

SCIENCE IN RUSSIAN CULTURE, 1861–1917. By *Alexander Vucinich*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970. xv, 575 pp. \$18.50.

Professor Alexander Vucinich's new book is a valuable contribution to the study of Russian history and civilization and a worthy successor to his well-received earlier volume, *Science in Russian Culture: A History to 1860*. Presenting the development of science and scholarship in Russia in the second half of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries would be an enormous task, even if interpreted in the narrow sense of listing Russian advances and accomplishments in different disciplines. But Vucinich, himself a sociologist, opted again for the broad sense. He is concerned not only with science and scholarship proper but also with relevant institutional structure and government policies, Russian education as a whole, and indeed the entire intellectual and cultural history of the period. Within the two-part chronological framework divided by the years 1883–84, chapters cover not only such topics as "the life sciences," "modern mathematics," and "modern physics and chemistry" but also "science and ideology," "science and educational reform," "scientific institutions," "universities, politics, and science," "the Academy and the learned societies," and "the philosophical challenge." The result is a rich, full, and interesting—if uneven and often sketchy—book. It is also very much the author's own, expressing sharply his point of view and reflecting his preferences.

Vucinich's study will probably prove most useful as a rich and rewarding account of numerous Russian scientists, scholars, and their work. As such it is unmatched in the English language, and it has a distinct contribution to make to the literature at large. (When, for example, will Soviet scholars be able to treat Russian sociologists with Vucinich's perception and freedom?) Usually effective and convincing in dealing with giants like Mendeleev and Pavlov, Vucinich may be even more valuable when discussing such little-known figures as Paul Lilienfeld or Jacques Novicow. The author's virtues include what appears to be a remarkable fairness to the Russians in regard to the perennial issue of scientific priorities, and in other matters as well. Though, of course, not at all a Russian nationalist, Vucinich treats his subjects with understanding and sympathy and entirely without the remoteness and suspicion characteristic of much writing on Russian science by non-Russians.

As to the larger issues of Russian government, society, and intellectual life discussed in the book, the author's personal, opinionated, and of necessity somewhat fragmentary approach deserves attention, if not always assent. Vucinich takes an almost totally negative view of the imperial government, and apparently considers that struggling against it, or at least opposing it, was a cardinal virtue—for scientists and scholars as well as for other Russians. This is an extremely appealing position when dealing with the period in question, although still not the entire story. The author is in favor of science and progress and against church and religion, or at least all but the most rational forms of religion. As a result he presents with marvelous empathy the ideologies of the sixties and the seventies, and even Lenin's *Materialism and Empiriocriticism*, but his exposition of Berdiaev's thought verges on parody. However, the questions involved here go beyond the book, let alone a review.

The book is well produced, except that Stanford University Press keeps relegating footnotes to the back of the volume. There are relatively few misprints, although the Russian minister of education bore the name of Delianov, not Demianov (pp. 187, 565), *Kraft und Stoff* was not quite the title of Büchner's book

(p. 6), and it is imperative to eliminate the impossible form *krushoky* from the next edition (pp. 93, 94, 191, 192, 194, 195, 202, 379, 416, 570, at least). The volume contains a rich bibliography and a good index.

NICHOLAS V. RIASANOVSKY  
*University of California, Berkeley*

ROSSIISKOE SAMODERZHAVIE V KONTSE XIX STOLETIIA: POLITICHESKAIA REAKSTIIA 80-KH-NACHALA 90-KH GODOV. By P. A. Zaionchkovsky. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1970. 443 pp. 1.65 rubles.

This latest study by Zaionchkovsky is a continuation of his book *Krizis samoderzhavii na rubezhe 1870-1880-kh godov* (Moscow, 1964). The author's aim is to "investigate the internal policy of Russian autocracy during the period of the political reaction . . . (1882-1894)" (p. 5). Attention is focused on "high state institutions" and "the governmental policy toward the judicial system, education, and censorship"; the greater part of the book is devoted to the counterreforms (p. 6). Economic and financial institutions and policies receive attention only when they clarify governmental functions and policies as a whole; the worker's problem and the government's attitude toward it are not considered. The main sources are archival documents, diaries, and letters.

The major theme of Zaionchkovsky's work is that though the "political reaction . . . was due to the general situation in Russia at this time," Alexander III and his camarilla gave the tone and direction to the course of reaction and greatly influenced its form (pp. 429-30). To present this most effectively the author characterizes the policy-makers and functionaries, describes and analyzes the functions of major state institutions and the policies of the reign, and then shows in detail the policies that resulted and how they resulted. The approach is essentially a cautious description of factual developments.

The author divides Alexander III's reign into three parts (p. 429) and the period of reaction into two (p. 82)—from May 1882 to the end of 1885 and from 1886 to 1894. (Zaionchkovsky argues that the years 1881-82 were a continuation of the "crisis of autocracy.") The author maintains that Alexander III, despite his ignorance and mediocrity, was not the innocent tool of his advisers (p. 427). The tsar purposely surrounded himself with the most reactionary elements and was determined to correct the "liberal permissiveness" of his predecessor.

The first phase of the reaction was one of intensive struggle by the "quartet" D. A. Tolstoy, K. P. Pobedonostsev, M. N. Katkov, and V. P. Meshchersky, the closest advisers of Alexander III, against the "liberals" in the government, such as A. P. Nikolay, D. N. Nabokov, and N. Kh. Bunge. According to the author the only way the "liberals" differed from the "reactionaries" was in their "slight moderation" toward the issues (p. 84). Zaionchkovsky makes no serious attempt to indicate exactly what this "moderation" meant. After all, if this were a matter only of tactical differences in policy, there would seem to be no reason for the great animosity that existed between the two camps. The author does not indicate why the liberals so vigorously continued to oppose the tsar and the counterreforms even after their ouster from positions of executive power.

The second phase was the triumph of reaction—that is, the undoing of the reforms of the postemancipation period through counterreforms (the laws concerning the land captains in 1889, and the *zemstvo* and town reforms of 1890 and