fighting for his health, his sanity, his very survival, and his tone of contrition was a necessary expedient if he was ever to regain his freedom.

Written in Russian, the *Confession* has been translated into German, Czech, French, Polish, and Italian, but only excerpts have previously appeared in English. We are therefore indebted to Robert C. Howes for this workmanlike rendition, as well as to Lawrence D. Orton, who has provided a solid introduction and detailed annotations, making use of earlier editions and of the many articles—by Max Nettlau, B. P. Kozmin, M. P. Sazhin, and Vera Figner, among others—inspired by the original publication of the document. The *Confession* is remarkable not only for the light which it sheds on Bakunin's personality but for its account, by a leading participant, of the turbulent events of the 1840s. Professors Howes and Orton are to be congratulated for making this important work accessible to the English reader.

PAUL AVRICH
Queens College, CUNY

IN THE NAME OF THE PEOPLE: PROPHETS AND CONSPIRATORS IN PREREVOLUTIONARY RUSSIA. By *Adam B. Ulam.* New York: The Viking Press, 1977. xiv, 418 pp. Illus. $15.00.

The comprehensive title, with the subtitle "Prophets and Conspirators in Prerevolutionary Russia," suggests a mixed bag, and the contents of Professor Ulam's impressive volume do not altogether belie the first impression. The period is comparatively brief—from the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 till the collapse of the People's Will organization in about 1883 after the repression which followed the assassination of Alexander II. Every Russian who in that pregnant period warred against the autocracy with pen, pistol, or bomb is swept into the net. The immense and scattered literature, much of it contemporary, some dating from the Soviet period, has been thoroughly combed. Personal memoirs, not the most reliable kind of historical source, figure largely in it. Some of the anecdotes may have grown in the telling, but there is no reason to doubt the substantial correctness of the picture. Even those moderately well acquainted with the period will find unfamiliar and rewarding material in Professor Ulam's pages.

The main thread of the narrative runs from publicity and propaganda to terrorism, from Herzen to the People's Will; and Professor Ulam's chief preoccupation is with the character and causes of the change. He recognizes the sincerity of the genuine, though often naïve, beliefs of the narodniks, and the idealism which inspired even many of the terrorists. But he perhaps underestimates the force of the disillusionment when the early promise of Alexander II's reforming zeal was not fulfilled, and the extent of the revulsion and horror triggered by the later repressions. The battle between those who hoped for peaceful reform and those who were convinced that nothing but force could shake a monstrous and hated authority—the dilemma which tormented Herzen to the end of his days—was lost some time in the 1860s.

The book inevitably challenges comparison with Professer Venturi's *Roots of Revolution*, now more than twenty years old. Professor Ulam has dug up many fresh sources, and has provided the student with a greater wealth of detail. But one should still go to Venturi for the deep feeling for the period which is sometimes lacking in his successor. No doubt, increasing commercial and financial activity accounted for the rise of a group of wealthy Jews, some of whom achieved a kind of official acceptance. No doubt, the big wave of pogroms in the countryside did not come till later. But can one really say that "to the bulk of the Jewish population Alexander II became known as the good emperor"? It may be just a matter of words. But it does jar a little to have Chernyshevskii's *What is to be Done?* described as "a silly tale," and Nechaev

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. Zaionchkovsky.* 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 stoletiia* 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 samoderzhaviia.* 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