

they utilized popular forms of performance, theatricality, and ironic parody, to make their messages “legible” and “visible” to a wider public (119). Throughout *Popular Bohemia*, the city of Paris is integral to this line of inquiry. Theatres, clubs, cafés, cabarets, and the streets of the capital, all factor into Gluck’s ideas about the performative nature of the bohemian, and famous sites such as the Salpêtrière and the Trocadero Museum play critical roles in her fashioning of a public modernism. The city and its artists also figure prominently in her collection of illustrations from popular publications such as *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes* (1841), and famous caricatures by Honoré Daumier. These depict the many varieties of bohemian culture, and underscore Gluck’s point about its pervasiveness at the commercial level.

There may be some disagreement over Gluck’s approach to popular culture and its public venues. She admits as much when she points to critics such as T. J. Clark, who contend that bohemian spaces such as cafés and cabarets, while popular and democratic on the surface, and open to a “heterogeneous audience” that blurred class divisions, were not truly able to erase the “economic inequalities, social injustice, or class oppression of modern society” (125). Gluck’s reply is that bohemian cultural venues were never intended to fight this battle. Their goal, in her estimation, was to “transform perceptions” about the world in which people lived: “their hope was to transform modernity on the symbolic and experiential level, making it transparent, accessible, and emotionally expressive for ordinary people” (125-126). In linking various aspects of bohemian culture to this objective, not only through her discussion of artists from the romantic hero to the Primitive artist, but also through her re-evaluation of key figures such as Gautier, Baudelaire, and Gauguin, Gluck presents us with an alternative version of bohemia which “never subscribed to the myth of autonomy” (187). In this way, *Popular Bohemia* is an important study that should encourage historians to envision a modernism that is rooted in a public and popular experience, and will be of interest to those who continue to explore the intersections of art, culture, and society, as well as the historical conditions of modernity.

Julie A. Johnson—Queen’s University

Victor Serge, *What Every Radical Should Know About State Repression: A Guide for Activists* (Melbourne and New York: Ocean Press, 2005). Introduction by Dalia Hashad. First printed as *Les Coulisses d’une Sûreté générale. Ce que tout révolutionnaire doit savoir de la repression* (Paris: Librairie du Travail, 1926).

How do we understand the role of the police and law in maintaining capitalism? As revolutionaries and radicals how do we watch for and evade the police before

the revolution? After the revolution of the working class what will become of the police and the law? Will we continue to repress dissent and criminality with a police force and law of our own? Historians have been interested by the first of these questions for years. Radicals and protestors have been rightly concerned by the second. The last two questions, however, about the future after some inevitable class revolution, have become much less popular for radical and left historians in the West and North, regardless of whether or not they are politically active. True, in the conclusion of *Whigs and Hunters*, E. P. Thompson ruminated on the rule of law as both a bourgeois legal idea and an important institution following the revolution. But, most historians today do not await or much-debate the content of a coming working class revolution.

In the years following the Bolshevik revolution of late 1917, the Belgian-born Russian Victor Serge engaged with all of these questions. For Serge these were more than academic problems encountered in interpreting historical data or in theorizing about the future: they were essential to understanding what had hindered Russian and stopped other European revolutionaries in the first quarter of the twentieth century and for explaining the structure of the Soviet state after 1917. His investigations and answers, first published in *Bulletin Communiste* (Paris) in 1921 and expanded in 1926, have recently been reprinted in English as *What Every Radical Should Know About State Repression* with a new introduction by Dalia Hashad.

The pamphlet is broken into four chapters: a long description of the anti-revolutionary activities of the Russian Okhrana; ruminations on the relationship between workers' organisations and the law in Russia and the West; advice about avoiding and dealing with state repression; and a comparison of pre and post revolutionary law, policing, repression, and state terror. The chapters are quite distinct in content and flavour, yet each on its own and together offer something of interest to the contemporary reader, even one who is not a Russian/Soviet historian.

The first and longest chapter discussing the Okhrana is an exciting example of history wrapped up in the politics of its time. Here, a European sympathiser and late joiner of the Bolshevik party takes his readers through the archives of the anti-revolutionary secret police. He exposes informers, describes reports on individuals and organisations, and dissects the role of the police in suppressing and provoking revolutionary parties in Russia and among their sympathisers in exile communities beyond. This section reads like the North American muckraking journalism of its era, except that it is based upon archival research and was written after the destruction of the Okhrana. The third chapter, "Simple Advice to Revolutionaries," is a distillation of the lessons he learned from his investigation into a series of aphorisms. Knowing what he now does of how secret police work, he instructs his European allies on what they must do to avoid being followed, to hide their plans, and to deal with police

interrogation after the inevitable arrest. Some of this is interesting, but sections like the advice on how to avoid being followed are reminiscent of *The Hardy Boys Detective Handbook*.

Among the recommendations he makes in the third chapter is this: after arrest “Don’t reply to any question without having a defense counsel present and without previously consulting with him” (102-03). It is an interesting piece of advice, and one that speaks to the larger theoretical issues he describes in the second and fourth chapters. He asserts that for the worker in a capitalist country, the law is “nothing but a purely material obstacle to his class” (86). Having said this, Serge recognises the importance of the legal form (Thompson’s rule of law) as an imperfect but necessary protection from state authority. Hence the advice that one have legal counsel. These chapters are interesting as discussions of the law and police under capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The stridency of Serge’s class reading of the law is invigorating, and not without insight: “In conflicts between capital and labour, the army has often intervened against labour—never against capital” (86), or “In a word, respect for capitalist anarchy is the rule for the state. Whether you produce sell, resell, speculate without limit, with no concern for the general interest: it’s all right” (126). But, it lacks the sophistication of his contemporary Pashukanis, let alone the flourishing of Marxist and radical legal studies and criminology since the 1970s. His defences of state repression and terror under the dictatorship of the proletariat are less easy to accept today than they may have been in 1926.

Dalia Hashad’s introduction draws links between the Okhrana tactics Serge identifies and those of the US government today. In the months since she wrote these remarks, the revelations about state repression in the US (secret surveillance without warrants), the UK (the shooting of an innocent Brazilian worker as a suspected terrorist on the London Metro), and elsewhere allow us to draw such links even more clearly. But despite the parallels, is there much value in this book today? Like the best of revolutionary pamphlets it is an exciting, fast-paced read. For historians of the Russian Revolution and interwar socialism it is probably a useful primary document. For the radical today, however, there are equally intelligent and brief guides to state repression available that focus on current police forces. However revolutionary Victor Serge may have been himself, this book no longer is.

James Muir—Chang School of Continuing Education
Ryerson University