

honest and trustworthy than people on higher rungs of the social ladder. This bias stayed with him all his life; his trust in Stalin was, for example, colored by Stalin's peasant background." They say this of the man who wrote the famous memorandum to the other members of the editorial board of *Iskra*: "We should show every kindness to the peasantry, but not yield an inch in our maximum program. If the peasants do not accept socialism when the dictatorship comes, we shall say to them, 'It's no use wasting words when you have got to use force.'" As for Stalin, he was no peasant, but the son of a cobbler, who studied to be a priest, worked in a subordinate capacity in an astronomical observatory, and when in power put into concentration camps and killed more millions of peasants than any other ruler in history.

In short, as a popularization the book is neither sound enough nor popular enough, and as a serious study it is lacking in scholarship.

BERTRAM D. WOLFE  
*Hoover Institution*

LENIN. By *M. C. Morgan*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1971. xii, 236 pp. \$8.75.

Although the title implies a biography, this is an unpretentious study, organized chronologically for the most part, which focuses on Lenin's ideology and politics. The narrative is leavened by occasional asides depicting the informal Lenin, and a sketchy biographical framework is provided. The author uses no sources in the Russian language and relies heavily on the forty-volume English edition of Lenin's *Collected Works* (Moscow, 1960–68), which is drawn largely from the unsatisfactory fourth Russian edition. His other sources are chiefly secondary, but he has used (or appears to be familiar with) a wide range of scholarly Leniniana and related material on Russian history. Much of the book is rather conventional, presenting a textbookish summation of various topics that have little or no relation to Lenin or to the Bolsheviks. The chapters on 1917 are based to a considerable extent on Trotsky and Sukhanov, and Mr. Morgan would have been well advised to make better use of the recent work of Alexander Rabinowitch on the July Days and Robert V. Daniels on the October Revolution. The final chapters are concerned with Soviet domestic issues and hardly more than touch on foreign relations or Comintern affairs. The tone is scrupulously objective, though one detects a certain sympathy, if not admiration, for Lenin the man. The style is simple, generally lucid, and free from pedantry ("workmanlike" as book reviewers used to say) but not compelling or "popular" enough to attract any large segment of the general public.

When compared with Harold Shukman's *Lenin and the Russian Revolution* (New York, 1967), a somewhat similar treatment in short compass, Morgan's work does not appear to the best advantage. The two books illustrate the difference between the informed nonspecialist and the experienced professional in command of the primary sources. Though it may seem more than a bit redundant, *Lenin* is nevertheless a skillful synthesis and useful reading for undergraduates. And on a number of matters (e.g., Lenin's philosophical views, the Red terror) it has something reasonably original to say.

ROBERT D. WARTH  
*University of Kentucky*