World. The emergence of neo-Marxian political economy along with systems theory have fostered widespread dissatisfaction with the Rostowian view of economic growth. Even if these models (for example, the metropolis-satellite thesis or core-periphery variant) and their theme of "dependency" fade from popularity, they have pushed development thinking clearly into a new arena. However, Bairoch's book flows mainly out of the traditional, liberal school of economics. The volume is not organized to test any general theory of development, but is useful primarily as a descriptive reference or compendium of Third World macro-economic statistics. It is not a global explanation of underdevelopment, as advertised, but a worldwide, macro-statistical accounting of growth indicators in selected sectors of regional and national economies since 1900.

Nevertheless, the book is an excellent resource for development scholars regardless of theoretical persuasion. The translator (Lady Cynthia Postan) and publisher are to be commended for their excellent presentation of the 4th French edition of Bairoch's original 1967 work. The author's purpose was to formulate a longitudinal, comparative view of economic development in the Third World from 1900 to 1970. Ten aspects of economic growth in underdeveloped countries were chosen for statistical scrutiny: population, agriculture, extractive industry, manufacturing industry, foreign trade, terms of trade, education, urbanization, labor and employment, and macro-economic data. By using statistics drawn from a large number of cases, Bairoch compiled over 50 impressive tables highlighting directions of economic change. Whenever possible, Bairoch attempted to compare conditions in Third World countries with those of developed nations at the time of their "take-off." His discussions of the significance of trends are always interesting. Similarly, his comments on such diverse topics as the green revolution or the historical meaning of unemployment are enlightening.

My major criticism is that this edition already seems behind the times, despite a 1977 publication date and claims of timeliness. Although many issues have been effectively analyzed, others have been put aside with worn cliches and stereotypes of the 1950s and 1960s. Does anyone seriously believe that present economic conditions in Third World countries are comparable to "take-off" conditions of early industrial Europe? Is it still fruitful to view underdeveloped countries as autonomous and autochthonous units, seemingly following the same path of development experienced by the West? For those who answer these questions affirmatively, this book will make superb reading. For the rest of us, perhaps still in the minority, it will be welcomed on our shelves mainly as an excellent quantitative reference.

Robert Rhoades

University of Arizona
Tuscon, U.S.A.


The study of early Sino-Russian relations has attracted the attention of a number of Western writers and scholars. As early as 1911, Gaston Cahen published his Histoire des relations de la Russie avec la Chine sous Pierre le Grand (1689-1730), and John F. Baddeley's monumental Russia, Mongolia, China (2 vols.) was published in 1919. Since
then, monographs on Russia’s eastward expansion (R. J. Kerner’s *The Urge to the Sea* and G. V. Lantzeff’s *Siberia in the Seventeenth Century* among others), her trade interests in the East (including R. H. Fisher’s *The Russian Fur Trade, 1550-1700* and C. M. Foust’s *Muscovite and Mandarin*), and her early diplomatic contacts with China (M. Mancall’s *Russia and China: Their Diplomatic Relations to 1728*), not to mention general surveys of Russo-Chinese relations, have appeared. Moreover, the onset of the Sino-Soviet dispute in the late 1950s and early 1960s has resulted in the publication of several useful, though self-serving, soviet accounts of Russian relations with the Ch’ing dynasty (including V. A. Aleksandrov’s *Rossiia na kal’nevostochnykh rubezhakh: vtoria polovina XVII v.*).

Yet the Russian ecclesiastical mission in Ch’ing China has, until now, scarcely been studied. Eric Widmer has filled this gap in the work under review. Starting with a brief but useful summary of early Russo-Ch’ing relations, he provides a skillful analysis of the differing world views and interests of the Tsarist and Manchu courts. He points out that the Treaty of Nerchinsk (1689) and the Treaty of Kiakhta (1728) not only resolved their territorial, commercial, and legal disputes, but also offered the Russians the opportunity to establish a permanent ecclesiastical mission in Peking. Housed in the Ming hostel for foreign emissaries, the Hui-t’ung-kuan, the mission survived into the nineteenth century, and the building is now the site of the Soviet embassy in China. Seven ecclesiastical missions were dispatched to Peking in the eighteenth century. Widmer describes their frustrating, frequently hilarious, but also often pathetic experiences in China.

He documents, in some detail, the obstacles encountered by the missions. The Russian government frequently showed little interest in and concern for the ecclesiastical envoys, while the Ch’ing court treated them as typical tribute bearers and lamas from the Inner Asian steppes. Many of the envoys themselves were reluctant to go to China. The Tsarist court was hard pressed to recruit priests and monks for the missions. Those who were recruited often acted bizarrely when they reached China. Several were alcoholics and thieves, and one was accused of “reeling about the grounds of the monastery in female dress” (p. 133). Ch’ing officials were not amused.

The institutions associated with the mission were, according to Widmer, largely ineffective. The O-lo-ssu wen kuan, a Russian language school for Manchu students, was abandoned as a failure in the early nineteenth century, and the O-lo-ssu hsüeh, a Chinese and Manchu language school for a small number of Russian students residing in Peking, trained few capable interpreters and translators. Both the church (O-lo-ssu nan kuan) for individual Russian citizens living in China and the official Sretenskii Monastery (O-lo-ssu nan kuan) for the ecclesiastical missions were constantly in need of repairs. Only in the late nineteenth-century did the Russian government provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of the buildings and grounds.

To some readers, Widmer’s indictment of the mission may appear unduly harsh. After all, as he himself admits, some of the Russian envoys were serious and dedicated. One compiled a fine Manchu-Russian dictionary, another translated a history of the Yuan dynasty, and still another acquired so many Chinese and Manchu books that fifteen camels were required to transport his collection back to Russia. The Russian mission did not make full use of the opportunities granted to it by the Ch’ing, but, considering the failures and blunders of the Western nations in East and Southeast Asia in the twentieth century, the reader may question Widmer’s overly negative assessment of its contributions.