

in the surprisingly rigid opposition of Konstantin Nikolaevich, the chairman of the Main Committee on Peasant Affairs which had overall responsibility in legislative matters in this area until its abolition in 1882. The "progressive" grand duke defended the structure of the 1861 settlement as if it were sacred. But Chernukha's material allows us to postulate a more far-reaching explanation for the government's failure to act decisively and quickly—namely, the nature of the Russian legislative process itself. The machinery of change was slow, cumbersome, and designed to produce half measures. Ministers had both administrative and legislative responsibilities. Reports and commentaries were passed to and fro among institutions and commissions. Shuvalov fell out of favor. Bariatinsky returned to private life, and Timashev lacked initiative. The military reforms of Dmitrii Miliutin and the Eastern Crisis drew attention away from important internal policy debates, and when Loris-Melikov, Greig, and Abaza returned to them, new crises and Konstantin Nikolaevich again interfered.

The policies of Alexander III and Dmitrii Tolstoy removed the possibility of decisive action against the commune, and as Chernukha points out, it was only under Stolypin that the plans of an earlier generation of Russian officials were realized.

DANIEL T. ORLOVSKY
Harvard University

LENIN: GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF A REVOLUTIONARY. By Rolf H. W. Theen. Edited with a preface by Walter Kaufmann. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1973. 194 pp. \$6.95.

As the subtitle indicates, the book focuses on Vladimir Ulianov's childhood and youth, in order to give a clue to Lenin's future development. The author brings together the scanty evidence about his ancestral background. He stresses the deep impression of Chernyshevsky's elitist message on the young student—its praise of the "New Man," the *deiatel'* as an individual, "condescension, if not contempt, for the masses." Vladimir Ulianov had been in close contact with Russian Jacobins and former Narodovoltsy at least two years before he became acquainted with Marx and Marxism. Though I feel that his indebtedness to such Russian revolutionary ideas as those of Pestel and Petrashevsky, which Lenin could not have known at the time, is doubtful, the author's thesis about Lenin's close relation to the Russian radical tradition is valid. It serves well its purpose to explain the deep crisis in his thought when he became acquainted with Bernstein's ideas. In fact, Social Democracy, although it continued to preach Marx's creed, became revisionist, and thus "Bolshevism" seemed the legitimate answer to those Marxists who had no chance to take part in a process of step-by-step parliamentarization. The author's concept of "Lenin's voluntarism" narrows the vision, for he does not attempt to answer the question whether, for instance, Menshevism was a valid alternative in the given Russian situation. "Utopianism" is not the best of all possible labels for *State and Revolution* either. When read against the background of Bukharin's essay (where he stated that in the age of imperialism the state turns out to be the worst exploiter), it sounds like a rather clumsy attempt to solve the dilemmas of a revolutionary elite in power. For Lenin the transition to "socialism"—whatever that might have meant besides the nationalization of the means of production—had to be linked with the world revolution. As this prospect faded away he proved

himself a political pragmatist concerned with the building up of a shattered economy. I do not think that Lenin "in the end was a failure as a statesman." According to his last writings he might have followed the Yugoslav pattern of self-management.

Writing this book was no easy task; the interrelation between the man and the general political situation is too complex to be dealt with fully in 160 pages. Too much psychologizing mars at times the author's thoughtful approach, which successfully avoids many well-known clichés.

PETER SCHEIBERT

Philipps-Universität Marburg

MALOZNAKOMYI LENIN. By *N. Valentinov*. Collection "Les Inédits Russes," vol. 4. Paris: Librairie des Cinq Continents, 1972. 195 pp. Paper.

Introduced by Boris Souvarine, this volume focuses on Lenin's years in exile and emigration. It is substantially the same work as the manuscript "Kak zhil Lenin v emigratsii? Ego material'noe polozhenie" (in the Nicolaevsky Archive at the Hoover Institution). The two versions, however, differ in the documentation they offer. The scholarly apparatus of *Maloznakomyi Lenin* could have been enhanced by consulting the Hoover manuscript and providing an index.

Based on close scrutiny of Lenin's correspondence with his family, his letters to various Russian socialists, Krupskaja's memoirs, and other sources, Valentinov's latest work examines how Lenin made a living and financed his political activities in exile and emigration. Its contribution here lies not so much in novel revelations—Valentinov published the major outlines of his findings in an earlier article ("Znal li Lenin nuzhdu?" *Novoe Russkoe Slovo*, Jan. 17, 1952)—as in the details which it provides, details that enable us to round out our sketchy picture of this aspect of Lenin's life.

Like Valentinov's other works, this book is beautifully written, full of suggestive insights into the psychology of Lenin and the movement he created, rich in perceptive observations about the Bolshevik leader *chez soi*: his personal habits, manners, and emotional characteristics. Lenin is portrayed as a complex, intriguing, and in many ways attractive individual; as a self-declared materialist and militant atheist who nevertheless represented a "peculiar religious type"; as a revolutionary who remained the lifelong prisoner of traditions, a strict regime, and a routine in his personal life that are difficult to reconcile with his political stance as a radical; as a utopian and realist whose moods changed suddenly from an optimistic and chiliastic outlook to extreme depression; as a man, in short, who might have said with Goethe's Faust: "Zwei Seelen wohnen, ach! in meiner Brust. Die eine will sich von der andern trennen."

In his poem *Portretov Lenina ne vidno*, Poletaev expressed his belief that only the centuries could create a true portrait of Lenin. Perhaps he was right. Valentinov apparently was unwilling to wait passively while the ages began their slow work. There is evidence that he had resolved to paint the "unpaintable portrait." His papers in the Nicolaevsky Archive reveal that *Maloznakomyi Lenin* constituted merely one chapter (more specifically, chapter 6 in part 3) of an ambitiously conceived work entitled *Lenin s detskikh let*—a work which projected a total of twenty-four chapters. With the exception of a missing chapter on "Chernyshevsky, 'Young Russia,' Russian Jacobinism and Lenin," the essays published as *The Early Years of Lenin* (1969) constitute the first two parts and chapters 1 and 2 of part 3 of this projected