

I and/or the personal deficiencies of Nicholas II, or was this progress ephemeral to begin with? Mendel focuses on the question itself, Riha gives a brief description of Russia's constitutional development from 1905 to 1917, and Von Laue addresses himself to the general problems of industrialization. The discussions are not without value, but one wonders, in this age of rhetoric about cross-cultural studies, when the social sciences will begin to produce scholars who can get beyond the question of whether a non-Western society has a chance of being like us ("optimistic" view) or is doomed to be not like us ("pessimistic" view).

Robert Byrnes's essay on Pobedonostsev offers not only a concise summary of his earlier works on Pobedonostsev's thought but also a very good statement regarding the distinguishing features of Russian conservatism. It is regrettable that he does not go further and try to account for these features. Donald Treadgold offers the novel (to me) idea that Russian radical thought was losing its influence in 1894–1917—a useful and perhaps even seminal idea in the form he has given it, but not yet fully stated or well supported in this short essay. Alexander Vucinich offers valuable new insights and information on the ups and downs of science and Russia's educational institutions under Nicholas II. Disappointingly, he does not consider soil science, one of the fields in which Russians led the world. Roderick McGrew discusses the general outlines of foreign policy in 1894–1914, indicating that much of Russia's difficulty sprang from the problems she faced rather than the inadequacies of her statesmen. He is, I think, largely correct in what he says about Nicholas II's reign, but he sometimes treats geopolitical necessities as if they were objective entities instead of scholarly generalizations for making sense out of history. Some of his paragraphs could be used to make a case for Switzerland's inevitable yearning to push toward the sea. Gleb Struve makes it clear that he likes the poetry of Nicholas II's time, but his essay will have little meaning for the student who, like myself, does not comprehend the isms of literary history.

GEORGE L. YANEY
University of Maryland

EDUCATION AND THE STATE IN TSARIST RUSSIA. By *Patrick L. Alston*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969. ix, 322 pp. \$8.50.

This volume is a welcome addition to an all-too-brief list of modern works dealing primarily with *education* in the Russian Empire. Political and social histories of the Romanov regime are numerous, and many current analyses of Soviet education look back at least as far as the 1860s in order to establish a better perspective. But comprehensive studies of pedagogical policy, thought, and practice in tsarist Russia are rare indeed.

Unfortunately, a brief review of this important contribution is insufficient to deal at length with even its major strengths and weaknesses; therefore, only samplings can be offered. First among the positive aspects may well be the translation and interpretation of hundreds of documentary sources unavailable to most students of the subject. A second value is the attractive literary style in which these elements are presented (always cautious and scholarly, yet never pedantic), and the excellent selection, organization, and arrangement of a stupendous quantity of material. Lastly, several of the author's views demand serious attention, particularly his conclusions that "in general education tsardom was working hard, productively, and intelligently at the moment when military disaster retired it from history" and

that "by 1914 state education in Russia was becoming public education faster than autocracy was becoming constitutional government" (pp. 248–49). In support of this opinion the author reveals (p. 205) that in the period 1907–12 total government expenditures rose only 20 percent but the budget for education increased 155 percent. If one recalls that the empire enjoyed less than a decade of peace between the crushing defeat by Japan and the outbreak of World War I, the pace of educational effort must be classified as remarkable.

It hardly seems fair to expend space on the deficiencies of this work, when numerous other interesting evaluations by the author could be mentioned. He quite properly relies on official Russian sources; however, he has apparently neglected to use even the few secondary works devoted to the period. Occasional references are made to general historical studies by Baddeley, Sumner, Mirsky, and Fischer, but never to those of Vernadsky, Masaryk, Robinson, or von Eckardt. Even more serious is the total omission of several recognized authorities in the field of tsarist education itself. No mention is made anywhere of the pioneer works of Sir Bernard Pares (1907), and Thomas Darlington (1909), nor of the later publications of Daniel Leary (1919), Paul Ignatiev (1929), and Olga Kaidanova-Bervy (1938). The late Nicholas Hans, whose classic work came out in 1931, would have been pleased to know that he rates two footnotes, just as this reviewer is flattered to have one. Let no one infer, however, that this book cannot stand on its own; the criticism is offered merely to demonstrate that even this neglected area of study, seemingly so distant both in time and in space, has already had its *Armstrongs* and its *Aldrins*.

WILLIAM H. E. JOHNSON
University of Pittsburgh

A RUSSIAN EUROPEAN: PAUL MILIUKOV IN RUSSIAN POLITICS.

By *Thomas Riha*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969. xviii, 373 pp. \$8.95.

A good biography of Miliukov, leader until the Bolshevik Revolution of Russia's most important nonrevolutionary political party, needs no special apology. Both Miliukov and Russian liberalism generally have been the victims of scholarly neglect. Students of modern Russian history can only applaud the appearance of serious works on these subjects. Riha's book is indeed a valuable—though limited—addition to the sparse literature on Russian liberalism. There is really nothing to compete with it as a carefully researched, objective, and well-written account of the "major part of [Miliukov's] political fortunes." Two chapters on Miliukov's early life, scholarly career, and gradual commitment to politics (1859–1905) are followed by five on Miliukov the full-time oppositionist politician (1905–17) and one on Miliukov in power, as foreign minister in the first Provisional Government (February–May 1917). A concluding chapter carries the story in brief to December 1918, when Miliukov left Russia, and also offers a variety of final considerations by the author.

The sweep of generally reliable narrative is perhaps the book's chief merit. To achieve it, Riha chose to define his topic most narrowly. He did not attempt to probe Miliukov's personality, to evaluate his significance as a historian, or to pursue in depth such germane subjects as the inner history of the Kadet party. This is understandable. The support available from specialized studies to the historian who essays a full biography is very limited, and much important material in Soviet