but they do suggest the general direction of this distinctively Russian reaction to Darwin.)

The biologists, geographers, and naturalists who form the subject matter of this study are principally seven: the botanist A. N. Beketov, the botanical geographer S. I. Korzhinskii, the zoologist and pathologist I. I. Mechnikov, the ichthyologist and theorist of mutual aid K. F. Kessler, and the geologist and geographer P. A. Kropotkin who is better known in the West as an anarchist and defender of the mutual aid thesis. Each of these scientists receives a separate chapter devoted to his life and work. The naturalist N. A. Severtsov and the plant physiologist K. A. Timiriazev are treated together in one chapter, both singled out as examples of the most orthodox or "classical" Darwinians in Russia. Their reluctance to criticize Darwin for his use of the Malthusian metaphor marked them as a minority among Russian biologists of the nineteenth century. Quite a number of other scientists are treated with more than a passing mention, but are not accorded chapter-length treatment. Though the volume does not pretend to be a comprehensive overview of the whole of nineteenth-century Russian biology, it would serve nicely as an introductory Who's Who for the interested reader not previously familiar with the subject.

Among Todes' conclusions is the claim that the Russian response to Darwin's "struggle for existence" was a genuinely national one in two senses. First, it was exceedingly widely shared; the discussion of Darwin preoccupied not only scientists but philosophers, social theorists, novelists and essayists. The moral implications of the Malthusian metaphor were viewed as highly significant by much of educated opinion in Russia. Second, Todes points out that the consensus view that Darwin's use of the Malthusian metaphor was a serious defect in his theory was strikingly widely shared across ideological divides. Nihilists, populists, liberals, monarchists—all were united in resistance to the Malthusian perspective. The same unity could be found across generations and across professional divides as well: botanists, zoologists, geologists, psychiatrists and hygienists could all be found in the same camp on this issue.

By way of explanation of this striking national consensus Todes makes two suggestions. First, he reminds us that Russia's social and economic history in the nineteenth century was very different from England's. Russia lacked the English experience of an aggressive bourgeoisie pursuing wealth in an essentially laissez faire economic system. The Russian social and economic milieu of landowners and peasants engaged in agriculture, with a comparative lack of competitive economic individualism, did not provide fertile soil for Malthus' theory. Second, Russia's natural conditions of vast, sparsely populated lands combined with a harsh climate made Malthus' fundamental images seem simply irrelevant to the nature which they knew. On both these grounds, Darwin's reliance on Malthus seemed seriously mistaken.

The book is very elegantly produced, seems largely free of typos, and contains both name and subject indexes as well as an extensive apparatus of notes.

Philip T. Grier
Dickinson College


Joravsky describes the subject of his latest book as "the Russian mind" and "modern claims to know what mind is or how it works." (p. viii) His choice of the
word "mind" alerts the reader early on that—the title notwithstanding—this is far from a typical history of psychology. While the scope of this work is vast, the author's aim is not to provide a comprehensive catalogue of theory and empirical research in the field of psychology. Rather, he identifies four distinctive conceptions of mind (scientific, aesthetic, ideological, and philosophical), and examines nineteenth and twentieth-century variants of each. Similarly, although he employs a chronological approach, Joravsky's goal is not to chronicle advances in scientific understanding but to document his contention that "the modern science of mind was predestined at conception to flounder between philosophy and neurophysiology and social science." (p. xv)

The book's central themes are the stunning failure of modern attempts to understand the human condition and the complex relationship between theorizing in these areas and the world of politics. Although the argument centers upon Russian writers and researchers and their socio-political context, Joravsky extends his argument to modern societies in general: "My purpose is to shame the philistine narrowness and smug self-deceptions that are so widespread among twentieth-century specialists and to overcome blind contempt for Marxist-Leninist ventures in the human sciences. Their self-defeating efforts to stamp out the fragmentation of culture derive in large part from the genuine crisis of fragmentation which we share with them." (p. 47)

Traditional societies offered a unified ideology based upon religious assumptions about the human body and soul. While Joravsky expresses no desire to restore the unifying themes of bygone eras, he does argue that the attempts of modern cultures to find meaningful substitutes in scientific understanding of human beings have failed. Instead, the modern approach has resulted in the "fragmentation, specialization, and isolation" of knowledge, while scientific disdain for political matters and claims of value neutrality have merely obscured rather than eliminated "the subordination of scientists to political masters." (p. 78)

To set the stage Joravsky begins his discussion with an account of the "genteel disintegration" of traditional solutions to the mind-body problem first in the West and then in much greater detail in late imperial Russia. He begins with the science of neurophysiology and the emergence of mechanistic views which sought to eliminate the mind altogether, and he chronicles the mixed reaction of creative writers to that perspective. This is followed by an excursion into the realm of psychology, whose various efforts to study mental processes scientifically have resulted in a hodgepodge of conflicting schools, which the author describes as "disagreeable tribes claiming a single territory, shaping a history of dynamic tension within enduring wilderness." (p. 26)

This analysis of scientific research and theoretical speculation is accompanied by a discussion of the response of rulers to the undermining by those endeavors of the traditional ideologies which had legitimized their authority. Joravsky also provides ample evidence that neither scientific theorizing nor the behavior of individual scientists remained independent of the influence of ideology.

The Russian Revolution, as Joravsky describes it, ushered in a grand attempt at a new "genteel integration." Seeking paradigmatic unity in Marxism-Leninism, intellectuals and scientists explored new avenues of thought, negotiating disagreements with relative civility (if not successfully resolving them), until the rise of Stalin substituted a superficial "plastic unity" for the gentility of the 1920s. Joravsky explores in depth the impact of Stalinism on the various human sciences. His efforts to decipher Stalin's position on the intellectual issue at hand and his role in the "Pavlov solution" reached in the early 1950s are particularly intriguing.