

subsumed) discusses mainly the theories of N. Ia. Danilevskii and A. S. Lappo-Danilevskii. Finally, Vucinich devotes virtually a chapter each to the contributions of V. A. Kistiakovskii and M. M. Kovalevskii. The spectrum of schools represented reflects Vucinich's concerns with the scientific goals, quality, and connectedness with future developments in sociology of their major representatives. Several of them are forgotten pioneers, their contributions obscured by the reputations of European and American sociologists and philosophers of history whose work entered the intellectual mainstream. Given the close ties between sociology and ideology in Russia and the character of the regime, many of Russia's foremost social thinkers conducted their work while on the run, so to speak. Others suffered the fate of being branded as heretics in postrevolutionary Russia as well. Some suffered because of Russia's relative inaccessibility to Western scholars, often as much a consequence of Western attitudes as of Russia's peculiarities. Vucinich has done well to make some of Russia's most distinguished thinkers accessible to nonspecialists.

Unfortunately, the character of the book, neither a full survey of Russian social thought nor a well-balanced study of carefully selected and organized problems, will diminish its appeal both to the general reader and the specialist. The former will find too much about too few and the latter too little about too many thinkers, despite Professor Vucinich's erudition and intellectually honest effort. Neither of these can be doubted, though one can question some of his judgments and his reliance upon the judgment of others. For example, his reliance upon H. E. Kaminski's comparison of Marx and Bakunin did not improve the quality of his discussion. I found no factual errors as such, except for the obvious typographical error on page 71 which dates *The People's Cause* 1898 instead of 1868.

PHILIP POMPER  
Wesleyan University

IDEOLOGIES AND ILLUSIONS: REVOLUTIONARY THOUGHT FROM HERZEN TO SOLZHENITSYN. By *Adam B. Ulam*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1976. x, 335 pp. \$15.00.

LENIN IN ZURICH: CHAPTERS. By *Alexander Solzhenitsyn*. Translated by *H. T. Willetts*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976. vi, 309 pp. \$8.95.

LENIN V TSIURICHE: GLAVY. By *A. Solzhenitsyn*. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1975. 241 pp. Paper.

The characterization of V. I. Lenin as a historical personality has challenged several generations of writers, but the overall results have perhaps been more confusing than enlightening. It is a rare author who can find a genuinely new path in the enterprise, and the books here in hand represent the efforts of two just such explorers. It is all the more intriguing to compare the points on which these two books cross because Ulam devotes one of his chapters to the consideration of *The Gulag Archipelago*, and he has also described *Lenin in Zurich* as "art in search of historical truth" (*New Leader*, May 24, 1976).

*Ideologies and Illusions* is vintage Ulam; most of the essays have been published before. For persons who enjoy reading his lively and challenging thoughts, the work is a pleasure. To be sure, some of it seems dated (for example, a reference to a "recent *Lenin's Miscellany*"), but as an Ulam sampler it could serve well in the classroom were it not for its exorbitant price in hard cover.

Solzhenitsyn's work has received far-ranging publicity and review. Solzhenitsyn himself chose to unite these chapters, excerpted from his trilogy on Russia and World

War I, as an essay on Lenin, and his intention was to offer a novelist's viewpoint on Lenin's character, program, and activities. The translation is basically able, although there is one bad error. In Lenin's internal monologue while riding on the train to Cracow, he is thinking of Krupskaya's thyroid problems and not Inessa's. The translator was apparently misled by the rambling nature of the monologue.

In comparing Solzhenitsyn's portrait of Lenin with Ulam's, we come up with some interesting contrasts. Whereas Solzhenitsyn presents Lenin as only one-quarter Russian, hating Russia, and demanding Russia's defeat in war, Ulam describes him as a "passionate patriot and a fervent internationalist," proud of his Russian heritage. Ulam's Lenin is concerned with raising Russia's cultural level; Solzhenitsyn's is only scornful of it. Solzhenitsyn's Lenin considers chasing revolutionary will-o'-the-wisps around the world and is concerned with problems of the seizure of power; Ulam's Lenin seems more practical and farsighted, deeply concerned with problems of administering a revolutionary government. Solzhenitsyn attributes the worst aspects of contemporary Soviet society to policies established by Lenin; Ulam argues that "one cannot assume [Lenin's] unqualified approval of current Soviet reality."

For those concerned first of all with the least controversial interpretation of historical events, neither Ulam nor Solzhenitsyn provides comfortable reading. They are both outspoken, challenging, and even audacious. For the reader ready to accept controversy and stimulation, they are exciting.

ALFRED ERICH SENN  
*University of Wisconsin*

THE GULAG ARCHIPELAGO 1918-1956: AN EXPERIMENT IN LITERARY INVESTIGATION, III-IV. By *Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn*. Translated from the Russian by *Thomas P. Whitney*. New York: Harper & Row, 1975. vi, 712 pp. \$15.00, cloth. \$2.50, paper.

Was Stalin an accident, a cruel joke of fate, or was he inevitable, historically determined by the nature and aims of the Bolshevik coup? This is surely one of the important questions which any serious student of the Soviet experience must face. The orthodox Party view, first adumbrated by Khrushchev and evidently shared by large numbers of Soviet citizens (even those who have been imprisoned and/or exiled), amounts to what one might call the "Stalin-was-a-bad-man theory." Marxism, or rather Marxism-Leninism, is held to be ideologically sound and to have survived intact the "cult of personality." The denigration of Stalin has been balanced by the official apotheosis and canonization of Lenin.

Solzhenitsyn's response is diametrically opposed to such a view. In the *Gulag Archipelago*, as the dates in the title suggest, Solzhenitsyn seeks to demonstrate that Stalin was merely a symptom of a profound ethical and spiritual sickness that began in 1917: "The Archipelago was born with the shots of the cruiser *Aurora*." He insists upon the central role of Lenin in the creation of the terror and the camp system, quoting an August 1918 telegram in which Lenin urged that "doubtful" elements should be locked up in a "concentration camp." He quotes other documents to show that Lenin took the lead in urging and implementing "merciless mass terror." Solzhenitsyn argues that Lenin set the stage for Stalin and laid the foundations for the later slave labor system. In his opinion, the role of Frenkel, a Jew from Constantinople who has been credited by some historians with the creation of the Archipelago, was simply to persuade Stalin in 1929 of the enormous economic benefits of slave labor on a massive scale.