

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

study; the remaining eleven chapters were apparently not completed. *Vstrechi s Leninym* was to be included as an appendix.

The portrait of Lenin, to quote Poletaev, is still *nedorisovannyi*. Some of its basic contours, however, have already been etched sharply and clearly by the masterful hand of Valentinov, to whom we are greatly indebted for this latest sketch of the Bolshevik leader—a sketch which, like his earlier ones, constitutes a solid achievement and a work of art.

ROLF H. W. THEEN
Purdue University

VIOLENCE DANS LA VIOLENCE: LE DÉBAT BAKOUNINE-NEČAEV.

By *Michael Confino*. Bibliothèque Socialiste, 24. Paris: François Maspero, 1973. 212 pp. Paper.

When that perverse old reactionary Dostoevsky created Peter Verkhovensky, little did he know of the trouble he was storing up for the poor devils in the history business. So strange and complex was the model, Sergei Nechaev, that the literary image—never meant as the man *wie er eigentlich gewesen ist*—has come to stand for him. Why, even today, does a novelist still speak for the historian? Well, why not? The reality of Dostoevsky (and Camus) is no less true than the historian's version. But for those who relish the *variety* of reality, there remains the nagging desire to know the facts.

The documents that Michael Confino has assembled are useful, pertinent, and timely. They include the "Catechism of a Revolutionary" and letters of Bakunin, Lopatin, and others. Some have appeared in print before, others come from the archives of the Bibliothèque Nationale, none are really new. Only Confino's intelligent editing and his ninety-page introduction make them come alive and form a pattern. The result is an excellent statement of the Nechaev myth. Confino has outlined many of the key problems and has made some perceptive associations that escaped previous investigators. When coupled with his own previous studies (editions, rather) in *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, this new discussion of the Bakunin-Nechaev quarrel stands as easily the best available, and Confino's analysis of the "Catechism" is both new and convincing.

On the question of Nechaev's spectacular and, so far as anyone can determine, largely unmerited rise in the revolutionary movement, Confino tends to go along with the old school in citing the "hate, energy, and action" that impressed some of Nechaev's contemporaries. Of *course* the revolutionary Oblomovs (if that is not already a contradiction) marveled at Nechaev's energy; having little themselves—they were too lazy even to hate—they gravitated toward a man who shouted and waved his arms and pulled guns out of his coat. But those Oblomovs, who made Nechaev, were a minority. Confino tends to slide over the extremely hostile reactions of the old "Ruble Society" (including Lopatin, who virtually destroyed Nechaev in Geneva in May 1870), of Zasluch, Mikhailovsky, and many others.

There are a few other problems, all minor and none able to detract from the value of this excellent study. Closer attention to better sources would have saved Confino from making some misleading comments on the 1869 translation into Russian of the *Communist Manifesto*. There are elements in the Nechaev-Liubavin episode over the translation of *Capital* that Confino does not discuss; and use of