

events provided means “to transgress the symbolic barriers habitually erected between the social actors” (p. 111), Pagis may overemphasize this “breakdown in social barriers between the worlds of workers, students and farmers” (p. 136) since workers often ignored or rejected student activists’ attempted intrusions into their strikes. Furthermore, farmers were largely indifferent or hostile to urban strike movements. The inability of the sacrificial and missionary *établis*, who were usually Maoists, to create significant political or social change was evidence of the difficulty of overcoming class barriers.

Engagement or reconversion of former militants into academic research or journalism in publications such as *Libération* often eased the transition of those who had become disillusioned with their faith in the “revolutionary masses”. The new professions promoted a sounder but still sympathetic view of the disadvantaged. At the same time, the return to the university or commitment to an intellectual profession often meant escaping the downward mobility and marginalization that were sometimes consequences – and, as the author makes clear, not causes – of post-May activism. Other former militants were unable to make this transition to a more conventional existence and suffered depression, alcoholism, and even suicide.

The author’s ‘68ers were successful in transferring their generally leftist politics and countercultural practices to their children, even if the second generation was less militant than their parents. Only one fifth of their offspring became activists. The children experienced what Pagis labels “dissonant socialisations” and felt trapped between their parents’ “countercultural” socialization and the more orthodox one promoted by the state and society.

Even though this English translation from the French contains too many grammatical, formatting, and spelling errors, these faults pale in comparison to the author’s formidable research not only on the actors’ ability to shape events, but also into the consequences of the events for the actors. Her portrait of French ‘68ers offers a judicious alternative to both hagiography and denigration.

*Michael Seidman*

History Department, University of North Carolina  
Wilmington, NC 28403, United States

E-mail: [seidmann@uncw.edu](mailto:seidmann@uncw.edu)

doi:10.1017/S0020859020000449

TOTH, STEPHEN A. *Mettray. A History of France’s Most Venerated Carceral Institution.* Cornell University Press, Ithaca (NY) [etc.] 2019. xii, 263 pp. Ill. \$43.95. (E-book: \$21.99.)

This monograph by Stephen A. Toth, Associate Professor of Modern European History at Arizona State University, is dedicated to the history of the Mettray penal and agricultural colony. Founded in 1840 by Frédéric-Auguste Demetz, this institution aimed to socially rehabilitate young delinquents by subjecting them to agricultural work in order to promote their moral regeneration. An ancestor to the *bagnes d’enfants* that the journalist Henri Danjou denounced in 1932, the colony of Mettray has become famous thanks in particular to one of its most famous residents, Jean Genet, who wrote about it in his book *Miracle de la Rose*, and to the chapter devoted to Mettray by Michel Foucault in his book *Surveiller et*

*punir*. As Toth notes in the introduction to his book, according to Foucault Mettray constitutes the most successful disciplinary model and the culmination of the modern prison system following its birth at the end of the eighteenth century. While opening up an extremely stimulating field of research for historians, Foucault also bequeathed to them a conceptual “toolbox” that Toth questions and uses by proposing a history of power (paying particular attention to the resistance it provokes) and a history of juvenile bodies subjected to the injunctive canons of the masculinity of an era. To do this, Toth immerses his reader in a micro-history based on a rich bibliography and, above all, by an exhaustive examination of the archives of the penal colony of Mettray kept in the departmental archives of Indre-et-Loire.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, philanthropists, penal reformers, and magistrates became interested in the question of juvenile delinquency and its causes (“Origins”, Chapter One). Coming from the lower classes, the young *Gavroche* who walked the Parisian sidewalks were considered victims of a failed education provided by families too poor to support themselves. To remedy this situation, the lawyer Frédéric-Auguste Demetz envisaged a system of care for juvenile delinquents intended both to keep them out of prison, where they were subject to the deleterious influence of adults, and to keep them away from the corruption of major urban centres (particularly Paris). Drawing inspiration from the models he discovered during study trips to the United States and Europe, Demetz developed a penal colony project whose young inmates were subjected to a system of moral reform centred on a “substitute family”. Under the leadership of the *chef de famille*, they were subjected to rural work. This was supposed to promote their regeneration by bringing them closer to nature and allowing them to acquire agricultural training to repopulate the countryside (p. 32).

Established on lands donated by Viscount Hermann de Brétignières de Courteilles (who co-directed the colony with Demetz until his death in 1852), the colony of Mettray was built in 1839 and received its first residents the following year. The minors detained there could include those who were guilty but had been acquitted on grounds of having acted “without proper judgment” (*sans discernement*) in the commission of a crime (article 66 of the penal code); those sentenced to between six months and two years in prison; and those subject to “paternal correction”; that is to say, imprisoned at the request of their fathers (they were imprisoned in Mettray in a *maison paternelle*, the subject of Chapter Five). The colony comprised a central chapel flanked by ten pavilions and a disciplinary quarter. This architectural layout translated into stone the importance of religion, which remained, along with work, the cornerstone of the moral re-education intended in Mettray.

Even if the buildings were not enclosed by a wall, the disciplinary regime applied to the colony of Mettray rendered this institution a real penitentiary, the subject of the second chapter of the book (“Regime”). The children were divided into “families”, each headed by a family head (*chef de famille*), who applied a military-type discipline that the inmates were required to obey without fail. *Chefs de famille* were foremen (*contremaîtres*), who were trained in Mettray and aided in their duties by an “elder brother” (*frère aîné*) chosen from among those with a record of good behaviour.

An inmate’s day began at five a.m. and finished at nine p.m. Its course was immutable and included eight hours of manual work, one and a half hours of instruction, and two hours and forty-five minutes devoted to meals and recreation. It was only during these times of recreation that the inmates were allowed to speak. Silence was mandatory during all other activities. During the weekends, the inmates were occupied mainly with gymnastic exercises, and during a Sunday “parade” they were required to participate in a military review.

These various activities were supposed to instil in them values of virility and masculinity intended to transform them into “citizen-soldiers” (p. 59). Those who did not comply with this harsh discipline faced a range of punishments. Despite this threat, many inmates resisted the institution and its relentless settlement, the subject of the third chapter (“Resistance”). The author lists the various types of refusal by the inmates, ranging from homosexual practices, tobacco use, and tattooing, to attempted escapes.

Over the years, the disciplinary system at Mettray increasingly became the subject of sharp criticism, in particular from the press. And, from the 1880s, even some of the deputies were shocked by the level of violence at the colony (“Discord”, Chapter Four). This criticism and three scandals (in 1887, in 1909, and during the interwar period) led to the institution being discredited. This had an important impact on French society and led to its being closed on 5 November 1937 (“Denouement”, Chapter Six). As Toth shows, what began as a resolutely utopian project that emerged from an optimistic representation of juvenile delinquents by reformers in the first half of the nineteenth century was marked by a slow drift towards a strictly authoritarian and punitive model.

*Jean-Lucien Sanchez*<sup>1</sup>

Direction de l'administration pénitentiaire, Ministère de la Justice  
13 place Vendôme, 75001 Paris, France  
E-mail: [jean-lucien.sanchez@justice.gouv.fr](mailto:jean-lucien.sanchez@justice.gouv.fr)  
doi:10.1017/S0020859020000450

MCGEEVER, BRENDAN. *Antisemitism and the Russian Revolution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2019. 247 pp. £75.00.

The Russian revolutions of 1917 gave rise to a practical question: Could the socialist transformation of Eastern European societies solve the “Jewish problem”? The Jews of the Russian Empire welcomed the overthrow of the Tsarist regime in March 1917, viewing it as a great victory that would end their suffering and open a new era of liberation. The new government repealed 650 decrees that prevented equal rights for Jews. However, although antisemitism was officially outlawed, the administrative apparatus was not free of antisemites, and the Orthodox Church, a main advocate of antisemitism, was not impeded. Church-sponsored newspapers continued to rally against the Jews. As a result, antisemitism “increased markedly on the streets of the Russian capital and beyond, in the former Pale of Settlement” (p. 23).

There are a number of works on antisemitism in 1917 as well as during the Russian Civil War, focusing mainly on the anti-Semitic atrocities of the counterrevolution. Little has been written about anti-Semitism within the Red Army, however. Following the works of Ulrich Herbeck and Oleg Budnitsky, the present book, authored by Brendan McGeever, Lecturer in Sociology at Birkbeck College, University of London, is the most detailed study on this topic to date.

Only a minority of Jews supported the Bolsheviks in November 1917. Bolshevik leaders of Jewish origin such as Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Sverdlov, Radek, Litvinov, and Joffe

1. The author thanks Chris Gordon for his help in proofreading this review.