

accuracy. Emmons has not done enough research to cover the enactment of the statute nor even the role of the gentry in it, and whenever his account swerves into these wider subjects it gets thin. In any case, there is not much point in writing yet another history of the statute from the liberal point of view, and in his better paragraphs Emmons shows his awareness that this is the case. What is chiefly of interest in the book is the story of how the gentry's experience in 1856–62 led many of them to find liberal principles meaningful.

GEORGE YANEY
University of Maryland

DMITRII MILIUTIN AND THE REFORM ERA IN RUSSIA. By *Forrest A. Miller*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1968. ix, 246 pp. \$7.50.

Although the title suggests a study of greater scope, Professor Miller's book is essentially a detailed description of the Russian military reforms planned and executed during the reign of Alexander II together with an account of the exertions of Dmitrii Miliutin, minister of war during virtually all of Alexander's reign, to guide the emperor's reform measures through the labyrinth of bureaucratic and court intrigues. The book does not provide a full biography of Miliutin nor does it point to the meaning of the military reforms in the context of autocratic reformism of the 1860s and 1870s, which began with the emancipation of the serfs.

The book contains admirably clear and thorough descriptions of the reform of the military district system (1862), the reorganization of the structure of military education (1863–70), and the introduction of universal military training (1874). It also presents, though less critically than one would have hoped, the general principles on which Miliutin based his plans for reform. Miller accepts without reservation Miliutin's claim that his policies served the "best interests of the nation" and concludes that Miliutin's enemies were defending only narrow class or personal interests.

Much less satisfactory is Miller's account of the tortuous passage of the reform measures through the higher reaches of the military and governmental bureaucracies. It is to this narrative that we look for Miller's interpretation of the politics of the reform era. What we find is the familiar tale of personal likes and dislikes, patronage and vendettas, which for too long has passed for an acceptable version of the politics of autocratic Russia in the nineteenth century. By introducing such notions as "planter party" and "Miliutin party" into his retelling of this story, the author has merely encumbered it with questionable terminology. For example, Miller uses "planter party" to denote a faction of noble landowners, of which, he asserts, P. A. Valuev, minister of the interior, was a member and spokesman. No evidence is adduced in the book, however, to connect Valuev with any incipient "party" of noblemen. On the contrary, during his years as minister of the interior, Valuev was no less adamant than Miliutin in opposing political pretensions of any kind by representatives of the nobility.

Behind the personal conflicts among members of the government and court lay the important issue of the future development and political influence of the state bureaucracy—its role and responsibility in creating legislation and its relationship to the emperor. A struggle went on between those who believed that the bureaucracy should retain as much as possible its traditional, prescribed character and those who wished to introduce into the operation of the government the principle of *Rechtsstaat*, including a definite legal role for the bureaucracy in the legislative process,

which would lead to a degree of bureaucratic constraint on the powers of the emperor. This struggle, and Miliutin's role in it, remains unilluminated in Miller's book.

In an especially interesting chapter Miliutin emerges as a militant chauvinist on the Polish question, employing the pages of the War Ministry's official journal to impugn the integrity of Polish culture. But a more ambitious study of Miliutin must be attempted before it will be possible to relate his attitude toward Poland to his role in Russia's "forward policy" in Turkestan and his broad influence on foreign policy in general through the period of the Russo-Turkish War.

The book is generally well researched, but the failure of the author to consult primary and secondary materials now available to Western scholars in Soviet archives and libraries results in lacunae even within the work's limited purview.

Despite the disappointments and shortcomings listed above, with so many important facets of the Great Reforms still to be carefully examined, Miller's clear account of the military reforms is a useful and welcome addition to the field.

PETER CZAP, JR.
Amherst College

THE MAJOR WORKS OF PETER CHAADAEV: A TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY. By *Raymond T. McNally*. Introduction by *Richard Pipes*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969. xix, 261 pp. \$7.95.

Not only was Chaadaev an important figure in Russian intellectual history; he was also in a certain sense the starting point of that history. Yet for more than fifty years the only direct access to his work has been the Gershenzon edition, published in Moscow in 1913. It is with some joy, therefore, that one can greet both Raymond McNally's critical edition of the French texts published in Berlin in 1966 and his English translation of those texts in the present volume. This is especially so, since McNally has thoroughly acquainted himself with the work of Russian scholars such as Dmitri Shakhovskoi, work of discovery and collation that the Soviet Union is still reluctant to publish even though Chaadaev has recently been consecrated as an "acceptable" figure in the history of Russian revolutionary thought—an idealist and an aristocrat but nevertheless a revolutionary.

McNally knows the texts and has managed to straighten out much of the garble of the Gershenzon edition. His translation, except for a very few curious usages (such as "traditive" on p. 31), is excellent. He captures Chaadaev's eloquence and poignancy in an English that yet manages to sound, like Chaadaev's French, slightly stilted and archaic, with long cadences and a kind of weariness of breath, and all this without departing far from the literal meaning of the original. There joy ceases, however. I am afraid the volume leaves much to be desired.

The title, to begin with: why the "major" works? Was Chaadaev the author of any minor works? Since he was not a professional writer and all his work is at best fragmentary, it makes no sense to divide the texts into major and minor, or public and private for that matter. It is true that the eight philosophical letters, as McNally has constituted them here, have a kind of coherence and seem to have been intended for publication, in a sense that was not nearly so clear in the Gershenzon edition. Nevertheless, their coherence is far from complete; except for the first letter, they are unusually opaque documents. And the fragment called "Apology of