

***Druz'ia ponevole: Rossiia i bukharskie evrei, 1800–1917.*** By Al'bert Kaganovitch.  
Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2016. 526 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index.  
Photographs. Figures. Tables.  
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.315

The attitude of the authorities of the Russian empire to its Jewish citizens was a kind of “administrative paranoia.” It is established knowledge that at certain historical times about a quarter of all legislative activity, including various decrees, orders, and circulars was devoted to the Jews, primarily as various prohibitions. The study of various aspects of the policies of Russian authorities toward the Jewish question is far beyond its local context, and is therefore interesting to a wide range of specialists in Russian history.

Another, no less interesting topic is the colonial policy of the Russian empire in the newly conquered Muslim provinces, primarily in Central Asia. The monograph of Albert Kaganovich *Obliged Friends: Russia and Bukharan Jews, 1800–1917*, is the intersection of these two subjects and, therefore, of interest not only to specialists in the field of Jewish history and ethnography, but for general understanding of the methods and principles of the Imperial Russian bureaucracy and Russian colonialism in the east.

Kaganovich's monograph is primarily dedicated to the evolution of Russian policy toward the Bukharan Jews. The author discusses not only a number of Russian legislative initiatives in relation to the Bukharan Jews, but also what the concrete reasons for the Russian administration were and what place the “Bukhara Jewish” strategy occupied in general Russian-Jewish politics. The view of the historian is “stereoscopic.” Kaganovich sees as the subject of the historical process not only local and St. Petersburg authorities, but also the Bukharan Jews who were involved in dialogue with the authorities, who reacted to the administrative policies, and who tried to modify them or use in their favor.

One of the primary advantages of this work is its extensive base of sources: published, including periodicals, and unpublished archival documents, including private and personal archives. Sources in many languages were used in the book, including Russian, Yiddish, Hebrew, and Bukhary (Bukharan Jewish language). The thoroughness of the author makes his monograph an indispensable source of bibliography on Bukharan-Jewish history.

The book is structured as a skillful combination of macro- and micro-historical approaches and the discussion of “big” historical subjects and specific cases, such as the Davydov case, the prosecution of a renowned merchant family for usury that provoked the growth of antisemitism in Turkestan. Changing his “scientific optics,” the author makes more visible the major trends in the history of relations between the Russian administration and Bukharan Jews.

The basic idea of the monograph is that from the time of the Russian conquest of Turkestan until the Revolution, the administrative status of Bukharan Jews slowly deteriorated. In its initial period of colonization of Central Asia, the tsarist government saw in the “aboriginal” Jews natural helpers and allies, but later on its anti-Semitic “instinct” attained the upper hand and played an increasingly important role in late-imperial politics. The second problem that plagues the monograph throughout is the difference in the legal status of the “aboriginal” Jews, that is, those who lived in Central Asian cities that were at once included in the empire, and the Jews who migrated to Russian Turkestan as subjects of the Emir of Bukhara. The tsarist government even tried to create for them a special “Central Asian Pale of Settlement.”

In general, the position of Bukharan Jews in tsarist Russia was much better than that of the more numerous Ashkenazim. The author rightly points out that the era

from the late 1860s (conquest of Turkestan) until 1917 (the end of the Russian Empire) was the “Golden age” of Bukharan Jews, the period of their national development and their formation as an ethno-cultural community.

Kaganovich pays comparatively less attention to ethnography and the cultural life of Bukharan Jews in this period, but this is quite understandable, as he takes the historical point of view and tries to adhere strictly to this discipline.

Kaganovich notes in the introduction that he prepared his research at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem under the supervision of Mikhail Zand, a leading expert in eastern Jewish communities; Shaul Stampfer, whose anthropological approach updated contemporary Jewish historiography; and Mordechai Altshuler, a leading historian of Russian and Soviet Jewry. Kaganovich also notes as his consultants many leading Russian and Israeli historians. All suggestions and criticisms were beneficial, as we have received a clever, fascinating, well-illustrated, and very useful book.

VALERY DYMSHITS

*European University, St. Petersburg*

***The Holocaust in the Crimea and the North Caucasus.*** By Kiril Feferman. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 2016. 600 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Tables. Maps. \$58.00, hard bound.  
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.316

Kiril Feferman has written a definitive biography of the Holocaust in the southwestern parts of the USSR—in Crimea and the North Caucasus. The book begins with a clear narrative treatment of the period, laying the groundwork for a subsequent discussion. We see how the government approached the evacuation question after the German attack on the USSR. The Soviet authorities did not prioritize the civilian population over valuable materials, and poorly organized their evacuation. Because of this, the author considers that no more than 20% of all Jews from the Crimean peninsula managed to escape, or approximately 25,000–30,000 people, which he posits was 38–46% of the prewar Jewish population. Feferman estimates that only 40–50% of Jews managed to escape to the east from the North Caucasus, which was occupied almost half a year after Crimea. It is not clear if the author includes Jews who fled to the North Caucasus from other regions in his estimation. In both cases, the proposed figures do not contain statistical justification or explanation.

This is followed by two chapters devoted to the destruction of the Jewish population in Crimea and the North Caucasus. His numbers of Jewish victims are presented with more in-depth argumentation. Referring to a killing operation, the author argues that it is plausible that regular German Army units participated in the genocide of the Jews to some extent. Regarding the Crimea, he concludes that the local police, especially in the Tatar-dominated towns, and, to a lesser extent, in Russian localities, assisted in the logistical organization of the actions (145). His research benefited from discussing particular issues: internal organization of Jewish life in ghettos, the medical domain, the fate of Jewish prisoners of war, and mixed couples.

One chapter is committed to the German attitude towards Crimean Karaites, Krymchaks, and Mountain Jews. These so-called Mizrahi (Oriental) Jewish ethnic groups had lived in these places since the Middle Ages. Their language, mindset, and traditions were similar to the surrounding Muslim majority. It is not surprising that