

last orders of the day and with whom the emperor argued before, during, and after the campaign. Caulaincourt recorded the *rabotosposobnost'*, the *tverdost' dukha*, the blindness, and the bonhomie which Manfred notes elsewhere but which are missing from this chapter, as is the awesome spectacle of a vast army's relentless disintegration.

There is no bibliography, as there was none in the 1957 reissue of Tarle's book on Napoleon, of which Manfred was *otvetstvennyi redaktor*. (Tarle's 1942 edition had an excellent one.) But there are useful footnotes. The index contains names of persons but not of places or topics. Proofreading of foreign words is poor. Thus one finds Rodocanadri (for Rodocanachi), Khissinger (for Kissinger), Insbruck, Saint-Ildefonso, Somosnerra, la politik, progets, Grognhards, Donhadieu, D'Abrantés, and so forth.

Nevertheless this is an absorbing account of a great, tragic figure, a victim of hubris, one who could fascinate Goethe, Leopardi, Pushkin, Stendhal, and succeeding generations. This "cult of personality" was different. One can only speculate on the comparisons forty-five thousand Soviet readers will make with their own recent dictator as they read of a Corsican despot who at the height of his power spoke to Goethe as an equal, who had no cities named after him, who fascinated savants before he had power, who never could bring himself to silence the opposition of the Paris salons, who offered to pardon Staps for seeking his murder if Staps would only renounce this intention (Staps declined), and who, some time after banishing his minister of police to his estates for plotting against him, recalled him to power.

ALLEN MCCONNELL
Queens College

DECENTRALIZATION AND SELF-GOVERNMENT IN RUSSIA, 1830–1870. By S. Frederick Starr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972. xiii, 386 pp. \$15.00, cloth. \$8.95, paper.

This is a study of the "attempt to reconstitute the decrepit system of provincial government" which was part and parcel of the reform process begun after Russia's defeat in the Crimean War (p. x). It consists of five chapters: the first is devoted to a survey of provincial government under Nicholas I; the second deals with the contours of reform ideology concerning administration at the opening of the reform era; the third describes efforts at legislating administrative decentralization (deconcentration); the fourth does the same for public self-government (devolution); and the fifth deals with the aftermath (1864–70) of the zemstvo reform, primarily in terms of the reassertion of the centralizing tradition.

There is a great deal to commend this work: it marshals to its task an extraordinary range of sources, including an almost astonishing amount of material from Soviet archives, with the result that we have for the first time a systematic study of the whole problem of administrative reform in the context of the other reforms of the "sixties." In the process it provides an unprecedented depth of view into the variety of opinions and maneuverings within the government bureaucracy, which is too often treated in the literature as a monolith. Space forbids a sampling of these wares. Anyone interested in the reform era and in the character of the Russian state can read this book with considerable profit.

There are points of conceptualization and interpretation with which I would take issue. At the conceptual level, for example, I found overdrawn the author's

analytical distinction between “undergovernment” and “misgovernment”—a distinction employed in service to his general thesis that the administrative reforms of the 1860s “were first of all a response to the conditions of Russian provincial life over the preceding generation” (p. 348). Although it is true that some writers apparently assumed that provincial Russia simply had too much government, many advocates of self-government were perfectly aware that, in Starr’s sense, the provinces were undergoverned. Their conviction was that the provinces could not be brought to a proper state of governance by the extension or reorganization of bureaucratic offices and practices alone. Were they wrong? Boris Chicherin, the foremost “centralist” in the public debate of the late fifties, eventually came around to agreeing with them, and there is plenty of material from the subsequent administrative history of the country from which to construct a case for their position. I also found rather forced the categories imposed on various “constitutionalist” proposals of the early sixties; arguments for changes in Petersburg and in the provinces were too often linked to make very serviceable the author’s tidy distinction between the “oligarchic” and the “federalist” positions (pp. 262–71). At the level of interpretation, I found unconvincing and inadequately documented the author’s version of the intent behind such government edicts as the well-known “rules of April 21, 1858,” or the “five points” of December 1860 (pp. 199–201, 216). Both, it seems to me, are bent to the author’s general effort to rehabilitate Lanskoj and Miliutin from the reputation of bureaucrats who were distrustful of an independent public role in administration all along but were brought to lay the ground for the zemstvo reform largely under political pressure from the gentry. I, for one, am not ready, on the evidence presented here, to vote for full rehabilitation (one may check some of the crucial documents in the argument against fuller versions presented by A. A. Garmiza in the work cited in the notes).

The author engages in a considerable amount of archeographic sleuthing in connection with the authorship of certain memoranda, the origins and sequence of reform plans, and the like. Although some of this is convincing, in other places it is not. For example, the evidence presented for authorship of the zemstvo draft legislation on pages 243–44 seems inconclusive at best. Garmiza, who plowed the first deep furrows in the archeographic background to the zemstvo reform, is repeatedly taken to task, and not always justly. Thus he is accused of erring in “claiming that only thirteen provinces were asked to submit responses” to the aforementioned “five points” (pp. 223–24n.). In fact, Garmiza says no such thing: he writes only that thirteen were published (see pp. 67–68 of his work). This is tricky business to be engaged in by a foreign scholar whose delving into the voluminous papers of the government bureaucracy is impeded by limitations of time and lack of systematic access to archival catalogues. One has to start somewhere, of course.

For a book as carefully structured as this one, there is a surprisingly high incidence of errors in transliteration, a good many of them arising from insufficient respect for the rules of Russian case endings. There are a few mistranslations. Thus Valuev’s famous phrase “Sverkhū blesk; vñizu gnīl’ ” is rendered “Glitter above; below—clay” (p. 124).

The book reinforces the established view of a government dominated, in the long run, by “suspicion of all public groups and institutions not directly under the guidance of the state” (p. 262).

TERENCE EMMONS
Stanford University