

STRUVE: LIBERAL ON THE LEFT, 1870–1905. By *Richard Pipes*. Russian Research Center Studies, 64. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970. xiii, 415 pp. \$10.00.

Few figures in Russian intellectual history present more tantalizing problems to a biographer than Peter Struve. In the 1890s he was the best-known domestic protagonist of Marxism; early in the new century he played a seminal role in the movement for constitutional democracy; and after the 1905 revolution he became a leading advocate of Russian state interest. Contemporaries, not surprisingly, wondered how anyone, least of all a man of unquestioned integrity, could reconcile such contradictory beliefs. On the far left he was distrusted by many as a renegade, and Lenin in particular developed for his former colleague a personal antipathy that left a lasting imprint upon the Bolshevik political credo.

Richard Pipes's magisterial study is the first work in any language to give this brilliant and paradoxical character his due. We are given a convincing portrait of a man smitten by "intellectual schizophrenia," beholden only to the dictates of his conscience: "his mind worked so quickly, and on so many different levels, that even his most devoted admirers could never tell where he stood on any particular issue"; yet he possessed such penetrating insight into the problems of his age that he was usually a leap ahead of everyone else. Ordinary mortals, alas, do not take kindly to such paragons, and even today his personality will probably command more respect than affection.

Struve was a remarkably reticent man, by the standards of the old Russian intelligentsia, and for several key periods of his life the information available is regrettably sparse. Pipes has coped in admirable fashion with these difficulties, skillfully reinterpreting the widely scattered published material and supplementing it with gleanings from Western and Soviet archives. (He was, alas, unable to see all the relevant material preserved in the USSR.) The result is a wide-ranging and profound analysis of the whole milieu in which Struve moved, a study that fairly sparkles with original insights. We discover, for instance, that Struve was the first scholar to investigate Marx's thought in his "pre-Marxian phase," which enjoys a considerable vogue today, and that he foresaw in the 1890s the threat which uncontrolled technological progress would pose to the values of modern civilization. His essays in philosophy and economics are shown to have much more than mere historical interest. Dealing with the political facet of what is loosely (and inaccurately) called "legal Marxism," Pipes enlarges upon the findings of previous historians to the effect that for some years Struve and Lenin were linked in a close alliance against the populists—something which each of them later found expedient to deny. The story of the fateful breach between Russian liberalism and social democracy has never been told so clearly, or with such exemplary objectivity.

It is, however, going rather far to call the twenty-year-old Struve "the first Social Democrat in Russia" (as distinct from those in emigration). Even if one rules out working-class neophytes whose understanding of Marx was inferior to that of the precocious young Struve, and looks indulgently upon his idiosyncratic interpretation of the master, there are several rival claimants to the honor: N. I. Ziber, for example, who like Struve preferred the *kafedra* to the *krushok*. Nor can it fairly be said that the Union of Liberation, for all its undoubted significance, was "the only successful revolutionary organization in the history of imperial Russia," or that in 1905 "the monarchy capitulated unconditionally to [its] ultimatum." The ministers assembled at Peterhof did not, after all, base their constitutional thinking

on Struve's radical draft, and some credit for the October Manifesto must go to those who supplied the muscle-power. Incidentally, the government's provisional regulations on the suppression of university unrest were promulgated in July 1899, not in 1900 (p. 261).

Yet it is better to see Struve's historical role overemphasized than minimized or ignored, as has hitherto been the general rule. This biography promises to be a monument worthy of its subject's cardinal significance in the intellectual and political life of modern Russia. Readers will keenly await the sequel to the present volume, which is to cover that period in Struve's career when fear of mass violence turned him into "a liberal on the right," who sought to avert catastrophe by forging a democratic brand of Russian nationalism. The attempt failed, but the aim was not an ignoble one.

JOHN KEEP  
*University of Toronto*

THE INDUSTRIALIZATION OF RUSSIA: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE. By *William L. Blackwell*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1970. x, 198 pp. Paper.

This historical survey of Russian economic development from the middle of the nineteenth century to the present aims to provide students with "background usually lacking in more detailed and technical examinations of the contemporary economy of the U.S.S.R." The subject matter is therefore quite familiar, at least to the historian, as is the descriptive approach stressing political and social phenomena unadorned by economic or social analysis other than passing references to Rostow's stage theory of growth. Given his framework, the author has produced a good manual that should prove useful in classroom teaching situations.

Since the fate of the survey writer is almost invariably to say little that is new or controversial, it is of utmost importance how well he says what is old and commonplace. Blackwell fares well here: not only does he know the literature, but he writes with flair. This enhances his description and generalization, which are particularly satisfactory for the pre-Soviet and Stalinist periods. Some insights are genuinely thought-provoking, and they should stimulate all but the dullest to learn more.

One may hope, perhaps without justification, that this work will be used where it actually complements and not where it only repeats. It would be an asset in most courses on the contemporary Soviet economy, not to mention Soviet politics, foreign policy, or literature. There the skillfully presented common knowledge of historians with economic inclinations can provide students with another dimension that also bears upon different questions receiving more detailed and perhaps more sophisticated treatment in the respective courses. In my opinion, this would not be the case for most survey or period courses in Russian history, since the book duplicates to a considerable extent standard descriptive material and analysis. As for students of Russian or comparative economic history, they will probably be better off tackling Nove's *Economic History of the U.S.S.R.*, a rougher but more challenging work for them.

JOHN P. MCKAY  
*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*