

nationalists in Manchuria in the 1930s. Like some Russian émigrés, the Ukrainians were virulently anti-Communist and were willing to collaborate with the Japanese military in Manchukuo against the USSR. But while most White Russians were too patriotic to support Japanese efforts to separate the Russian Far East from the rest of Russia or the Soviet Union, the Ukrainians championed the "liberation" of Siberia. They thought well of a man like Ataman Semenov, who held out self-government to Ukrainians in the Russian Far East, while most Russian émigrés (not to mention the Soviets) regarded him as a scoundrel.

To the student of Russo-Japanese relations the book is most interesting for the light it sheds on Japanese attempts to exploit minority problems in Russia and the USSR. There are such tidbits as the revelation that during the Russo-Japanese War an American senator, Dr. Russell of Hawaii, who had been educated in Kiev, started an anti-Russian publication in Japan to subvert Russian prisoners of war.

The fragmentation of national history into minority history is misleading in the study of international relations. Sweet asserts that Iosif Goshkevich, Russia's first diplomatic representative in Japan, was a Ukrainian; V. Guzanov in his book *Odissei s Beloi Rusi* (Minsk, 1969) contends that Goshkevich was Belorussian. Whoever may be right, can we really describe Goshkevich's contacts with the Japanese as an example of Ukrainian-Japanese or Belorussian-Japanese relations? Would this not be tantamount to depicting the reception of Kodayu by Catherine the Great as an episode in German-Japanese relations, or the negotiations between Karakhan and Yoshizawa as an aspect of Tatar-Japanese relations? I wonder, furthermore, whether the publication of this book in New York in Ukrainian is worth the price—its restriction to a very limited readership. On the other hand, who but a Ukrainian nationalist would take pride in its content?

GEORGE ALEXANDER LENSEN
Florida State University

BRIDE OF THE REVOLUTION: KRUPSKAYA AND LENIN. By *Robert H. McNeal*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972. ix, 326 pp. \$10.00.

Nadezhda Krupskaya's life was so closely interwoven with Lenin's that it is not easy to appreciate her own personality and outlook. We think of her as having totally subordinated herself to her husband's goals and activities, as is suggested by the adjectives that have stuck with her over the years—"dedicated, single-minded, self-effacing, self-denying," and, as she appears in numerous photographs with Soviet children in the later period, "dowdy and grandmotherly."

In this book her portrait emerges fundamentally unchanged, though filled in and rounded out. Since this is the first substantial work on Krupskaya in English, it will be of interest to the specialist, though it is clearly intended also for a general audience, including the growing number of women who, in trying to define new roles for themselves, have been examining the lives of prominent women in history. The author has worked intelligently from Russian-language materials published in the Soviet Union, supplemented by a few of Trotsky's writings, the archive of the Paris office of the Okhrana, and the sparse studies of Krupskaya in the languages of Western Europe.

Whether we would find in Soviet archives closed to Western scholars

evidence, for example, of her feelings on Lenin's probable affair with Inessa Armand, one does not know. On the basis of the information available to him, the author perceptively handles this episode, which left on Krupskaja "emotional scars that were still tender years afterwards." Everything he tells us about her suggests that she kept her feelings largely to herself.

What is interesting about this account of Krupskaja are her childhood influences and sources of inspiration (her mother's religion with an emphasis on ethical faith, the poetry of Nekrasov, and the example of a village populist schoolteacher), her thoughts on education, which she owed largely to Tolstoy and what she had read about American schools, and the last chapters on the period after Lenin's death when Krupskaja stood on her own and briefly joined with Zinoviev and Kamenev in opposition to Stalin. One would like to know still more about her views on the struggles and policy debates of that time.

In the central section of the book Professor McNeal deals with the complex maneuverings of Lenin and his colleagues in the revolutionary movement in a way that may not be entirely clear to the general reader. One has the persistent feeling of looking at the reflection rather than the major figures in the drama. This feeling is intensified by the author's occasional lapses into judgments of Krupskaja by the measure of Lenin himself: "Realizing her limitations, he never urged her to take up the central problems of theory or current politics. . . ." Without access to self-analytical evidence in Krupskaja's letters or memoirs, the author ventures too far, in my view, into psychological speculation when he writes of her "yen for deprivation" or the "wish not to enjoy Europe." Perhaps this trait could be characterized more simply as an incapacity to enjoy Western Europe or material comfort.

In conclusion, the book is on the whole balanced and well written and is a useful minor contribution to this period in Russian history. Whether a different kind of study might reveal more of Krupskaja's own thoughts and the influence she may have had on Lenin is conjectural, but it would require greater responsiveness to the contemporary interest in women as more than satellite figures.

COLETTE SHULMAN
Aspen, Colorado

REVOLUTION AND POLITICS IN RUSSIA: ESSAYS IN MEMORY OF
B. I. NICOLAEVSKY. Edited by *Alexander and Janet Rabinowitch* with
Ladis K. D. Kristof. Russian and East European Series, no. 41. Bloomington
and London: Indiana University Press, for the International Affairs Center,
1972. xii, 416 pp. \$12.75.

These essays were intended as a tribute to Boris Nicolaevsky on his eightieth birthday in 1967. His death in 1966 made them a memorial. Nicolaevsky had a remarkable career. He was the son of an Orthodox priest in a little Ural town and ended his schooling when barely sixteen. From his middle teens his innate humanitarianism and love of freedom made him active in the Russian revolutionary movement as a Menshevik Social Democrat, and he was often in prison and in exile in the Russian north, where he read as much as he could on political and social problems. He also delved into local history and developed his latent talents as a scholar. After the February revolution he helped to investigate the Okhrana archives and organize