

Japan by Spanberg and Walton and those along the Arctic coast from the White Sea to the Lena and farther east, which together with Bering's second voyage constituted the Second Kamchatka Expedition, again very little is said, and mostly in passing. Furthermore, except for the first three chapters of the first volume, a matter of twenty-four pages, the two volumes are given over entirely to the second voyage, a reflection of the more detailed documentation of this voyage. In part 1 of the first volume, Golder presents Peter's brief orders for selecting the officers of the first expedition, his brief instructions to Bering, Bering's account of the voyage, the so-called "Short Account" presented to Empress Anne, and Nartov's report of Peter's statement of the purpose of the voyage—all of these in chapter 2. Part 2 is made up of the official order of the Second Kamchatka Expedition (abridged), dated December 28, 1732; the logbook of the *St. Peter*, Bering's vessel on the second voyage; Waxel's report on the voyage of the *St. Peter*; the journal of Chirikov's vessel, the *St. Paul*; and Chirikov's report on the voyage of the *St. Paul*.

The second volume is given over almost entirely to Steller's journal of the sea voyage from Kamchatka to America and return, translated and in part annotated by Leonhard Stejneger. Steller was the German naturalist who sailed with Bering on the *St. Peter* and whose account is a valuable addition to the logbooks and journals of the first volume. For a fuller account, however, of the context of the two voyages one has to turn to Golder's other work, *Russian Expansion on the Pacific, 1641–1850* (1914). Golder devotes more than half of this work to the two expeditions, their objectives and the preparation for them, and to the other voyages of the Second Kamchatka Expedition.

In *Bering's Voyages* and *Russian Expansion* Golder has provided the most extensive account in English of Bering's voyages, and for that reason his works are the basis of many derivative accounts of them by others. But his treatment is far from complete. Soviet scholars have brought to light much new material relating to the origin of and preparation for the voyages, and to their place in Russian imperial policy in the first half of the eighteenth century, especially under Peter. The purpose of these voyages, especially the first, is in need of re-examination, a task which this reviewer is now carrying out. The traditional view, perpetuated by Golder, that Peter sent Bering to determine whether Asia and America are joined or separated, whether a water passage between the Arctic and Pacific exists, does not stand up after careful examination of old and new material. In short, though the republication of these two volumes will no doubt meet the needs of libraries and those individuals who have been unable to acquire them in the secondhand book markets, study of Bering's voyages will bring more profitable results by turning to the materials, both documentary and monographic, put out by Soviet scholars in the last three or four decades.

A minor concluding caveat: Golder's translations from the Russian are not always to be trusted, and his abridgments of documents are in a few places misleading.

RAYMOND H. FISHER

*University of California, Los Angeles*

ARAKCHEEV: GRAND VIZIER OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE. By *Michael Jenkins*. New York: The Dial Press, Inc., 1969. 317 pp. \$5.95.

Michael Jenkins, of the British diplomatic service, has filled a long-felt need in presenting to the public the first biography in any language of Count Aleksei

Andreevich Arakcheev, the talented artilleryist of Paul I's Gatchina regiments who became under Alexander I inspector of artillery in 1803, war minister in 1808, and in the last decade of the reign a "grand vizier." Although Jenkins was not permitted to consult the Arakcheev papers in the Soviet archives, he has used printed materials to good advantage, tracing Arakcheev from his impoverished youth to the pinnacle of power and the final decade of neglect under Nicholas I.

The author's approach is guardedly sympathetic, stressing Arakcheev's personal loyalty to his emperors, "the mainspring of his character and his most attractive quality" (p. 14). But this sympathy for Arakcheev's loyalty, honesty, energy, Spartan simplicity, and lack of vanity makes Jenkins soft-pedal his hero's ruthlessness and pedantic cruelty in enforcing discipline. I do not believe the term "sadism" appears in the book. It is not enough to disparage the numerous critical accounts as "highly colored and unreliable" without giving any examples, much less refutation. Kiesewetter's pre-World War I articles, using the same sources, give a better analysis of Arakcheev's character.

Jenkins writes vividly and keeps his narrative moving. The account of the horrible trial and vengeance for the murder of Arakcheev's mistress is excellent, given in exemplary detail and with control. Shumsky, Arakcheev's natural son, is portrayed with sensitivity, although Jenkins eschews placing any blame for the boy's desperate drinking on Arakcheev. The author shows convincingly, in contrast to Kiesewetter, that Alexander initially chose Arakcheev for his talents in military administration and at no time used him just so that he could withdraw from affairs himself.

A number of points raise queries. The subtitle (the Grand Vizier) is something of an exaggeration, and the period to which it refers is not clear. Kenneth T. Whiting's unpublished doctoral dissertation is sounder on the question of Arakcheev's power, noting that he had no say in foreign policy, the secret police, the obscurantist campaign, and so forth, and that many decrees bearing his signature were actually drafted in Alexander's handwriting. According to Jenkins, Arakcheev was enthusiastic at the inception of the plan for the military colonies. He was, in fact, opposed to them at first and even slept in his uniform in fear of uprisings. The speech Jenkins has Alexander making before the Guards after the murder of his father was actually his Accession Manifesto before a very different audience. The author gives to the tsar's young friends of the Secret Committee credit for the liberal decrees that undid Paul's follies in the first hundred days of Alexander's reign, but they had not yet all returned to the capital, much less met in committee, in that period. Jenkins believes that Alexander was sincere in collaborating with Napoleon in the "spirit of Tilsit," a view long since disproved.

Mertvago, one of the leading sources for Arakcheev's life, is spelled here "Mertvovo." The footnoting is casual, never citing pages, documenting what is well known and not documenting what is dubious or new. There is no mention of Arakcheev's plan of emancipation, which Whiting noted prefigured much of the 1861 law. While it is probably true that Arakcheev was loyal to Alexander, Jenkins is casual about the indifference Arakcheev showed toward the threat to his sovereign's life, and does not cite, much less comment on, the opinion of Arakcheev's subordinate, Batenkov, that Arakcheev loved Paul I but despised Alexander and rejoiced in his unpopular acts as threatening his rule. The author stresses Arakcheev's honesty, an astonishing new phenomenon in his day; but given his severity and loyalty to the tsar, it would be interesting to know what if anything Arakcheev did or tried to do to curb the terrible problem of graft (if such a mild term is justified) in the army. The appointment of Kankrin was certainly of great value

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