made it difficult for them to become literate or obtain an adequate education. Jewish women were held back by similar family traditions and risked harsh sanctions if they left the Pale of Settlement. Fieseler acquaints her readers with the many different paths around these obstacles that ingenious women managed to find. Because the lives of many of the women she has discussed ended in Stalinist concentration camps, this impressive study inevitably ends on a sad note.

ALFRED G. MEYER
University of Michigan


Dispassionate and serious study of Lenin’s thought that conforms to the rigor of contemporary scholarship on other major political thinkers is still in its infancy. Prevalent judgments on Lenin are still based more on prejudice and political parti pris than they are on normal canons of textual and contextual evidence. A symptom of the primitive state of Lenin studies is the virtual absence of thorough and detailed studies of his major (and allegedly seminal) texts. Kevin Anderson’s Lenin, Hegel, and Western Marxism is an attempt to remedy that deficiency as far as Lenin’s Philosophical Notebooks is concerned. Anderson’s title might lead one to suppose that the broader issue of the Hegelianization of Marxism in the twentieth century is his major theme, whereas, in fact, the third part of the book (the least satisfactory) is largely concerned with the much narrower issue of how later Marxists received Lenin’s Notebooks (or explained why they neglected them). Part 1, “Lenin on Hegel and Dialectics,” is undoubtedly the most impressive and original part of the book in which the claim that Lenin’s whole mind-set was transformed by his reading of Hegel in 1914 is made and sustained. There is an earnestness about Anderson’s exegesis and a proper scholarly concern for the detail of those passages in Hegel’s Science of Logic that Lenin highlighted as well as those he ignored. This, one feels, is Anderson’s métier, he is a man for detailed annotation and careful exegesis.

It is the larger picture that unhappily tends to be set aside. Nowhere do we really get the flavor of Lenin’s original. Anderson’s careful commentaries and reflections lead us to suppose that what we are dealing with is a finished and continuous original text expressing a considered and distinctive philosophical position, but Lenin’s text is not like that at all. The Philosophical Notebooks are notoriously difficult to interpret precisely because there is very little of Lenin in them. There are underlinings, extracts in boxes, exclamations, quotations with emphases, brief marginalia, occasional reflections combined with a virtual absence of continuous narrative. These are undigested notebooks of Lenin’s reflections on other thinkers—particularly Hegel. For that reason, they are the most difficult texts to construe and to integrate into Lenin’s oeuvre. There is, about this section of Anderson’s book, something of the law of diminishing fleas. Anderson is himself too engaged ever to reflect that what he is doing is offering us Anderson (via Raya Dunayevskaya) on Lenin on Hegel (and Anderson’s filial piety to Dunayevskaya pervades not merely the acknowledgments but the whole of his book).

There are some rather curious omissions in Anderson’s treatment of the Notebooks. In the first place there is no attempt to compare and contrast what we can make of Lenin’s philosophical position in 1914 with the certainties of his own Materialism and Empirio Criticism of 1908. There is, second, little discussion of the immediate context that prompted Lenin’s absorption with Hegel from September 1914. There is, admittedly, an initial chapter on “The Crisis of World Marxism in 1914,” but it offers no convincing explanation of why Lenin plunged so abruptly and enthusiastically into Hegel. The wartime context and the abrupt “betrayal” of the leaders of the Second International is alluded to but nowhere features as a central aspect of Lenin’s “conversion” to Hegel.

Anderson has written a solid and thorough book that adds to a growing scholarly view that Lenin is to be understood more as doctrinaire than as opportunist. In An-
The distinctive feature of mature Leninism was its dialectical roots in Hegelianism (and here my Leninism [1996] is in full agreement). What Anderson, following Dunayevskaya, never questions is whether this newfound emphasis on the dialectic itself led to, or at least disposed Lenin to, an overwhelming certainty about the correctness of his philosophical-political line and an exaggerated intemperance toward and intolerance of the views of others. For a "critical study" centered on the Hegelianization of Lenin and western Marxism, these questions surely need to be broached.

Neil Harding
University of Wales, Swansea


Some thirty years ago Leopold Haimson advanced the thesis that the outbreak of World War I actually postponed the beginning of the Russian revolution because social grievances were temporarily forgotten in an outburst of patriotism. Hubertus Jahn takes this unifying outburst as his starting point in this original study. He argues that if patriotic enthusiasm could have subdued revolutionary tendencies in Russia, then "either a decline in or redefinition of patriotism appears to have been a prerequisite for a successful revolution" (3). Using a broad and inventive source base ranging from postcards to operas, Jahn traces the disintegration of a common sense of nationhood in Russia during World War I.

Jahn offers a very broad definition of his subject matter: "Patriotic culture represents the expression of and search for national identity through artistic means" (4). He makes clear at the outset, however, that he is not interested in propaganda generated by the state. Although he examines the work of the Skobelev Committee, a semiofficial propaganda organization generating posters and films, his main task is to trace expressions of patriotism coming from independent artists, entertainers, and cultural entrepreneurs. The relationship between artists and audience is complex, and Jahn follows it largely through the mechanism of the market. In his analysis, audiences paid for what they found meaningful, and cultural offerings changed in part to meet audience demand.

Organized by types of material, this richly illustrated study offers a broad overview of the visual arts, performing arts, and film during World War I. Each chapter is subdivided into smaller genres, introduced by a brief history of the form. Jahn provides a wealth of information on modes of cultural expression that have received little attention, such as circus monologues and nightclub routines, along with reflections on how familiar institutions like the Moscow Art Theater adjusted to the war. He also shows how multimedia heroes emerged during the conflict; the exploits of the Cossack fighter, Koz'ma Kriuchkov, were celebrated on postcards, in the circus, and even on film. In Jahn's view, Russian patriotic culture was eclectic and inventive, borrowing from earlier patriotic campaigns, folk culture, urban consumer culture, and even the avant-garde. At times cultural products openly opposed governmental policies: when the state tightened its restrictions on Jews during the war, for example, variety performers and filmmakers devised works that celebrated Jewish patriotism. In the course of the war, Russians discovered new methods of spreading their messages that were later imitated by those masters of propaganda, the Bolsheviks.

Jahn argues persuasively that there was no simple chronology to trace the shifts in patriotic culture—it changed according to medium and constituency. Nonetheless, some basic patterns do emerge. The initial unity forged around a common foe quickly dissolved into two broad tendencies. What Jahn calls socially active or social patriotism, most clearly identified with the educated classes, generated expressions of charity and concern for wounded victims. More common was the passive enjoyment of patriotism as mass entertainment, which turned patriotism into "a consumer good, a cultural stimulus, an exciting by-product of the war" (81). While social patriotism en-