

lumbia University before joining the history department at UVM in 1956, where he worked until his retirement in 1988.

Daniels achieved his extraordinary record of scholarly accomplishment—an authentic demonstration of “Bolshevik tempo”—while a full-time teacher and administrator at an institution with a heavy teaching load and without a research library or doctoral program. As a teacher, he was admired for his challenging courses and truly impressive knowledge of just about everything. As an administrator, he was the founding director of the Area and International Studies Program at UVM, 1962–65, and a co-founder of the Center for Research on Vermont. He chaired the history department, 1964–69, and directed the Experimental Program of the College of Arts and Sciences, 1969–71. He edited a history of UVM for its bicentennial celebrations in 1991. The university honored him with a University Scholar designation in 1982 and an honorary LLD in 1994. In 2004, the Area and International Studies Program created the Robert V. Daniels Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Field of International Studies.

Daniels was also an active citizen of the state of Vermont. From 1973 to 1982, he served in the Vermont Legislature as State Senator from Chittenden County. One of the founders of the Vermont-Karelia sister state project, he served on its advisory board and was also a trustee of the Vermont Historical Society.

This recital of his professional accomplishments gives insight into Bill Daniels as a professor and scholar, but what about Daniels as a person? He had a fertile mind and catholic interests, and his erudition, which ranged far beyond the Russian studies field, was truly amazing. (When a friend shared a Norwegian poem with him, Daniels immediately recognized the language not as Norwegian but as Nynorsk, an artificial poetic language invented in the nineteenth century.) So strong was his enthusiasm for history and politics that he never really aged. He loved wit and humor. He was constantly thinking new thoughts, investigating new fields, teaching anyone who would listen, and reading the staggering amounts of stuff piled on every flat surface in his office and study at home. His opinions prompted real reflection and commanded special respect. One of the least prepossessing scholar-intellectuals that one could hope to meet, Daniels was a genuine, supportive, and friendly colleague.

The last year of Daniels's life was a difficult one. At the beginning of 2009, he suffered a major stroke that kept him in a nursing facility for months. His mind remained as sharp as ever, and his ability to maintain his good spirits was inspiring. Foremost on his mind were his latest writing projects (although he became addicted to the Sudoku puzzles that a colleague brought him).

Daniels is survived by his wife of 64 years, the former Alice Wendell, and by his four children and four grandchildren. Bill's keen intellect, generous sense of humor, and positive attitude will be missed by everyone who knew him

DENISE J. YOUNGBLOOD  
*University of Vermont*  
*September 2010*

## Moshe Lewin, 1921–2010

Born in Wilno, Poland, on 6 November 1921, Moshe (Misha) Lewin was the product of a unique cosmopolitan culture in which Jews, Poles, Lithuanians, and Russians lived uneasily together. Life in a place of such intense political activity forced one to choose one's movement literally as an act of self-defense. For young Misha the choice was Hashomer Hatsair, a Zionist socialist youth movement that proposed a non-nationalist, binational state for Arabs and Jews in Palestine. When his home city, then the capital of Soviet Lithuania, was invaded by the Germans, Lewin escaped eastward. He never saw his family again. Both his Russian-speaking mother and his father, a butcher whom Misha described as a real “Hercules,” were murdered by the Nazis. Misha eventually reached the Urals where he worked on farms, in factories, and in a mine before joining the Soviet Army and moving westward back toward Poland. As an officer, he witnessed the victory parade on Red Square in May 1945.

After working clandestinely in Paris to facilitate Jewish migration to Palestine, he emigrated to Israel in 1951. As he told the story, he was first shocked by Ariel Sharon's raid into Jordan in 1953 that ended in a massacre in the village of Qibia; later, while serving in the Israeli army in the 1956 war with Egypt, Lewin concluded that his original Zionist ideals diverged too greatly from the actuality of the state of Israel. He turned to scholarship, first at Tel Aviv University, where he received his BA in 1961, and then at the Sorbonne, where he completed the doctoral thesis under Roger Portal that became his first book: *La Paysannerie et le pouvoir soviétique: 1928–1930* (1966).

Deeply influenced by the social historical *Annales* school and by his friend, the sociologist Basile Kerblay, Lewin taught in Paris at the *Ecole pratique des hautes études* before moving to the University of Birmingham (1968–1978). In 1978 he joined the faculty at the University of Pennsylvania where he and his colleague Alfred Rieber organized a highly influential series of seminars that brought a generation of younger historians from the study of imperial Russia into the post-1917 period.

From the beginning Lewin considered himself a “historian of society,” rather than simply of a regime. His *Russian Peasants and Soviet Power: A Study of Collectivization*, trans. Irene Nove (1968) was the first empirical study of collectivization in the west. *Lenin's Last Struggle* (1968, 2005; *Le dernier combat de Lénine*, 1967) presented a portrait different in all ways from the Cold War stereotype of a power-hungry and dogmatic despot. What was striking at the time to this reader, then a graduate student, was how the author revealed a Lenin with serious doubts about the direction in which his experimental regime was moving and who tried desperately but futilely to shift to another path. Rather than a fatalistic line drawn from Marxism or the revolution to Iosif Stalin's despotism, Lewin saw alternatives to Stalinism within Bolshevism, contingencies and choices, as well as the deep social structures, determining what the Soviet Union would become.

In his master work, *The Making of the Soviet System: Essays in the Social History of Interwar Russia* (1985), Lewin brought together sprawling seminal essays on early Soviet history, enveloping great social processes in pungent phrases: “quicksand society,” “the contamination effect,” “superstructure’ rushing ahead” of the social base, a “ruling class without tenure.” Such innovative and suggestive interpretations continued in what might be considered its sequel, *Russia, USSR, Russia: The Drive and Drift of a Superstate* (1995). Here too the contingency and evident improvisation of the Bolsheviks challenged the monophonic view of a rigid consistent ideology from which the regime could find formulae for the future. For Lewin, Nikolai Bukharin, the champion of the New Economic Policy, offered a more rational path to socialism.

In his own way Lewin remained politically active even after entering the academy. He consistently worked toward a more détente attitude toward the Soviet Union, elaborated “revisionist” views about totalitarianism as an explanation of Soviet behavior, and questioned facile deductions from ideology to the imperatives of real politics. Along with Ken Coates, Dorothy and Edward Thompson, he initiated the influential European Nuclear Disarmament movement in the early 1980s. Lewin was a socialist, deeply influenced by Marxism, and his work was consistently informed by his profound optimism about the possibility of a more humane outcome for the Soviet Union, as is evident in his *Political Undercurrents in Soviet Economic Debates: From Bukharin to the Modern Reformers* (1974). His influence flowed, not only from his written words and lectures, but from personal contacts, his infectious enthusiasms, and his combination of hospitality (schnapps, sausages, and cheeses) with passionate conversations that were more like monologues.

In *The Gorbachev Phenomenon: An Historical Interpretation* (1988, 1991), he argued that the Soviet system, born out of rural backwardness, profoundly changed in the decades before and after the war. Urbanization and the society it created enabled intellectuals and ordinary people to question and criticize the system. Society moved ahead, but the state system born in earlier eras remained imbedded in the old agrarian despotism. In his last book, *The Soviet Century*, edited by Gregory Elliot (2005; originally published as *Le siècle soviétique*, 2003), Lewin provided a powerful counternarrative to the dominant post-Soviet story of Soviet socialism as a utopian attempt to do the impossible. Russia's twentieth century, he wrote, involved a “collision between a developing industrial society and the reaction—or lack of reaction—of the peasantry, as well as the impact of this complex mix on the political regime” (69). When the regime coerced the countryside to abandon its

traditional ways, the peasantry found ways to exact “its revenge, as it were, by compelling the regime further to strengthen its already imposing administrative-repressive machinery” (69). What had been a participatory and radically democratic regime in the first year of the revolution now metastasized into an autocracy with an exaggerated sense of what it could do.

While he was as critical of Stalin and Stalinism as any liberal or conservative, Lewin warned historians not to “‘over-Stalinize’ the whole of Soviet history by extending it backwards and forwards . . . a common practice that serves a variety of purposes—but not that of historical inquiry” (322). Lenin’s gamble that seizing power in Russia would spark a revolution abroad and provide international aid for the building of socialism in a peasant country did not pay off. “That Russia was not ready for any form of Marxian socialism was a self evident truth to every Marxist” (308). But when masses of new recruits came into the party who did “not know the difference between Marx and Engels and Marks & Spencer,” the way was open for a plebeian “propensity for authoritarianism” (291) to take over. This was no “failure of socialism,” Lewin wrote, “because socialism was not there in the first place. Devastated Russia was fit neither for democracy as Pavel Miliukov [the leader of the Liberals] understood it, nor for socialism, as Lenin and Trotsky knew full well” (309).

As a socialist, Lewin’s dominant emotion throughout was regret that things had not turned out differently, that the earlier promise of the revolution could not be realized given conditions outside the control of any leader or party. But at the same time his writing was not at all sentimental about the actuality of the Soviet system. Socialism remained an ideal—“ownership of the means of production by society, not by a bureaucracy. It has always been conceived of as a deepening—not a rejection—of political democracy. To persist in speaking of ‘Soviet socialism’ is to engage in a veritable comedy of errors” (379). This hippopotamus should not be confused with a giraffe! He summed up his own position on both the USSR and its historiography as “anti-anti-Communism.” His colleagues, even though many may have disagreed with his values and approaches, nevertheless recognized his extraordinary achievements and honored him with him the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies award for Distinguished Contributions to Slavic Studies in 2006.

Intellectual fashions come and go, and Lewin did not care much for more recent approaches to Soviet history, once coining the neologism “deconstruction” to denote his displeasure. He once signed a letter to me: “Misha (Director, Upside Down Studies Institute).” For many post-Soviet historians, Lewin’s insistence on preserving the idea of socialism as distinct from the Soviet system seems an irrelevant exercise. But his engagement with the history of social transformation unavoidably involved an evaluation of the worthiness of such an endeavor given the unpredictability of consequences. Values are a close cousin of even the most neutral, ostensibly objective historical writing, and it is naive as well as hubristic to think that historical interpretation can free itself from ethnic or political commitment or ideology in the broadest sense.

RONALD GRIGOR SUNY  
*University of Michigan*  
 September 2010

## Robert C. Tucker, 1918–2010

In the tributes published this summer after the death of Robert C. Tucker on 29 July 2010 at the age of 92, one word that appeared with great frequency was “seminal.” Indeed, Bob Tucker made seminal contributions in a dauntingly wide array of fields and topics: Marx studies, Russian area studies, Sovietology, comparative communism, leadership studies, psychologically oriented biography in theory and practice, to provide an incomplete list. Perhaps this quality of Bob Tucker’s work is best brought out by a series of carefully thought-out, beautifully written, and still influential essays on the nexus between Russia and communism that appeared in *The Soviet Political Mind: Stalinism and Post-Stalin Change* (1971) and *Political Culture and Leadership in Soviet Russia: From Lenin to Gorbachev* (1987),