

**KRIEGSALLIANZ UND WIRTSCHAFTSINTERESSEN: RUSSLAND IN DEN WIRTSCHAFTSPLÄNEN ENGLANDS UND FRANKREICHS, 1914–1917.** By *Bernd Bonwetsch*. Studien zur modernen Geschichte, no. 10. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag, 1973. 256 pp. DM 29, paper.

Bernd Bonwetsch's study of the relation of the economic interests of France, Great Britain, and Russia to their wartime alliance of 1914–17 is a revised version of a Hamburg doctoral dissertation. Basing his study on American, British, French, and Russian archival materials located in Birmingham, London, Paris, New York, Stanford, and Washington and on extensive published sources and secondary works, Bonwetsch examines in considerable detail how World War I influenced certain British, French, and Russian businessmen, politicians, and publicists to look to victory as a means of crippling Germany, not only militarily but also economically. In Russia, however, an extreme anti-German, postwar economic policy received only limited support, for Russians did not want to be mere suppliers of raw materials for French and British industry and had little to gain from allowing Britain and France to replace Germany as the principal foreign supplier of industrial goods for the Russian market. Indeed, in many ways the Russian and German economies complemented one another, and the Russian champions of economic discrimination against Germany, therefore, tended to be either nationalists who wished to undermine Germany's position as a world power or diplomats who were interested in strengthening the wartime alliance.

Bonwetsch's monograph is well conceived and organized and written in clear historical prose. It is of interest to both diplomatic and economic historians. Diplomatic historians will find it of value as a case study in how conflicting economic interests can affect the relations of wartime allies. For the economic historian Bonwetsch offers both insight into the nature of wartime economic policy-making in Britain, France, and Russia and a discussion of the postwar prospects (assuming victory and political continuity) of the Russian economy. He assesses these prospects more pessimistically than Alexander Gerschenkron and John P. McKay do, emphasizing that unresolved agricultural problems and the addition of a heavy burden of wartime debt to what Russia already owed her Western allies seriously called into question whether or not there would be a resumption of the rapid rate of economic expansion that had taken place in Russia during the nineties and between 1908 and 1914.

EDWARD C. THADEN  
*University of Illinois, Chicago*

**RUSSIA AND ASIA: ESSAYS ON THE INFLUENCE OF RUSSIA ON THE ASIAN PEOPLES.** Edited by *Wayne S. Vucinich*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1972. xiv, 521 pp. \$15.00.

This volume presents revised versions of papers originally read in late 1967 at a conference on "The Russian Impact on Asia." The Asian peoples or countries are treated in articles on the Georgians (David M. Lang), Armenians (Vartan Gregorian), Muslims in European Russia and the Caucasus (Alexandre Bennigsen) and in Central Asia (Manuel Sarkisyanz), Siberian peoples (Stephen P. and Ethel Dunn), China (Mark Mancall), and Japan (George A. Lensen). These essays are preceded by historical surveys of Russian attitudes toward Asia (N. V. Riasan-

ovsky), Oriental studies in Russia (Richard N. Frye), and the organizational vicissitudes of Soviet orientology (Wayne S. Vucinich).

The general question of the rationale of the various contributions to this volume is raised by the first three articles. Together they comprise one-third of its contents. Whatever their merits otherwise, they are not effectively related to the problem of Russian influence, and they constitute far too lengthy a prelude to the major topic. The seven case studies are essays based on existing monographic works (frequently the authors' own) rather than products of new research. Still, since much of the monographic literature is in Russian or more exotic languages, these essays provide convenient digests of scholarship otherwise difficult of access. Too often, unfortunately, they seem little more than that. (Mancall's interesting thesis on the structure of Sino-Russian contact is a striking exception.) Larger issues, such as the distinction between Soviet and Russian influences, continuity and change, or the net value of Soviet rule, are raised, but not systematically pursued. This failure detracts from the coherence of the volume as a whole.

As these articles make clear, the somewhat Europocentric concept of "Asia" embraces a tremendous diversity of cultures, and the Russian impact from place to place is equally diverse in character. Can the diversities be usefully juxtaposed? In fact, the degree of complementarity which these essays do exhibit suggests the value of a comparative approach. The studies of Georgia and Armenia shed light on each other, as do those of the various Muslim minorities. And the particular aspects of Russian influences in all these cases are further highlighted by contrast with the small and primitive Siberian ethnic groups, or with China and Japan, which never came under Russian control. Still, the complementarities seem to be outweighed by the overall impression of incommensurability.

This is unfortunate, for there are approaches which would lend greater coherence to the examination of Russia's impact on Asia. In an age of the emergence of national identities (in some cases stimulated by Soviet policy), Russia has appeared as the prophet of a new universal truth, champion of an international cause, and claimant to supranational loyalties. Russia has played a unique role in the development of nationalism, internationalism, and social revolution around her Asian perimeter, and these developments indeed provide a common framework for considering the Russian influence on China and Georgia, on Uzbeks and Aleuts. One might have hoped that the conference which yielded this volume would also have generated some such community of focus among the authors of these articles—perhaps even a substantial introduction to pull their findings together.

DON C. PRICE  
*University of California, Davis*

UKRAINIAN-JAPANESE RELATIONS, 1903–1945: HISTORICAL SURVEY AND OBSERVATIONS. By *John V. Sweet*. New York: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1973. xi, 371 pp. \$8.00.

John V. Sweet (Ivan Svit) was the editor of the Ukrainian weekly *Man'dzhurskii Vistnik* in Harbin from 1932 to 1937; he was also secretary of the Ukrainian Club in that city and a representative of the Union of Ukrainian Emigrants in Manchuria. His book is not so much a history of Ukrainian-Japanese relations from 1903 to 1945 as a journalistic memoir of the life and political activities of Ukrainian