

landscape” (p. xiii). A variation on this theme reappears a bit later in the book: “Much of the familiar landscape painting of the Group of Seven, for example, owes its genesis to sights seen and recorded in the mud and trenches of the western front” (pp. 54, 58). These are problematic claims, since A. Y. Jackson’s *Terre Sauvage*, painted in 1913, so closely resembles both his wartime works *A Copse, Evening* (1918) (p. 64), and *Gas Attack, Liévin* (1918) (p. 65). Of the three other Group members involved in the war, Fred Varley was sent overseas only in 1918; Arthur Lismer and Frank Johnston were commissioned but never left Canada. Whatever effects the Great War may have had on the Group of Seven, a style of painting was not one.

In view of this book’s subtitle, and because the paintings are so visually dominant, I expected that its central concern and unifying theme would be the relationship between the events of the war, the official art programmes, and the paintings themselves. However, the authors have been satisfied to present this relationship only in a material, not in an intellectual manner, perhaps in the hope that the physical proximity of paintings and text would create a synthesis. Unfortunately, this synthesis does not occur, and the many striking images produced by Canadian war artists continue to elude explanation.

Molly Pulver Ungar  
Hamilton, Ontario

Judith Pallot — *Land Reform in Russia, 1906–1917: Peasant Responses to Stolypin’s Project of Rural Transformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Pp. viii, 225.

The land reforms undertaken by the tsarist regime in its last decade (1906–1917) have long been at the centre of historiographical debates in Russian and Soviet history, yet there has been until now no English-language monograph of these reforms. Judith Pallot’s meticulous and original account of the Stolypin agrarian reforms not only fills a gap, but provides a sophisticated analysis of the complex interactions between reform ideology, administrative practices, village institutions, and peasant culture. The author’s stated goal is to evaluate the state’s attempt to transform and modernize rural Russia and to elucidate peasants’ response to this “project of social engineering” (pp. 1–2). Pallot convincingly argues that the fundamental misunderstanding and miscommunication between state and peasantry fatally distorted the reforms and undermined the reformers’ dreams of creating an independent and progressive peasantry freed from the constraints of communal agriculture.

Pallot’s book considers all stages of implementation of the reform, and the argument can be summarized in three broad themes. First, the author considers the ideals underlying the land reform project. She deftly cuts through debates over the primary intended purpose of the 1906 land legislation, debates that cannot be resolved since reform meant different things for different people. Instead, the author examines how land reorganization was represented both to the public and to local officials responsible for implementation. If doubts, nuance, and debate existed within the top eche-

lons of the land reform bureaucracy, these rarely transpired into the official “public transcript”. In public pronouncements, exhibits, model maps, brochures, and administrative instructions, the reforms had a decidedly “utopian character”. These documents betrayed an unmistakable “liking for squares” such that “local agents were left in no doubt that the physical separation of peasant from peasant was a priority” (p. 37). Land reorganization was to bring about not only a restructuring of agriculture, but was to impose orderly, rational, and modern practices into the chaotic, tradition-bound, and irrational countryside. Pallot presents the reform vision as nothing less than a geographical, social, and cultural disciplining of people and landscape.

Blinded by their utopian visions, officials misunderstood the institutions that they were attempting to transform. While communal agricultural practices (namely periodic redistribution of strips, obligatory crop rotations, open fields, and field fragmentation) were relentlessly condemned as evidence of peasant ignorance and backwardness, Pallot shows that many of these practices in fact made economic sense. Reformers were thus ill equipped to overcome peasant misgivings, to respond to obstacles, and to understand the motives behind peasant resistance. It is interesting to note that Pallot’s understanding of the economic rationality of communal practices comes from the wealth of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century studies with which land reform officials were familiar. While the author thankfully restores variety and complexity to the views of the “bureaucracy”, it does remain to be explained how agronomic knowledge of the commune became marginalized and politically irrelevant.

In the second theme of the book, the author moves away from the reformers’ goals to study implementation. The focus here is on peasant motives for applying for title or enclosure. While the reform bureaucracy viewed such applications as a sign that peasants were embracing individualized agriculture, Pallot shows that they in fact often hid non-agricultural motives: households that stood to lose land in future repartitions took out title; entire communes applied for enclosure to prevent unilateral action by individual households; individuals undertook fictitious enclosures to obtain grants and loans. Meanwhile, local officials — under bureaucratic pressure to show large numbers of households engaged in the reform — made significant concessions to communal agriculture, particularly with respect to the retention of commons. In evaluating the agricultural impact of reforms, Pallot provides the most cogent explanation thus far for geographical variations, arguing that the differences between enclosed and unenclosed farms were less than those between regions. Overall, the author concludes that, while there may have been land reorganization, there was little agrarian reform, the commune was not destroyed, and there was limited progress towards independent farming.

Finally, Pallot considers the issue of peasant resistance. Following historical sociologist James Scott, Pallot seeks to uncover the peasants’ hidden transcripts to reveal the wide range of “weapons of the weak” villagers used against both officials and individual petitioners. While the author’s description of intimidation, foot dragging, and manipulation of legislation are rich and nuanced, there does appear at times to be a disjunction between the argument and the evidence. While Pallot examines resistance as emerging from a “common oppositional counter-culture” (p. 157) and seek-

ing to “sustain the idea of solidarity” (p. 165), she also recognizes that the impact of the reforms was to “exploit the fault lines in the village” (p. 159). The apparent contradiction is never fully explained, and much of the evidence presented in fact shows villagers divided and fighting each other. This is one area where broadening the source base may have been useful, for much of the conflict generated by the reforms did not reach the land reform administration, which is the object of Pallot’s study, but was fought out in the local courts and in administrative hearings. Nevertheless, a different reading of the story of peasant resistance would not alter Pallot’s conclusion that “the likelihood that an agricultural advance in Russia would be based on farms formed under the Stolypin Reform’s provisions was limited” (p. 30).

Overall, Pallot makes an important contribution to our understanding of late Imperial Russia. This work is also distinguished by the seriousness of intellectual engagement with historians with whom the author disagrees, a welcome departure from the all too frequent propensity to argue against a caricature of the work of predecessors. *Land Reform in Russia* will be indispensable reading for students of the period and should be more generally of interest to scholars interested in reform projects undertaken in the name of modernization. My only substantive criticisms of this book have little to do with the author, but are aimed at the publisher. Most of the errors can be attributed to a disappointing editing job by Oxford University Press. Several maps are poorly formatted, rendering them virtually useless; a few errors in footnotes are compounded by the lack of a bibliography. At the prohibitive price of \$119 (Canadian), this slim volume may be bypassed even by many university libraries and may not reach the audience it deserves.

Corinne Gaudin  
University of Ottawa

M. E. Reisner, ed. — *The Diary of a Country Clergyman, 1848–1851: James Reid*.  
Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2000. Pp. lxxxvi, 371.

James Reid was born near Dunkeld in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1780. In 1801 he was swept up by the evangelical preaching of a lay missionary from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He became involved in the missionary activities of the Haldane brothers and joined the Congregational movement in Scotland. Between 1802 and 1806, Reid attended the seminary in Edinburgh where he trained as a missionary. He was ordained in 1806 and immediately sent to a British North American mission. In Glengarry County, Reid’s mission work met with opposition because his sponsors had failed to provide him with proper credentials. The local Presbyterian and Catholic missionaries viewed him as a “promoter of schism”. Finally, when the Haldane brothers impugned the doctrine of infant baptism, Reid abandoned the Congregational church in Glengarry and moved to Cornwall, where he started a school. There he met John Strachan, who had recently left the Presbyterian church for the established Church of England. Strachan introduced Reid to the Rev. Charles Stewart, the Anglican missionary at St. Armand in Lower Canada, who was destined to