

in this regard during the 1812–14 war, but he is mentioned only for his later appointment as finance minister in a list of Arakcheev's protégés. The question of Arakcheev's role in the "peace party" in 1812 is avoided. The fall of Golitsyn is considered Arakcheev's only intrigue, but he had worked for Speransky's downfall as well. Was Alexander I as intolerant of criticism as Paul I (p. 16)?

Scholars of this period will still have to consult Whiting for a more thorough work, especially on Arakcheev's administration of the military colonies and for bibliography, but for students this is a balanced and highly readable account of an important figure in Russian history.

ALLEN MCCONNELL  
*Queens College*

SOLDIER-SURGEON: THE CRIMEAN WAR LETTERS OF DR. DOUGLAS A. REID, 1855–1856. Edited, with introduction and notes, by *Joseph O. Baylen and Alan Conway*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1968. vii, 158 pp. \$5.25.

Thanks in part to the substantial introduction supplied by the editors and to the useful background material at the beginning of each chapter, this little volume gives an interesting glimpse of the medical side of the British campaign in the Crimea. The account is far from complete, for Dr. Reid did not arrive at the front until February 1855, five months after the landing and the battle of the Alma. He also missed the battles of Balaklava and Inkerman, the terrible storm of November 1854, and the horrors of the winter that almost destroyed the British force. Even so, his letters show the lack of a proper medical system in the army, which continued well into 1855. They also reveal the terrible casualties of the British, especially in the costly repulse of the assault on Sevastopol in early June and in the final attack that led to the Russian evacuation of the fortress. In September respect for the Russians—even though defeated—was far higher than when they had held their positions in the spring. On the whole, however, the book is disappointing in its scanty coverage of the military events of the war.

Probably it is only natural that Dr. Reid wrote frequently about trivial matters concerning food (his favorite subject), clothing, shelter, and amusements. He made much of an elegant billiard table that was brought in in the later months of the war, and also devoted a good deal of space to complaints over slow promotion, scanty pay, and the ineptitude of his superiors. He expressed the opinion that the Guards had done little to justify the honors given them and held that the navy had done so little in the war that its men did not deserve the war medal.

This small volume, then, is a rather slight addition to the literature on the Crimean War and is valuable chiefly for the little that it tells about the British medical service.

JOHN SHELTON CURTISS  
*Duke University*

W KREGU KONSERWATYWNEJ UTOPII: STRUKTURA I PRZEMIANY ROSYJSKIEGO SLOWIANOFILSTWA. By *Andrzej Walicki*. Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964. 493 pp.

In the decade from 1956 to 1965, Polish historians, philosophers, and sociologists had the opportunity to engage in original research, make use of primary sources

located outside the Eastern Bloc countries, accept as valid findings of non-Communist and even anti-Communist scholars, and publish the results of their findings with relative impunity.

Moreover, during the same period outstanding Polish professors of the caliber of Maria Ossowska and Nina Assorodobraj, the continuer in Poland of the Durkheim-Czarnowski school of sociology, were able to impart to their graduate students the art of careful and imaginative scholarship. Andrzej Walicki, Jerzy Szacki, Alina Osiadacz-Molska, students and collaborators of Professor Assorodobraj, are among the outstanding examples of the sophisticated maturity of intellect that emerged in post-Stalinist Poland.

Because none of the works of these scholars have been translated, the English-speaking academic community is not aware of the rich originality of their contributions to intellectual and social history. A case in point is Walicki's book *W kregu konserwatywnej utopii* (Within the Circle of Conservative Utopia). This multifaceted, sociologically inspired analysis of Slavophile thought from approximately 1839 to 1867 is one of the two outstanding contributions to the history of Russian conservatism, along with Professor Edward C. Thaden's work on *Conservative Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Russia*. Actually Walicki's analysis forms an excellent preface to Thaden's detailed exposition.

Walicki set the following parameters for his analysis: the reaction of the Russian intelligentsia to Hegel, the Hegelian left, and German Romanticism, the dialogue between the Slavophiles and the Westerners in the "period of the forties," and the changes in the political life of Russia that occurred during the reigns of Nicholas I and Alexander II.

Within these limits Walicki examines thoroughly the following propositions: (1) The Slavophiles, arguing the continuity of Russian history, created a utopian world view that included a critical attitude toward Western individualism, capitalism, and constitutionalism. (2) As propagators of a utopian view they rejected "official nationality" and advocated the supremacy of the collective. Individualism for the Slavophiles was the consequence of a total identification with the collective and of an "interiorization of the values of the collective." (3) Their utopian *Weltanschauung* did not lead them to the discovery of a conceptual framework that would enable them to deal effectively with the reality of Russian life, and when Alexander II's reforms did create for them a field of action, their utopia and with it their unity disintegrated. The author validates these propositions through a careful analysis of the writings of the leading Slavophiles. The points he makes are sharp, and the substantiating evidence is unequivocal.

To help the reader through the maze of arguments and the profusion of personalities and to prevent misunderstanding of his theoretical-sociological framework, Walicki summarizes his basic arguments at the end of every major analytical section. Especially noteworthy is his masterly overview of the dialogue of the 1840s between the Slavophiles and Westerners. Walicki agrees with Herzen's finding that "we [Slavophiles and Westerners—A.B.] are like [the god] Janus or like the two-headed eagle. We were looking in two different directions: although within us beats one heart" (p. 365).

Historians interested in the distant roots of Russia's contemporary intellectual and political development might find a challenge in Walicki's hypothesis, even though but faintly articulated, that the Slavophiles' essentially conservative utopia played a major role in the formulation of Russia's left radical thought and even in the Leninist "enrichment" of Marxism.

There is a saying in contemporary Poland that "everything is political." Accepting the truth of this dictum, this reviewer found a very poignant note in Walicki's discussion of the "superfluous man." He quotes Belinsky, Turgenev, and Herzen's observation that in the 1840s Russian intellectuals of gentry origin were aimless wanderers, strangers at home, foreigners abroad—an apt description of Poland's young intellectuals since the end of the Thaw.

ALFRED BLOCH

*State University of New York, New Paltz*

YEARS OF THE GOLDEN COCKEREL: THE LAST ROMANOV TSARS, 1814–1917. By *Sidney Harcave*. New York: The Macmillan Co. London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1968. x, 515 pp. \$12.50.

While the New Left is occasionally patterning itself after the Russian revolutionaries of the nineteenth century, the Establishment seems enamored with the Russian autocracy. For the long-range perspective we have Ronald Hingley's work, *The Tsars: 1533–1917*. For slow-motion detail there is the sentimental documentary of *Nicholas and Alexandra* by Robert Massie. Professor Harcave now has given us an intermediary volume covering the last five tsars. He treats his subject in the spirit of allegory, taking his title from Pushkin's tale, subsequently made into an opera by Rimsky-Korsakov, about the Golden Cockerel and the mythical tsar Dadon, who, after having reached great magnificence, neglected his duties and came to grief. The tsars from Alexander I to Nicholas II, Harcave pleads, were like Dadon—rulers of exalted power who did not live up to their promise.

The allegory has shaped this book in a variety of ways. It begins not with the accession of Alexander I but with the "zenith of Romanov success" in 1814, when the tsar, "second in renown to none," like Dadon, rode into Paris at the head of the Allied forces, a gracious and high-minded victor. Eleven years after his triumphal entry into Paris, Alexander was in decline and the country was stagnating, except for the preparations of the Decembrists. The book ends with the murder of Nicholas II and his family in the cellar of the Ipatiev house in Ekaterinoslav. Down to the end of the Romanovs (and to the present, too, one might argue) each new regime passed through the cycle of a strong start and a disastrous end, as if under a curse. In the ascending phase the country was moving forward, confidence ran high, tranquillity prevailed. Then came the descent into ruin: the Crimean War, the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, the revolutions of 1905 and 1917. The only exception was the reign of Alexander III, who died at a moment of relative stability in his country's fortunes. In Harcave's telling it became largely the prologue to the next regime.

The symmetrical zigzag of imperial fortunes as laid out in this tale poses certain problems of chronology and historical analysis. The tsars' successes and failures were, in fact, not as neatly separated as they are in Harcave's chapters. Events belonging together in time had to be separated to fit the pattern—a practice that tends to impede historical understanding. There is indeed much truth to the pattern, and that needs to be stressed. The arrangement also gives the book a pleasing aesthetic quality. At times, however, the effect is one of oversimplification. Besides, the intrusion of allegory seems somewhat incongruous for a historian whose stated creed is to let facts speak for themselves.

Harcave's facts bespeak a standard historical approach. By necessity a history