

Russia, Bolshevism, and the Versailles Peace. By John M. Thompson. *Studies of the Russian Institute*, Columbia University. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966. Pp. vii, 429. Notes, maps, note on sources, bibliography, index. \$11.50.)

The Versailles Peace Conference, like the Congress of Vienna a century before, faced the double challenge of restoring political order after both a major war and a major revolution. Its experience in the second of these endeavors is the subject of Thompson's book. Like a Soviet book published a few years ago on the same subject, it might well have been entitled *The Russian Question at the Paris Peace Conference*.

The author has emphasized those issues which were of the most direct concern to the conference, such as the Prinkipo proposal, the Bullitt mission, and various plans for the containment of the revolution in Russia. Further, he has centered his attention on the conference and its deliberations rather than on the Russians or events in Russia. The White Russian representatives in Paris are treated briefly, though perhaps adequately in view of their impact on the conference. The formation of the Third International, while of the greatest interest in this context, is properly given only the briefest mention. The Japanese, both as members of the conference and as directly interested parties where the Russian Revolution was concerned, are a subject that could profitably have been given a larger role in this narrative.

Separate topics are given continuity in a way that seems appropriate in view of their importance in the minds of the conference leaders. They are related to the large issues which the conference faced, such as: defeated and revolutionary Russia, defeated and potentially revolutionary Germany, and the widespread fear that these two currents might run together either from their political right or left or a combination of these extremes.

The treatment of these topics and issues is characterized by a careful weighing of a considerable amount of evidence, much of it new but all of it very effectively used. It is also characterized by balanced judgments on many individual, significant issues; by a conspicuous readiness to give full consideration to individual and national interests; and by a high degree of respect for the contemporary context of views and events. In short, the book is a gratifying product of a search for an understanding of the early reception of the Soviet regime in the West.

University of Hawaii

John Albert White