

(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

1892). The period is also known for the successful realization of the government policy "Russia for the Russians" (p. 97). Zaionchkovsky suggests that the "political reaction of the 1880s and the beginning of the 1890s became one of the reasons for the revolutionary events during 1905–1907" (p. 436).

The general failure of government policy in this period the author ascribes to the contradictions of autocratic Russia's "modernization," the growth of administrative *proizvol*, divisiveness within the government, and the "growth of a massive workers' movement and its unification with social democracy" (p. 261). Zaionchkovsky presents his case effectively on all these points except the last. Even if there was "unification" of the workers with any ideological group, it could hardly have been with social democracy, which at the time was still in embryo. Except for this instance, the author discusses Marxist class analysis only in commonplace references, such as the "gentry interests" and their support of the government. He even restricts the Soviet-Communist jargon used to very modest proportions.

The book has some obvious faults. The author's analysis of the censorship of press, publications, and the libraries is essentially a reworking of previously published studies. As a result, nothing is mentioned of the malicious activity of the "Black Ministry," which strictly checked religious writings and publications, and frequently intercepted and opened the mail. Similarly Zaionchkovsky includes only a sketchy analysis of the *zemstvo* counterreform, and is satisfied to refer the reader to the detailed study of his student, L. G. Zakharova. More serious is the author's failure to analyze the intellectual content of political activity during the reign. Thus Zaionchkovsky does not discuss seriously the ideological evolution of the reactionary "quartet," nor does he analyze his use of the "holy trinity" slogan of Uvarov or assign to it some meaning beyond common textbook generalities (p. 309). Finally, the book should have been supplied with an errata sheet—for example, the second sentence on page 105 makes sense only after *kak* is added: "Tak [kak] ia naznachaiu."

None of these comments should be taken as seriously detracting from the book's overall worth. Professor Zaionchkovsky introduces a wealth of new information, and his study must be considered an outstanding pioneer work.

VIRGIL DEWAIN MEDLIN

*Oklahoma City University and the University of Oklahoma*

THE POLISH QUESTION IN THE RUSSIAN STATE DUMA. By *Edward Chmielewski*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970. vi, 188 pp. \$7.50.

This book is a study of an important problem in both Polish and Russian history. It is a novel study from the standpoint of the historical perspective it offers while also dealing with the topic in its entirety. The author examines in detail the stenographic reports not only of the four Dumas but also of the State Council (his title is incomplete in this connection), and he makes broad use of contemporary newspaper accounts, memoirs written by participants and witnesses, and the existing literature, both Russian and Polish, on different aspects of the problem. It is a conscientious work and a worthy contribution.

For the informed reader, however, there are notable disappointments. First, the introduction on "Russo-Polish Relations in the Nineteenth Century" (nineteen pages) is too sketchy. One would especially like to know more about the different