

graded by bound black laborers. All the while, road gangs suffered from unsanitary conditions, poor diets and draconian punishments often indistinguishable from torture.

"Above all," Alex Lichtenstein writes, "convict labor made modern economic development of the South's resources compatible with the maintenance of racial domination." Noting that "Over four hundred convicts perished during the first twelve years of leasing in Georgia", Lichtenstein turns to Walter Benjamin's apt dictum that "There is no document of civilization that is not at the same time a document of barbarism." *Twice the Work of Free Labor* is an indispensable study of forced labor systems that will inform historians and public policy students as well as bring contemporary debates on "prison reform" in our own time to a higher level.

Paul Ortiz

HABERER, ERICH. *Jews and revolution in nineteenth-century Russia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [etc.] 1995. xv, 346 pp. £40.00; \$59.95.

In this erudite study, Erich Haberer suggests a revisionist interpretation of central aspects of the highly politically sensitive issue of Jewish participation in the Russian revolutionary movement, particularly during its Populist phases of the *Zemlia i Volia* and *Narodnaia Volia* of the 1870s and the 1880s.

Haberer argues that the depiction in existent histories of the role played by Jews in Russian revolutionary Populism is dominated by an ideologically motivated sort of "accepted version" that is built of, or rather distorted by, fallacies and clichés. According to this version, in contrast to latter-day Russian Marxism with its Western internationalism and proletarian determinism, there was nothing in Russian Populism – imbued as it was with admiration for rural traditionalism and anarchic peasantryism – that could attract Jewish revolutionaries. Accordingly, this version continues, the participation by Jews in Populist movements was low – 4.4 per cent in the 1870s – and did not exceed their percentage in the population. The accepted version further marginalized the contribution of those allegedly few Jews who did join revolutionary Populism by describing them as merely "technicians of revolution", i.e. they were active in the organizational and logistic sides of underground activity, but had only negligible influence on Populist ideology and politics. Finally, according to this version, the Jewish revolutionaries underwent a process of "de-Judaization" and became "non-Jewish Jews". That is, they were cosmopolitan socialists and Russified assimilationists whose revolutionary activity was hardly influenced by their Jewish origin and was devoid of any specific Jewish content. Moreover, paying but little attention to the future of their own people, they assumed that Jewish suffering under the Tsarist regime would be solved by the revolution, an approach that reached its apotheosis in their passive attitude to the sympathy revealed by Russian Populist circles to the pogroms of the 1880s.

Haberer's revision is based on a reconsideration of the essential elements of the accepted version. His main conclusion is that they are empirically groundless and that the role played by Jews in revolutionary Populism should be "re-

Judaized". Like previous studies of Jewish participation in Russian revolutionary movements, Haberer's interpretation is built methodologically, of a careful use of biographical data pertaining to Jewish revolutionaries, combined with contemporary political, sociological and ideological background material. He also makes use of the rich biographical data he compiled to conduct sophisticated statistical analyses.

These statistics comprise the cornerstone of Haberer's revision. He convincingly proves that the ratio of Jewish participation in Russian revolutionary Populism in the 1870s was about 8 per cent – or nearly twice as much as the figure that has been repeatedly suggested by scholars – and that it rose to almost 20 per cent in the 1880s. Using the quantitative approach, he further challenges another underlying assumption of the accepted version, namely that Jews were "technicians" and not "generals" of the revolution. Employing data drawn from numerous biographical sketches, he shows that Jews occupied leading positions in Populist underground, especially in the *Zemlia i Volia* and the *Narodnaia Volia*, and played an important role in shaping their ideology, politics, strategy and tactics. After he has established that Jews had contributed considerably – numerically, politically, militarily and ideologically – to revolutionary Populism, Haberer turns to the gist of his thesis. He argues that the Jewish revolutionaries were not Russified assimilationists as they are depicted by the accepted version, but rather that their motives and activities were highly influenced by their Jewishness.

Haberer maintains that the Jews were drawn to the revolutionary camp by specific Jewish motives, in particular the persecutions and the poor legal status of the Jews under the Tsarist regime. Most of them were ardent *maskilim* – followers of the *haskalah*, the Jewish version of the enlightenment – and nurtured a Western *Weltanschauung* based on constitutionalism and human and civil rights. Disillusioned by the reforms of Alexander II, these Jewish *maskilim* turned to revolution as a last resort and as the only way to improve the status of the Jews in the Russian Empire. Haberer emphasizes that although the Jewish revolutionaries had reservations about central elements of the Populist *credo* – such as its specific Russian nature, the idealization of the people and the anarchic peasant rebellions – they were attracted to the revolutionary circles as the only environment in which as Jews they could feel equal to everyone else and, therefore, realize their Jewish *maskilic* vision. The Jews held, then, a dual position in revolutionary Populism: on the one hand as Jewish *maskilim*, they were critical of its avowed principles; on the other, as an oppressed and discriminated against minority they found in it a unique sense of home and comradeship. This dualism may explain their attitude to the sympathy expressed in Populist circles towards the pogroms of the 1880s. The Jewish Populists understood that this sympathy originated, not from anti-Semitic motives, but from a mistaken conception that considered the pogroms as heralding the long awaited uprising of the peasantry and the coming revolution. They were, however, adamant in their condemnation of both the pogroms and of such an interpretation of these actions; and they were instrumental in enlisting the Populist leadership against any such sympathetic support.

Haberer maintains that the Jewishness of the Jewish Populist came to the fore mainly in the political and ideological spheres. As *maskilim*, with a Western enlightened *Weltanschauung*, the reservations of the Jewish revolutionaries about Russian Populism were coupled with inclination towards Western values and German social democracy. After he has established that Jews were not only "tech-

nicians” but also “generals” in the Populist underground, Haberer goes one step further. He argues that detached from concepts of “going to the people”, and the anarchic peasants revolution, the Jewish revolutionaries exerted Western influence on Populist ideology, politics and tactics. Jewish leaders of the *Zemlia i Volia* and the *Narodnaia Volia*, going against the Populist stream, were successful in bringing into revolutionary Populism elements of organized political work along the German model. Thus, they contributed to both a moderation and a politicization of Populism, which in fact anticipated the Marxist phase in the Russian revolutionary movement. The *maskilic* background of the Jewish revolutionaries is, then, the crux of Haberer’s revision. Their *maskilic* upbringing influenced many Russian Jewish young men and women to join revolutionary Populism, and as *maskilim* they worked to Westernize its distinctly Russian peasant character.

Haberer’s quantitative revision – namely the high ratio of Jews in revolutionary Populism and their share in its leadership – is well founded and of immense contribution. His explanation for this phenomenon, particularly the *maskilic* argument, however, needs reconsideration. It is questionable whether the Russian version of Jewish enlightenment was such a Westernizing or revolutionizing force as Haberer depicts it, and whether the non-insignificant number of Jewish revolutionaries who converted tells us something different about their Jewish motives. Moreover, Haberer’s account posits the Jewish Populist revolutionaries as almost a monolithic group, whereas available data indicate that there were a number of Jewish revolutionary types, each coming from different backgrounds, possessing different attitudes to their Jewishness and harboring different goals. From the perspective of a more heterogenic approach to the Jewish revolutionaries, Haberer’s study may be said to describe one segment of the Jewish Populists, that stands at the opposite end of the continuum from the accepted version, with several other types in between. On the whole, it seems that while the accepted version may have minimized the Jewish factor in the activity of Jewish Populists, Haberer’s revision undoubtedly tends to overemphasize it.

Haberer’s study is, nevertheless, the most updated, authoritative study of Jewish participation in Russian revolutionary Populism, and the above reservations, more than questioning its conclusions, are proof of its productivity. Indeed, one can hardly exaggerate the contribution that Haberer’s study makes to the fields of Russian Jewish history and the history of Russian revolutionary movements.

Daniel Gutwein

MINCZELES, HENRI. *Histoire générale du Bund. Un mouvement révolutionnaire juif*. Austral, Paris 1995. 526 pp. Ill. F.fr. 190.00.

As the first historians of the Jewish labour movement wrote mainly in Russian and in Yiddish (with an occasional sprinkling of German and, occasionally, Polish or Hebrew), the fruit of their labours unfortunately remained inaccessible to readers unfamiliar with these languages.

From the end of the 1960s onwards, a host of seminal books on the subject have appeared in English – we need only mention the works of Bernard K. Johnpoll, Ezra Mendelsohn, Henry J. Tobias, Nora Levin and Jonathan Frenkel – opening up this field of studies to the English-reading public. Much