

described as "a prankster." Perhaps the trouble is that Professor Ulam is very much a twentieth-century man, and his preoccupation with his own day and age constantly intrudes on his nineteenth-century picture. There may be some sense—not much!—in equating Herzen's and Solzhenitsyn's aversion to the "rotten West," or in comparing Herzen with the Mensheviks. Stalin keeps cropping up in predictable contexts. But it is surely tedious to have an advocate labeled as "the Clarence Darrow of the Russian Bar," or the publicist Mikhailovskii as "Russia's Walter Lippmann." The historian belongs to his own time, and cannot sever the cord which binds him to it. But this imposes on him a particular obligation of sensitivity to the deep differences which separate it from the times which he is seeking to interpret.

One minor puzzle. References to the Russian sources are liberally supplied in footnotes, but the titles of Russian books and periodicals are invariably translated into English. The references are useless to anyone who does not read Russian. But anyone who does will have the tiresome job of retranslating the titles into Russian if he wants to check them. On page 125, my book, *The Romantic Exiles*, is cited as the source for a story of which—no doubt, to my shame—I was entirely ignorant. But such slips happen to all of us.

E. H. CARR

Trinity College, Cambridge

THE RUSSIAN AUTOCRACY UNDER ALEXANDER III. By *Peter A. Zaionchkovskii*. Edited and translated by *David R. Jones*. The Russian Series, vol. 22. Gulf Breeze, Fla.: Academic International Press, 1976 [Moscow, 1970]. xiv, 308 pp.

Published in 1970, P. A. Zaionchkovskii's *Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie v kontse XIX stoletii* was the first thorough monographic study of bureaucracy and state policy during the reign of Alexander III. It continued the story Zaionchkovskii had begun in *Krizis samoderzhavii*. Once again, he brought to his task an imposing mastery of archival materials and a keen sense of the historical situation. Zaionchkovskii's approach is to avoid broad simplistic characterizations and to focus upon specific interactions and clashes taking place within the Russian state. For this purpose, he marshaled great amounts of unpublished material and thus was able to reveal what was happening behind the scenes. To read the book was to see historical events anew and to witness, firsthand, occurrences that had previously seemed the unmotivated acts of some disembodied evil force. Zaionchkovskii's book shows how state policy evolved in the midst of the fear, confusions, and corruption of the late nineteenth-century bureaucracy. While stressing the reactionary direction of this policy, he brings out the lack of unity among the tsar's advisers and the bitter opposition of much of the bureaucracy to the counterreforms. Zaionchkovskii argues that the reaction brought not only increasing oppression and a determined, if largely ineffective effort to roll back the reforms, but a general increase of administrative arbitrariness and illegality as well. He alludes to, but does not dwell upon, the other aspect of state activity in Alexander's reign—the effort to embark upon a new policy of industrialization. Alexander's policy appears, as a result, not as a monolith, but as the outcome of a complex interaction of many different attitudes, interests, programs, and impulses. We can be thankful for this able and conscientious translation to David R. Jones, who has made a basic work on an important reign available to the nonspecialist.

RICHARD WORTMAN
Princeton University