Franziska Davies / Martin Schulze Wessel / Michael Brenner (eds.)

Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union

V&R

V&R Academic

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Religiöse Kulturen im Europa der Neuzeit

Herausgegeben von
Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, Miloš Havelka und
Martin Schulze Wessel

Band 6

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union

Edited by
Franziska Davies, Martin Schulze Wessel and Michael Brenner

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

With 12 figures

Cover: see page 165

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: http://dnb.d-nb.de.

ISSN 2197-0955
ISBN 978-3-647-31028-2

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our website: www.v-r.de

Typesetting by textformart, Göttingen | www.text-form-art.de

© 2015, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Contents

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Franziska Davies, Martin Schulze Wessel

Introduction: Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union

Studying the history of Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union is not a new topic, but one which has gained a particular relevance in the context of the research of empire or the "new imperial history". Over three decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union which triggered a renewed interest in Russia's imperial heritage, the fascination of scholars with its ethnic and religious heterogeneity is still unbroken. Jews and Muslims were the two largest non-Christian groups in the Russian Empire and the early Soviet Union and in many ways they presented the imperial bureaucracy with similar challenges. In some cases the state formulated similar responses.

When looking into the historiographical narratives of Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire and Soviet Union, similarities are also discernible. In the last decades, a number of studies on Jewish-Russian history have been published, which emphasize the interaction between the imperial state, Russian society and Jews and underline that the history of Jews in Russia was not merely a story of victimhood and suppression, but that there were also examples of relatively successful integration.[1] Similar historiographical trends are discernible with regards to the Muslim-Russian encounter, at least for the imperial period. Robert Crews has argued that the emphasis on the antagonism between Muslims and the Russian state caused historians to overlook the processes of interaction and interdependence which equally shaped the relationship between the imperial state and Muslim communities.[2] This trend of deconstructing narratives of victimhood is not confined to Jewish and Muslim communities. Recent publica-

1 See for example Petrovsky-Shtern, Y., *Jews in the Russian Army, 1827–1917. Drafted into Modernity* (Cambridge, 2009); Nathans, B., *Beyond the Pale. The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia* (Los Angeles, 2002).

2 Crews, R., "Empire and the Confessional State. Islam and Religious Politics in Nineteenth-Century Russia", The American Historical Review 108:1 (2003), 50–83. However, in his study published in 2006, Crews applies the paradigm of the confessional state mostly to the Tatars and Bashkirs of the Russian Empire and to some extent to the Crimea and Central Asia, but leaves out the empire's most troubled Muslim region, the Northern and Southern Caucasus: Crews, R., *For Prophet and Tsar. Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia* (Cambridge, Ma., 2006).

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

tions on the Baltic region argue along similar lines.[3] Phases of violence and persecution alternated with phases of co-operation and integration.

Nonetheless, there are also differences with regard to the historiography on Jews and Muslims in Russia. Even though Western scholarship on Muslims in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union has grown immensely in the last decades, it is still not as extensive as the research on Jews – at least with regards to the Jews of "European Russia". At the same time, the history of the Jews of Central Asia remains under-researched.

Comparing Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire

The main focus of this volume is the history of Jews and Muslims in the imperial period. Studies which offer a comparative approach to this field have already been published in recent years. A. K. Tikhonov has analyzed the state's policy towards Catholics, Muslims and Jews in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[4] Hans Dietrich Löwe has identified certain "patterns" of the Russian Empire's "Nationalities policies" by comparing the state's treatment of Poles, Jews and Tatars.[5] Löwe outlines the religious and educational policy towards these groups as well as their integration into the imperial estate system. They presented a particular challenge to the Tsarist state, not only because of their numbers, but also due to the difficulties of integrating such diverse groups into the Russian administrative and social system. Islam, Judaism and Catholicism were often seen as an obstacle in this context and consequently Muslim, Jews and Poles all experienced onslaughts on their religion at different points in time. While falling short of a systematic comparison, Löwe raises important points. One intriguing aspect of Russia's imperial history is the question of how her elites drew on experiences with one particular minority to deal with another. For example, when the policies towards the relatively new Jewish subjects were discussed in preparation for the Jewish statute of 1804, the model of the state's policy toward Tatars was an important point of reference. Gavriil Derzhavin, who was principally opposed to an equal treatment of the Jews, nonetheless argued for the establishment of a religious authority for them, and explicitly named the Muslim Spiritual Assembly in Ufa as a model.[6] On a more general level Löwe identifies parallels in the state's approach to educating Jews and Tatars through

3 Brüggemann, K./Woodworth, B. D. (ed.), *Russland an der Ostsee. Imperiale Strategien der Macht und kulturelle Wahrnehmungsmuster (16. bis 20. Jahrhundert)* (Wien, 2012).

4 Tikhonov, A. K., *Katoliki, Musul'mane i iudei Rossiiskoi Imperii v poslednei chetverti XVIII–nachale XX v* (St. Petersburg, 2008).

5 Löwe, H.-D., "Poles, Jews, and Tartars [sic!]: Religion, Ethnicity, and Social Structure in Tsarist Nationality Policy", *Jewish Social Studies* 6:3 (2000), 52–96.

6 Löwe, H.-D., "Poles, Jews, and Tartars", 61.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

the establishment of state-sponsored schools. In both cases theses schools produced mix results from the point of view of the authorities.[7]

Löwe conceptualizes his analysis of Russian policy as part of the empire's rather elusive and incoherent "nationality policy". However, with regards to administrative practices, religion remained a central category until the end of the imperial regime. The religious policy of the Russian Empire has received particular attention in the context of empire studies. Robert Crews has emphasized that the Russian Empire should be regarded as a "confessional state" and has identified similar strategies toward Jews and Muslims in this respect. Jewish as well as Muslim communities witnessed the emergence of modernist and reformist movements in the nineteenth century. These more secularist movements were perceived as a threat to the autocratic regime and thus prompted government officials to support the conservative forces both within Jewish and Muslim societies.[8] Seen in this light, Judaism and Islam were also identified by some within the imperial bureaucracy as potential allies of the state. Religion was an important pillar of imperial rule, an instrument of managing Russia's diverse population. Religious authorities of the various faiths – some of whom had been created by the Russian policy in the first place – became mediators between the imperial state and their respective communities.

Crews's generalizations about Russia's religious policy have been drawn primarily from studying the empire's treatment of Islam in the Volga-Ural region and Crimea, and to some extent in Central Asia. However, his portrayal of the Russian Empire's policy toward Islam has been criticized as one-sided, because it is centered on the state's perspective and fails to take into account Muslim perceptions of Russian policies beyond rhetorical declarations of loyalty.[9] According to Crews' broader understanding of the Russian Empire as a "confessional state", imperial rulers forged political loyalty and social integration on the basis of the empire's various confessions, not only Russian Orthodoxy but other faiths as well. In a very general sense, the political role of the "confessional state" in shaping religious groups into confessions can also be applied to other regions of the empire. Yet, close examination of confessional politics in the western borderlands – which were particularly important for Russia's experience with religious and national diversity – makes clear that Crews' paradigm is not sufficiently complex for a general analysis of Russian imperial policy towards all confessions. As Mikhail Dolbilov shows in his study of imperial policies in the

7 Löwe, H.-D., "Poles, Jews, and Tartars", 71–75.

8 Crews, R. D., "Empire and the Confessional State", 52.

9 See for example the reviews by Michael Kemper in *Die Welt des Islam* 47:1 (2007), 126–129 and Michael Khodarkovsky in *The American Historical Review* 112:5 (2007), 1491–1493; Alexander Morrison has challenged the thesis that the paradigm of the "confessional state" can be applied to Central Asia: Morrison, A., *Russian Rule in Samarkand. A Comparison with British India* (Oxford, 2008), 56.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

General Government of Vilnius, Crew's findings cannot simply be transferred to other parts of the empire. Dolbilov offers a more complex model distinguishing between logics of "disciplining" and "discrediting" in Russian confessional policy. According to Dolbilov, the disciplining logic featured the permanent intervention of the state into confessional affairs in order to assure political loyalty and social integration. This strategy required that the confessions be brought closer to the state's basic aims, such as the proliferation of education and enlightenment. Dolbilov sees "disciplining" as being in permanent tension with an opposite logic of "discrediting," by which state servitors questioned the loyalty and legitimacy of non-Orthodox confessions and thereby placed the policy of "tolerance" towards them in some doubt. In this context, the alternations between positive and negative policies towards Catholicism and Judaism appear to have been far from accidental. The discrediting of one confession was a significant factor in the disciplining of the other. With regard to Dolbilov's findings about the entangled logics of Russia's policy towards Catholicism and Judaism it is an interesting and so far unanswered question to which extent the imperial logics of disciplining and discrediting were intertwined in the case of Judaism and Islam as well.[10]

By the second half of the nineteenth century, Russia had developed what Paul Werth has called a "multi-confessional establishment" into which Jews and Muslims were integrated to different degrees. Werth argues that Jews and Muslims had the most to gain from their integration into this kind of bureaucratic structure because it brought them implicit toleration by the imperial state after serious onslaughts on their religion in the course of the eighteenth century.[11] Thus, one way of conceptualizing a comparative history of Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire is to analyze and compare state practices and policies towards them. In doing so, the historian reconstructs the perspective of the entity which brought Jews and Muslims together in the first place: the shared experience of Russian and later Soviet imperial rule. The perhaps most palpable way of integrating Jewish and Muslim experiences into one narrative and analytical framework is to look at their participation in Russian imperial institutions. The present volume is no exception. Franziska Davies and Vladimir Levin chose this path by looking into the role of Jews and Muslims in the imperial army and the Duma respectively. Franziska Davies argues that it was precisely the advanced integration into Russia's "multi-confessional establishment" that enabled Muslims to successfully lobby for the institutionalization of Islam in the armed forces at the beginning of the twentieth century. Jews did not possess compara-

10 Dolbilov, M., *Russkii krai, chuzhaia vera: etnokonfessional'naia politika imperii v Litve i Belorussii pri Aleksandre II,* (Moscow, 2010).

11 Werth, P. W., *The Tsar's Foreign Faiths. Toleration and the Fate of Religious Freedom in Imperial Russia*, (Oxford, 2014), esp. 46–73.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

ble resources. Vladimir Levin shows that while Jews and Muslims faced similar challenges on the Duma floor, this did not lead to cooperation between Jewish and Muslim politicians, partly out of fear by the Muslim parliamentarians to be associated with the Jewish minority whose position in late imperial Russia was arguably worse than their own. The history of the parliamentarian sessions shows that Muslims enjoyed broader support among the Russian political elites and were better integrated into the imperial space on both a practical and a symbolic level which ultimately secured them greater success in the Duma.

Michael Stanislawski takes a different angle in his contribution. Rather than looking into the Jewish and Muslim participation in imperial institution or state policies towards them, Stanislawski focuses on Muslim and Jewish responses to a changing world by comparing Jewish and Muslim reformist movements in the Russian Empire. Stanislawski conceptualizes this approach by concentrating on two central figures of these movements in Russia, Judah Leib Gordon in case of the Jewish *Haskalah* and Ismail Bey Gasprinskii in case of Jadidism. Through his comparison of their ideological outlook, Stanislawski demonstrates that there were striking similarities between Gordon's and Gasprinskii's world views: both called for thorough cultural and educational reforms within their respective communities and a rapprochement to European and Russian culture, both shared skepticism toward particularistic notions of ethnic and national identities because these contradicted their vision of universalistic values of enlightenment. But there were also important differences. For example, Gordon's loyalty to the Tsarist regime was largely pragmatic, while Gasprinskii expressed a profound admiration for the empire's imperial achievements. This ideological difference reflected their unequal social standing in Russian society: Gasprinskii was much closer to the Russian imperial elite, with his father having served in the Russian army. He himself had been educated in a military school in Moscow.

Stanislawski's paper illustrates that a comparative history of Muslim and Jewish reformist movements could be an extremely promising field of research, even if its linguistic requirements are perhaps too many for just one researcher. A collaborative comparative history of the Russian Haskalah and Jadidism would be an extremely challenging, but rewarding project. At the same time, it is important to keep in mind that there is not one history of Muslim enlightenment in the Russian Empire as little as there is one history of the *Haskalah* in Russia. Jadidism originated in the Crimean Peninsula, had its greatest impact in the Volga-Ural region, but also spread to Central Asia. With the possible exception of the Caucasus, Jadidism was a phenomenon which influenced the diverse Muslim regions of the empire to varying degrees. Thus a comparison between Jewish and Muslim experiences in the Russian Empire should avoid essentialising the category of "Jews" and "Muslims" since neither were a homogenous group and they did not perceive themselves as such. Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

makes this clear in his contribution to this volume in which he outlines the pitfalls of a comparative approach to the history of Jews and Muslims in the Russian and Soviet realm by pointing to the many differences not just between Jews and Muslims, but also between the various Muslim communities. This begins with the history of their relationship to the imperial state: In a process spinning more than three hundred years, the Russian Empire integrated various Muslim peoples into its realm, starting with the Muslim peoples in the Volga region in the sixteenth century and ending only in the last decades of the nineteenth century with Russia's conquest of Central Asia. In comparison to the process of integrating Muslim societies, the incorporation of the Jewish population in the western peripheries was far less complicated and completed a lot quicker. However, the Jews of the Russian Empire were not a homogenous group either. With the expansion into Central Asia in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the empire did increase the number of its Muslim subjects to a very considerable degree, but it also subjected the Jews of Bukhara to its rule. Thus, in case of the Jews of Central Asia and those of the Western provinces one may conclude that they too shared little but the coincidence of Russian rule. It was only during the Soviet era that these communities came into closer contact with each other.[12] In spite of the limits of a comparative approach, Petrovsky-Shtern also identifies a number of research fields which would profit from such a perspective including the extent to which Russia's imperial policy towards one confession was inspired by the experience with the other or a comparative history of Jews and Muslims in Central Asia in the imperial as well as the Soviet period – to name just a few of Petrovsky-Shtern's proposals for future research.

The contributions of this volume already outlined above follow a comparative perspective, the others concentrate either on Jews or Muslims in specific regions of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union and cover a range of different topics. Michael Khodarkovsky reconstructs the experience of those individuals from the Caucasus who moved between their communities and Russian society as officers, administrators or intellectuals. He concludes that these intermediaries became strangers in both worlds. Not fully Russified because of their strong ties to their home communities, they nonetheless ceased to be natives as they returned to their villages in the uniform of the Tsar's army or speaking their mother tongue with a strange accent. Nonetheless, these individuals were important for the construction of imperial identities. Many of them were responsible for bringing "modern" concepts such as ethnicity to their communities. As they began to write the history and sometimes the language of their peoples, they not only fostered the construction of ethnic identities, but also shaped the way

12 Levin, Z., "When it all began: Bukharan Jews and the Soviets in Central Asia", in I. Baldauf/M. Gammer/T. Loy (ed.), *Bukharan Jews in the 20th Century. History, Experience and Narration* (Wiesbaden, 2008), 23–36, on p. 25.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

in which Russian society viewed these non-Russian and non-Christian peoples as well as their own empire. The question of Russia's imperial identity is closely connected to the nature of Russian rule. Russian elites insisted that the Russian imperial experience fundamentally differed from those of the Western European colonial regimes which were merely grounded in political subjugation and economic exploitation, while Russia's expansion was allegedly the result of a peaceful process of offering protection to various indigenous peoples who had somehow always belonged to Russia's imperial realm. But in reality, Russian rule in the Caucasus and Central Asia exhibited many features of colonial rule. Khodarkovsky points out that this "cognitive dissonance" in many ways persists to the present day.

David Schick looks into the behavior of economic elites within Jewish society through a case study. Schick analyses the interrelation between religious identity and economic behavior by reconstructing the transnational business networks of the Jewish merchant Markus Silberstein in Łódź. He argues that with regard to long-distance trade, shared religious affiliation was a source of trust and therefore shaped the economic behavior of Markus Silberstein. David Fishman shows how Yiddish culture and language underwent a transformation at the turn of the nineteenth century. Fishman maintains that it was the social and cultural transformation of Jewish society in late imperial Russia which accounts for the changing role of Yiddish culture. At the turn of the century a large number of Jews had migrated from the *shtetlekh* to the cities in the Pale of Settlement where they became the producers and consumers of a secular Yiddish culture in theater, journalism and literature.

Two contributions are dedicated to the revolutionary and early Soviet period. In the Soviet context, too, there are obvious parallels between Jewish and Muslim experiences: like all religions, Islam and Judaism were subjected to brutal onslaughts by the atheistic state. However, in this case too, there are interesting differences in local contexts: Muslim women of Central Asia were discovered as a surrogate for the proletariat who had to be liberated from male domination and a backward social order. This new policy became most visible in the unveiling campaigns of the 1920s. In spite of the fact that the Bukharan Jewish women traditionally also wore a veil, they were much less targeted by the Soviet authorities.[13] The contributions in the current volume, however, are less focused on state's policy, but look at different forms of Jewish and Muslim participation in and re-interpretation of the revolution and Soviet modernity.

13 Northrop, D., *Veiled Empire. Gender and Power in Stalinist Central Asia* (Ithaca/London, 2004), 51; Levin, Z., "When it all began: Bukharan Jews and the Soviets in Central Asia", in I. Baldauf/M. Gammer/T. Loy (ed.), *Bukharan Jews in the 20th Century. History, Experience and Narration* (Wiesbaden, 2008), 23–36.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Adeeb Khalid's contribution is dedicated to the revolutionary period and the Muslim population's responses to the advent of Soviet power in Central Asia. Khalid's contribution illustrates very clearly that one cannot speak of the "Muslims in the Russian Empire", but that the regional and cultural context of Muslim identities needs to be taken into account. Central Asia was not integrated into the Russian Empire's "multi-confessional establishment". Nor did the Muslims of the Russian Empire conceive themselves as one community, attempts to mobilize the diverse Muslim communities of Russia under the banner of Islam ultimately failed. Not only did Russia's Muslims experience the revolution in different ways, but Adeeb Khalid shows that the urban elites of Central Asia were also deeply divided over the meaning of Islam and the political and social order of Turkestan after the downfall of the imperial regime. The revolutionary events in the urban centers of Central Asia soon turned into bitter dispute between the older elites of the *ulama* and the modernist Jadids who competed for moral authority. The penetration of Central Asia by the Soviet regime led to the Jadids gaining the upper hand and in the early 1920s an anti-clerical discourse emerged which was initially more influenced by the older conflicts within Muslim society than by Soviet ideology.

David Shneer analyses the role of two Jewish individuals who participated in the construction of Soviet modernity through photography. Georgii Zelmanovitch and Semyon Fridlyand were only two of many Jewish-Soviet photographers. Fridlyand was originally from Kiev, Zelmanovitch was an Ashkenazi Jew born in Tashkent. Both were central figures for the photographic documentation of the empire's ethnic diversity and the advent of Soviet civilization in the imperial peripheries. Zelmanovitch documented the assumed achievements of Soviet policy in Central Asia and both photographers were deeply involved in visualizing the Soviet experiment of creating a "Jewish Autonomous Region" in Russia's Far East, in Birobidzhan.

This volume is the result of a conference which took place in June 2013 at the *Historische Kolleg* in Munich and was funded by the International Research Training Group "Religious Cultures in 19th and 20th-century Europe". The aim of the conference was to bring together leading specialists in the field of Jewish and Muslim history in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union and to reflect on the possibilities and limits of a comparative approach to the history of these communities who shared many features, but who were also shaped by specific cultural, local and political experiences.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern

Jewish Apples and Muslim Oranges in the Russian Basket: Options and Limits of a Comparative Approach

In the 1860s, the Russian imperial bureaucrat Vasily Grigor'ev decided to enlighten the Russian reading public about the Kazakh steppe and to criticize the condescending manner in which the Russian regime treated the Muslim population. With his firsthand knowledge of the Kazakh region and its people, Grigor'ev sought to have an impact and alter the imperial colonization patterns. He was confident that there were many significant matters which Russian state officials, journalists, and the reading public could learn from Muslims and about Muslims. Grigor'ev considered this knowledge crucial for a better perception, control, and reform of the people of the steppe. To make sure that he, a Russian clerk, would seem credible to Russian readers, Grigor'ev needed an authoritative voice – one with undeniable legitimacy. Toward that end, Grigor'ev invented an interlocutor, a Kazakh sultan named Mendali Piraliev. The sultan was a wise, enlightened, and thoughtful individual who combined the best qualities of an Oriental ruler as described in Persian folklore with the real-life experiences of a contemporary nineteenth century Kazakh. The invented sultan reached his audience through the Slavophile newspaper *Den'*, which Grigoriev used as a pulpit to present Muslims in a favorable light; to give a favorable explanation of the culture of the steppe; and to justify Islam, its laws, and its customs in the eyes of Russians.[1]

About twenty years later, a certain Piotr Rachkovskii, a Russian administrator who supervised the work of the Russian secret police in Europe, decided to enlighten the Russian reading public about the East European Jews, the internal structure of their communal power, their attitudes to non-Jews, their role in political violence and revolutionary upheavals, and their idiosyncratic ethical qualities. Acting as a behind-the-scenes adviser, Rachkovskii commissioned hack Russian émigré journalist Matvei Golovinskii to create a text which would

1 Remnev, A., "Sultan Mendali Piraliev: the History of a Hoax", *Ab Imperio* 1 (2012), 106–117; for the first book publication of the bogus correspondence, see Grigor'ev, V. V., *Sultana Mendali Piralieva deviat' khivinskikh pisem v redaktsiiu "Russkogo mira"* (St. Petersburg, 1873); for Grigor'ev's orientalism and imperialism, see his most representative collection of articles, *Rossiia i Aziia. Sbornik issledovanii po istorii, etnografii, napisannykh v raznoe vremia V. V. Grigor'evym, orientalistom* (St. Petersburg, 1876).

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

prove that Jews were innate revolutionaries, cynical international manipulators, and immoral seekers of world domination. To convey all these things in a compelling way, Rachkovskii and Golovinskii needed an authoritative voice. Like Grigor'ev with his sultan Piraliev, Golovinskii resorted to literary invention. He fabricated the collective voice of an imaginary group of highly influential Jewish rulers, members of a clandestine international Jewish *kahal*, who drafted their plans for the conquest of the world and subjugation of non-Jews in their classified protocols. Golovinskii chose to speak to the reading public through the voices of the Elders of Zion, whose protocols had allegedly been stolen by a woman in the Russian diplomatic service, brought to Russia, and published for the first time in a Kishinev-based newspaper. The compilers of the protocols sought to have an impact and change the Russian attitude toward the Jews – and as we know, they certainly had an impact.[2]

These two Russian political fictions, one produced the persona of sultan Piraliev, the other the persona of the Elders of Zion, addressed differences between Muslims and Jews in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. One Russian administrator created a literary fiction to raise the profile of Muslims and Islam by speaking through an authoritative Muslim interlocutor. Another Russian administrator, assisted by a Russian journalist, chose a similar model to defame the Jews and Judaism. Through the guise of a Muslim, the Russian clerk called for tolerance toward Muslims, for a better understanding of Islam, and for a closer study of the legacy of the Great Steppe. In the second case, the Russian author called for a curtailment of any discussion of granting Jews civil equality. Instead he sought to reverse Jewish emancipation, if not banish Jews from Russian public life altogether. The invented Sultan Peraliev portrayed Muslims as enlightened, rational, and tolerant friends of the Russians. The fic-

2 The literature on the protocols is vast, for the most recent works, see Horn, E./Hagemeister, M. (ed.), *Die Fiktion von der jüdischen Weltverschwörung: Zu Text und Kontext der "Protokolle der Weisen von Zion"* (Göttingen, 2012); Matussek, C., *Der Glaube an eine "jüdische Weltverschwörung": Die Rezeption der "Protokolle der Weisen von Zion" in der arabischen Welt* (Berlin, 2012); Landes, R./Katz, S. T., *The Paranoid Apocalypse: A Hundred-Year Retrospective on the Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (New York, 2012); Webman, E. (ed.), *The Global Impact of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion: a century-old myth* (London/New York, 2011); Romano, S., *I falsi protocolli: il complotto ebraico dalla Russia di Nicola II a oggi* (Milan, 2011); Taguieff, P. A., *L'imaginaire du complot mondial: aspects d'un mythe moderne* (Paris, 2006); Ben-Itto, H., *The Lie that Wouldn't Die: The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (London/Portland, 2005); De Michelis, C. G., *The Non-Existent Manuscript: A Study of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion* (Lincoln, 2004); Tazbir, J., *Protokoły mędrców Syjonu: autentyk czy falsyfikat* (Warsaw, 2004); De Michelis, C. G., *La giudeofobia in Russia: dal Libro del kahal ai Protocolli dei savi di Sion* (Turin, 2001). For the review of the previous works, see the essay and bibliography amassed in Petrovsky-Shtern, Y., "Contextualizing the Mystery: Three Approaches to the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*", *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 2 (2003), 395–409.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

tive Elders of Zion presented the Jews as staunch, cunning, and perfidious enemies of the Russian people, and indeed of all humankind.[3]

These two literary inventions open up several issues related to Muslims and Jews in the Russian context. Sultan Peraliev and the Elders of Zion represent very different images, indeed, but Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire were also far from being similar religious minorities. In the case of Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire, we are dealing with apples and oranges: Jewish apples and Muslim oranges. Nevertheless, the Russian basket supplies us with a useful, if not absolutely necessary, framework for comparing Jews and Muslims. Before one traces parallels between the two religious groups in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union, we must consider several major historical, geographic, political, administrative, and cultural differences.

Let us start with Russia's appropriation of lands which, with some margin of error, one can identify as Muslim. This appropriation went on for more than three centuries and was characterized by highly diverse military and political strategies and colonizing practices. Kazan, the center of the Volga Tatar lands, fell to the troops of Ivan the Terrible in 1552. Later in the sixteenth century, the Russians established a fortress in Ufa, the center of the Bashkir lands. What is today Tatarstan and Bashkortostan became nominally Russian long before Russia transformed itself into an empire. The Crimean peninsula with its khanate residence in Bakhchisarai was famously annexed under Catherine II in 1783, while Russia came to control the coastal line of present-day Azerbaijan in the late 1820s. The war for the Northern Caucasus lasted more than thirty years and ended in the late 1850s. After several unsuccessful attempts to take control of the Transcaspian region, the Russian troops finally conquered the territories of Central Asia in the 1860s, particularly what is today Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.[4]

3 On Muslims and Jews in Russian public discourse and political imagination, see above all, Campbell, E., "The Muslim Question in Late Imperial Russia", in J. Burbank/A. V. Remnev/M. Von Hagen (ed.), *Russian Empire:Space, People, Power, 1700–1930* (Bloomington, 2007), 321–351; Campbell, E., "The Autocracy and the Muslim Clergy in the Russian Empire (1850s–1917)", *Russian Studies in History* 44:2 (2005), 8–29; Smirnov, A. V., *Rossiia i musul'manskii mir: inakovost' kak problema* (Moscow, 2010); Gudkov, L. (ed.), *Obraz vraga* (Moscow, 2005), 102–126. Limits of interreligious tolerance in the Russian empire based on Jewish, Muslim and other examples is discussed at length in an excellent volume Geraci, R. P./Khodarkovsky, M. (ed.), *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca, 2001).

4 On the appropriation of the Muslim lands by the Russian empire, their subsequent absorption and transformation of Russia into an Eurasian empire, see among other publications, Firouzeh, M., *On the Religious Frontier: Tsarist Russia and Islam in the Caucasus* (London/New York, 2006); Arapov, D.Iu., *Imperatorskaia Rossiia i musulmanskii mir: sbornik statei* (Moscow, 2006); Crews, R. D., *For Prophet and Tsar: Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia* (Cambridge, Ma., 2006); Laruelle, M., *Russian Eurasianism: An Ideology of Empire* (Washington, D. C./Baltimore, 2008); Abdulatipov, R. G., *Sud' by islama v Rossii: Istoriia i perspektivy* (Moscow, 2002).

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Compare this 300-year process of absorbing the eastern lands to the relatively swift conquest of two-thirds of Poland-Lithuania, accomplished without excessive military intervention in three phases: in 1772, 1793, and 1795. With facile territorial expansion, about one million Jews previously not allowed into the empire became Russian subjects. Russia's very different military experiences in its eastern and western borderlands informed the differences in approach to the people inhabiting these lands. The imperial administrators came to the conclusion that the more easily appropriated territories in the west should and could be more expediently and more aggressively incorporated into the empire.[5]

After the first Partition of Poland Catherine reorganized the former Polish palatinates as provinces, and integrated them into the Russian administrative system made up of *guberniias* (provinces). The territories which Russia acquired after the second and third partition were dealt with in the same fashion. In the following decades Russian imperial institutions expanded westwards. Within half a century, these institutions were firmly rooted in the former lands of eastern Poland.

What occurred in the eastern lands of the empire was quite different. For several centuries, Russia treated its new eastern lands as territories for moving troops and trade caravans between the European and Asian parts of the empire. Unlike Polish palatinates not all of them were administrative entities under direct state control. Instead, the conquered lands were called "roads" – the Kazan military road, the Orenburg military road, the Caucasus military road, and so on. However, these descriptive labels did not apply to roads alone, but to huge territories which these roads traversed. Among the diverse Muslim population of the empire, only the Tatars and Bashkirs of the Volga-Ural region and the Crimea lived under Russian civilian rule in the nineteenth century especially in the governorates of Kazan, Orenburg, Ufa and the Tauride province. In the steppe, Central Asia and the Caucasus things were more complicated: Although the Kazakh khanate accepted the Russian protectorate in the 1730s, Russian expansion into Central Asia continued well into the nineteenth century with the first Turkestan governor-generalship only being established in 1866. Until then Orenburg had been the empire's outpost in the steppe.[6] Civil administration came to partially replace, partially reinforce the military administration even later, in 1899. Hitherto, the vast territories of the Russian South-East in the trans-Caspian region were controlled by the war minister. Before the im-

5 On the partitions of Poland and Russia's absorption of the Polish Jewish population, see Klier, J., *Russia Gathers Her Jews: The Origins of the "Jewish Question" in Russia, 1772–1825* (DeKalb, 1986); Bartal, I., *The Jews of Eastern Europe, 1772–1881* (Philadelphia, 2002), 23–37; Polonsky, A., *The Jews in Poland and Russia*, in 3 vols. (Oxford/Portland, 2010), 1: 323–337.

6 Khodarkovsky, M., Russia's steppe frontier (Bloomington, 2002), 28–30.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

position of direct imperial rule, the territories east of the Caspian Sea were considered the *krai*, or periphery of the empire, and were supervised by the administrator located in distant Tiflis (Tbilissi). Apparently the Russian regime, for a variety of reasons, was reluctant at first to establish imperial governing institutions in the southeast, and unwilling to organize the administration of the new territories regionally.[7]

One of the obvious reasons for this discrepancy between the lands acquired in the east and those acquired in the west was the enormity of the geographical expansion, particularly in the east. The empire simply lacked sufficient administrative personnel and could not afford to spread itself too thin. Another reason was military. The incorporation of the former Polish lands into the empire was not without its problems. The Poles rebelled in 1794, 1830, 1846 (in the free city of Krakow), and 1863/64, but these rebellions were quickly and successfully suppressed, and Krakow punished by the cancellation of its status as a free city and its transfer under the Austrian imperial administration. Order was imposed by iron fist, and colonization was enhanced. While the Poles considered Russia's western borderlands a war zone, for the Jews it was definitely a realm of peace. Their loyalty to Mother Russia manifested itself during the Crimean and Balkan campaigns and also much earlier, during the 1812 Napoleonic invasion, in the midst of which the leaders of the Jewish communities publicly supported the anti-Napoleonic campaign and the highest Russian bureaucrats seriously discussed how to establish a secret intelligence service drawing on the Russian Jews' ties to international Jewry and relying on Jewish patriotic fervor.[8] The Polish rebellions notwithstanding, Russia was more concerned with its military rivalry with Prussia, Austria, and the Ottomans rather than the conquered and rebellious Poles. These were far more serious adversaries.

The eastern expansion had opposite results. Various groups of Muslims – particularly the ethnically diverse groups in the Northern Caucasus – considered the territory loosely controlled by the Russian troops as the *dar al-harb*, the Abode of War. Representatives of the ruling Muslim clans signed what historians of Islam in Russia called a "*fetvah* with the White Tsar" – what should perhaps more accurately be called a *hudnah* (the former meaning a responsum, legal opinion or ruling, the latter a temporary cessation of hostilities). But this peaceful agreement, from the viewpoint of the Muslim elites, was only temporary (as mandated by Islamic law) and binding only for some groups in the Caucasus, Ural, and Central Asiatic lands. The 1704–1711 and 1755–56 Bashkir

7 Abashin, S., "Razmyshleniia o Tsentral'noi Azii v sostave Rossiiskoi imperii", *Ab Imperio* 4 (2008), 456–471; Bobrovnikov, V., "Chto poluchilos' iz "Severnogo Kavkaza v Rossiiskoi imperii": poslelovie redaktora neskolko let spustia", *Ab Imperio* 4 (2008), 501–519.

8 Lukin, B., "'Sluzhba naroda evreiskogo i ego kagalov': evrei i Otechestvennaia voina 1812 goda", *Lehaim* 11:187 (2007), 38–42.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

uprisings, the multiple Tatar rebellions, and continuous Tatar support of Ural Cossack and peasant rebels such as Stepan Razin and Emelian Pugachev, as well as the 1873–76 Kokand and 1898 Andizhan rebellions, proved that the autochthonous populations, for a complex variety of reasons, did not accept Russian control and readily resorted to drastic military measures in an attempt to overthrow it.[9] The Muslims of European Russia abandoned their resistance against Russian rule after the implementation of Catherine's policy of toleration in the late eighteenth century and even experienced a religious and cultural revival in the nineteenth, but things were quite different in the Caucasus. Here, the Russian military had to conduct extensive military and diplomatic initiatives and even resort to cunning maneuvering between various groups of Muslims to finally put an end to the more than thirty-year war in the Northern Caucasus, a campaign which lasted from 1834 to 1859. This experience contributed to the idea of the "fanatic" Muslim, who fiercely opposed Russian rule but whose capability of resistance also fascinated military elites. The landless Jews, on the other hand, did not rebel against the empire even once, and when they did, in the wake of the rising socialist movement in the 1890s and later in Krynki, Vilna, or Odessa, they did so as proletarians fighting for the emancipation of the international workers, not as Jews with a distinct Jewish national or political agenda.[10]

The colonial projects in the imperial east fell short of the relative success of the colonization of Russia's west. In the formerly Polish territories there were religious conflicts between *Hasidim* and *Mitnagdim*, followers of the movement of religious enthusiasm and its radical opponents; clashes between the Eastern Orthodox, the Uniates, and the Catholics; and of course much more serious social tensions between the landlords – Polish, then Russian – and the peasant population. These conflicts sometimes took the form of anti-Jewish violence. Yet these nineteenth-century conflicts were a far cry from the bitter geopolitical, ideological, religious, and territorial rivalry between the Bashkirs in Ufa and the Tartars in Kazan over territory and ethnogenetic myths, between the Uzbeks and the Kyrgyz over control of the Fergana valley, and between various ethnic groups of Muslims in Dagestan and Chechnya in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Elite representatives of these groups sought Russian support and approval for their actions, and made consistent attempts to get the imperial authorities and the military involved, while the regime allowed itself to get involved only in extraordinary circumstances. The imperial (and

9 Babadzhanov, B., "Andizhanskoe vosstanie 1898 goda i 'musul'manskii vopros' v Turkestane (vzgliady 'koloniztorov' i 'kolonizirovannykh')", *Ab Imperio* 2 (2009), 155–200.

10 Pipes, R., "Jews and the Russian Revolution: A Note", in A. Polonsky et al. (ed.), *POLIN: Studies in Polish Jewry.* Vol. 9: *Poles, Jews, Socialists. The Failure of an Ideal* (London, 1996), 55–57.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

later the Soviet) administration knew well that these conflicts bordered on open inter-ethnic clashes.

The regime also treated Jews and Muslims differently because of the internal cultural characteristics of the two groups. Muslims in the Russian Empire, particularly in the Caucasus and the Ural regions, had their local customs, called *'adat*, that shaped the way of life of local Muslims, although these customs often contradicted the universal Muslim laws (*shariah*). In various regions of the Pale of Settlement, traditional Jewish communities, like Muslims with their *'adat*, also had their customary law, called *minhag*, and raised it to the level of legal regulation by emphasizing that *minhag ha-makom doheh halakhah* – or, local customary law annuls a corresponding universally accepted legal ruling. Of course, most *minhagim*, local customs, reflected differences in liturgy or ritual law, and almost never encroached on criminal, family, or financial matters. Despite this parallel between local and general law among Muslims and Jews, the Russian authorities almost never dealt with the contradictions between Jewish custom and the law in the western provinces and as a rule they relied on their general (although superficial) understanding of the basic aspects of Judaism. On the contrary, in the Caucasus and elsewhere, the imperial administrators had to fight against the local customs (sometimes atavistically pagan), and take sides in the clashes between the *'adat* and the *shariah*, and even to favor further spread of the laws of the *shariah*.[11] It would not be an exaggeration to claim that in the long run, the Russian conquest of the new territories in the Caucasus, the Urals, and Central Asia became conducive to the ubiquitous establishment of the *shariah* norms among Russian Muslims. These legal differences need particular scrutiny.[12]

Muslims and Jews were too different socially and economically to be treated on par with one another. In the western provinces, the Russian regime dealt with a predominantly sedentary population, however mobile the trading estates among the Jews were. This population treated their marketplace towns as their immediate home and blessed their dwelling place by calling it *kehillah kedoshah*, a holy community. Be it Berdichev, Dubno, Eishishek, Pinsk, or Uman, Jews considered these holy communities as their homeland, although it was an exilic and temporary one. Long before Zionism came into being, these Jews raised funds for the *yishuv* communities in the Holy Land. Starting in the late eighteenth century, they flocked to the sermons of the *shelikhim* (communal messengers) from Hebron, Jerusalem, Tiberias, and Safed. They adorned their houses and synagogues with ornaments decorated with symbols of the second

11 Kemper, M., "'Adat Against Shari'a: Russian Approaches toward Daghestani 'Customary Law' in the 19th century", *Ab Imperio* 3 (2005), 147–174.

12 For one of the productive attempts to scrutinize this issue, see Crews, R. D., "Islamic Law, Imperial Order: Muslims, Jews and the Russian State", *Ab Imperio* 3 (2004), 467–490.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

Temple, Jerusalem, and the Holy Land. They knew well that their promised land had been, was, and would be Eretz Yisroel, the land of Israel. Once Herder's idea of *Volksgeist* (the spirit of a people) began to shape Jewish diaspora nationalism, it was East European Jews who insisted on the commonality of the land of Israel for Diaspora Jewry, whereas western European Jews readily entertained alternative options for a Jewish national home. In short, Jews in Russia had a clear vision of their sedentary dwelling in the Diaspora – and dreamt of a future and permanent residence in the land of Israel.[13]

On the other hand, a variety of Muslim groups in the newly acquired Russian territories in the East and South East lived a nomadic life, considered themselves nomads, and conceptualized their understanding of homeland (*watan*), and peoplehood (*millet)*, along the lines of the European national-building programs very late, only with the rise of the Jadidism (enlightened) movement and not before the 1890s.[14] For example, Tartar national history remained in the hands of the *ulema*, Muslim clerics, throughout the nineteenth century, hence Tartar historiography resisted western European nation-building programs. Furthermore, Muslims in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russia did not always necessarily see themselves as part of the larger Muslim world. Consider that until the late nineteenth century Muslims from Bashkiria and Tatarstan went on *hajj* to the holy graves of great sheiks in Khiva, Bukhara, Urgench, Osh, and Samarkand (where it is said that the hand of the prophet Daniel was re-buried). Of these many towns, Bukhara was their Mecca and they went there from Ufa, Kazan, and Orenburg on pilgrimage much more often that to Mecca and Medina.[15] Whether Muslims in Russia considered themselves part of the greater Muslim *ummah* remains a mystery. Muslim ethno-nationalism was slow to come to the fore. It became particularly palpable immediately before the collapse of communism, with the Kyrgyz orchestrating ethnic cleansings in Osh, Tatars opting for the Turkish-esque Latinized alphabet, Chechen leaders seek-

13 See the chapter "If I Forget Thee…" in Petrovsky-Shtern, Y., *The Golden Age Shtetl: A New History of Jewish Life in East Europe* (Princeton, 2014), 273–303.

14 For more detail on the late encounter of Muslim thought with Western concepts of nationalism see, Noack, C., *Muslimischer Nationalismus im Russischen Reich. Nationsbildung und Nationalbewegung bei Tataren und Baschkiren, 1861–1917* (Stuttgart, 2000), 135–217, particularly 171–177.

15 The matter, however, remains complicated as some Muslims of Central Asia and Caucasus did go on pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina. See Brower, D., "Russian Roads to Mecca: Religious Tolerance and Muslim Pilgrimage in the Russian Empire", *Slavic Review* 55:3 (1996), 567–584. Still this traditional pilgrimage remains a privilege of the very few (in comparison to group pilgrimages to the shrines in Central Asia). Thus, the *hajj* to Mecca is mentioned only twice and in passing in a major book on Islam in Russia and the USSR, see Dudoignon, S.A./Hisao, K., (ed.), *Islam in Politics in Russia and Central Asia (Early Eighteenth to Late Twentieth Centuries)* (London, 2001), index (Mecca, *hajj*). Eileen Kane's forthcoming book will be an important contribution to answer these questions.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

ing to create an emirate in the Northern Caucasus, and the Bashkirs moving from the nineteenth-century ethnic rivaling to competing with their Muslim neighbors for Ancient Bulgar ethnic roots.[16]

The discrepancy between the roles the economic elites of the two communities, Jewish and Muslim, played in Russian modernization is particularly striking. The state reforms directed at Jews in the 1830s–1840s and those of Muslim life in the 1860s seemed to be a direct assault on the confessional autonomy of the Jewish and Muslim communities. While a complex combination of resistance and adaptation were common to both groups, the Jews were much quicker in absorbing the reforms, which subsequently contributed to the modernization of the empire as a whole. Jewish bankers, industrialists, and entrepreneurs, the direct beneficiaries of these reforms, invested in such strategically important branches of industry and international commerce as the Russian stock exchange, river steamboat transportation, oil and coal mining, sugar production and grain trade, the banking system, and railroad construction. Although the Russian administration almost privileged Muslim guild merchants and integrated Muslim elites much earlier than the Jewish ones, the former played a very modest role in the development of Russian capitalism. Hence, unlike the Russian Jews, they were not equated with the evils of Russia's industrialization, westernized modernization, capitalist exploitation, and the revolutionary consequences triggered by these processes. The Russian Jews therefore came to be associated with capitalism, whereas the Russian Muslims did not.[17]

Unsurprisingly, Jews became targets of the xenophobic far-right and counter-reform propaganda, whereas the Muslims were spared that fate. As in German anthropological, philological, and racial discourse, the "Semites" in Russia were the Jews, never the Muslims. Long-lasting Eastern Orthodox anti-Judaism permeated the anti-Jewish bias of Russian officialdom and created serious obstacles for successful Jewish integration into the empire. By the second half of the century, the regime increasingly mistrusted its ethnic and religious minorities in the western borderlands (Jews, Ukrainians, Poles) while it developed more trusting relations with the religious and ethnic minorities in the East. Muslims had their own military units, even regiments, and had state-paid imams in military service whose salaries and legal status were confirmed legislatively. At

16 Noack, C., "From Ancestry to Territory: Spatial Dimensions of Muslim Identity in Imperial Russia", *Ab Imperio* 2 (2006), 81–100; Frings, A., "Reforma pismennosti v Tatarstane i kulturnaia pamiat", *Ab Imperio* 3 (2004), 175–210.

17 Roberts, P., "Jewish Bankers, Russia, and the Soviet Union, 1900–1940: The Case of Kuhn, Loeb and Company", *American Jewish Archives Journal* 49:1–2 (1997), 9–37; Aronsfeld, C. C., "Jewish Bankers and the Tsar", *Jewish Social Studies* 35 (1973), 87–104; Khiterer, V., "The Brodsky Sugar Kings: Jewish Industrialists, Philanthropists and Community Leaders of Late Imperial Russia", *Jews and Slavs* 19 (2008), 25–41; Ananich, B. V., *Bankirskie doma v Rossii, 1860–1914 gg.: ocherki istorii chastnogo predprinimatel'stva*. 2 izd. (Moscow, 2006).

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

the same time, rabbis were allowed to tend to the Jewish soldiers in active service, but never had the legal status of military chaplains and subsequently disappeared from the war ministry books.[18] Furthermore, the "red" threat in the late Russian Empire was stereotypically associated with socialism and the leftist-minded Jews, and was more often than not juxtaposed with the "yellow" threat represented by Chinese and Japanese advances in the Far East.[19] However, the regime made very little, if any, attempts to include Russian Muslims as one of the stereotypical groups of enemy aliens.

There was little parity between the ways the empire treated Jews and Muslims intellectually. Judaism and Jewish languages were of very little, if any, interest to the imperial administration. The Hebrew language was a sublime subject for a highbrow custodian of the oriental collection of the imperial library like Avraham Harkavy, a university professor of Semitic studies like Daniil Chwolson, and his disciple, Russian and Soviet Orientalist Pavel Kokovtsov. These scholars dealt with books and manuscripts. Their expertise sometimes served a wider purpose – for example, during discussions of relations between the Jews and Slavic languages, Jews and Karaites, or Jews and blood libel (the Saratov or Beilis case) – but it played a modest role in Russia's geopolitics. A hundred years later, the Soviets established a KGB-based Hebrew teaching program only because they needed to deal with the Cold War situation and keep a close eye on the Arab-Israeli conflict.

On the contrary, the regime very quickly realized the geopolitical importance of Islam and the languages of the local Muslim populations, of which the Russian administration knew very little. Peter I commissioned a Russian translation of the Quran in 1716. Nicholas I ordered the Kazan military authorities to select the most gifted Tatar boys and create around their Turkish and Arabic teaching program a new school of military interpreters. The clash of Russian and British interests in Central Asia and Russian and Turkish interests in the Middle East definitely contributed to the strengthening of the Russian school of Oriental Studies. Governor von Kaufman lavishly sponsored a formidable project – the collection of texts, documents, and data on the peoples of the Turkestan region (including what later became Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan).[20] Although the project reflected a colonialist agenda and pursued the pragmatic goal of enhancement of imperial control, its scholarly value outlived this original purpose. Of course, there were solid yet

18 For Muslims and Jews as military chaplains, see Petrovsky-Shtern, Y., *Jews in the Russian Army, 1827–1917: Drafted into Modernity* (Cambridge, 2007), 66–69.

19 Rossman, V., "Prizraki XIX veka: 'zheltaia opasnost' i evreiskii zagovor v evropeiskikh stsenariiakh zakata Evropy", *Paralleli* 2–3 (2003), 11–52.

20 Gorshenina, S., "Krupneishie proekty kolonial'nykh arkhivov Rossii: utopichnost ekzostuvnoi Turkestaniki general-gubernatora Konstantina Petrovicha fon Kaufmana", *Ab Imperio* 3 (2007), 291–354.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282

largely unknown works written by some Russian administrators on the Jews – for example, notes on the Jewish question in Russia by Alexander Gradovskii, a renowned historian of law. There were also ethnographic works by Jews such as Moisei Berlin or Yakov Brafman, members of the Russian scientific societies. Even Jews who converted to Christianity pursued their scholarly agendas. Still, there was no university or Academy of Sciences-based specialist on Jews and Judaism in Russia or the Soviet Union who could compete with the depth and the breadth of Vasilii Bartol'd, the great Russian and Soviet expert on Islam.

By no means should the above differences obfuscate the multiple similarities in the historical destinies of the Russian Jews and Muslims. The socio-economic crisis of the late nineteenth century threw Jews and Muslims into the fulcrum of the socialist movement, particularly those disappointed in the failed projects of the enlightened Jewish reformists, called *maskilim*, and the no less enlightened and zealous reformist Muslims called *jadids*. Ultimately, this triggered the creation of Muslim and Jewish Marxist groupings and parties.[21] The Soviet Union synchronized the fate of Muslim and Jewish minorities as never before. The vociferous Soviet state-based atheistic campaign targeted any organized religion, be it that of the mosque, the synagogue, or the church. The *korenizatsiia* (indigenization) campaign was instrumental in creating loyal Jewish and Muslim national minority elites, who preached their communist gospel to the corresponding populations – and were subsequently purged. The human rights movement of the 1960s–1970s brought together the Crimean Tatars and the Zionists, who had a shared perception of the oppressive regime, resisted enforced assimilation, and tried to expose the hypocrisy of a regime that was not bound to its own constitutional law. The scope of this paper does not allow pondering, even briefly, these and other similarities between the two groups, although I would like to point out several that deserve immediate scholarly attention.

Perhaps the imperial administrators were well aware of the differences between religious aliens such as the Muslims and the Jews and made no attempt to apply the same set of laws to them. Yet quite a number of high-ranking Russian bureaucrats dealt with both groups, sometimes simultaneously, more often consecutively. Alexander Dondukov-Korsakov commanded the Russian troops in the Caucasus, dealt extensively with Muslims, and fought against Shamil – but also served as the general governor of Kiev, Volhynia, and Podolia, and dealt extensively with the Jews. General Major Freitag from the gendarme corps inspected the Jewish communities in Volhynia and Podolia on a regular basis, but also acted in the same capacity in the Muslim communities in the Cauca-

21 Lazzerini, E. J., "Reform und Modernismus (Djadidismus) unter den Muslimen des Russischen Reiches", in A. Kappeler/G. Simon/G. Brunner (ed.), *Die Muslime in der Sowjetunion und Jugoslawien* (Köln, 1989), 35–48; Frings, A., "Playing Moscow off Against Kazan: Azerbaijan Maneuvering to latinization in the Soviet Union", *Ab Imperio* 4 (2009), 249–266.

ISBN Print: 9783525310281 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647310282