

account of the main campaigns, free from rhetoric and written in a clear and understandable fashion. There is a helpful chronological table of events from early 1853 to April 1856, and there are numerous excellent maps. The volume has many fine illustrations from contemporary drawings by William Simpson.

But though the author has given a well-organized and understandable account of the war, he has failed to offer a well-rounded picture, for there is almost nothing on the Russians and their problems. He never suggests that throughout the war most of the Russian army was concentrated in Poland, along the Austrian frontier, and in the Baltic region, because of fear of attack by Austria, Prussia, and Sweden. The terrible logistical problems of supplying an army in the Crimea when there was no railroad south of Moscow are not even suggested, and there is no mention that often the Russian cannon in Sevastopol were woefully short of powder and projectiles. Written by an Englishman for an English public, this book is probably the best concise history of the Crimean War available. It does not, however, answer all the questions.

JOHN SHELTON CURTISS
Duke University

RUSSIAN JOURNALISM AND POLITICS, 1861-1881: THE CAREER OF ALEKSEI S. SUVORIN. By *Effie Ambler*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972. 239 pp. \$12.50.

Effie Ambler's study of the career of Aleksei S. Suvorin, the publisher of the important St. Petersburg newspaper *Novoe vremia*, is a useful addition to the sparse literature on Russian journalism in English. The heart of the book is devoted to the journalist's career from 1861 to 1881, but it also contains substantial material on the relation between politics and journalism. Well written in places, the book describes Suvorin's evolution from a close associate of liberals and radicals to a rabid nationalist, anti-Semite, and political conservative after his purchase of *Novoe vremia* in 1876. The tale ends in 1881, when, according to the author, Suvorin's "political metamorphosis" was completed. The remainder of his life, to 1912, is treated in a brief epilogue.

The author's choice of 1881 as a cut-off date seems arbitrary. She notes that after 1881 Suvorin became important as an entrepreneur and publisher of children's and classical literature. In this respect, then, the author has ignored a most essential period of Suvorin's activities. Moreover, she provides little explanation for the turnabout Suvorin performed in 1876. She admits that he was not a systematic thinker and that it is "impossible to determine Suvorin's private thoughts and intentions in 1876." But even unsystematic journalists leave some traces of their thinking in their letters. Because the author limited her research to published sources and to material Suvorin printed in his newspaper, her book becomes a simple description and not an explanation of Suvorin's apostasy. In his lifetime, Suvorin was called by a critic a "weather vane" of Russian society. If he was, then a more intensive analysis of his ideas and evolution might have cast light on the change in mood of Russian educated society around 1876.

Lacking an explanation, the book remains a description of Suvorin's odyssey. As such, there is little justification for ending the story in 1881. Furthermore, the author does not make full use of some of Suvorin's "principles": he remained a defender of "small deeds" as opposed to utopias; he opposed bureaucratic abuses;

and he demanded more information about actual conditions in Russia. Ambler's contribution to the history of conservative Russian journalism might have been even more useful if she had brought her history up to 1912.

DANIEL BALMUTH
Skidmore College

TSARIZM I RABOCHII VOPROS V ROSSII (1861–1917 gg.). By *V. Ia. Laverychev*. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1972. 340 pp. 1.62 rubles.

This is another major contribution by Professor Laverychev to our knowledge of social, economic, and political relations in urban prerevolutionary Russia. Drawing heavily on archival sources, it throws much light on the process of policy formation within the tsarist bureaucracy. Labor policies are treated mainly as a product of ongoing conflict between the Ministry of Finance (and, after 1905, the Ministry of Trade and Industry) and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, although the division between the two camps was not, it is noted, consistently maintained. The nature and evolution of entrepreneurial reactions to the workers' movement are also explored. Here the author's demonstration of the differing attitudes to be found among the employers marks a noteworthy step in the recent trend among Soviet historians away from earlier simplistic approaches to class conflict. While stressing the predominant reluctance of factory owners to make concessions to their workers, he also points to the presence of some among them who early recognized the necessity for limited reforms.

In a somewhat different category is Laverychev's effort to dispel what he considers to be the exaggerated importance attached to entrepreneurial resistance by Tugan-Baranovsky and Balabanov as a cause of the failure of the first governmental efforts to introduce factory legislation in the 1880s. But whether he means that the industrialists' opposition to reform has been exaggerated, or rather that their influence on the government was minimal, is unclear. He does clearly depict the way in which governmental pressures for concessions to the workers, together with official mistrust of employers' organizations, contributed to the growing political disaffection of some industrialists, particularly in the Moscow area. As a good Leninist, however, he concludes that all efforts to alleviate labor's unrest were doomed to failure, for the autocracy could never abandon its "custodial" approach toward the workers and accede to entrepreneurial and labor demands for the introduction of "bourgeois" reforms requiring the acceptance of civil liberties and the institution of a limited monarchy.

Particularly noteworthy is the new material that is presented concerning the Fedorov Commission on labor reform in 1906. It is Laverychev's judgment that this commission, rather than that headed by Kokovtsov a year earlier, marked the climax of official liberalism toward labor during the first revolution. The description of Witte's relations with Pobedonostsev during his tenure as minister of finance is of interest in view of his later confession before the State Council (not mentioned in this volume) of his failure to provide strong support for labor reform. On the other hand, the author's treatment of the uncertain course of labor legislation through the Third Duma, and the part played by the industrialists in that process, is disappointing. A more thorough discussion of the extent to which political liberalism among the Moscow factory owners during the later years was, or was not, re-