

maze of minor figures in Russian politics, German philosophy and theology, and so forth. How many readers of this English edition, for example, will know that the "Vinet" discussed on pp. 249–51 is Alexandre Vinet, a Swiss theologian noted particularly for his writings on church-state relations?

ABBOTT GLEASON
Brown University

TRAINING THE NIHILISTS: EDUCATION AND RADICALISM IN TSARIST RUSSIA. By *Daniel R. Brower*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1975. 248 pp. \$12.50.

In this book Professor Brower provides a historical interpretation of the sociology of the radical intellectuals in mid-nineteenth-century Russia. He argues, among other things, that, in Russian higher education, a "recruitment" system developed which fed a steady if small stream of committed revolutionaries into the life of the country, and that the radical intelligentsia was drawn from much the same social strata as university students in general. Brower seeks to investigate the details of this recruitment system and to explore the personal motives of active revolutionaries. He accomplishes these objectives rather well, although he is sometimes unduly repetitive.

According to Brower, the roots of radical rebellion lay in the Russian educational experience. More precisely, radicals tended to be formed in the most select institutions of higher learning, particularly the universities of St. Petersburg and Moscow and the Medical-Surgical Academy in St. Petersburg. The university student body in Russia was a very small elite with great expectations for the future, though often with little enough to eat in the present. A sense of solidarity among students, a feeling of apartness from society at large, coupled with the awareness that the larger fraction of the elite would eventually control the state apparatus and the destinies of the Russian empire, justified the smaller fraction's belief that, given the opportunity, it too could chart a course for the entire nation, and impose that course upon the people.

Brower writes that professors at the higher schools generally were not involved in radicalizing their students. They stood for traditional learning, whereas the radical young people demanded—to use a modern catchword—"relevant" knowledge. Indeed, the younger generation defined the very word "learning" to fit its own purposes. As one radical wrote explicitly, "learning" really meant "socialist ideology," founded upon "the ideal of brotherly love and universal equality." And Brower implicitly accepts this definition. When he writes of students in pursuit of learning, he usually has in mind students engaged in political speculation along socialist lines, theorizing about what would or should be, instead of analyzing what had been or was. Since they could not usually obtain such "learning" in the classroom, students formed shifting "circles," a major element of the recruitment system, for discussion. Students also supported the Sunday School movement of the early 1860s, and attempted to provide a model of the new way of life by forming communes. These efforts yielded little in the way of practical results—the students in the Sunday Schools fell away when they faced the drudgery of teaching reading and writing rather than the tenets of their political ideology—but that did not dampen the students' political interests.

Brower acknowledges that the number of students who emerged from this recruitment system as thoroughgoing revolutionaries was quite small, but the Russian authorities were intelligent enough to worry about even that seemingly insignificant number. They understood the impact which the complete defection of even a relatively small fraction of the nation's intellectual elite could have.

At one point Brower mentions the "striking parallels" between the American student movement of the 1960s and the Russian ferment of a century before. Although he decides to bypass this "tantalizing theme," one may hope that it will someday be investigated. Brower already has given us a very helpful treatment of the Russian half of the topic.

CHARLES A. MOSER
George Washington University

KRUPNAIA BURZHUAZIIA V POREFORMENNOI ROSSII: 1861–1900.

By V. Ia. Laverychev. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1974. 252 pp. 1.19 rubles.

After fifty years, Soviet scholarship has produced a work equal in importance to Pavel Berlin's classic *Russkaia burzhuaziia*. Other Soviet historians have written specialized works on banking, foreign trade, and monopoly capitalism, but Laverychev is the first to put the business class in the center of the narrative. He focuses on the aspirations and behavior of the industrial and commercial leaders themselves, and examines in more detail than did Berlin the economic and political developments of the decades before 1905. Laverychev has scoured the archives, read obscure trade publications, and unearthed rare secondary sources. Here is fascinating information on how the Russian manufacturers formed their companies and cartels, financed newspapers and journals, resisted the state's labor legislation, and pressured the government for tariff protection and access to foreign markets.

There are four chapters, structured around specific themes such as economic growth, cultural change and organizational development, public activity, and relations with the Ministry of Finance. Because each topic spans the entire forty-year period, the reader may lose a sense of the general chronology or miss important causal relationships. For example, Laverychev describes in three separate sections the industrialists' various efforts to defeat free-trade ideas in the late 1860s: the formation of the first Russian industrial society (pp. 95–96), the financing of the protectionist newspaper *Moskva* (pp. 117–22), and the tariff debate itself (pp. 176–81). This approach serves the author's own purpose only if it is to present a maximum of factual material on each topic without giving the comprehensive interpretation needed. Brief, almost off-hand citations from Lenin purport to explain, in Marxian terms, both the Russian industrialists' resentment of the state's bureaucratic tyranny and their refusal to throw their considerable financial resources behind the Russian liberal movement. But Laverychev's narrative leads the reader to question Lenin's mutually contradictory conceptions. Indeed, a close reading of the text suggests that noneconomic factors heavily influenced Russian industrial ideology before 1905. The persistence of traditional merchant faith in tsarism and the adoption of xenophobic and anti-liberal concepts from Slavophile and Pan-Slavic intellectuals, for example, appear to have been especially significant.