of the gang culture transforms gang suppression efforts into opportunities to enhance the reputations and cohesiveness of street gangs. The suppression programs may force the gangs to be more subtle in their public presentations, but these programs may also solidify the criminal nature of the gang culture.

Klein observes that the spread of street gangs is related to the growth in the urban underclass. Ultimately, he feels that the reduction of racism and increased economic opportunities for the lower classes may offer the best hope to reduce gang behavior. He believes that gang intervention programs, whether they be iron fist or velvet glove, will have little effect on the gang problem. Indeed, the more we spend on suppression activities, the less funding will be available for job creation and educational efforts.

*The American Street Gang* is an invaluable summation of Malcolm Klein’s gang career. Although he is now an OG among gang researchers, the new generation of gang scholars could gain much from his experiences and balanced theoretical approach. Klein neither supports those who wish to romanticize the street gang nor those who want to demonize it.

One topic that I would have wanted to be included in the book is the connection of street gangs to the mass culture. The popularity of gang dress fashions and the prominence of gang images in the hip hop culture are important new developments. In a sense, the crackdown on gangs has made some of these groups seem heroic to the adolescent culture. Moreover, gangs are marketable to middle class youngsters who consume the media images of gangs. For example, among modern teens the word “federal” is used as an adjective to describe the best of something. This phrase comes from the prestige that is attached to federal prosecution of street gangs.

Klein has given us a rare gift in his latest work. It should be included in most serious academic discourses on social problems and social control. Moreover, his sage advice deserves more attention in public policy circles.

Barry Krisberg, National Council on Crime and Delinquency


In this book Kevin Anderson advances a thesis that will surprise many and antagonize some: that Lenin was not so much the creator of a “vanguard” Party dictatorship that supposedly represented the interests of the “traditional industrial working class” as an intellectual who “helped point the way to the only type of
Marxism that is viable today: one with a multiple concept of subjectivity . . .” (p. xiv). According to Anderson, Lenin not only anticipated the anticolonial movements of the 1950s—in Vietnam, Algeria, Iran, etc.—but he also (and more controversially) “helped to give birth in the 1960s to Black liberation and New Left movements in the United States and other Western industrial countries” (p. xiv). As Anderson sees it: “Those 1960s movements in turn helped to bring onto the historic stage still newer social forces, especially the worldwide women’s liberation movement” (p. xiv).

In a closely argued exegesis, Anderson describes how Lenin’s study of Hegel in 1914–1915 forced Lenin to revise some of his earlier writings like *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (1908). Anderson argues that Lenin’s better-known “post-1914 writings on imperialism and national liberation were grounded in some important ways in his Hegel notebooks,” written from 1914–1915 but not published until after Lenin’s death (p. 123). Anderson’s intent is to show that Lenin was not just the inspired revolutionary leader but “the first Hegelian Marxist of the twentieth century” (p. 97)—a theorist who anticipated much of the work of Antonio Gramsci, Georg Lukács, Karl Korsch, Herbert Marcuse, Ernst Bloch, Henri Lefebvre, and Raya Dunayevskaya.

I suspect that the author’s dense commentary on Lenin’s efforts to come to terms with some of the niceties of Hegelian thought will absorb only those with the most specialized interests. Nonetheless, the main thrust of Anderson’s argument is not narrow in focus: Anderson’s thesis is that Lenin was a much more complex and flexible thinker than is generally acknowledged and that many of the theoretical and political issues with which Lenin grappled did not disappear with the demise of the Soviet Union. Yet, while he is sympathetic toward Lenin, Anderson is not uncritical. He notes that Lenin’s inability to discover “a dialectical opposite” to bureaucracy and to the forms of organizational and political rationalization favored by Stalin was “a real barrier in Lenin’s thought” (p. 165), and he concludes that Lenin’s undoubted commitment to “the Old Guard of the Party” after the end of the civil war in Russia was forced by necessary expediency and by the understandable desire to see the gains of the revolution defended. Anderson recognizes that Lenin often ducked the need to acknowledge the indeterminacy of all political struggle. He points out, moreover, that Lenin never entirely managed to reconcile his post-1914 appreciation of Hegelianism with his earlier calls to “militant materialism.”

In the latter part of the book, Anderson describes how Marxists in the fifties, sixties, and seventies both underplayed the significance of Lenin’s Hegel notebooks and overemphasized the continuities among Engels, Plekhanov, Stalin, and Lenin. The latter was particularly true of the French Communist Party, which continued to defend Lenin’s “materialist” and “scientific” approach several years after Stalin’s death. In the United States, Dunayevskaya’s *Marxism and Freedom*
introduced English-speaking readers to Hegel's great influence on Lenin, but, as recently as 1981, Neil Harding's prize-winning two-volume study on Lenin's political thought did not cite Hegel even once.

In a measured conclusion, Anderson acknowledges that Lenin's thought cannot be a model for us today, first, because the world has changed and, second, because Leninism was "even for its own time deeply flawed" (p. 252). The purpose of *Lenin, Hegel, and Western Marxism* is neither to praise nor to bury Lenin but to attempt to show (1) that, in terms of Alvin Gouldner's (1980) distinction between the "Two Marxisms," Lenin was more "critical," humanistic, and Hegelian and less "scientific" than is often supposed, and (2) that Lenin's Hegelian-inspired approach has increasing relevance for today's crisis-ridden "global order." By these criteria the book succeeds. It will be valuable to anyone interested in Lenin's thought or in the history of twentieth-century Western Marxism.

David Ashley, *University of Wyoming*


The contemporary American Right is a complex phenomenon whose various elements are hard to bring together in one analysis. In *Roads to Dominion*, Sara Diamond makes a concerted, sometimes interesting effort to do so. Drawing on a range of primary documents, she traces in great detail the development in the past half-century of four distinct, but related, parts of the Right, what she calls the conservative (or anticommunist) movement, the racist Right, the Christian Right, and the neoconservative movement.

Diamond employs a "state interaction approach," which she links to the "political process model" of social movements. She views political movements as "central, not marginal, to routine political decision making" (p. 3). She rejects the recurrently popular tendency among both scholars and progressive political activists to label elements of the Right as "extremist" or "radical," because such terms exaggerate both the difference and distance of right-wing movements from routine politics. Instead, she effectively shows how right-wing movements develop in complex interaction with the state, being both "system supportive" and "oppositional" in varying combinations.