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*The Revolution of 1905 in Odessa: Blood on the Steps* is a study of the labour movement in this economically-vibrant Black Sea port in the year of Russia’s first revolution. Robert Weinberg seeks to explore the interactions of class and ethnicity among Odessa’s ethnically-heterogeneous labour force as the city’s workers experienced them in 1905. Odessa labour began its struggles fragmented by economic grievances specific to each sector of this highly-diverse artisanal and industrial work force. It ended the year united by common concerns linking specific economic issues to the national revolutionary politics. Interspersed in this political evolution was the tragic pogrom of October 1905 in Odessa which diverted a part of the labour force—the unskilled and the marginal—away from revolution and toward a counterrevolution that served the interests of the state.

This work is a part of a large literature on working class history in pre-revolutionary Russia that seeks to understand the politicization of workers and, more generally, the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917. Weinberg’s contribution is to shift attention away from the standard focus on Moscow and St. Petersburg, and to explore the 1905 Revolution in a city with a more heterogeneous labour force and varied economy. Weinberg’s study is also unusual in that, like Charters Wynn’s recent *Workers, Strikes, and Pogroms,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), it seeks to account for the darker side of labour activism that ended in violence rather than to place exclusive emphasis on the issue of workers’ revolutionary class consciousness. Weinberg’s explorations of class are greatly enriched by his analysis of ethnicity and antisemitism. The standard division of workers into skilled and unskilled to explain which ones possessed this darker side is too simplistic and certainly not wholly substantiated by the evidence in this work. Nonetheless, the book tackles a difficult and sensitive issue that is useful for those interested in Russia labour history.

For historians who are seeking a more general picture of Odessa in 1905, this is probably not the book. The book is more accurately a labour history. As such, it is thoroughly researched, although too often general conclusions are speculative and causation can only be suggested. The chief problem of the book is the lack of a clear organizing principle and thesis. It is not until page 145 that the author is able to step away from his evidence to suggest a thesis. As a consequence, the reading is not easy and one sometimes feels that the author has lost sight of the forest for the trees. In this sense, the book continues to read like a dissertation. Having said that, I can still recommend this work as a solid piece of research by a historian thoroughly versed in the source material on his subject.

Lynne Viola, Department of History, University of Toronto


Early in *Power and Pauperism,* Felix Driver establishes the twin focus of his well-crafted and interesting study of the workhouse system in England from 1834 to 1884. His starting point is the reform of the *Poor Law* in 1834 and the accompanying ideological and administrative discourses which delineated the aims and goals of government social policy. “The debate which preceded the reform of the Poor Law in 1834 was, by common consent,” he rightly notes, citing another historian of the period, “concerned as much with government as it was with poverty” (p. 18).

One of the most salient features of the *Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834* was its attempt to differentiate between pauper and poor by insisting that the condition of the able-bodied pauper be less “eligible”—desirable or agreeable—than that of the “lowest class” of the independent labourer. To implement the principle of “less-eligibility” the Act proposed that relief for the able-bodied and their families be given only within the confines of the workhouse. In itself, the institution of the workhouse was not new; it was as old as the poor law itself and was generally intended as a means of caring for those who could not care for themselves. The workhouse proposed in the *Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834* was intended as a test of the neediness of the applicant for “the fact of his compliance with the prescribed discipline” was in itself a confirmation of destitution.

For his theoretical paradigms, Dr. Driver relies upon Michel Foucault, Anthony Giddens and others who have theorized about the relationship between the disciplinary order of institutions and society at large. While Foucault is concerned with the “technologies of social policing,” through an analysis of discourse, Driver aims to analyze the institutional programmes actually put into effect. Driver argues the case for a geographical perspective on social policy; “one which emphasizes the fractured nature of nineteenth-century government and the uneven impact of surveillance.” (p. 165) Drawing upon an impressive array of sources, including financial records of workhouses, reports by Poor Law admin-