

The account of the preparation of the emancipation includes no major revisions, but numerous small changes alter the tone of the section significantly. Typical is the new stress placed on the innovative role of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, particularly in publicizing the celebrated rescript to Nazimov which brought the issue of abolition into the open. The cumulative effect of many such shifts in emphasis is to encourage the reader to see the final legislation as the outcome of a complex of factors—administrative, moral, and psychological, as well as economic.

The present edition of *Otmena* appears in a *tirazh* of forty thousand copies as contrasted with the first revision of only fifteen thousand. This, along with the fact that the second revision bears the imprimatur of the Academy of Sciences rather than that of Uchpedgiz, confirms what is evident from the text itself—that the most recent edition is the definitive one. Libraries should include it in their collections, even though they may already own its predecessors.

S. FREDERICK STARR
Princeton University

MIROVOZZRENIE D. I. PISAREVA. By V. A. Tsybenko. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1969. 352 pp. 1.75 rubles.

In this new study of Dmitrii Pisarev (1840–68), V. A. Tsybenko suggests that previous Soviet scholarship has not understood Pisarev because of his “Aesopian language.” Tsybenko believes that Pisarev’s articles must be “deciphered literally” to reveal what he concealed because of tsarist censorship. Tsybenko has built his book on four theses which he uses as guides for “deciphering” Pisarev’s articles: (1) Pisarev “correctly” understood the problem of the role of the masses and the individual in history and of the origin and role of ideas in society; (2) Pisarev understood the path of socialist development in Russia and Europe by applying materialism and the dialectic to the interpretation of nature and society; (3) Pisarev played a major role after 1861 in the struggle between the liberals representing the bourgeoisie and the nihilists representing the growing proletariat; (4) Pisarev overcame the limitations of utopian socialism and approached scientific socialism.

Anyone acquainted with Pisarev’s writings will not be surprised that Tsybenko offers no satisfactory evidence for his misconceived theses. They reflect a less than adequate understanding of either Pisarev or his time. Tsybenko’s evidence consists of quotations from Pisarev’s articles, often out of context, which he interprets (“deciphers”) by irrelevant references to Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Tsybenko also puts forward unusual claims for Pisarev’s analytical ability. According to him, Pisarev was not only the first “philosopher” in the world to understand the implications of Darwinism, but he even “resolved more correctly than Darwin” several problems concerning the origin and evolution of species. Tsybenko unfortunately does not identify these problems. Pisarev’s denial of the validity of metaphysics in his essay on Darwin is quoted out of context and attributed to Pisarev’s “profound” appreciation of the dialectical character of Darwinism, rather than to Pisarev’s very obvious admiration for the mechanistic materialism of Büchner, Vogt, and Moleschott.

Tsybenko’s concern with making Pisarev into a consistent precursor of Soviet Marxist doctrine is not typical of Soviet scholarship on Pisarev. A. N. Maslin summarized in 1968 the contemporary Soviet interpretation when he praised Pisarev as a passionate and original thinker who provided a rationale for materialism,

revolutionary ideas, and the transformation of society. But Maslin also warned, from the Soviet Marxist point of view, of the errors in Pisarev's elitism and his positivistic and mechanistic approach to science and society.

Tsybenko's book has little to contribute to the serious study of Pisarev and his time. The best guide to Pisarev remains his collected works and the magisterial study of Armand Coquart on Russian nihilism.

JAMES ALLEN ROGERS
Claremont Men's College

PIONEERS FOR PROFIT: FOREIGN ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND RUSSIAN INDUSTRIALIZATION, 1885-1913. By *John P. McKay*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970. xiii, 442 pp. \$11.50.

At the beginning of this century the prominent Belgian banker and director of the Société des Wagons-lits, Jules Nagelmackers, had contracted to provide dining and sleeping services for the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Payment for part of the bill was long overdue, but when in 1903 Nagelmackers presented his contract personally to Count Witte, as related by John P. McKay, "Witte asked to see the contract, read it, and then 'carefully taking it between thumb and forefinger, tore it to pieces and threw it in the wastebasket without adding a word of explication or justification.' Nagelmackers left St. Petersburg that evening in a hopeless rage, 'vowing never again to return to this country of savages'" (p. 278). This little scene dramatizes a very important point that McKay makes in his study of foreign enterprise in Imperial Russia during the last three decades of the old regime. The Russian economy was not being placed "under the control of the henchmen of Rothschild and Bleichröder," as Lenin taunted Witte (p. 274). There was never an imperialistic "imbalance of power in the foreigner's favor." Tsarist Russia, as Witte said, was not China (p. 277); the government was too strong to capitulate to foreign enterprise. It kept the whip hand. Diplomatic pressures were not decisive, nor was the foreign businessman permitted to ensconce himself in an insulated enclave from which he could drain the country dry. Why then was he attracted to a seemingly inhospitable land where the classic imperialist "wedge" was so obstructed? Profits, according to McKay, could be made by the foreigner coming into partnership with Russian capital and a *modus vivendi* with the tsarist government, arrangements mutually profitable for all concerned. The foreigner profited by selling his superior technology, which Russia could not duplicate. Advanced technology was worth money, and it saved money in lower production costs. Russian as well as European capital sought investment in such profitable ventures; and Russian businessmen, with their connections and knowledge of local affairs, could help the foreign entrepreneur establish himself in Russia. For Russian officialdom, on the lower levels, here was a new and lucrative source for bribes. For the Minister of Finance, it was a way to industrialize Russia through the importation of foreign capital and technology. McKay departs from previous scholars in attaching more importance to this aspect of the tsarist government's modernization efforts than its other more direct attempts to develop and control industry. He also suggests that the massive and rapid growth of foreign enterprise and technology during the reign of Nicholas II, particularly in the south, helped to "infuse a missing dynamism and growth outlook in Russia" (p. 383). On balance, he sees foreign enterprise in Russia as productive pioneering rather than plunder, more useful than harmful for the country.