

Die Beantwortung der aufgeworfenen Fragen kann ohnehin nur geleistet werden, wenn nicht nur die persönlichen Lebensumstände, die Sozialisation und Motivation zur politischen Betätigung der jüdischen Sozialisten ausgebreitet werden. Wistrich legt auf diesen Bereich großen Wert und erläutert demzufolge ausführlich die familiäre Herkunft, die Kindheits- und Jugenderlebnisse sowie den Bildungsweg, während dagegen die Erörterung der politischen Entwicklung und der Position der jeweiligen Partei zur Judenfrage vergleichsweise kurz ausfällt, obgleich die Partei als Wirkungsfeld und unmittelbare soziale Umwelt von großer Bedeutung für die Meinungsbildung war. Hier drängt sich fast die Frage auf, ob nicht Passagen des Buches dem Rotstift eines Lektors zum Opfer fallen mußten, weil der Verfasser in seiner Dissertation sehr viel Wert auf die Einarbeitung der sozialen und politischen Rahmenbedingungen gelegt hat und ihnen durchaus gerecht wird. Aber dieser Gedanke muß natürlich Spekulation bleiben. Die Integration des gesellschaftlichen und parteipolitischen Umfelds, ihre Bedeutung für die Einstellung der jüdischen Sozialisten und umgekehrt der Einfluß ihrer Haltung auf die Position der Arbeiterbewegungen zur Judenfrage sind dem Autor jedenfalls am treffendsten in den Kapiteln über Bernstein, Luxemburg und die beiden Österreicher Adler und Bauer gelungen. Doch leider werden die Gemeinsamkeiten in der Haltung der sozialistischen Parteien zur Judenfrage, die sich aus dem stärkeren Einbeziehen der allgemeinen sozialen und politischen Rahmenbedingungen ergeben hätten, zu wenig herausgearbeitet, so daß sich aus diesem Mangel auch einige Wiederholungen und Überschneidungen – besonders in den Kapiteln über Luxemburg, Martow und Trotzki – ergeben. In diesem Zusammenhang vermißt man auch nach der Lektüre der einzelnen Biographien eine zusammenfassende Betrachtung, die nochmals die Ausgangsfragestellungen aufgreifen und einige Ergebnisse zusammenhängend referieren würde, die sowohl die Gemeinsamkeiten als auch individuelle Differenzierungen in der Position der jüdischen Sozialisten kurz umreißen und miteinander abwägen sollte, nachdem die individuellen Besonderheiten schon durch die etwas plakativen Kapitelüberschriften (Ferdinand Lassalle, the Gladiator; Victor Adler, the Father-figure; Julius Martow, the Revolutionary Conscience etc.) hervorgehoben wurden.

Das Buch eignet sich jedoch sehr gut als Einführung für alle, die sich diesem Themenkomplex widmen möchten. Es vermittelt nicht nur die wichtigsten Stellungnahmen jüdischer Sozialisten zur Judenfrage und einige Hinweise auf die Situation des Judentums in Westeuropa und Rußland, sondern spricht auch den Leser ästhetisch an; denn Porträts der vorgestellten Persönlichkeiten und zwei Karten zur Übersicht über die jüdischen Bevölkerungszentren in Österreich-Ungarn und Rußland (S. 94, 172) lockern die Darstellung auf. Das ausführliche Register erleichtert das Nachschlagen und Auffinden der Zitate und Quellen, und die Auswahlbibliographie bietet schließlich eine Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten Veröffentlichungen zu diesem Themenkomplex. Die Stärke des Buches liegt darin, daß es neue Denkanstöße und Diskussionsgrundlagen vermittelt, an deren Ausführung jedoch noch weiter gearbeitet werden müßte.

Rosemarie Leuschen-Seppel

Hector Zoccoli, *Die Anarchie*, Verlag Karin Kramer, Berlin 1976, XVII, 616 S., kart., 26,50 DM.

Hector Zoccoli's *Die Anarchie*, which first appeared in German translation in 1909, is a massive compilation of information on anarchism and its adherents. Devoted primarily to a survey of anarchist thought, it also traces the history of anarchism as a political movement, taking the story into the early years of the twentieth century. As is generally the case with books that diligently summarize the contents of writings and documents, the work as a whole is somewhat tedious reading. As an introduction to the theory and practice of anarchism at the high-point of its history, however, the book is useful and highly informative.

The first part, which takes up one-half of the book, is entitled »The Theorists«. It is an extensive summary of the ideas of five anarchist thinkers whom Zoccoli regarded as the »founding fathers« of anarchism: Stirner (»The Metaphysical Critique«), Proudhon (»The Economic Critique«), Bakunin (»The Political Critique«), Kropotkin (»The Sociological Critique«), and Tucker (»The Individualist Critique«). The somewhat schematic nature of the book becomes apparent here, for anarchist thought cannot be divided up into such neatly labeled packages. The kinds of criticism these theorists levelled against nineteenth century society overlapped and intertwined with one another. By and large, they repeated and elaborated a set of common themes which eventually formed an identifiable political and social theory. A more serious problem is the selection and relative treatment of the five theorists. When even anarchists themselves have disagreed sharply over who their »founding fathers« were, the historian who tries to trace their intellectual ancestry must be particularly cautious. Students of anarchism may well quarrel with Zoccoli's inclusion of Benjamin Tucker, a much more lightweight figure than the other four, among the major theorists of anarchism; and with his very brief and rather exasperated treatment of Proudhon, whose work he found riddled with so many deficiencies and contradictions that he could not bring himself to take it very seriously.

The second part of the book, called »The Ideas«, moves from anarchist theory to the realm of everyday propaganda. Zoccoli sought to determine how anarchism expressed itself in its popular press and other propaganda literature – in other words, how its basic philosophical concepts were »vulgarized« in the literature it produced for mass consumption. This section examines the anarchist viewpoint on the subjects of law, religion, family, education, art and revolution. It is the shortest and also the weakest part of the book, for it singles out a few figures and journals of the turn of the century as authoritative voices of anarchism, and the selection inevitably appears arbitrary. In addition, it goes over much of the same ground as the first section of the book, and overlaps somewhat with the third section, which is devoted to anarchist efforts to put their ideas into practice.

This third section is an admirably detailed survey of the anarchist movement. First it traces the development of the anarchist press, the series of international congresses at which anarchism emerged from the ruins of the First International as a movement distinct from socialism, and the formation of local anarchist groups and federations. Then it takes up the activities of the anarchists, explaining the rise of »propaganda by the deed« and describing the various kinds of public actions, both collective and individual, carried out by anarchists.

Finally, in his conclusion, Zoccoli evaluated anarchism. First, he found its theories woefully lacking in »scientific« rigor, devoid both of logic and of a grasp of social and historical reality. Anarchist doctrine, he maintained, was nothing but a »web of contradictions«. Secondly, he found anarchism deficient on ethical grounds as well: such a seriously misguided theory must inevitably yield morally misguided acts like the bombings and assassinations which had punctuated the history of anarchism. Although he recognized that not all anarchists sanctioned such deeds, he felt that anarchism as a whole, by propagating confused ideas, must assume ultimate moral responsibility for the results those ideas produced. Since Zoccoli regarded the state as the foundation of all civilized life, the essential framework for reconciling the interests of individuals with each other and with society, he necessarily rejected the most basic and distinctive tenet of anarchism, its anti-statism. Hence he concluded that the success of anarchism would lead not to a higher form of human existence, as the anarchists themselves claimed, but to barbarism.

The great strength of this book, and the chief justification for reprinting it so many years after its original publication, is the thoroughness with which the author documented the rise of the anarchist movement. Though hostile to anarchism, he was highly conscientious in tracing its development, and when he wrote in his preface that he felt he had left no

source unturned, he was not making an idle boast. His extensive footnotes identify the primary sources and evaluate the worth of much of the previous literature on anarchism. He used sources in Italian, German, French, Spanish, and English (both British and American), although he apparently lacked Russian. Especially valuable for the present-day student of anarchism are Zoccoli's references to the vast anarchist periodical literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, much of it ephemeral and difficult to trace today. The student of anarchism who wants a convenient introduction to the writings of an anarchist theorist, to the origins of a particular anarchist group, or to the work of an international anarchist congress will probably find it here, and the inclusion of an index of names greatly increases the book's value as a reference work. The more serious researcher of the history of anarchism will find the book a very useful bibliographical aid in tracking down the sources of this diffuse and fragmentary movement.

The book's major weakness is its narrow approach to anarchism as an historical phenomenon. Zoccoli weighed anarchist doctrines and activities primarily in terms of how »scientific« they were, and his general implication throughout the book is that no one with any sense could possibly adhere to such a »web of contradictions«. Yet we know that a considerable number of men of good sense did in fact accept the positions of anarchism. While it is important to point out faulty assumptions and unwarranted conclusions in anarchist thought, this kind of abstract philosophical analysis yields only limited results. What is lacking in this book is a broader historical perspective on the rise of anarchism, one that would take into account the political, social, and economic conditions under which it emerged. The correctness or incorrectness of ideas, their intrinsic rationality or absurdity, is not enough to explain their potency or their historical significance. The limitation of Zoccoli's book – perhaps inevitable in a work published at the beginning of the twentieth century, when anarchism was so closely identified with »propaganda by the deed« – is that it is chiefly concerned with disproving anarchism rather than understanding it. A modern scholar hoping to accomplish this larger task, however, would do well to take Zoccoli's book as one of his starting points.

Marshall S. Shatz