclaim their serfs who had fled. Even serfs who came with their masters often won and kept substantial improvements: they were bound to the land, but could not be sold, given away, transferred to domestic service, punished without trial, or deprived of property. In 1801 of Novorossia's half million people only 5.7 percent were serfs.

There is no bibliography, an inconvenience if one is trying to recall a title among a chapter's 327 footnotes; the crosshatching on maps blurs place names; Ochakov, Molochnye Vody, and Budzhak are not on the maps; there are no maps of rainfall, soils, temperature ranges; no use has been made of Vasilenko-Polonskaia's history of colonization or Rochechouart's and some other émigré memoirs. But these are small matters. This is an impressive work of scholarship, based on enormous research, presenting important new questions and elucidating a complex, dynamic quarter-century of history with scrupulous care.

ALLEN McCONNELL  
*Queens College*

RUSSKOE NASELENIE ALIASKI I KALIFORNII: KONETS XVIII VEKA—1867 G. By S. G. Fedorova. Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut etnografii im. N. N. Miklukho-Maklaia. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 276 pp. 1.20 rubles, paper.

At last the initial Soviet work on Russian America by Okun, Andreev, and Efimov is being continued by a new generation of historians, especially S. G. Fedorova, R. V. Makarova, and L. A. Shur. In 1971 four books about Russian America were published in the USSR; of them Svetlana Fedorova's paperback is the most comprehensive. On the basis of ethnohistorical sources she tries to analyze "the formation of the Russian ethnic community," from the time of the first settlement in the 1770s,

in the Aleutians, mainland Alaska, and California. More specifically, she attempts “to trace the routes and determine the tempo of Russian settlement,” “to localize and date the permanent Russian settlements,” and to ascertain the home provinces and social composition of Russian-American Company employees up to 1829 (pp. 9–10).

She succeeds in doing all this reasonably well. She finds that Russian occupation followed the “Eastern Siberian” (fur trade) rather than the “Western Siberian” (agricultural) model because of Alaska’s limited arable land and severe climate, so that few Russians migrated to Russian America, whose small population (peaking at 823 Russians in 1839) and scattered settlements (thirty-four in 1866) offered weak resistance to British and American rivalry on the Northwest Coast, although the Russians were strong enough to reduce the Aleuts from 12,200 around 1750 to 4,500 in 1862; prior to the 1790s most Russian arrivals were state peasants from the northern provinces of European Russia, but during the first quarter of the 1800s most were Siberian *meshchane*; up to sixty Russian settlements were formed between the 1770s and 1867, some of which commanded vast hinterlands and affected many natives; most Russians were engaged in administration, shipping, and defense, not the fur trade, which was nevertheless the prime object of the Russian-American Company; the Russian population was heavily concentrated at Novo-Arkhangelsk (Sitka) and on Kodiak Island, and despite its small size it created a “firm seedbed” (p. 247) of Russian culture that appreciably influenced the aboriginal population and steadfastly maintained its identity long after the 1867 sale; Russian America’s overriding problems were logistical remoteness and environmental harshness, leading to insufficient personnel (especially settlers) and inadequate supplies (especially food-stuffs), which were critical flaws in the face of vigorous American and British expansion. Russia was, after all, already overextended on the Asiatic side of the Pacific, let alone the American side, the difference being that in the Russian Far East there was no serious foreign competition, thanks to Chinese and Japanese isolationism. However, none of this information is very new or startling.

The narrative is long on facts and short on interpretations; moreover, it seldom focuses deeply on any important problem or question. The author unaccountably has used only seven of the seventy-seven reels of microfilm of the “colonial” archives, although she acknowledges that they form a “major source” and that they are available in at least two Soviet depositories (pp. 39 and 41n.); in addition, she has cited only half of the company’s published annual reports. Greater use of these and other materials (such as those unearthed by Shur) would have been desirable. There is no final chapter of overall conclusions or bibliography, although the author does begin with a detailed, thorough, and quite critical review of primary and secondary sources. The book’s title is misleading, for Russian California is hardly treated at all.

On the more positive side Fedorova has used an interesting and unfamiliar 1821 survey of the colonies by Khlebnikov (pp. 179–84), and she has compiled a useful table in the appendix showing the population of Russian America from 1799 to 1867. Also, there are fourteen plates (in the appendix) of maps, plans, and views—some of them reproduced for the first time. The text contains nine maps, which are adequate (except map 5, which is based on Bancroft’s distorted map of Russian California), and there are two passable indexes (personal and geographical names).

JAMES R. GIBSON  
*York University*