

of translators, has consulted a wide range of Russian sources, especially memoirs of people who either accompanied Lenin on the train or who surrounded him after his return to Russia.

While the book will suffice as a popular introduction to 1917, and while it does relate incidents and details previously unavailable in English, from a scholarly perspective it adds little to our understanding of the Russian Revolution. The author provides few notes to indicate sources of specific information; his use of memoirs is often uncritical and questionable; interpretations, especially those relating to the impact of German money on Lenin, are dubious and overdrawn; and his account of the October Revolution completely ignores Professor Robert V. Daniels's *Red October*, preferring, instead, Trotsky's self-serving assessment. Pearson shows little understanding of why the Bolsheviks—regardless of the support they may have received from Germany—could so successfully exploit their resources. These and other problems significantly attenuate the value of this work for the reader seriously interested in the Russian Revolution.

MYRON W. HEDLIN
San Francisco

THE 'RED YEARS': EUROPEAN SOCIALISM VERSUS BOLSHEVISM, 1919–1921. By *Albert S. Lindemann*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974. xviii, 349 pp. \$15.75.

Albert S. Lindemann's study deals with an important period in our recent history, the encounter between Western European Socialist parties and the October 1917 Revolution in Russia. The book is an objective, scholarly inquiry into a highly controversial subject—the conditions prevailing in the years immediately following World War I. Lindemann sees the development of the internal conflicts within Western European Socialist parties—and later between the proletarian parties in Germany, Italy, and France—essentially in the context of local conditions, which determined the splits and the ensuing fratricide. This approach follows, in a way, the ideas of the late Russian Menshevik Julius Martov, one of the most brilliant exponents of Russian socialism of the pre-October era. In his book, *Mirovoi Bol'shevizm* (Berlin, 1924), Martov analyzes the genesis of the Bolshevik ideology and psychology that emerged in Europe as a result of the horrors of World War I, and the ensuing social crisis that dislocated the very structure of European society.

Lindemann devotes much of his study to an analysis of the situation in the Socialist parties of Germany, Italy, and France, and the interrelationships between the leaders of various factions. He concludes that the failures of Western socialism were caused not only by local conditions, but also by differences dividing the various factions of the Socialist movement and the inability of these factions to establish mutual confidence and a disciplined basis for collaborative efforts directed toward their goals. The Comintern, of course, did what it could to use local conditions to suit its own purposes. Nevertheless, the splits within the Western Socialist parties were primarily a result of social trends existing before the Bolsheviks took power in Russia.

In his discussion of militants in the workers' movements in the West, Lindemann points to some similarities in the reaction of the Socialists of various Western countries to the emergence of bolshevism, and he groups these militants

according to what he considers their main characteristics. Writing about those who accepted and supported the pro-Communist "21 conditions," he points to a group which, he contends, was motivated by opportunism rather than conviction, and includes among this group Frossard of the French Socialist Party. (We do not know how Frossard appears to a present-day student of the period, but I remember him well from my student days in France, when he was seen as essentially a French "homme de gauche," neither better nor worse than many other militants of the Left, notwithstanding his transmigrations from one group to another, transmigrations that occurred throughout the whole spectrum of French political life.) While Lindemann's effort at classification is understandable, his approach, in my opinion, often oversimplifies the real situation. Caution is called for in examining motivations on both sides of the battle. A psychological reconstruction could be made, but it would require a *different approach and perhaps a different methodology*.

Lindemann appears to be saying that Western Socialist leaders were unable to resist "dynamic and clear-sighted leaders like Lenin and Trotsky, who stood at the head of the first Socialist revolution in history." Although lack of space prohibits going into details that might include a discussion of the "clear-sightedness" of Lenin and Trotsky, this position is highly disputable. Moreover, a more precise definition of terms is needed, especially in regard to the Russian Socialist revolution. In my opinion, October 17 was not, under Russian conditions, the "first socialist revolution in history." I would agree, instead, with Leon Blum's view, cited by Lindemann, that Lenin and his followers were in the Blanquist and not in the Marxist tradition.

This book is an important contribution to the study of the Socialist movement and of the post-World War I period. Students will appreciate both the thorough research underlying it and its bibliography.

LEON SHAPIRO
Rutgers University

THE LENIN ANTHOLOGY. Edited with an introduction by *Robert C. Tucker*.
New York: W. W. Norton, 1975. lxiv, 764 pp. \$18.95.

Anthologies are needed and should be published periodically. In this respect, Professor Tucker has performed a service—he offers a well-edited collection with an index for easy browsing. He has also prefaced the collection with an excellent essay on Lenin's emergence as revolutionary leader who singlemindedly combined Marxist thought with Russian revolutionary tradition. Regrettably, he has not provided citations for the various extracts from Lenin's writings.

Anthologies may serve a variety of purposes: to answer the queries of a new generation of readers about the ideas of the author; to permit a look at the author from a longer perspective of time; to seek answers to questions that earlier readers did not consider important, and so forth. On this score, Professor Tucker's collection needs to be amended. In recent years, as Soviet and Western intellectuals have become actively concerned with civil rights, government oppression, and national equality and development in the Soviet Union, they have looked to Lenin's writings for support of their positions. For example, was the Catholic priest right when he invoked Lenin's sanction for teaching children religion at a court which charged him with law violation on just this score? Were the Crimean Tartars correct in claiming that the current Soviet nationality policy violated Leninist norms? Did