Reviews


Fascism and modern art were once considered reassuringly antithetical. If proof were needed, it was surely provided by the 1937 Nazi exhibition of degenerate art in Munich, which juxtaposed modernist paintings and photographs of the mentally disabled with the ill-disguised determination of denigrating them both. Yet, in the last 15 years, this comfortable assumption has been increasingly challenged by the contention that fascism, despite an avowed opposition to abstraction, nevertheless propounded a modernism of its own. Mark Antliff’s scholarly and thought-provoking monograph is a valuable contribution to this ongoing debate, and his interdisciplinary case studies will be of considerable interest to European art historians, while also enlivening the perennial controversy on the interwar French right.

Recent research on fascist cultural politics has, as Antliff rightly observes, largely neglected the French context. Drawing on the theory and interdisciplinarity of historians of German and Italian fascism (especially Roger Griffin, Emilio Gentile, and Günter Berghaus), Antliff proposes an analysis of the aesthetic dimension of the ‘fascist revolution’ among French intellectuals. His particular intention is to explore how theories of art, creativity, and political violence became intertwined; his broader concern is to reassert the primacy of ideology in the history of French fascism, deliberately challenging the recent preoccupation with praxis. At the centre of Avant-Garde Fascism is a twofold contention: first, that ‘art’s function was central — not marginal — to an understanding of fascist ideology’ (14); and secondly, that fascist art and ideology in France were marked by the same ‘permeability’ to modernism that has already been identified in the German and Italian contexts (59). Antliff’s contention rests on four well-illustrated case studies, a set of pithy intellectual biographies united by a common focus on the ideology and legacy of the anarcho-syndicalist Georges Sorel. Sorel himself is the subject of the initial study, which argues that the writer’s well-known and highly influential reflections on regenerative violence were underpinned by an anti-Semitic theory of creativity. Subsequent chapters explore the adoption and adaptation of Sorel’s legacy by three ‘fascists’ of the interwar years: Georges Valois, founder of the Faisceau movement; Philippe Lamour, Faisceau militant and contributor to the short-lived journal Grand’Route, and Thierry Maulnier, a royalist writer prominent in such periodicals as Combat and L’Insurge.

These are complex studies, sensitive to contradictions in the political and ideological trajectories of the subjects in question. Valois, for example, describes himself as a ‘futurist’ and Charles Maurras as a ‘passéist’ (137), and yet appears strangely ambivalent towards...
Le Corbusier’s technocratic projects for the French cité, preferring a Sorelian emphasis on a society of producers to Le Corbusier’s elitism. Lamour’s promotion of the avant-garde photography of Germaine Krull on the front covers of Grand’Route suggests a right-wing openness to experimental modern art, but Lamour was also open to the poetry of bolshevism and became resolutely antifascist in 1933. Maulnier (who never described himself as a fascist) was more sympathetic to traditionalism in artistic terms than to the machine aesthetics of the non-conformist Lamour, although he too remained sympathetic to a profound regeneration of society and politics with Sorelian overtones.

There is, therefore, a certain tension between the complexity of these case studies and the more eye-catching argument that theories of art and modernism were central to the linear development of a fascist cultural programme in France. Although Antliff claims to ‘reveal the ideological import of Sorel’s aestheticized politics for the first time’ (14), the attention accorded to Sorel’s theories on the visual arts is limited, and we find more on Sorel’s better-known concepts of creative violence. The relationship between French fascism and modernism is also, as these case studies convincingly demonstrate, more complex than the initial contention suggests. Most importantly, one might challenge the degree to which these four individuals can be considered representative of French fascism in the years 1909–1939. Sorel’s theories appealed to fascists and antifascists alike; Valois distanced himself from his fascist phase by becoming a libertarian communist in the 1930s; Lamour was antifascist after 1933; and Maulnier also rejected the fascist label (and, unlike many of his colleagues, the Nazi invasion of France in 1940). Intellectuals are certainly relevant to the history of fascism in France, but this history remains essentially incomplete without reference to the readership of their periodicals and the membership of their associations, or to the ideology and activism of the larger extreme-right movements and parties in the 1930s. Antliff discusses neither the Croix de Feu/Parti Social Français nor the Parti Populaire Français, and yet their publications addressed the political role of art, theatre and film, and the amateur films produced by the former contributed significantly to the ideological and social life of the movement. There is, in short, much that remains to be explored in the cultural politics of the French right, and Mark Antliff’s engaging study raises important questions while also providing a stimulus to further research.

JESSICA WARDHAUGH, Christ Church, Oxford

Jay W. Baird. Hitler’s War Poets: Literature and Politics in the Third Reich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2007; 284 pp., 8 illus.: 9780521876890. £47.00 (hbk)

Historians tend to dismiss the Third Reich as a literary wasteland. According to the familiar account, the great novelists and dramatists of Weimar fled their country upon the ascent of Hitler, and Germans bided their time until the post-war years, when a vibrant literary scene was born in the FRG and the GDR. Jay Baird seeks to counter this simple narrative by exploring the work of Nazi-era authors. Nonetheless, he faces a unique challenge in making these forgotten and reviled writers relevant. How can he revive their works without asserting their greatness? What do we gain by dusting off copies of right-wing, völkisch novels and memoirs? Baird is well aware of these questions. He convincingly chooses not to welcome these writers into the German literary pantheon, but rather to elucidate their importance to National Socialist politics and ideology.
Baird focuses on six authors whom he sees as representative of a conservative, anti-communist, and, at times, anti-Semitic literary tradition which helped fuel Nazi ideas. Rudolf Binding, the upper-crust head of the literature section of the Prussian Academy of Arts when Hitler came to power, was perhaps the least ‘nazified’ of the authors, focusing on the noble struggles of the individual rather than the race. Yet, his call for a ‘revolution of the spirit’ (50) overlapped with Nazi ideas about national rebirth. Josef Magnus Wehner offered a Christian vision of a new Reich. He was a xenophobic anti-modernist who ‘saw himself as a prophet of national regeneration’ (82). Hans Zöberlein was the leading figure of the literary front generation. His memoirs and historical novels were marked by anti-Semitism, anticommunism, and an aesthetic celebration of war. An avid Nazi, Zöberlein fought in World War II, eventually engaging in murders at the end of the war that led to his imprisonment by the Allies. Edwin Erich Dwinger was the voice of German anti-bolshevism. The son of Russian and German parents, Dwinger proclaimed his love for the Russian people but his abiding hatred of communism, which eventually transformed into deep anti-Jewish sentiments. Eberhard Wolfgang Möller was an avid Nazi and SS man, whose poems and plays were saturated with völkisch language and Nazi stereotypes. Möller became a celebrated writer in the Third Reich, only to run afoul of the party leaders for, among other things, his seeming religiosity and his shoddy biography of Hitler. Finally, Kurt Eggers represented ‘the leading muse of the S.S.’ (209). He was a learned but violent bard in uniform, whose anti-Catholicism, anti-bolshevism, and anti-Semitism propelled him enthusiastically onto the battlefield, where he died a poetic death in the name of National Socialism.

Not all of these authors were Nazis, but they all shared a revolutionary sensibility and a desire to purify and resuscitate Germany after the defeat of 1918. In recounting these authors’ biographies, explicating their works, and locating their relationship to Nazi policymakers, Baird does masterly work. He also offers a fascinating glimpse into the mercurial nature of Nazi cultural policies. Most of these writers either had tensions with the Nazis or fell out of favour entirely. Authors like Binding and Wehner occupied an ideological grey area, in part because the hodgepodge of Nazi ideas was hard to pin down. A nationalist and völkisch writer could be lionized one day, and the next day be accused of ideological betrayal by writing about death in too maudlin a manner. As these writers discovered, what constituted ideologically ‘correct’ poetic imagery could be difficult to determine.

Despite its fine detail, the book still begs a number of broader historical questions. In his first chapter, Baird makes a point of mentioning the continuities in German literature: each of the six writers began their careers in Weimar and, in some cases, continued writing in West Germany. However, he never returns explicitly to this theme, and we are left to wonder whether these continuities reveal something damning about Weimar and post-war literature. Does it invite us to see Hitler’s war poets as reflecting larger themes in German literature which do not (or do) necessarily bear a Nazi taint? Likewise, Baird does not offer an entirely satisfactory account of ‘politics,’ a word in the subtitle of the book. While he does show the ties between the party and the writers, and outlines the grand reception of Möller and Eggers, it is still unclear to what extent these writers influenced cultural politics. Did their popularity allow them a certain authority, such as to challenge our notion of party ideologues and hacks being in charge? Did literature play a larger role in consolidating Nazi power and enabling its crimes than heretofore believed? Or was it a mere ‘aesthetic accompaniment’ (see book jacket) to Nazi criminality?
Despite these unanswered questions, Baird has written a valuable work which reminds us how vibrant – and distorted – the literary scene of the Third Reich was. While we might not want to incorporate these writings into the German literary canon, we cannot ignore their power to reflect the twisted hopes and dreams of the Front generation.

S. Jonathan Wiesen, Southern Illinois University


In recent years much attention has been paid to British attitudes towards the French Revolution. This rich and diverse field has moved beyond the traditional realm of the political ideas of Burke and Paine to examine the experiences of the middle and lower orders during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic decades. The first text to be concerned with British radicals was E. P. Thompson’s The Making of the English Working Class (1963), while new work has focused on loyalists and patriots. Despite the growth in this field, most of the work has largely concentrated on men, aside from studies of Mary Wollstonecraft and Hannah More. One way to discover British women’s opinions of the French Revolution is to read their writings from the period. Fiction is one genre, but travel writings are another which historians can benefit from more readily. This seven-volume collection from the Chawton House Library Series on Women’s Travel Writings brings together five major works of British women authors on the subject of France. The series editors claim that these works are ‘from a distinctly feminine perspective’, but they also contain important insights about the politics, society, economics and culture of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century France.

Helen Maria Williams (1762–1827) is one of the most well-known authors in the collection and two of her works are reproduced here. Williams was a prolific poet and arrived in France on 13 July 1790 – a day before the Fête de la Fédération, which commemorated the fall of the Bastille in Paris. Letters Containing a Sketch of the Scenes which Passed in Various Departments of France during the Tyranny of Robespierre (1796) and A Tour in Switzerland (1798) are two very different works, but Williams’ tone throughout them is the same. She was sympathetic to the Revolution, even at the height of the Terror, and wanted to redeem the Revolution’s degeneration into violence because she still believed in the ideals of 1789. Williams viewed the Revolution not as an abstract political debate, but as something experienced by the men, women and children of France. A sentimental language is employed throughout the texts, but this language of sentiment had a profound impact on the development of sympathy and empathy in the late eighteenth century as Lynn Hunt and John Brewer have argued in recent work. Williams’ interest in the impact of high politics on individual lives has produced some valuable material for social and cultural historians. Her description of Parisians divided over observing the decadi or Sunday as the traditional day of rest is revealing and she declares that they solved the problem by ‘making merry’ on both days. In A Tour in Switzerland, she idealized the common people of the countryside and viewed them as the ‘last champions’ of liberty. However, she was very clear that the Swiss peasants were
still oppressed when compared to their French brothers, who had been freed from taxation by the Revolution. Williams was also very supportive of Napoleon Bonaparte and claimed that his glory extended far beyond the limits of France or her Revolution. According to Williams, ‘Buonaparte belongs to the world’.

A very different perspective on the events of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic decades is provided by Charlotte West in her work, *A Ten Years’ Residence in France, during the Severest Part of the Revolution: from the Year 1787 to 1797* (1821). This is a much more conservative memoir in which the author initially celebrates the fall of the Bastille, but then is concerned with the corruption, paranoia and violence of the Revolution and particularly the Terror. West uses very sentimental language to describe both Marie Antoinette and Josephine Bonaparte, and even recounts a (fictitious?) meeting with the Royal Family during the Flight to Varennes. After the Queen found out that West was English, she reportedly declared, ‘Oh! madame, madame, what would I give were I and my family in your hospitable country’. West clearly intended to stir up the sentiments of the Church and King at home by advising the British aristocracy and men of property ‘not to abandon their king, as the French noblesse did’, and echoes Burke when she proclaims that the ‘after twenty-eight years, the wheel has gone around and stands just where it did’. The anonymous *A Sketch of Modern France. In a Series of Letters to a Lady of Fashion. Written in the Years 1796 and 1797, during a Tour through France. By a Lady* (1798) is also full of British pride, but is much more concerned with observation than participation. It describes the history, topography and inhabitants of France from a position of relative detachment, but is very perceptive on the impact of the French Revolution, which the author describes as ‘an earthquake on society, it has shook and subverted everything to the very foundation’.

The final work in the collection is Anne Plumptre’s *A Narrative of a Three Years’ Residence in France, 1802–5* (1810). Plumptre was a well-known literary figure of the day and began her *Narrative* during the Peace of Amiens (1802–3), when many British travellers went to Paris. What makes her account different is that she remained in France after the war with Britain recommenced and spent most of her time in southern France. Plumptre, the daughter of Robert Plumptre, President of Queen’s College, Cambridge, had a wide range of interests and knowledge and her scholarly and anthropological approach is impressive. The *Narrative* is filled with perceptive and rich details of the history, monuments and people who inhabited Languedoc and Provence. What makes Plumptre’s work unique is her pro-Napoleon stance and her defence of Napoleonic France in the face of very hostile British public opinion. She was not an apologist for Napoleon, but she wanted to give him a more balanced reading and to describe life in France as it was lived during the Empire. Plumptre stressed the humanity of ordinary French people, which was often forgotten in British political rhetoric of the day. But Plumptre herself had some blind spots. When describing an encounter with two of the ‘heroes’ of the Bastille, her tone is very positive, but when she was in Nîmes, Plumptre was very disparaging of the ‘vile, miserable inhabitants’ who lived inside the Roman amphitheatre, thus degrading ‘this noble relic of antiquity’. Throughout this 1500-page work, Plumptre is hopeful of the benefits of 1789 and Napoleon who restored these ideals. She also puts the events of the Terror in perspective and claims that they were no bloodier than those celebrated and perpetuated by the British Empire.

These richly produced volumes are an important collection of writings on Revolutionary and Napoleonic France. Nevertheless, they could have benefited from a more comprehensive
introduction which set out the larger historical context and provided more detail on who the authors actually were and what they were doing in France. The lengthy editorial notes, which explain key terms, are difficult to use as no reference is made to them in the text. There is, however, a very substantial consolidated index which lists people, place names and concepts for all five works. Overall, this is an interesting collection of women’s travel writing that certainly deserves a place on library and specialists’ shelves.

Noelle Plack, Newman University College, Birmingham

Cyprian Blamires, The French Revolution and the Creation of Benthamism. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2008. 442 pp. 9780230554221. £60.00 (hbk)

Cyprian Blamires’ book can be read as a combination of three interlocking texts. The first is an intellectual biography of Etienne Dumont (1759–1829), the Swiss politician and thinker who translated Jeremy Bentham’s philosophical manuscripts into French, making their intricate contents accessible to a global audience. The second text is a history of Panopticon, or more precisely, a history of Panopticon’s role in Bentham’s life, and of its subsequent obscurcation and misunderstanding by interpreters. The third text is a case study of the political conversions impelled by the French Revolution. Here, Dumont’s ideological journey from Rousseauism to Benthamism becomes exemplary of the problems of social organization posed by the Revolution, and of the solutions they prompted.

The book’s opening describes Panopticon as Bentham intended it and critiques Foucault’s vision of the famous transparent building as the ultimate incarnation of power-as-surveillance. Panopticon, Blamires underlines, was originally a concept not only for prisons, but for any public building involving the supervision of persons—schools, hospitals, factories, hospices, poorhouses. Its purpose, moreover, was not to discipline but to increase the efficiency and, especially, the economy of public administration so that ordinary citizens would be burdened with less taxes. In its beginnings, then, Panopticon was not really a prison but a method for attaining cost reductions through architectural transparency. As such, it was a broad social vision that absorbed most of Bentham’s energies from 1786 to 1815—as Blamires is the first to recount in detail.

Dumont’s intellectual biography serves to explain how Panopticon was first eclipsed from the public mind and then misrepresented. To set Dumont in context, Blamires’ narrative moves to eighteenth-century Geneva, where nationalists and aristocrats vied over government control, and where by the 1760s Rousseauian virtuism replaced Calvinism as the ethical inspiration of Genevan patriots. Dumont was formed in this ambiance as a devoted nationalist who, distraught when the French and Bernese invaded the city to restore aristocratic power, left Geneva for London to tutor Lord Lansdowne’s children. When the French Revolution broke out, Dumont became one of Mirabeau’s speechwriters, indirectly influencing key decisions in the National Assembly. But Dumont soon grew disillusioned with Mirabeau and the Revolution and returned to England. There, he adhered enthusiastically to Bentham’s philosophy—which he now saw as superior to Revolutionary Rousseauism—and began translating Bentham’s manuscripts into French. As Bentham tended to present his ideas voluminously, fragmentarily and abstrusely, Dumont’s translations frequently constituted summaries and paraphrases rather than literal renderings.
Being most interested in Bentham’s legal philosophy, Dumont demoted Panopticon to a mere essay among sundry others published in the third volume of the *Traités de législation civile et pénale* (1802), his concise, elegant and accessible rendition of extracts from Bentham’s legal manuscripts. Dumont also presented Panopticon only as a penitentiary-house—rather than as the versatile and generalizable principle of public economy Bentham had envisioned—because both men wanted to convince the French Convention to build a Panopticon prison. As a result, Panopticon was divulged to the world primarily as a place of punishment, while its role in the popularization of Benthamism became as minimal as its role in Bentham’s own life had been great.

Blamires believes that Dumont’s aim in translating Bentham was to demolish European Christian morality completely and replace it with a consequentialist ethics derived from the Enlightenment. In encountering Bentham, Dumont would thus have moved away from the austere Calvinism of his youth to an equally austere scientism centred on the greatest happiness principle. Unfortunately, this argument remains speculative. Blamires simply dismisses as misleading Dumont’s statements that the *Traité* was not socially revolutionary, and he does not support his theory of Dumont’s translation agenda with an account of the latter’s evolving attitudes towards religion. Considering especially that Dumont was a Calvinist pastor, an account of his religious attitudes would seem to be integral to his intellectual and political biography, but it remains, regrettably, untold.

Dumont’s story, however—which goes on to cover his last years and Benthamism’s international impact after the publication of the *Traités*—enables Bentham’s legal manuscripts to emerge, originally, as the sources of a creed of post-Revolutionary disillusionment. The path Blamires traces to such discoveries, however, can be tortuous, leading the reader through long if informative disquisitions on unexpected and not entirely necessary topics—like the class wars of eighteenth-century Geneva—in a manner that is itself rather Benthamic. One suspects, in fact, that Blamires takes pleasure in transgressing the conventions of the academic monograph in reminiscence of his subject. He writes also in a fresh, direct and lively style that is quickly and easily readable—as Bentham’s own legal code was supposed to be—and that serves well what is ultimately an unconventional and inventive book. Indeed, in revealing, for the first time, the ill-known Bentham of Panopticon and reconciling him with the familiar Bentham of utilitarianism, Blamires has produced an original piece of research and writing which is indispensable reading for historians interested in Benthamism and its legacy.

*Carolina Armenteros, University of Cambridge*

Donald Bloxham, *Genocide, the World Wars and the Unweaving of Europe*. Vallentine Mitchell: London and Portland, OR, 2008. x + 268 pp.; 9780853037200, £50.00 (hbk); 9780853037217, £19.99 (pbk)

In *Genocide, the World Wars and the Unweaving of Europe*, Donald Bloxham provides a fascinating and rigorous analysis of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust. This collection of essays, several revised or modified for this work, makes a compelling case that these genocides must be placed in a broader regional and international context in order to understand the radicalization that propelled mass killing. Bloxham examines the influence of external powers (much more important in the case of the Armenian Genocide) within the
pattern of exclusionary ethnic relations and politics in the regions most affected by mass violence. Bloxham also reflects in a final section on memory and history.

At its core, this collection presents a cutting edge comparative analysis of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust. The essays avoid simplistic comparisons and forced connections. Bloxham at least implicitly takes issue with the notion that German involvement proves a close connection between the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust. The scorn some German military advisers displayed toward Armenians. Bloxham states, in no way proves that Germans played any key part in actually formulating the mass murder of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. Racism is not equivalent to ‘concurrence with genocide’ (77).

Bloxham outlines processes of radicalisation which led to genocide. He argues effectively against straightforward intentionalist models. For the Armenian Genocide, Bloxham’s interpretation both complements and amends the work of Taner Açıkm. Like Açıkm, Bloxham stresses the importance of a sequence of crises which radicalized key elements within the CUP, but Bloxham sees the final key steps in that process of radicalization taking place only in May 1915 with the Russian advance on Van. Bloxham ventures, with some bravery, to discuss the role that Armenian nationalist action had in catalysing ‘the destruction process’ (37). Such an effort to place the path to genocide in its contemporary political context is especially difficult because of polarized debate. ‘I am attempting to explain, not to excuse’, Bloxham states (38). Yet, in truth, it was not always easy to distinguish between ‘acts of self defence and acts of revolt . . . ’ (63). The genocide was real, the violence unleashed against Armenians extreme, and the consequences extraordinarily destructive, but Bloxham also maintains that ‘the actions of the few contributed to radicalisations of CUP policy’ (64). Bloxham’s discussion of the Holocaust relies more on a synthesis of existing works. He demonstrates mastery of a wide array of sources to outline the connections between different killing programmes. In an essay on perpetrators, he borrows Mommsen’s term ‘cumulative radicalisation’ (146).

Bloxham aims to normalize the history of genocide during the world wars. Such normalization does not mean at all to think of mass murder as excusable, but rather to see the broader context for genocide in the ‘unweaving of Europe’. The Armenian Genocide, while the most violent of all programmes of mass violence carried out during the First World War, was also part of a broader process which led to the formation of a more homogeneous Turkish state. The Holocaust, Bloxham explains, was also part of the same process, but he does not overextend the argument here. There were real differences between the Holocaust and other programmes of violence and exclusion in that Jews presented no real ‘threat’ to the German perpetrators. In stressing that some of the roots of the Holocaust lay in broader trends not unique to Germany, Bloxham strives for balance. The ‘early scholarship of exceptionalism did have clear merit’ because of the tendency to obscure the destruction of European Jews under the general heading of Nazi crimes. ‘The Jews had a paramount and peculiar place in Nazi ideology and the relentlessness of the “final solution” when it was underway was unquestionably greater than in other Nazi programmes’ (112–13). But many other killing programmes took place, and some remain peripheral within historical literature — for example, Bloxham points to gaps in the general understanding of the killing of psychiatric patients by Einsatzgruppen and the relative lack of detailed research on the murder of Romanies. ‘These historiographical lacunae’, he suggests.
tell us more about the priorities of latter-day scholarship, about the way that the mass murder of the Jews has been promoted to obscure so much of the rest of the Nazi record of atrocity, than it does about the relative significance of the historical issues at stake.

The first point on priorities is convincing. However, the comment that one mass murder has been promoted to obscure other atrocities seems out of place in a work which otherwise takes a critical stance towards intentionalism (114).

The final section of the book on memory is clear, though less singular. Historians have become increasingly accustomed to the complexity of representing genocide. The tension between stressing the aberrations of genocide and seeing its roots in more common and even normal historical patterns persists, and Bloxham makes a valuable contribution in striving to reconnect genocide to history beyond genocide.

Benjamin Lieberman, Fitchburg State College


This magnificent study of witchcraft in the Duchy of Lorraine, c. 1570–1630 is the fruit of a 30-year labour by its pre-eminent historian. Nowadays, who devotes so much time to researching a book? But then, how often does a book of this quality appear? Through mastery of extraordinary archives and the patient maturation of ideas, Robin Briggs positions himself atop and within his subject. We are shown the sweep of witch-hunting from on high, and guided round the most intimate social spaces where taut dramas of suspicion and rage were played out.

Fifty years ago, Étienne Delcambre sorted the Lorraine data with the clinical detachment of a demonologist. Briggs adds an interpretation, reconstructing a series of ‘enchained stories’ of remarkable richness and kaleidoscopic variety. Focusing on the internal logic of these tales, he treats supernatural beliefs not as archaic curiosities, but as a normal part of early modern life. ‘Precisely because witchcraft was an accepted feature of their world, contemporaries treated it in a much more matter-of-fact style than many historians have done’ (172). Without a common-sense approach, people would have endured lives of unremitting panic and persecution. The potential for witch-hunting was ever-present, but needed to be triggered by unusual arrangements of contingent factors. Suspicions that did reach the courtroom had been ‘generated within a multicausal matrix of extreme complexity, whose outcome . . . could never be reliably predicted’ (377).

Briggs is relatively unconcerned with explaining the rise of witch-trials, covered by his 1996 book, Witches and Neighbours. A world regulated by custom was traumatized by demographic change, harvest failure and inflation: villages trebled in size. Social polarization intensified from the 1560s, so that ‘the community often became a focus for conflict instead of cooperation’ (24). Witchcraft prosecutions surged. But it is the place of witchcraft in social relations and parish politics that captures Briggs’ attention. Trials came and went, but beliefs were deeply embedded and so endured. Magical healers ‘formed an integral part of the therapeutic system of the times’ (6), and were at least as important for their ability to heal as to harm.

Briggs has 1339 trials at his disposal. Yet, however impressive this figure seems in isolation, there was no concerted ‘witch-craze’. By 1600, ducal agents had extended their control
over a patchwork of jurisdictions, but ‘it is inherently unlikely that these men could ever have thought in specific terms about the benefits of witch-hunting as a means of bolstering princely authority’ (20). This idea was incongruent with prevailing mentalities, besides which witch-hunts were laborious and costly. Restraint also came from below. Neighbours balanced fear of witches with fear of rebuttal and humiliation, and preferred counter-magic.

Briggs’ purpose exceeds the creation of a three-dimensional picture of witchcraft. Rather, he sees it in an ethnographic vein as ‘a language for describing personal interaction in both reality and fantasy . . . a natural idiom in which to understand and manage sickness’ (217). To appreciate this, we need to listen to the voices in the archives. ‘These documents’, he warns, ‘teem with problems and ambiguities’ (92). Witnesses knew how to tell a good story to maximize their chances of success; zealous officials helped too. ‘Even the modern reader of the trial documents’, warns Briggs, ‘is likely to feel that the evidence in many cases is strangely compelling, however unreasonable the assumptions behind it’ (61).

And yet, no matter how much inquisitorial convention muffled and distorted the sound of humble folk, it did not render it inaudible. The dossiers at Nancy do contain signs of people thinking and the distinctive phrases and images by which thought was expressed. Briggs writes brilliantly about the fantasies encoded within confessions, ‘a form of imaginative revenge . . . an expression of psychic realism on the part of their makers’ (117). He also detects traces of narcissism, infantilism and masochism here, and more generally, a fascination of early modern people for ‘the dichotomy between the everyday and the diabolical world’ (150). This cultural tendency was important less as a motor of prosecution and more as the framework for various quotidian strategies for comprehending and neutralizing fear, malice and misfortune – perennial features of peasant life.

In rural society witchcraft did not stop making sense, although at law the fine line between the possible and the implausible, central to the process by which legal evidence was evaluated, would prove decisive in ending European witch-trials. In Lorraine, however, more significant were French depredation of ducal authority and the dispersal of communities along with their customs, beliefs, memories and feuds. One of the many valuable lessons of this enormously subtle, sophisticated and satisfying book is that witchcraft was both a constituent and a barometer of power. When there was no longer any fraught ambiguity left in social relationships, witch-beliefs ceased to have a useful function.

MALCOLM GASKILL. University of East Anglia


This compact book traces the notion and practice of asylum in France, as asylum was conceived, debated, enacted, and enforced between its articulation in Enlightenment jurisprudence as a natural right to find refuge and a state obligation to provide asylum, to its effective end in the decree laws of 1938, which regulated the entry, residence and employment of foreigners in the interests of policing and national security. In actuality, as Greg Burgess notes, ‘droit d’asile’ did not become a legal doctrine until the first half of the nineteenth century and the French ideal of asylum remained a site of memory, as defined by Pierre Nora, long after a 1952 law adopting the United Nations convention regarding refugees.
The author demonstrates that the idea and implementation of asylum varied considerably over one and a half centuries, depending upon the interests of the state, especially in relation to waves of refugees and immigrants into France, and upon the international situation. Changes of regime, international threats or migrations, and shifts in the refugee and/or immigrant population prompted these variations. For instance, the Old Regime Monarchy initially welcomed and aided the influx of Dutch Patriots into France, but when Dutch refugees sought to control the distribution of refugee assistance in 1789, a new proclamation of monarchical asylum insisted that the refugees live under French laws. Subsequent refugee efforts to govern themselves would elicit the same response. Although revolutionaries reiterated the promise of asylum, once they faced foreign invasion, in 1792, they began to make distinctions between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary refugees. Thereafter, security concerns episodically led to distinctions between desirable and undesirable refugees, by revolutionary and conservative regimes alike.

Burgess further explains that the French conception and administration of asylum had fault lines. The definition of refugee, as a foreigner in exile for political reasons, wavered, with the term sometimes restricted to exiles receiving financial assistance and sometimes hard to distinguish from the broader category of foreigners. Laws initially limited to refugees, such as an 1832 law providing for the expulsion of refugees, were later extended to all foreigners (1849). One of the more constant but contradictory elements of asylum was the use of depots, usually distant from Paris and from vulnerable frontiers. Often converted prisons or barracks, they distributed assistance to refugees but also contained and controlled them. Although humanitarian (or charitable) ideals were almost always proclaimed, the more consistent approach adopted in practice was one of policing.

After the massive international migrations of the second half of the nineteenth century and the wars of the twentieth century, Burgess recognizes that international events played a decisive role in French policies. After the Great War, antipathies towards war refugees and people displaced by the collapse of European empires intensified anti-foreign/anti-refugee attitudes. Public policy emphasized the deployment of foreign labour for post-war recovery, until mounting unemployment led to repatriations and restrictive quotas on foreign workers in businesses (1932). Using a language of racial selection and anti-Semitism, many French opinion-makers turned on foreign workers, whether refugees or not. Add to this distasteful mixture, a refugee crisis brought on by Germans fleeing Nazi Germany, often without visas or even passports, and French public policy turned its back on the tradition of asylum by instituting exclusionary practices. When called to task for attacking the right of asylum, government spokesmen insisted that the issue was not asylum, but foreign labour – a variation on the good versus bad refugee dichotomy. Even the Popular Front could not enact a liberal policy on refugee admission, though the government did sign the League of Nations’ provisional arrangements for refugees from Germany.

If the debates about the principle of asylum, the variable practice of asylum and the situation of most refugee groups in France are admirably detailed in this book, the experiences and voices of refugees, especially colonial or minority refugees, are less well represented. Any scholar who tries to address this lacuna will, however, have to read this survey to understand the history of asylum in France.

Mary Lynn Stewart, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby

This interdisciplinary investigation by the cultural theorist Iain Chambers provides a timely reminder that the Mediterranean is a fusion of European, African and Asian influences. It is an informed polemical challenge to prevalent Western perceptions of the region, which are the product of fixed and limited geographical, political and historical classifications. The author condemns the increasing European inclination to view the Mediterranean as a frontier between the developed and the developing worlds, and to control it as such. By describing the sea as an environment of metaphorical forces – of waves, winds, currents, tides, and storms – he stresses that the sea’s ancient function as a means of communication directly opposes the erection of artificial barriers across it. The Mediterranean is a large geopolitical space which has long served as a point of exchange for a multitude of cultural transactions. In this flexible zone, North, South, East and West are all ‘entangled in a cultural and historical net cast over centuries, even millennia’. Chambers is careful not simply to add the neglected North African and Middle Eastern components to an overwhelmingly Eurocentric understanding of the region. Instead, he examines the dissemination of the Arabic, Jewish, Turkish and Latin cultures throughout the Mediterranean, considering how various elements of each civilization have crossed it in one direction or another. He explores the movement of peoples, languages, trade, music, cuisine and ideas, citing such evidence as the shared roots of words used on each shore of the sea, the passage of musical influences across it, and the fact that the ‘traditional’ Mediterranean diet has global origins.

Throughout his study, Chambers is concerned with the Mediterranean from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the postcolonial age. His examination moves back and forth within that period without losing either clarity or coherence. He attacks the widespread notion that occidental civilization possesses a monopoly on modernity, and argues that, although the languages of economic exchange, technology, justice, democracy and truth might once have been overwhelmingly European, they are no longer the West’s to define or impose. He reminds us that Europe was once a peripheral, underdeveloped zone distant from the wealthy centres of civilization in the Middle East, Africa and Asia, and that it derived greater advantage from the lines of passage across the Mediterranean than vice versa. He notes that the term Mediterranean entered the European lexicon during the nineteenth century, at roughly the point when the states to its north began to assert their control over its resources. He criticizes the widespread tendency to look upon the region through the cultural gaze of northern Europe, a world which views itself as the pinnacle of progress and modernity and which, he argues, is increasingly inclined to dismiss the rights of the many non-European states and cultures on the sea’s southern and eastern coastlines. Chambers sees particular irony in the fact that Turkey is today expected to negotiate its re-entry into Europe even though, as the Ottoman Empire, it was once the Continent’s most powerful and technologically-advanced state. He argues that Europe should embrace twenty-first-century migration across the Mediterranean, from which it stands to be revitalized and enriched. Chambers’ principal thesis is that the Mediterranean is shared; it belongs exclusively to no one.

There is much in Chambers’ work that will interest those aiming to improve their understanding of the complexity of the Mediterranean’s cultural composition. The book is handsomely presented, reasonably priced, and tackles an issue which is important at the dawn of the twenty-first century. However, the text itself is most likely to appeal only to academics
with a specific interest in the region’s cultural heritage or contemporary politics. It is difficult to imagine many readers relishing such phrases as the ‘teleology of temporal stratification’. There are also a few peculiar paradoxes. Chambers uses inverted commas sparingly in order to emphasize that he does not agree with the popular use of certain terms. For example, he does so to show his disapproval of the West’s regard for itself as the bastion of ‘modernity’ and ‘progress’, but he is not quite consistent in his usage of inverted commas; he even employs the outmoded terms of First and Third World once or twice without them. Chambers’ assertions that Turkey is a European state and that Islam is a European religion are undermined by his reference to Naples as having been the second city in Europe after Paris and the second in the Mediterranean after Istanbul; an entity cannot be second to two others within the same context, so the inference here is that Istanbul is a Mediterranean city, but not a European one. This slip is particularly ironic considering that few people would actually dispute Istanbul’s claim to be European on geographical grounds, even if they might doubt it from a cultural point of view. Finally, Chambers probably regrets supporting his description of Naples as a city that ‘works’ by suggesting that, however notorious it might be for corruption and crime, at least ‘the rubbish is collected every night’. It is deeply ironic that in the month this book was published the Neapolitan streets were overflowing with uncollected refuse, owing to the mismanagement of landfill sites which are allegedly controlled by the Camorra. All in all, however, this study tackles an interesting and important subject in a manner which provokes much thought.

O. J. Wright, Kingston University

Nicholas Coni, Medicine and Warfare. Spain, 1936–1939. Routledge: New York, 2008; 266 pp., 7 illus.; 9780415385978. £95.00 (hbk)

The role of the Spanish Civil War in contemporary history is usually analysed from the perspective of international politics. Other important aspects, such as the living and health conditions of the Spanish population itself, are only rarely taken into consideration.

The active participation of the Spanish authorities in international health institutions during the first decades of the twentieth century, such as the International Bureau of Hygiene and the League of Nations Health Organization, together with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, helped Spain construct a health system similar to that of other European countries. National health institutions and a decentralized sanitary system based on municipal and provincial action expanded during the 1920s and 1930s. After the proclamation of the Second Republic, some of the experts trained in public health with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation took over the running of health affairs. They launched a health reform with a bigger budget and the support of the socialist government.

The Civil War obstructed those reforms, although the work done prevented the population’s state of health from being severely damaged during 1936 and 1937. The report by experts from the League of Nations (1937), which analysed the health situation on the Republican side, and the post-war report by J.A. Palanca, head of the Francoist General Directorate of Public Health, pointed out deficiencies, but both demonstrated that health services managed to adapt to the conditions of war, using the available resources to provide healthcare at the front and in the rear. Although from the beginning, care of refugees was a big problem, health indicators initially only showed a slight deterioration, before becoming worse from the
autumn of 1937. At that point, in addition to traditional health problems such as infant mortality, tuberculosis, venereal diseases and malaria, four large new threats appeared: epidemic outbreaks of typhoid, sporadic outbreaks of spotted fever and smallpox, and an increase in the incidence of bacterial dysentery. Diphtheria, almost absent before the war, reappeared strongly among children. From August 1938, supply and transport problems drastically decreased food intake, and deficiency diseases appeared as a consequence of malnutrition.

Coni’s book adds to a series of important contributions published in recent years as a consequence of specific events: an international conference on the Spanish Civil War held in Madrid in 2006, and a similar event in Valencia on Valencia, Capital Cultural De La República (2007). During the Franco years (1939–1975) and the transition to democracy, most of the historiography devoted to the Spanish War was produced by foreign scholars, but nowadays Spanish historians are updating and revising this work. Medical historians such as Bernabeu, Perdigueró, Huertas, Rodríguez Ocaña and others (including this reviewer) have published a great deal of important research on health and medicine in Spain during the first decades of the twentieth century. The most important deficiency of Coni’s book is precisely that he overlooks this extensive Spanish literature, which considers not only the problem of the war, but also the transition in health and sanitary care undergone by Spanish society since the start of the twentieth century. This book, based mainly on the testimony of those sanitarians taking part in the conflict, is full of anecdotes, and it shows specific aspects of medical organization, nursing, surgical activities, blood transfusions and international aid, including biographical notes on some of the most relevant actors. Nevertheless, the book lacks any historical context concerning Spanish health institutions, policies and organizations before and during the war, something essential to understanding the complexity of what was going on. The few incursions the author makes into wider Spanish history make little sense, such as talking about the Middle Ages in the first chapter, devoted to medicine in pre-war Spain, and ignoring the great importance of epidemiological research during the 1920s and especially during the Republican period. There is no mention of health organization, dispensaries, rural health centres, provincial institutes of hygiene or national health institutions such as the Instituto Nacional de Higiene Alfonso XIII or the Escuela Nacional de Sanidad. This all shows that Coni’s contribution lacks a general perspective. Despite this serious deficiency, the personal testimonies and the good use Coni makes of international sources such as reports in the British press nonetheless add some original information to our existing knowledge. Considered in the context of the recent historiography on health and medicine during the Spanish Civil War, Coni’s book summarizes the interesting testimony of the protagonists, but it cannot be regarded as giving a comprehensive analysis of the topic.

JOSEP L. BARONA, Universitat de València


Raphael Lemkin, the inventor of the word ‘genocide’, tireless campaigner for the United Nations Genocide Convention, and historian, is by any standards an important figure in the international politics of the 1940s and 1950s and a seminal thinker for contemporary genocide research. Hitherto, however, although his life story has been told, no book-length biography
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existed. John Cooper’s is the first to reach publication, although at least one other is anticipated. Cooper is a lawyer and – apparently in his spare time – a prodigious historian of Jewish life, and in this first foray into political and intellectual history he has ventured thoroughly into both the archives and the continuing debates following on from Lemkin’s work. He has produced a very informative work which will be valuable to scholars of genocide as well as historians of the United Nations.

All the same, this is not really a conventional biography. Lemkin was born in Poland in 1900 and, although he was nearly 40 when forced to flee by the German and Soviet invasions, Cooper (despite considerable research) manages to devote only 20 pages to these first two-thirds of his life, interweaving the little that is known about Lemkin with a historical narrative which situates his international legal career, including his well-known early attempts to deal with ‘barbarity’, in the context of his family’s situation amidst changing threats to Jewish society. The book is overwhelmingly about Lemkin’s final two decades (he died in 1959), when his life and career appear almost completely taken up with – if not taken over by – his genocide research and campaigning. Hence, although this study gives an outline of his personal life and indications of his personality – he had many relatively brief and seemingly unsatisfactory relationships with women, and his relations with academic colleagues and co-campaigners were often fraught – we are left wondering about the man. He seems almost the stereotype of one who, caring deeply about humanity in general, lacks strong, enduring relationships with particular human beings, even if his rootedness in the terrible experience of his own family in the Nazi genocide partially contradicts this impression. One wants to know more.

Cooper’s achievement is to enable us to see more than in any previous work the links between Lemkin’s times, his ideas, and his campaigning. Lemkin was formed in a strongly Zionist environment and was later closely linked into Jewish circles in the USA in which Zionism was predominant, but he avoided over-identification with the emergent Israel, partly because he saw the need to recruit the Arab states to the Genocide Convention. The Nazis’ destruction of Polish Jewry was obviously crucial, but Lemkin’s major work, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (1944), presented a general concept of the Nazi genocide, so much so that, Cooper criticizes, ‘he tended to underplay the uniqueness of the Jewish situation’. Yet this general concept, far from ‘blurring his analytical insight’, as Cooper suggests, is precisely what has made a new generation of genocide scholars return to Lemkin’s work.

The author’s account of Lemkin’s campaigning activities is the fullest to date, and it fills out existing accounts of the debates leading to the Convention with valuable political context. It is striking how little the genocidal events of 1945–48 – the brutal expulsions of Germans from Eastern Europe, Muslims and Hindus from the new India and Pakistan respectively, and Arabs from Israeli-controlled Palestine – impinged on Lemkin’s campaigning or on the debates in the UN. On all sides, Nazism’s crimes proved too convenient a reference point and there was little sense that the instrument which the UN was fashioning might already apply to its own members, although the Soviet Union and Britain, both identified here as having very ambivalent attitudes, seem to have recognized the danger to their own positions. Yet afterwards, as the Cold War hardened, Lemkin’s genocide activity (now focused on the campaign to secure US ratification of the Convention, unsuccessful largely because of opposition from racist Southern Democrats) became increasingly dependent on anti-Communist émigré Eastern European groups, and conflicted with those pressing for stronger international ‘human rights’ legislation.
Lemkin’s last years saw him, and the Convention which he had achieved, politically marginalized, and he put his energies into the plan for a history of genocide which is now attracting renewed scholarly interest. Cooper gives a useful summary of his plans, and of the extant writings, which confirm his continued adherence to a broad and general conception of genocide (much in contrast to that of recent scholars who have narrowed the phenomenon to mass murder). However, Cooper is no theorist and his strategy, to intersperse Lemkin’s writing with summaries of recent contributions, does not quite work. In sum, this is a valuable contribution, but perhaps only the beginning of a full appreciation of this remarkable figure.

Martin Shaw, University of Sussex

Sharon Dale, Alison Williams Lewin and Duane J. Osheim, eds, Chronicling History: Chroniclers and Historians in Medieval and Renaissance Italy, Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, PA, 2007; xix + 332 pp.; 9780271032252, £74.95 (hbk); 9780271032269, £22.50 (pbk)

This book provides a taster of Italian historical writing during the middle ages and early Renaissance in the form of 11 chapters by different contributors on particular historical writers or groups writing history, each followed by a short sample extract of the texts translated into English: the individual chapters are prefaced by a short introduction, presumably from the editors, and followed by a bibliography of primary and secondary sources and an index. Two features of this historiographical tradition are immediately striking: its sheer volume, consisting of literally thousands of texts ranging from scrappy fragments to rhetorically polished narratives; and its authors, usually secular writers, mainly from Italy’s dense network of towns. Here, the Italian medieval and Renaissance tradition diverges significantly from its transalpine counterpart, composed largely of ecclesiastics mainly preoccupied with royal, episcopal or monastic issues. In contrast, the concerns of Italians were normally civic, although some exceptions emerge in these covers: the chroniclers of Norman Sicily, who focused on the growth of their Norman kingdom; the thirteenth-century Franciscan Salimbene di Adam, who, under the influence of Joachim of Fiore’s prophecies, strove to detect the divine plan in history; and the fifteenth-century humanist, Flavio Biondo, who, preoccupied with the classical Roman heritage, took a pan-Italian rather than a local or regional perspective. The other writers selected rehearse well known themes from medieval and Renaissance Italian history and historiography: the Villani chroniclers focus on the growing domination of Tuscany by Florence; the Lucchese Sercambi was preoccupied with maintaining liberty in his faction-torn native city, eventually opting for a monarchist solution by supporting the local despot, Paolo Guinigi; the Lombard chroniclers similarly backed the rising Visconti family as rulers of Milan, hoping for peace and an end to internal and external discord; Venetian chroniclers attempted to justify their city’s prominent place in the Italian and Mediterranean world; Giovanni Conversini da Ravenna employed foundation myths to demonstrate the Carrara dynasty’s right to rule over Padua; Leonardo Bruni became an ardent apologist for oligarchic rule in his adopted city of Florence.

Some of the articles are genuinely interesting and the overall standard of treatment is competent, although there are some dubious contentions too. It is hard to see how Graham Loud can describe the Norman chronicler Falco of Benevento as a mere annalist when he follows classical historiographical practice by placing evidently invented speeches into the
mouths of participants (37–8, 53) and makes reference to ancient Roman history (40), besides lacing his narrative with rhetorical questions and exclamations (52–3), not to mention his use of the cursus (43) – all characteristics of the stylus altus of dictamen, a style employed in the middle ages for history, not chronicle or annals. Salimbene’s reliance on eye-witness evidence is taken by Alison Lewin as ‘another sign of the critical historical mentality that was to characterize humanist writers in later centuries’ (88), when preoccupation with eye-witness evidence was characteristic of medieval historiography in general (there are further examples in this very volume on pages 58, 70–1, 148), derived not from the classical tradition but rather from hagiography and elevated into a theory of historical criticism by Isidore of Seville. Questionable too is Paula Clarke’s view that Giovanni Villani was influenced by the ‘prehumanist movement’, which she defines as ‘intellectuals [who] demonstrated an increased admiration for the classics and a desire to imitate classical forms, concepts, and ideals in their own work’ (114). One key characteristic of undoubted pre-Petrarchan humanists such as Lovato Lovati or Geri d’Arezzo was a genuine appreciation of classical style and an ability to differentiate classical literary practices from contemporary Latin and vernacular usages; such new sensibilities resulted in an attempt to rid Latin prose of the rhythmic practices imported from poetry (cursus), and a clear distinction between classical Latin prose and poetry. Clarke describes Villani as having ‘a long-term commitment to essentially prehumanist ideals. From the start of his chronicle, Giovanni demonstrates the influence of ancient historians, together with an admiration for the Roman political achievement and the classical tradition’ (115–16). She herself seems uncertain of her ground here, writing in the next paragraph that,

he was much less capable, even than Dante, of imitating the stylistic and rhetorical techniques of classical literature . . . Villani did not have the opportunity to acquire a higher education in Latin, although he certainly learned enough Latin to be able to read the classical authors whom he cites. (116)

However, the theory that Giovanni Villani enjoyed some kind of affiliation with the ‘prehumanist movement’ is vitiated by an extract which this contributor herself publishes from his chronicle: Villani lumps poets such as Vergil and Lucan together with genuine prose-writing historians such as Sallust and Livy. There could be little sympathy for classical Latin, when Villani confesses to taking inspiration as a historian from ancient authors (and not so ancient, in the case of Orosius) indiscriminately:

reading the histories and the great deeds of the Romans written by Virgil and by Sallust and Lucan and Paulus Orosius and Valerius [Maximus] and Titus Livy and other masters of history, who wrote of the lesser and of the greater deeds and affairs of the Romans and even of others of the whole world, I took my style and form from them. (131)

ROBERT BLACK, University of Leeds


As a result of the German invasion of 1940, several million French citizens became refugees in their own country, fleeing the Wehrmacht from the north and the Paris region to the country’s
southern departments. As Hanna Diamond notes, despite the fact that the exode affected so much of the population, for many years it occupied only a muted presence in the collective memory of the war, and was analysed in detail by relatively few historians. In recent years, it has attracted more scholarly attention, while the discovery and publication of Irène Némirovsky’s *Suite Française* (2004) has generated further public interest. Diamond’s balanced and moving account of this pivotal event is thus an especially timely, and most welcome, contribution.

The book is organized chronologically, and begins with an account of the preparations undertaken to respond to a German invasion. Broadly speaking, while arrangements were made, the official effort proved wanting. A widespread confidence in eventual victory, and the relative calm of the *drôle de guerre* in 1939–40, tended to encourage a false sense of security; when the crisis did come, the government wavered over crucial decisions such as whether or not to evacuate Paris, resulting in further confusion. In general, the leaders of the collapsing Third Republic do not come off well in this account. Despite a reputation for decisiveness and anti-Nazi convictions, Premier Paul Reynaud seemed irresolute in the final stages of the crisis. Many prefects and some mayors fled, citing the importance of discouraging official cooperation with the Germans. While their reasons for doing so were perhaps understandable, there was a widespread sense that the government had abandoned its own people, a mood which both the occupying forces of the Third Reich and the nascent Vichy regime would capitalize upon.

Blending affecting primary accounts with clear analysis, Diamond effectively recreates the turmoil of the exode. As waves of French citizens joined Dutch and Belgian refugees on the roads they were initially hopeful, believing that the Germans would eventually be halted. But deadly aerial attacks upon refugee columns, the presence of fleeing soldiers, worsening news and oppressive summer heat undermined this mood. Families had agonized over what to take with them and what to leave behind. Now they worried about how to keep moving in the face of petrol shortages and were concerned about their loved ones, whether they were in uniform or had somehow become separated during the flight south. Diamond draws attention to the fact that class could be a significant determinant of one’s experience, with the wealthy having greater resources and thus often more choices at their disposal. The departments which took in the refugees were often overwhelmed, as officials scrambled for accommodation and provisions. There were many instances of touching solidarity as small towns and villages offered what solace they could to the displaced, but there were also signs of social breakdown, evidenced both by cases of looting and the restrictions imposed by some communities in order to keep refugees out.

As H.R. Kedward made clear in an influential article published in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* in 1981, Pétain capitalized on the exode to build support. By decrying the Third Republic for misleading and abandoning the French people, and by identifying with the traditional peasant values of fortitude and solidarity which had proven so invaluable to those in need, France’s new leaders were temporarily able to establish a degree of legitimacy. Diamond notes a convergence between these efforts and those of the German occupiers, who instructed their troops to behave properly and emphasized that they, too, wished to help those who had been displaced and to restore order. For confused and disoriented refugees, such messages could be very appealing. Yet, while both Vichy and the occupiers benefited from this desire for normalcy, the aftermath of the exode posed challenges as well. Most refu-
gees eventually returned home, but some—including many Jews—were not allowed to do so. Other individuals and families decided it was better to remain in the Unoccupied Zone. While the Vichy government continued to emphasize how it provided stability in a time of upheaval, Diamond suggests that, within a year, popular support for Pétain was waning. The humiliation of being forced to flee in 1940, and the experience of sheltering refugees, had even encouraged some to engage in resistance.

Diamond’s emphasis upon the multiplicity and complexity of experiences during the refugee crisis of 1940 is reinforced by her effective use of the recollections of a diverse cohort of individuals, and the book is enhanced by good maps and a generous quantity of illustrations. In sum, Fleeing Hitler provides an accessible yet nuanced account of a critical moment in the Second World War, one which both specialists and a broader public will benefit from reading.

Sean Kennedy, University of New Brunswick


Dejan Djokić is to be commended for having produced an excellently researched and very well-written book. He has avoided nationalist clichés and a strongly partisan tone and presented the reader with new interpretations of original source material. As such, the book contrasts markedly with much of the writing about the former Yugoslavia since the 1990s. It is good, for instance, for the reader to be reminded that Alojzije Stepinac, the future Archbishop of Zagreb, served in the Serbian Army in the First World War. The text is empirically rich with informative, sometimes witty footnotes throughout. I was amused to find out that Garibaldi was known as ‘the Karadjordje of Italy’ in Mihajlo Pupin’s village. Perhaps, at times, certain points should even have been brought out of the footnotes into the main body of the text. The comparison between Vlado Maček and Ferenc Deák’s use of the term ‘the waistcoat is unbuttoned’ (which implicitly compares the ‘badly buttoned’ Serb-Croat relations in 1921 with the poor relations between Austria and Hungary in 1867) deserves more illumination as it is often such the knowledge that individuals have of their own past and the limits of the possible that enlivens the writing of history. More significantly, since the book is on the creation of a new state in 1918, it would have been valuable to look more extensively at how both Serbia and its new regions freshly integrated from the Habsburg Monarchy had suffered during the First World War. It has been estimated by Andrej Mitrović that that half of Serb men between 18 and 55 perished between 1914 and 1918. The loss of individuals such as Jevto Dedijer who, had they lived, would probably have been intelligent servants of the new state was inestimable. The sheer scale of the losses, the destruction of the basic transport infrastructure during the war (and the traumatic fact that ‘Yugoslavs’ had killed one another on opposing sides) surely deserve more emphasis in the book. The rapid changes in society in terms of literacy and other social developments could also have been stressed, as well as the impact of the 1919 agrarian reforms which drastically altered ethnic relations, in particular in the banovina of Drinska. The ‘sacrifice’ of Montenegro in surrendering its sovereignty is dealt with very cursorily, as are other ‘big events’ such as the assassination of the King in 1934. In this sense, the title is somewhat misleading as the book does not cover all aspects
of interwar Yugoslavia and I suspect that the choice of title owes more to marketing and the increasingly utilitarian approaches of libraries than to scholarship per se.

As a study of high politics, particularly in terms of Serb-Croat relations, especially in terms of the author’s grasp of intricate detail, the book can be compared with Ivo Banac’s magisterial *Nation Question in Yugoslavia* and certainly complements the latter. It is well worth general library purchase and nicely augments the existing literature on interwar Yugoslavia. The chapters on the 1939 *Sporazum* and the aftermath of the agreement between Maček and Dragiša Cvetković are superb. The maps are simple, but effective. Occasionally Djokić is given to understatement. ‘Bad temper’ rather than more serious illness or the driving ambitions of his younger brother Alexander apparently led to the exclusion of Prince George from the Serbian succession in 1909. Overall, this is an important monograph and an essential commentary on Serb-Croat relations during this volatile period.

Cathie Carmichael, *University of East Anglia*


In his *Political Economy of Socialist Realism*, Evgeny Dobrenko explores the political, cultural and aesthetic dimensions of Socialist Realism, examining their role in the manufacture of an alternative or substitute reality – so-called ‘real socialism’. In so doing, Dobrenko seeks not to understand ‘how ideology constructed reality, but rather the reality of the ideology itself’ (25). To unveil this reality, Dobrenko closely analyzes cultural production in a variety of spheres – not just in literature and film, but also in the sciences, in marketing, in the world of the camps, as well as in mass cultural events such as Stakhanovism. In each, he discovers a network of signs, symbols and motifs which served to articulate a substitute reality, in effect leaving contemporary experience unacknowledged and, to use Dobrenko’s term, ‘de-realized’.

To understand Dobrenko’s argument, readers need only carefully examine his book cover, which illustrates the nature and the function of the cultural production that Dobrenko examines in his book. The cover features small rectilinear boxes containing stylized Soviet citizens – a pilot, a sailor, a policeman, a school girl, and the like. Each figure holds a sign which celebrates some defining symbol of socialism: a biological chart, a roadway sign, a banner celebrating labour, the image of a cosmonaut, a stop sign, a picture of Krupskaya, and more – all symbols of Soviet ideals such as discipline, work, abundance, technological mastery and Marxism. In Dobrenko’s argument, Socialist Realism and its ‘typified’ personages play the same role: to produce a system of signs, an alternative discursive space in which to live – in effect, the ‘real’ space of socialism.

Dobrenko views Socialist Realist cultural production – this substitute reality – as the defining product of socialism, something without which socialism as an entity could not exist. In fact, he argues that reality outside of this aesthetic realm ‘had nothing truly socialist in it’ (19). Thanks to the discursive bounds on this space, Soviet citizens dwelt in an ever-present future, but never truly in the present, because Socialist Realist language and culture refused to articulate the present. In contemporary life, official discourse recognized only the remnants of the past and the seeds of the future. In effect, then, Socialist Realist discourse served to ‘de-realize’ the present, so that the objective world never received representation in art; at best
(and when convenient), everyday living served as an ornament to the ‘real reality’ produced through signs, symbols and metaphor.

Dobrenko applies his theory of displacement – that is, of Socialist Realism as a mechanism for producing an alternate reality – to all spheres of Soviet cultural production, something which yields new insight into advertising, Lysenkoism, and the All-Union Agricultural Exhibition. Arguably, his theory works best when used to explain the relationship between the violent and coercive nature of the Soviet system and the mythic illusion promoted by Socialist Realism. As he explains, Socialist Realism served as a mechanism for managing the public and collective interpretation of the violence inherent in the Soviet political-cultural project. Its language and art conceptually displaced violence and poverty, relegating these to the past or to capitalist lands, even as it celebrated the domestic products of ‘disciplining’ and ‘self-disciplining’ – namely, the ‘reforged’ criminal and then the ‘hero of labour’. In effect, ‘real socialism’ left domestic violence unarticulated and thereby ‘de-realized’, relegated in public understanding to no place and no time.

Although Dobrenko rather brilliantly demonstrates how Socialist Realism served to produce an alternative reality, his book arguably ought to address more fully the relationship between ontology and epistemology – that is, the relationship between ‘articulated reality’ and human perception or reception of that substitute reality. His work appears to operate on the theoretical premise that human subjectivity and ‘reality’ reside in language – that is, in what can be publicly and collectively articulated. He does not consider the extent to which social relationships or material places might have resisted substitution, although of course such person-to-person and person-with-place interactions may very well have been mediated by the language of ‘real socialism’.

Dobrenko’s work nevertheless represents a masterful new interpretation of Soviet cultural production and, in particular, of Socialist Realism. Because its scope covers such a broad range of cultural production – not just film and the arts, but also science, exhibitions and marketing, specialists on all these aspects of Soviet history will find his work to be indispensable for their own work – if not as the perfect explanatory tool, then as a very powerful argument to be addressed. Certainly, Dobrenko’s book merits serious attention from a wide range of scholars, both because of its theoretical power and because of his finely nuanced analysis of the various aspects of Soviet culture.

HEATHER D. DEHAAN, Binghamton University


Philip Dwyer’s biography reflects a growing tendency in Napoleonic scholarship to identify Napoleon with the cultural trends associated with romanticism. Like Steven Englund and David Bell, Dwyer highlights Napoleon’s ability to recognize the power of the romantic fascination with the heroic individual, and his skill in harnessing it to his goals. One of the purposes of Dwyer’s biography is to demonstrate that Napoleon’s cultivation of a public image as a military hero was the source of his success. This argument is an old one, and will be familiar to most historians. Dwyer does, however, add a new dimension to Napoleon’s myth-making. He proposes that, during Napoleon’s formative years, he continuously devel-
oped his own self-image even as he sought to construct a representation of himself for public consumption. Moreover, these images eventually met, and Napoleon’s need to conform to his own myth exerted a decisive influence over his actions as a general and as a politician. Dwyer’s book examines these processes, and explains their role in Napoleon’s life and career until the coup of Brumaire.

Dwyer begins with Napoleon’s Corsican roots and his difficulties in adjusting to life in France. Because Napoleon resented being sent away from Corsica by his father and felt like an outsider in France, Dwyer claims that he developed a strong Corsican identity characterized by a reverence for his homeland, its people, and especially its leader, Pasquale Paoli. The young Corsican likewise despised France and all things French. With time, Napoleon grew more accustomed to France, and was inspired by the French Revolution. His hatred of the country abated, and he regarded himself as both Corsican and French. His self-image changed yet again during the political struggles that the Revolution generated in Corsica. After his ambitions were thwarted by Paoli, he abandoned his Corsican identity and embraced France and Jacobinism. Dwyer explains that Bonaparte then lost his faith in the Jacobins when Cristoforo Saliceti denounced him to the authorities following the fall of Robespierre.

Disappointed by the political causes that he espoused, and Josephine’s failure to return his affections, Napoleon became increasingly cynical and egotistical. He also turned away from external sources of identity and began to fashion a self-image from his own ideas about how he wished to be perceived. The critical moment in this development, according to Dwyer, occurred when Napoleon won his first major military victories in Italy. Napoleon’s concerns about managing public opinion did not originate in the Italian campaign. In pursuit of higher rank and political influence as a young military officer, he learned to present an idealized image to others in which he claimed responsibility for the success of any enterprise in which he was involved, exaggerated his achievements, and concealed his mistakes. The Italian campaign was a turning point because now Napoleon started to believe his own propaganda. Dwyer argues that military success convinced the young general that he possessed extraordinary talents and was destined to accomplish great things. While Napoleon adopted this heroic identity, he also perfected the techniques of self-promotion. For Dwyer, the Italian campaign represented a propaganda triumph equal in magnitude to its military success. He demonstrates how Napoleon employed a variety of media to portray himself as a dynamic, virtuous, and brilliant general, and that these methods generated tremendous enthusiasm for him in France. With a firm sense of self established, Napoleon endeavoured to fulfil his destiny by leading the invasion of Egypt and participating in the overthrow of the Directory. His propaganda skills allowed him to overcome his failures in the former, and to obtain the popular support necessary to acquire political power through the latter.

Dwyer’s biography, which is the first instalment of a multi-volume work, ranks among the most important books in the new wave of scholarship inspired by the bicentennial of the Napoleonic period. Napoleon enthusiasts will probably object to Dwyer’s critical treatment of his subject. Dwyer’s admirable determination to penetrate the mythology of the Napoleonic legend leads him to devote as much attention to their hero’s flaws and crimes as his qualities and achievements. Those expecting an examination of Napoleon’s military skills will be required to look elsewhere. In truth, Dwyer’s book could benefit from a more extensive analysis of Napoleon’s talents. Its focus on his image formation at the expense of his other abilities will leave some readers wondering how Napoleon was able to accomplish
what he did. Dwyer’s approach, however, allows him to provide a compelling interpretation of Napoleon’s motivations as a military leader and politician. Others have studied Napoleon’s propaganda techniques, and his efforts to cultivate his public image. Yet, Dwyer reveals the complex relationship between Napoleon’s myth-making and his development as an individual and as a public figure. In doing so, he has made an essential contribution to our understanding of Napoleon and his era.

Michael J. Hughes, Iona College


With this meticulous study, Scott Eddie gives us the first comprehensive analysis of landownership and land usage in Prussia’s eastern provinces during the period 1880–1910. Like most scholars working on this area of Germany, his focus is on the large estates: those 11,000 properties of 100 hectares in size or more, which together accounted for just under half of the total land area here.

This book – and this is made clear on the front cover – is a quantitative study. Drawing on information listed in contemporary property address books, and fore-fronting his methodology in an admirably transparent fashion, the author provides us with a statistical breakdown of ownership by size of property, and by type of owner, including individuals, the Prussian state, and, less numerous, banks, businesses, municipalities, and medical and religious establishments. For individual owners, Eddie compiles detailed figures on noble and ‘bourgeois’ ownership, and on the military rank of estate owners. One conclusion he reaches in this part of his investigation is that the purchase of estates by non-nobles should be viewed as a phenomenon of the early and mid century, but not of the late nineteenth century. The ‘bourgeois’ incursion into the countryside had ground to a halt by the last two decades of the century. In his evaluation of land usage, there is another surprising finding. Here, the author maps the prevalence of arable land, land used for animal husbandry, and that set aside for forestry, but also draws our attention to the fact that more than a third of estates also possessed one or more ‘rural industries’, including brickworks, sawmills, grain mills, breweries, distilleries, starch factories and sugar mills.

Eddie’s work is clearly in itself a fine piece of scholarship. It may be, however, that in the long run the main value of this economic history will be as a foundation for future social historical research on the German countryside. His study shows that there was a diversity to ownership, and to the economic life of estates, that has not been given due attention in studies of East Elbia thus far. Little has been written on the landholdings of municipal government, or on the ownership of estates by hospitals. The rural enterprises which Eddie highlights are all but invisible in existing historical accounts of life and work on estates. To my knowledge, forestry too has largely been overlooked.

Some sections of the book will prove off-putting to readers who dislike extensive use of statistical tables and who are unfamiliar with quantitative methods, but for all this it is surprisingly readable, and, in the main, Eddie keeps the non-specialist on board. The structure of chapters, which begin with helpful ‘previews’ and end with concluding summaries is partly
responsible, but it can also be attributable to the author’s clear prose style, sparse use of technical vocabulary in the main body of the text, and, not least, to his occasional injections of humour (‘Data are like potatoes: you have to clean them before you can cook them’ (37)).

**Simon Constantine, University of Wolverhampton**

Omar G. Encarnación, *Spanish Politics: Democracy after Dictatorship*. Polity: Cambridge, MA. 2008: 192 pp.; 9780745639925, £47.50 (hbk); 9780745639932, £15.99 (pbk)


The recent history of Spain is a real success story. From an impoverished international pariah, associated with the regimes of Hitler and Mussolini, after the end of the Second World War, Spain rapidly developed into a successful democracy and a respected and economically flourishing international partner. In particular, Spain’s successful transition to democracy after Franco’s death in November 1975 has attracted considerable attention. The young American political scientist Omar Encarnación, in his *Spanish Politics: Democracy after Dictatorship*, even characterizes this transition as the Spanish miracle. Compared to other new democracies from the ‘Third Wave’ of democratization, which started in 1974 with Greece and Portugal and continued with most Latin American and East-European countries well into the 1990s, Spain has developed into a remarkably stable, prosperous and well-functioning modern democracy. Nonetheless, Spain clearly diverged from most other cases as it did not follow the maxims of the so-called Washington consensus. According to the IMF, the World Bank and the US government, all based in Washington, a democratic transition provides a ‘unique political environment for introducing bold and comprehensive economic change’. However, instead of a clear rupture, accompanied by a shock therapy, the transition in Spain took several years, did not constitute a fundamental break with the past and was essentially the result of a pact between small groups of leading politicians both from the old dictatorship and from the democratic opposition, whereas economic reform was postponed. Nevertheless, it proved a huge success as, together with the help of the European Community, of which Spain became a member in 1986, the country became a well-functioning democratic state and now is the eleventh largest economy in the world, just after Italy.

The transition is treated in detailed chronological fashion in Javier Tusell’s *Spain: From Dictatorship to Democracy*. After analysing the various stages of the Franco dictatorship, this eminent Spanish historian recounts how Juan Carlos I, the grandson of Alfonso XIII, the last Bourbon king of Spain, became Franco’s official successor. Although he was educated under the close supervision of the dictator himself, Juan Carlos seemed to have had different ideas about the future. Nevertheless, he had to act prudently and take into account the power of those who resisted change within the regime, generally known as ‘the bunker’. Only after half a year did the king succeed in nominating Adolfo Suárez as the new prime minister. Suárez was a young apparatchik from the reformist wing within the regime and under his leadership Spain slowly moved towards democracy. Suárez took a legalistic path, promoting new laws allowing political parties and democratic elections and these were approved both by the existing Francoist Cortes and a referendum. After the first general elections in June 1977, a new constitution was drawn up by representatives of all the main political parties. The transi-
tion was completed after the military coup of Colonel Tejero failed in February 1981 – due to a lack of support and the energetic intervention of the king; the 1982 elections then resulted in a victory for the socialist PSOE, led by the charismatic Felipe González.

Whereas Encarnación explicitly uses a comparative framework, asking himself why the Spanish transition was more successful than others, Tusell frequently uses comparisons to show that Spanish developments were similar to, or different from, what happened elsewhere. He thus maintains that, instead of looking for similarities between the Franco regime and Hitler’s Germany or Mussolini’s Italy, it could better be compared with other pseudo-fascist dictatorships in Eastern Europe and Latin America. When speaking about economic and social developments he also often draws parallels with other countries, which generally show his wide erudition and sound judgement. In his chapters, Tusell, who unfortunately prematurely passed away just after finishing the manuscript of the Spanish original, chronologically discusses the main political events before dealing with the principal economic, social and cultural trends. Although his views are well argued and show a very wide knowledge of the period, Tusell, who has written more than 50 books on Spanish contemporary history, does not really have a central thesis which connects the various paragraphs and chapters. Furthermore, it is also clear that he has written the book with a well-informed Spanish public in mind. He debunks certain Francoist myths with authority, such as the notion that the regime brought peace and economic prosperity, which especially for older Spanish readers would be useful. However, for a more international audience the author does not sufficiently explain several minor events and scandals, especially during the democratic period. For example, he mentions the arrest of General Pinochet in London at the bequest of Judge Baltasar Garzón without making clear what the charges against Pinochet were. He apparently assumes that the reader already knows the main facts and limits himself to the interpretation of their significance. Nonetheless, for readers and students who are somewhat more familiar with Spanish history, this book provides a well documented and argued overview and even when discussing the most recent developments Tusell succeeds in providing a nuanced and balanced judgement of the period.

Contrary to the well-informed Tusell, Encarnación, who apart from a somewhat superficial introductory chapter only deals with the period after 1975, is sometimes inaccurate in his details. For example, the author affirms that on 11 March 2004, a terrorist attack was launched against the Atocha station in Madrid, whereas actually 10 bombs exploded in four commuter trains, of which only one was in the station. He further calls this tragedy after the day it happened ‘M-11’, whereas in Spain it is known as ‘11-M’. However, apart from these and some other slight mistakes, his overall analysis is nuanced and convincing in its explanation of why Spain became a successful democracy. He has structured his book in a thematic way, treating successively the political elites, party politics, civil society, political decentralization and economic developments, while finishing with two chapters on the increasing polarization during the recent governments of Aznar and Rodríguez Zapatero. Encarnación compares Spain’s democratic transition with other countries, but avoids mere theoretical schematism. Thus, whereas other scholars have ascertained that Spanish civil society is still rather weak, with extremely low figures for membership of all kind of social organizations, Encarnación points to the vigorous protest culture and the intense social life outside the home to explain that it is not so much weaker than in other Western countries, but rather organized in a different and less formal way. In general, he defends the consensual Spanish political transition, in
which economic reforms were slowly implemented and accompanied by the introduction of a welfare system and where the break with the past was slow and gradual, as a model for other countries. Under Zapatero, the Spanish political system seems stable enough to also come to terms with its own tragic past, by breaking the informal pact of the late 1970s for silence and forgetting the past.

Eric Storm, University Leiden


Charles Esdaile has produced a valuable and engaging study on international relations during the Napoleonic period. The book begins with two substantial chapters on the pre-Amiens years. Its final chapter explores the Congress of Vienna and Napoleon’s final defeat in 1815. Esdaile bases his work on an impressive number of printed sources and a wide array of secondary literature. A sequence of eight helpful maps precedes the text.

The author asks whether the history of Napoleon was the history of Europe and hastens to answer, and correctly so, in the negative. He insists that, while Napoleon was a prime mover in events, he did not operate in a vacuum; the other European powers had strategic and diplomatic interests and goals that predated Napoleon, and they continued to pursue them even when they felt threatened by Paris. Hence, Esdaile aims at providing a broad synthesis of the international relations of the period that transcends Napoleon’s biography, his policies and campaigns. He writes a history of the Napoleonic wars which reflects their pan-European dimension and is not merely Franco-centric. In addition to discussing common Napoleonic topics such as the Third Coalition, the Peninsular War, and the Russian campaign, the book presents substantial information and analysis about a broad range of regions and countries that do not receive as much attention in other Napoleonic studies. They include, for example, the Balkans, Serbia, Wallachia and Moldavia, and Scandinavia. The Ottoman Empire, including its relations with Russia and France, constitutes another important topic. Esdaile extensively examines the relations between European powers and non-European states including the United States, India, Persia and colonial Latin America. The book also contains much material about various European armies, their size, conscription, morale and casualties. To substantiate his presentation, the author provides numerous interesting and lengthy citations from diverse printed sources not found in other studies.

The author deserves much praise for ‘filling in the gaps’ on those and other topics. Yet, as he himself acknowledges, at times he devotes more space to them than to important Napoleonic subjects, thereby creating ‘curious’ results. While the reader learns, for example, that the French occupied Ragusa on 26 May 1806 and the British conquered Buenos Aires on 25 June 1806, no date is mentioned for Trafalgar or the signature of the Treaty of Tilsit. Despite the importance of the Balkans in the study, the reader gets very little information on the Illyrian Provinces and the reasons for the establishment of that territory. Most importantly, however, the Continental Blockade does not receive the space and elaboration it deserves. After all, the Continental Blockade was by far the most significant Napoleonic policy after 1806 and most of France’s important international policies aimed at tightening it and eliminating any obstacle to its successful implementation. The author introduces the Continental Blockade in
merely one page (276–77) and while he mentions it quite a few times, most references are short and do not stress and convey its crucial impact on the international arena.

One of the book’s objectives is to undermine the myth of Napoleon as a promoter of liberty and progress. Napoleon’s goal was to subjugate completely the other powers, Esdaile insists, leaving them no choice except to fight. For example, prior to the Third Coalition, Napoleonic aggression was, sooner or later, bound to antagonize the European powers. The author attributes this, rather excessively, to Napoleon’s personality: the French ruler was ‘uncomfortable with a life of peace’ or ‘triumph in the field filled a void in his personal life’. Esdaile states that, ‘the Napoleonic imperium showed itself to be bent on nothing more than attempts to produce more men and money’. Of course, Esdaile is not the first historian to emphasize this point. Obviously, Napoleonic aggression and exploitation played a very important role in stimulating alliances, geo-political changes, and wars. Yet a complete evaluation of Napoleon’s rule and its significance needs to go beyond his efforts to raise money and conscript soldiers in occupied Europe. Indeed, to make a complete assessment and understand Napoleon’s legacy, one must extensively discuss not only his foreign policy but his entire reform programmes and their consequences in France and throughout his Empire. Finally, given the considerable amount of data included in every chapter, it would have been helpful if the chapters had been divided into sub-chapters.

These comments do not diminish, however, the value of Esdaile’s work. The book contains a wealth of information and citations. It makes an important contribution to the literature on Napoleon and on international relations in the early nineteenth century. It should be read and consulted by all students of the Napoleonic epoch.

ALEXANDER GRAB, University of Maine


Cissie Fairchilds offers a comprehensive synthesis of the main categories associated with gender history in early modern Europe. In particular, she draws attention to the uneasy relationship between patriarchal theory and the real lived experience of women who negotiated and subverted masculine worlds during their everyday social interactions. Fairchilds has not intended this book to be a work of original research, but a textbook to present and reflect upon the major themes of gender history over the last few decades. As such, it is written in an engaging and accessible style, with clearly defined sections enabling the reader to understand the aims and intent of each part, as well as leaving him or her with a sound general introduction to gender history.

The introduction and first part succinctly bring the reader up to date with the historiographical background, explaining the timeframe and geographical scope of the text, alongside an explanation of patriarchal theory. This section also sets down the ideal values of gender which early modern contemporaries were born into and grew up understanding, explaining how these ideas came about and then persisted through time. It also explains the ongoing gender debate which punctuated the literary and philosophical discussions of contemporaries, exploring key primary texts and contributors to suggest that this period did much both to challenge and to consolidate medieval ideas about the role of women. The second part is divided into the
categories according to which – Fairchilds suggests – contemporaries defined women: as children, wives, mothers and widows. The author comments on geographical differences where appropriate, exploring attitudes towards women who had transgressed these ideal states of womanhood. The third part considers rural and urban working patterns and, more significantly, highlights the difference that status made to working opportunities and expectations for women. This section also considers female cultural worlds, and those women who choose music, art, theatre or science as their path in life, highlighting the problems facing women competing in a man’s world. The fourth part focuses on religion, explaining the paradox that women were regarded as men’s spiritual equals, yet denied any formal role within the church, leading some women to manipulate this ambivalence to their own ends in an effort to lay claim to their own spiritual authority. This section is particularly interesting, as it brings together the experiences of women in both the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, considering how women’s religious experience was dependent on their spiritual affiliations. This part concludes by examining popular belief and witchcraft and the myth of a gender bias against women in witchcraft prosecutions country by country. The final part considers whether women were able to play a role in the formal state apparatus, drawing attention to how class shaped female lives in this respect. Fairchilds cites examples of unique and individual women as rulers, regents, consorts and mistresses, across the different countries of Europe. This section also takes into account the crucial, yet often neglected study of women who played active roles in establishing new world colonies and empires abroad.

Overall, this book is ambitious in its scope, yet manages to explain in plain and simple terms a vast and often contentious topic in short, clearly defined segments, using a highly readable prose. Although not proposing anything new and often covering predictable and well-travelled ground, it retains some freshness by the inclusion of topics newer to the study of gender, which are perhaps not included in other well-known studies. In particular, it is worth mentioning the consideration of new worlds, informal participation in the political sphere below the level of elites, and the everyday negotiation of patriarchal ideals by ordinary women. The end result is a well-rounded read, which I would recommend without hesitation to any undergraduate student, or anyone looking for an accessible overview of women’s place in early modern Europe.

Fiona Williamson, University of East Anglia

Iain Fenlon, The Ceremonial City: History, Memory and Myth in Renaissance Venice, Yale University Press: New Haven, 2007; xvi + 448 pp., 162 illus.; 9780300119374, £35.00 (hbk)

This is an extremely wide-ranging and beautifully illustrated discussion of Venetian cultural history from the point of view of civic ritual, with particular attention to the latter’s musical (and more generally ‘aural’) aspects. The book’s structure is both ambitious and sophisticated, moving between longue durée and événementiel approaches to show how, inscribed into ritual, single events fashioned the identity and long-standing myth of Venice. The first part is essentially a survey of Venice’s traditional rituals and their genesis, stretching back to the early middle ages. At the heart of Venice’s political and ecclesiastical identity was its special relationship with the cathedral of St Mark and its role as new Jerusalem, Constantinople, Rome. Fenlon commands a range of disciplines, to do with ritual, visual art, historiography.
architecture, as well as music. He situates these themes firmly in their political context, and shows the connections between different arts and genres (for example, comparing Adrian Willaert’s musical classicizing with the same tendency in Jacopo Sansovino’s architecture).

The second part fills the stage with actors and events to do with the celebration, or mourning, of four momentous events: the constitution of the Holy League and the victory at Lepanto in 1571, the visit of Henri III of France in 1574, and the plague of 1575-6. Altogether, this must have seemed a time of divine reckoning to contemporaries (229). Other moments have been hailed as watersheds in Venetian history — particularly the defeats at the hands of the League of Cambrai in 1509, which attract little attention here. Nonetheless, Fenlon’s analysis is original in tracing the impact of events through the arrival of news, as well as their first repercussions. The final part then elaborates on how Venetians memorialized these events to inscribe them into the well-known myth of the Republic through printed accounts, changes to ceremonial and buildings, and literary and artistic exaltation of single individuals. Fenlon’s discussion of the printing press allows him to assess the popularization of the ritual message, whose direct audience was necessarily limited. Although Fenlon is perhaps too quick to identify texts with readers’ opinions, his discussion is extremely careful, including data on book prices and salaries, even if he never gives the rate of conversion (1 lira = 20 soldi).

This is one of the most vivid depictions of civic ritual in Venice or elsewhere, strong on both organization and lived experience. Having read this book, it will be impossible to ignore the music which permeated both open and enclosed spaces in the city, from piazza to church naves: bells, drums and trumpets, organs, lutes, fifes, portable clavichords, choirs. There is no doubt that this perspective greatly enriches our understanding of the experience of those who took part in ritual. All the same, it is a pity that Fenlon does not really tell us whether, and how, this attention to music should change the way we interpret those rituals. Indeed, he is rather evasive on the subject of previous interpretations (and for Venice they have been many, and influential, including Ernst Gombrich, Carlo Dionisotti, Edward Muir, Gaetano Cozzi, Patricia Fortini Brown, Elisabeth Crouzet-Pavan and others, not least Fenlon himself, in earlier works). Music remains a backdrop, although certainly a fascinating one. Fenlon’s own interpretation is that ritual served to prop up the unity of the state and of society. He is aware of the tensions underlying this façade, but is otherwise too ready to shift from façade to substance, to accept cultural homogeneity. Only at one point does he attribute the latter to the effect of censorship on historical evidence (259). To Fenlon, everybody interpreted events in a strongly religious framework, transformed heroes into Christian martyrs, appealed to patron saints through their relics, and looked to Christ himself as a leader to victory. In this view, Venice’s civic republicanism and the Counter-Reformation went hand in hand. While it is true that past historians took the opposition between Venice and Rome too far, Fenlon’s harmonious perspective does not do justice to a city which was famed for its relative tolerance of heretics and non-Christians. Nor does it explain the distance which many contemporaries perceived — justly or wrongly — between Venice’s traditional spiritual tradition and the ethos of the Tridentine Church (indeed, relics and saints would have had very different meanings in the two frameworks).

As is to be expected in a book largely concerned with liturgy, incense and sacred music dominate the picture. But how far did they really permeate the city? Fenlon quotes the physician Girolamo Donzellini’s incitation to prayer during the plague as typical of Counter-Reformation attitudes. Yet, only a couple of years earlier, Donzellini was accused of heresy.
before the Holy Office. Likewise, he refers to Tommaso Contarini’s devotion at the same juncture as also typical. But is this the same Contarini who, like many other patricians, was busy reading, annotating, and summarizing Machiavelli? Finally, in describing the memory of Lepanto, Fenlon’s model is one of all-out opposition against the Infidel. His references include Braudel and K. M. Setton, but more recent scholars, from Lucette Valensi to Eric Dursteler and Stefano Carboni, have emphasized connections and creative exchanges between East and West. If many hailed the victory against the Turks, what about those who lived off the trade with Istanbul? Was the populace of Venice really united in favour of war? Fenlon does not ask such questions, but there is no doubt that future historians trying to answer them will have to consult his impressive book.

Filippo De Vivo, Birkbeck, University of London

Danielle Fosler-Lussier, Music Divided: Bartók’s Legacy in Cold War Culture, University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, 2007; xx + 229 pp., 7 illus., 12 musical examples; 9780520249653. $55.99 (hbk)

In May 1938, Béla Bartók wrote from exile in New York to the German Foreign Office to complain that he had not been featured in the now infamous exhibition on ‘Degenerate Music’ recently held in Düsseldorf. One cannot help wondering how Bartók, who died in 1945, would have reacted to the ways in which his legacy was subsequently interpreted in his home country of Hungary, and elsewhere in Europe and America in the Cold War. Held up at one moment as a great national composer who had used folk idioms as the original inspiration for music which was close to the people, and at another as one corrupted by ‘the decadence and formalism of bourgeois music’ (24), Bartók occupied a unique place in the cultural confrontation ignited by the Soviet Communist Party’s resolution on music in February 1948. As one of few twentieth-century modernists with a wider public popularity, Bartók was a potentially valuable asset to East and West in the Cold War. At the same time, such an appropriation posed problems for both sides, as extremists staked out equally dogmatic theoretical positions in public debates about the future of music.

Awareness of these paradoxes and of subtle variations in national cultural contexts lies at the heart of this book. Danielle Fosler-Lussier focuses on the reception of Bartók’s music in Hungary after 1945, noting how he was initially seen as a model for artists seeking a ‘third road’, an independent path to socialism. She then analyses the torturous debates amongst Hungarian composers following the imposition of Zhdanovism in 1948, and the resulting partial censorship of Bartók’s music on radio and in the concert hall. Within months, Hungarian officials were forced into a partial rehabilitation of a ‘mythical socialist Bartók’ in response to claims by the Voice of America radio station that, under Soviet pressure, ‘Hungarian puppets’ were supervising a ‘progressive renunciation’ of their own culture (52). An ‘Epilogue East’ explores how, by 1955, communist intellectuals in Hungary were representing Bartók as a loyal socialist who nonetheless symbolized rebellion against Soviet impositions. Fosler-Lussier concludes that ‘Eastern Europeans were coming to ask the same questions about music’s ability to represent the truth of their situation as their Western counterparts’ (156).

Alongside this analysis are several case studies of the reception of Bartók’s music in the West. The first examines discussions amongst avant-gardistes in France and in West
Germany – Leibowitz, Adorno, Stuckenschmidt, Scherchen and Stockhausen. A consensus emerged amongst these important figures that Bartók was compromised both politically, by his populist use of folk idioms, and stylistically, by his abiding reliance on elements of tonality. For these men, and their students, Bartók had become a ‘composer of the past’. For others less concerned with arcane compositional issues, Bartók potentially straddled the typically separate worlds of popular and serious music. One of the book’s best chapters examines Bartók’s central place in an ‘emerging middlebrow aesthetic in which the modernism of the first half of the century was being domesticated’ (91). This was not a coincidental or spontaneous development, but one shaped by ideological concerns, and by the patronage of organizations like the Congress for Cultural Freedom. An ‘Epilogue West’ explores one attempted resolution of the Cold War ‘dynamic of negation’, the postmodernism of George Rochberg, and in particular, the references to Bartók in his Third String Quartet, first performed in 1972. Rather as some Hungarians in 1955 had sought to use Bartók to challenge Soviet intolerance, Rochberg deliberately violated the taboos of post-war modernism, seeking to ‘reunite the expressive spheres separated by the East–West divide’ (161).

There are problems with the methodology adopted here. There are substantial passages of musicological analysis which will be inaccessible to non-specialists. More significantly, the book appears as a series of case studies rather than as a coherent overview. While there is a clear logic behind the selection of the case studies, there are also imbalances. An excellent counterpoint is provided to the discussion of the Zhdanovshchina in Hungary in the late 1940s by the exploration of contemporaneous debates in Paris and in Darmstadt. Yet there is less balance between the ‘Epilogue East’, chronologically located just before the Hungarian revolution in 1956, and the ‘Epilogue West’, situated in the late 1960s and early 1970s. I missed a parallel discussion of Bartók’s fate in Hungary after 1956.

These difficulties are more than outweighed by the book’s strengths. Although the focus is on Bartók, Fosler-Lussier presents here a nuanced analysis of broader debates about musical modernism, and demonstrates with great clarity relationships between aesthetic questions and broader political and social issues. Her command of several languages and her knowledge of a huge range of sources, musical and written, published and unpublished, allow her to make genuine comparisons across not just the East–West divide, but between different cultures attempting to negotiate paths between the burdens of their own histories and the imperatives of the present. In so doing, she reveals deeper similarities in the behaviour of musicians and listeners apparently separated by the Cold War divide.

Toby Thacker, Cardiff University


The title of the new series from Greenwood, ‘Daily Life Through History’, of which these two edited collections are a part, sounds somewhat antiquarian, a reminder perhaps of the kind of children’s history books available from public libraries in the 1950s. Happily, however, this is far from the case, for these volumes are thoroughly modern academic texts with contributions
by leading scholars of the impact of war upon states, institutions, societies and individuals.

On the one hand, these collections represent the ‘new’ military history, a term itself now of declining utility after 30 years or more. Indeed, in the volume on the twentieth century, Frank Tallett refers to what he perceives as a more recent trend towards ‘newest’ military history. By this he appears to mean the way in which a more sophisticated treatment of operational history has been re-integrated into the study of war in recent years, though it might be argued that the cultural agenda has had the greatest impact in terms of such areas as identity and memory. The cultural impact of war, indeed, is everywhere evident in these two volumes. On the other hand, these volumes are also a useful contribution to the ongoing debate on the applicability of the concept of ‘total’ war, which some historians have been pushing steadily back from the twentieth century into earlier periods. Nicholas Atkin, in his introduction to the twentieth-century volume, as well as most of his contributors, address ‘total’ war directly. By contrast, in their introduction, Linda and Marsha Frey do not raise the issue, although they stress that war was not limited between 1648 and 1789. A number of their contributors most certainly do engage directly with the debate on totality, such as Michael Rowe and Michael Broers, who discuss the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars respectively. The Freys’ introduction, however, is still admirably wide-ranging and they point to the considerable contrast between the experiences in Western and Eastern Europe, where the divide between Christianity and the Ottomans heightened the violence.

The chronological approach of each volume, dealing with particular conflicts or periods in turn, confers an advantage over many other essay collections in terms of unity. Each contributor, however, is able to develop their individual emphasis, for, as Atkin notes in his own essay on the Second World War, experiences of war and conflict are both unique and universal. Rowe, for example, chooses the Vendée as a case study, though he notes that the armies of the old regime were just as destructive of civilian life as French revolutionary armies. Rowe, in fact, does not see the French Revolutionary Wars as being quite as significant as often portrayed and as an evolution of, rather than a departure from, existing warfare. The Freys, too, suggest that the French decree in 1792 making the occupied pay the costs of war was merely rendering practice into law. Broers, too, sees the Napoleonic Wars as falling short of totality, albeit largely through the lack of the technology available to later generations. Nonetheless, he still points to the considerable impact of 20 years of almost continuous conflict and sees conscription as especially significant in fashioning the experience of Napoleonic Europe.

Ideology tends to predominate as a determinant in the twentieth-century volume, but destruction, occupation, displacement, atrocity and disease were just as prevalent prior to the twentieth century, not least in the Thirty Years War, well covered by Tryntje Helfferich and Paul Sonnino. The sack of Magdeburg in 1631 remains a notorious example of the excesses of the period and they point out that, while Gustavus Adolphus was generally a moderating influence, after his death the Swedes, too, became ‘more German’ and, therefore, ‘more violent’. Interestingly, the Freys come surprisingly close to absolving the Germans from responsibility for their response to the francs-tireurs encountered in France in 1870–71. Equally, Michael Neiberg, in his essay on Europe between 1815 and 1900, suggests that German retaliation was intended to bring an end to hostilities rather than to enact genocide. Neither essay takes account, therefore, of Isobel Hull’s Absolute Destruction (New York 2005), which suggested a deeper cultural malaise in Imperial Germany. Neiberg, however, is well aware of the work on German and other colonial powers’ campaigns, citing the volume

There is a particularly interesting contribution by Dennis Showalter on Europe between 1648 and 1789. Showalter sees his period as that in which a separation of the soldier and the civilian occurred, though, as he puts it, armies and the parent societies from which they were recruited were not separate compartments. In discussing a period of war of only limited duration in Europe, or more distant colonial war, Neiberg’s emphasis is also very much upon its stylized and idealized impact upon European culture. Tallett, however, is less successful in applying a cultural perspective to the impact of the Cold War since there was clearly no war as such: this may well be why he devotes such attention in the early part of his essay to a more general discussion of the nature of military history. Curiously, François Cochet suggests that the wounded were the ‘only part of the real war that the home front ever saw’ between 1914 and 1918, before launching into a catalogue of the aerial and land bombardment suffered by many civilians during the Great War, as well as initial atrocities in Belgium and northern France in 1914. Not perhaps surprisingly, Cochet tends to cite French examples most, but there was far less censorship in the British provincial press than in the national press, and work by historians such as Eric Schneider suggests that British civilians at least were not shielded as much as usually suggested from aspects of life at the front by some conspiracy of silence. It should also be remembered, perhaps, that merchant seamen in both world wars were civilians. To be fair to Cochet, however, it is no easy task to condense the civilian experience of the Great War into 25 pages.

As Michael Richards notes in his interesting essay on the Spanish Civil War, ‘total’ war was originally applied to inter-state conflict rather than intra-state conflict. As he shows, it is equally applicable to civil war where there can be no rigid demarcation between front and home front and, of course, historians have long been accustomed to view the American Civil War in such terms. Atkin’s introduction usefully reminds us of the political sensitivities and potentially tainted sources involved in such conflicts. Indeed, while study of the Russian Civil War, on which Sam Johnson contributes an accomplished essay, has benefited from the opening of the Soviet archives, Maja Povrzanović Frykman’s piece on the conflict in the former Yugoslavia perforce draws upon oral evidence. Indeed, Frykman is an ethnologist rather than an historian.

In addition to the footnotes, both volumes are supported by full bibliographies and chronologies, the latter being more detailed in the case of the twentieth-century volume. Rather oddly, the twentieth century volume also contains an explanatory glossary of terms such as ‘Blitz’, ‘Falange’, ‘Kadets’, Romanovs’ and ‘Verdun’. This perhaps suggests that the intended readership is an undergraduate one, though this is not actually clear from the general series. On balance, they will be of great use to undergraduates, but there is enough for the specialist as well.

Mia Fuller. Moderns Abroad: Architecture, Cities and Italian Imperialism. Routledge: London. 2006; 288 pp., 90 illus.: 9780415194631. £64.99 (hbk)

In the first part of Moderns Abroad. Fuller addresses the cultural context in which the town planning of Italian imperialism took place. The first chapter, ‘Histories’, gives a lucid account
of the stages through which expansionism proceeded: the endeavour to establish Eritrea as a settlement colony in the late nineteenth century; the trauma of Italy’s defeat at Adwa; the conquest of Tripoli; the brutal campaign to pacify Cyrenaica; the war on Ethiopia, and the final stages of Italian colonial rule. It is a history that makes clear the cost in human lives which the drive to extend Italy’s borders involved and seeks to ascertain the set of shared premises making each stage of imperial development seem — at the time — either necessary or, at the very least, reasonable. The second chapter explores in detail the symbolic and rhetorical constructions of Italy’s colonies and their populations, examining how myths and legends concerning national identity fed into the colonial imagination and charting how differing racial, religious or gendered identities were mapped onto the inhabitants of the actual or potential sites of Italian expansion. It points, therefore, to the different status that Italy’s subject populations assumed within official discourse as well as to the disparities between public policy and private behaviour which were so conspicuously to mark Italian colonial rule.

The book as a whole is concerned with the way in which attitudes towards colonial architecture evolved both in tandem and sometimes in tension with official policy, and the third chapter examines the extent to which building in the colonies was, before Fascism, largely dictated by pragmatic and utilitarian concerns. What emerges strongly from Fuller’s analysis is the rapidity of the development, in the late 1920s, of an understanding of architecture as a means of expressing notions of modernity and national identity as well as a vehicle for asserting an idea of Italian domination. Chapter 4 covers in detail the Italian architectural profession, showing how it was energized by the interest of the state. However, Fuller also points to a complex relationship between government and groups of architects who pursued different ideas concerning modernity’s link with Italian history and tradition, with the international context, or with the architecture of the Mediterranean. Particularly interesting in Chapter 5 is the development of a modern form of colonial architecture between the 1920s and the 1940s. Leading figures within the profession, such as Florestano di Fausto, were prepared to adopt a syncretic style, drawing, in Libya, on Arabic styles of design, and then defended such a style by claiming that it reflected the influence of ancient Rome. But what is also significant, as Fuller rightly insists, is the transcultural dimension of the process: the importation of colonial styles to the metropole meant that the way in which architects ‘represented themselves to the colonized came to be the most appropriate vehicle for representing the colonized’ to Italians (111).

The vivacity and sophistication of debate on appropriate forms of architectural design in the colonies is something that comes across very strongly in the first half of Moderns Abroad, but Fuller is quite clear that the (more or less) successful conclusion of the invasion of Ethiopia marked an important turning point. In Chapter 6, she charts how — between 1936 and 1937 — architects shifted their attention to city planning in the new Empire and she traces the development of a ‘segregationalist mentality’ as it took shape in the ordering of the living spaces of both colonizers and colonized. The latter part of the book offers three cases studies where such practices were followed: in the ‘Italian colonial city’ of Tripoli; in the planned agricultural settlements in Libya and in the Empire as a whole; and in the ‘Italian Imperial city’ of Addis Ababa. Tripoli is defined as a ‘colonial’ city because the Italians adapted their presence to the original configuration of the city and a picture emerges of a rapidly growing urban space where intense architectural activity thrived on the flexibility and pragmatism that was a defining feature of Italo Balbo’s governorship of the colony (from 1934). The effect of
Balbo’s drive to encourage new settlements for Italian farmers in the coastal areas of Libya is also documented with particular care as is the propagandistic purpose that these settlements served both for metropolitan and foreign audiences. Addis Ababa, by contrast, represented an ‘imperial’ model of development in so far as it was for Italians a blank canvas on which they felt they could simply impose their own vision of how things should be. The writing on what was to be the capital of Italian East Africa is especially powerful with regard to the extent of the cultural racism of Italian rule and the way in which it fed into projects of segregation, displacement and mass surveillance.

Though space may have been made for greater reference to the building undertaken in Asmara during the period of the Italian occupation of Eritrea, Moderns Abroad is a methodologically complex, richly illustrated and extremely well researched study. The book is tightly and intelligently organized so that its findings are easily accessible both for the specialist and the non-specialist reader. It provides a detailed history of the evolution of an important element of architectural history under Fascism and it shows throughout how adherence to the regime was always the result of shifting personal and professional motives. The book enhances our understanding of the edifice of Italian imperialism and constitutes a significant addition to our knowledge of the theories and concepts on which colonialism ultimately depended.

Charles Burdett, University of Bristol


Robert Gellately has written an impressive and immensely detailed account of the human slaughter brought about by the two most notorious dictatorships of the modern age. In 600 pages of text (not counting endnotes) the author, a leading specialist in the history of Nazi Germany, examines Soviet and Nazi crimes from the Russian revolution to the fall of the Third Reich. His book is based on a vast array of printed primary sources, archival documents, and a judicious selection of the pertinent secondary literature, including the latest research on both regimes. Gellately uses numerous Russian language sources and is intimately familiar with the German research on the Soviet Union; his account of Lenin’s and Stalin’s policies is as authoritative as that of Hitler’s.

In contrast to Alan Bullock’s and Richard Overy’s comparative studies of Hitler and Stalin, Gellately includes Lenin and begins in chronological order with the October revolution. In Gellately’s interpretation, Lenin is the force behind the intolerant tone of the regime, the establishment of the one-party state, the terror, the camps, and the new secret police: he is the most extreme of the radicals, who pressed for terror more than anyone else. Even the inner circle of Bolsheviks shuddered at his ferocity and the executions he ordered without compunction. Gellately emphasizes that ‘Lenin had remarkably little empathy for the hopes and aspirations of the common people’ (8), and ‘was actually merciless and cruel’ (9) – judgments borne out by his subsequent analysis. While complaining about Stalin’s roughness and bad manners, Lenin said nothing about removing him from the most important party committees, and there is no evidence to suggest that he was preparing the ground for another successor. Gellately argues that, far from perverting Lenin’s legacy, as is often suggested, Stalin was Lenin’s logical heir and initiated little that Lenin had not already introduced. In
their experiments at ‘utopian social engineering’ (in Karl Popper’s phrase). Lenin’s followers were elitist to the core and took it upon themselves to create a new world order from top to bottom. Gellately stresses that it would be wrong to think that, if Lenin had managed to get rid of Stalin, all the abuses associated with subsequent Soviet history might have been avoided. Molotov, who closely worked with both, later remembered how Lenin reproached Stalin for his softness, and when asked whom he considered more severe, the answer came without hesitation: ‘Lenin, of course’ (153).

In his analysis of Nazi policies, Gellately focuses on the connection between Hitler’s anti-Semitic policies and his feverish anti-Bolshevism, arguing that Hitler’s anti-Semitism was rooted in his radical, racially-tinged German nationalism and that his war against communism was an extension of his war against the Jews. Millions were incarcerated in camps under both regimes, tortured, and often worked to death. Ethnic cleansing and ‘population transfers’ were the order of the day, and millions of Jewish men, women and children perished in the industrial killing perfected by the Nazis. In contrast to the Nazi utopia, which was exclusivist and geared merely towards Germans and some North Europeans, the message of communism was universal, with its claim of bringing the ‘Soviet paradise’ to all mankind. This universality explains why the mass murders committed in its name were never condemned quite as sharply.

Gellately examines every aspect of the crimes of both regimes. While he emphasizes that Nazi mass murders, the Holocaust and Hitler’s war of extermination in the East, are without parallel, he discusses the misdeeds of the Soviet regime in their whole magnitude: the stamping out of civil liberties and the creation of the Cheka following the October revolution; the brutal repression of Bolshevism’s enemies, the terror of the civil war, the forced collectivization, the elimination of the kulaks as a class, and the establishment of slave labour camps in the late 1920s; the party purges, show trials, operations against national minorities, and the concomitant growth of the GULAG in the 1930s; Soviet crimes in eastern Poland and the Baltic states, and ethnic cleansing in the Soviet Union during World War II. Gellately shows that the Cheka’s concept of ‘class origins’ was virtually comparable to that of ‘racial origins’ (71) and that during their brief occupation of eastern Poland before the Holocaust, the Soviets ‘killed or drove to their deaths three to four times as many people as the Nazis from a population half the size of that under German jurisdiction’ (364).

One of Gellately’s greatest achievements is relating the intricate details of his multi-faceted story in well-written, straightforward prose. The ease and grace with which Gellately unfolds this history of the catastrophic decades between 1917 and 1945 make his book eminently readable, despite its length. The author is to be commended for accomplishing a rare feat: a book on a crucial period in recent history which will be welcomed by the general public, students and professional historians alike.

HELMANN BECK, University of Miami

Robert Gerwarth, ed., Twisted Paths: Europe 1914–1945, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2007; 425 pp., 31 illus., 5 maps. 9780199281855. £71.00 (hbk); 9780199545308. £17.99 (pbk)

Textbook histories of Europe between 1914 and 1945 tend to be similar in two basic respects. First, and not unlike most general histories of modern Europe, they focus almost exclusively
on the so-called ‘great powers’. Second, they paint their narratives in sombre shades. In fact, the story tends towards unrelieved darkness – from the tragic losses of the Great War, through the failed peace, the economic collapse and the rise of brutal totalitarian regimes in the 1930s, to another, even more deadly war, and finally to the horrors of the death camps.

Robert Gerwarth, editor of this collection of essays, takes up the challenge of revising this textbook version on both counts: he promises not only to widen the focus, so as to include states and regions usually neglected, but to restore some balance by drawing attention to some unexplored patches of light amidst the darkness.

The book’s structure – a series of essays focusing on individual states and regions rather than a Europe-wide narrative of events – facilitates Gerwarth’s first goal. In addition to including essays on the major powers, he gives equal space to essays on states often marginalized in traditional textbooks, grouping them together by region. Thus, there are chapters on Scandinavia, the ‘two Irelands’, Belgium and the Netherlands, Iberia, the ‘successor’ states to the Habsburg Monarchy, and finally the Baltic and the Balkan states. A few of these groupings might, at first glance, appear problematic. Should Finland, for example, be considered with the Baltic states (on the grounds that Finns are ethnically close to Estonians) or with the Scandinavian states (on the grounds that Finland’s political and social evolution was closer to Sweden’s)? The editorial decision to place Finland in a chapter on the Baltic states does not prevent the chapter’s author, Kristina Spohr Readman, from discussing Finnish parallels with Scandinavian developments. Nor is the fact that Yugoslavia makes two appearances, first as a ‘successor state’ and then as a Balkan state, problematic; given the complexities of the Yugoslav situation, double coverage seems more than justified. Moreover, and more importantly, the real value of these chapters lies in the light they throw on regions of Europe either short-changed or ignored altogether in most general histories. Not only is the reader treated to exotic bits of information (we learn, for example, that King Zog of Albania had so many potential enemies that he would only eat food cooked and served by his mother), but expert knowledge of these neglected regions is presented in a comparative and easily accessible format.

The second of Gerwarth’s goals – to restore some ‘light’ to a narrative normally painted in unremittingly dark shades – is a much greater challenge. To be sure, for certain regions the task is easier. In the Scandinavian states, for example, not only was the economic crisis of the interwar years surmounted (Sweden’s industrial output grew by an impressive 67 per cent between 1932 and 1937), but compromises forestalled political deadlock and, as result, parliamentary democracy emerged strengthened. Likewise, in Belgium and the Netherlands, despite challenges from fascist parties, parliamentary democracy weathered the storm of the 1930s. Not only did Britain, as Ross McKibbin argues, remain largely immune to extremist politics and united to fight the Nazi war machine, but it began, in the midst of the war, the work of reforming its education and laying the foundations for the creation of the post-war welfare state. Given the humiliating defeat of 1940, the declinist narrative has had a stronger hold in French history. However, borrowing from recent work on the period, Joan Tumblety argues convincingly that the defeat was essentially a military debacle and should not be seen as an indictment of French social and political institutions.

Finding evidence of ‘light’ between 1914 and 1945, in the rest of Europe, is a more difficult undertaking. To the credit of Gerwarth and the authors he assembles, there is no attempt to conceal the grimness of the period for most of continental Europe – from the ravages of one
war, through the sad tale of failed democracies and the rise of dictatorial regimes, to another, yet more brutal war. Yet, if these events are rightly the main focus, they are not the only focus. We are reminded, for example, of the vibrant cultural experimentation in the 1920s in both Russia and Germany, the efforts at land re-distribution in eastern Europe, the constitutional experiments and pioneering welfare measures implemented across the face of Europe, and even the forgotten successes of the League of Nations (the volume includes a separate chapter on that organization). All of this, again, is not meant to suggest an artificial balance between the dark and the light, only to avoid assuming that the history of any period should be written as though there were a single, invariant narrative theme.

**Paul Mazgaj. University of North Carolina at Greensboro**


Only in retrospect do the French Wars of Religion even begin to cohere and follow their own perverse logic of Valois failings overcome by Bourbon *étatisme*. Yet, if ever accident and ill-fated choice conspired to redirect the fate of a country, it was during the crisis that engulfed France in the latter half of the sixteenth century. This new book by Mark Greengrass explores the compelling possibilities and missed opportunities for France from the Estates-General of Blois in 1576 to the Assembly of Notables held at Saint-Germain-en-Laye in 1583–84. This periodization, however odd at first, gradually makes sense as Greengrass traces the tortuous negotiations and conflicts over setting and agreeing upon the terms of ‘peace and reform’. Despite their many differences, all the various factions acknowledged these goals as necessary, if elusive.

Deeply researched and elegantly written, *Governing Passions* frames these debates and conflicts as essentially an ideological struggle between competing visions over what constituted a just and enduring ‘peace and reform’ for the kingdom. By mining archival and printed primary sources, Greengrass succeeds in capturing the nuances of language and inflection among the notables, men and women alike, who so passionately argued and adroitly manoeuvred to advance their agendas. The analysis revolves around the succession of meetings and negotiations that took place over this decade, confirming in minute, fascinating detail the self-destruction of the Renaissance monarchy described by J. Russell Major a generation ago. Contemporaries saw the troubles afflicting France in moral, religious and even physiological terms, all of which became encapsulated in the rhetoric of taming unbridled human passions. For this, Greengrass draws on the earlier work of Denis Crouzet, who has presented the Wars of Religion as essentially a clash between utopian and eschatological worldviews only resolved later with the triumph of ‘Reason’ under Henri IV. Where Crouzet sees a dialectical process at work, Greengrass stresses discontinuities and dynamic fluidity as French elites groped to translate high-minded words into effective action. He sets the analysis firmly in the particularity of time and place, emphasizing the regional nature of the struggle as it unfolded in the Loire, the Midi, and Paris. Ironies abound, as the seeming conclusion to one momentary crisis only set the stage for the next. Henri III, for example, cleverly hijacked the agenda of the Estates-General in Blois only to alienate the groups he had hoped to win over. Catherine
de Médici’s campaign of peace in 1578 and 1580 only inflamed tensions and led to war. Her attempt to build ties to her disaffected son-in-law, Henri de Navarre, through her daughter, Marguerite de Valois, only wrecked the marriage and kingdom further. Extremes of devotion — be it Catholic penitential movements or the rigours of Calvinist austerity — gave way to the sensual pleasures of court mignons or the cloying Neoplatonic platitudes of the king’s palace academy. It was a decade of profound, insoluble contradictions which took another decade of violence, political murder and foreign invasion to overcome, more by mutual exhaustion than any consensual conclusion to these differences.

The microscopic focus on this one decade in French history yields a number of intriguing insights. Greengrass contends that the ideology and rhetoric of reform among notables revealed their openness to rethinking how the kingdom and society functioned. It was both a constitutional and religious crisis that created the first of a series of ‘revolutionary’ moments — the Fronde being the next one, as Orest Ranum argued 15 years ago — when France stood on the edge of different pluralistic possibilities rather than the unitary promise of order eventually proffered by the Bourbons. Scholars are indebted to the author for reminding us of these unrealized other ends to a meta-narrative we all know only too well.

Michael Wolfe, St John’s University
guaranteed in the peace negotiated later that year, ending the Crimean War, in Ottoman diplomacy’s greatest achievement. Subsequently, the Empire lost the support of its traditional ally. Great Britain. British opinion, led by Gladstone, took an anti-Turkish turn, while the Suez Canal reduced the strategic importance of the Straits to the Admiralty. During both the Hamidian and Young Turk periods, Ottoman diplomacy avoided commitments, seeking survival by balancing the powers against each other, while avoiding confrontations. Abdülhamid II emphasized his role as Caliph of all the Muslims, both to strengthen his legitimacy internally and to increase his space for diplomatic manoeuvre by playing on European fears of Pan-Islamic sentiment. He also defended Ottoman territorial claims in the Arabian Peninsula against British encroachment. It was the Balkan Wars that convinced the Young Turk leadership of the necessity of a firm alliance with one of the powers. Thus, the alliance with Germany was the result of ‘Ottoman entreaties, not German designs’ (174).

The two constitutional eras (1876–78 and 1908–12) are discussed in detail in the dual context of authoritarian, bureaucratic centralization – as a reaction against it – and the diplomacy of the Eastern Question. Both the Young Ottomans and Young Turks found it necessary to adopt ‘Islamist’ rhetoric to win over conservative opinion, which suggests that these movements did not directly anticipate the post-war Republican regime.

Hanioglu’s deft treatment of politics contrasts with a limited and inadequate account of socio-economic developments, in light of the existing historiography, which he apparently did not consult extensively. There are only a few brief references to women and gender issues, and more could have been done to integrate that history into the socio-economic context. Most problematic of all is his discussion of what he calls the Ottoman ‘response to modernity’, which proceeds without a definition of modernity.

KENNETH M. CUNO, University of Illinois


Benjamin Harshav expands upon his previous research on the Jewish theatre, and provides us with this vivid documentary glimpse into the dynamics at play during the life of one of theatre’s most fascinating developments, the Moscow Yiddish Theatre, later known as the Moscow State Yiddish Theatre (GOSET). Although the majority of this book is documentary, Harshav’s opening offers more than a simple introduction. It provides a perceptive analysis of the theatre’s growth, principles, influences, struggles, and general impact. Indeed, the greatness of director A. Granovsky’s ‘polyphonic approach’, the ‘tragicomic sense of humanity and Jewish destiny’ of the lead actor, S. Mikhoels, and the iconography of ‘Chagall’s Box’ (so called because Chagall often enclosed the theatre in ‘total painting’) are shown to turn the artistic world upside down. Furthermore, Harshav taps into the grand narrative by showing the effects of Diaspora life alongside wider cultural trends. Thus, other themes include Max Reinhardt’s staging of mass performances, Meyerhold’s ‘Biomechanics’ (a system whereby actors were expected to be as agile as acrobats – inspired by the circus), and Chagall’s conflicts with fellow artists, such as the Suprematist, K. Malevich, who apparently usurped him as head of the People’s Art College in Vitebsk. These themes are assessed only in so far as they inform the reader’s understanding of the theatre movement itself, but it is a testimony
to the importance of the Revolution to the Yiddish theatre that this study cannot ignore the wider cultural energy of the period. As Harshav suggests, evidently inspired by the views of Abram Efros, the Yiddish theatre was not born of ‘organic development but emerged out of the blue’. Chagall’s painting, *Map of Introduction* (1920), is thus presented as the embodiment of the theatre’s attempts to design its own past, present and future – the Art of Three Times. Harshav argues that the secular Jewish culture, to which Chagall and the Yiddish theatre subscribed, had to borrow its past from religious tradition and its future from the Russian Revolution.

The documents themselves allow the reader to gain further insight into the internal and external dimensions of the Yiddish theatre. Their wealth and diversity constitute the larger part of the book and draw upon the reports, essays and memoirs of those active within the theatre body, as well as those reviewing or commenting upon its work. Of particular interest are Chagall’s sometimes mystic writings, which among other things, comment upon his relationship with Granovsky and Mikhoels. These documents form part of a section entitled ‘The Quarrel between Art and Theater’, which shows the tensions that arose within this creative organization. There is also a chapter dedicated to the theatre’s programmes, aims, and actions. Most impressive here is an article by Granovsky, which explains the theatre’s goals and objectives. In it, he repeatedly uses the phrase ‘we shall seek’, and even claims, in a manner that reminds one of the Capri School: ‘perhaps we will make gods for ourselves whom we will later topple from their thrones . . . ’. Further themes include Western reaction, the academic role of the theatre, and the theatre before and during the Revolution. This final section includes an article by Y. Lyubomirsky, which comments upon the sixteenth-century Italian theatre techniques adopted by Meyerhold, the Left Front movement, the innovative approach of Mayakovsky, and the stage designs of the Constructivists, before concluding that only ‘one theatre maintained the balance between revolutionary content and revolutionary form’ – ‘the State Yiddish Theatre’. The book is shrewdly rounded-off with two short plays – *Agents: A Joke in One Act* (1905) and *It’s a Lie! Dialogue in Galicia* (1906) – which typify the tragicomedy of the Yiddish theatre. These documents brilliantly capture the joy and energy of the movement.

Ultimately, we are presented with an excellent overview of the Moscow Yiddish Theatre and an intriguing picture of the various component parts that formed this institution. As the development of this movement is charted, the influence of Diaspora life and the Revolution are shown to be inexorably linked. This is a neatly balanced and thoroughly interesting work.

Andrew Willimott, *University of East Anglia*


Jeremy Hayhoe’s book begins with a simple question: is it true that seigneurial justice in France was decayed or dying during the eighteenth century, which has been known since de Tocqueville as the century of centralization? Hayhoe does not believe that the construction of a strong central state meant that royal courts had taken over this jurisdiction, given the small number of royal judges. So, if de Tocqueville had exaggerated the extent of the decline of
feudalism resulting from state centralization, seigneurial reaction could be a good explanation for peasant revolts in 1789. In order to answer these two questions, as to whether the seigneurial courts had declined, and if there was a seigneurial reaction or not, the author has chosen Northern Burgundy as a case-study. This part of Eastern France is well-known, thanks to studies by Pierre de Saint-Jacob and Jean Bart, as a region of active seigneurialism. From the abundant documentation on the seigneurial courts, the author chooses to examine two samples of court cases heard in 14 seigneurial courts over the course of two decades, the 1750s and the 1780s – a significant quantity of data. In addition to this, Hayhoe has collated data from various bailiages and from the Dijon Parliament. He has also examined a wide range of other sources, especially fiscal documents and nearly 300 parish cahiers de doléances, to set seigneurial justice in context. With this impressive documentation, the main goal is to understand not only judicial mechanisms but more particularly the role of the seigneurial court in village life.

The book is divided into two parts. The first deals with the role of seigneurial justice and the second with its reform, but the two are perfectly intertwined and give the feeling of a continuum. Hayhoe demonstrates that local courts were much more popular than most historians and many eighteenth-century commentators realized. The main reason is that seigneurial courts from the 1750s to 1780s remained the courts to which country-dwellers would resort most often. Moreover, contrary to the black legend about these courts, their officers were competent, most of them being university graduates. Hayhoe sheds new light on the balance between royal and seigneurial courts. In spite of the state building process, the seigneurial courts had not been replaced, especially for criminal cases. On the contrary, the two jurisdictions worked together. Another important point of the black legend was the courts’ cost. The author shows that the average cost of a criminal case was high, but cheaper than other regions. Above all, Provincial Estates and Parliament brought about important reforms in 1773 concerning fiscal and agricultural matters, inaugurating simplified procedures within the annual assizes. The result was a profound change in the nature of seigneurial justice which became cheaper, more efficient and closer to the village.

Nevertheless, seigneurial justice was not flawless. The main problem, strongly underlined by Hayhoe, was that officers were the employees of lords. Seigneurial justice was private property and remained so until the Revolution, despite the criticisms of the institution made by Enlightenment figures, which Hayhoe summarizes very well. Consequently, judicial decisions could be used to enforce seigneurial dues. Incidentally, the number of peasants sued by their lords tripled between the 1750–59 and 1780–89 periods, although the population had grown by only about 16 per cent. Hayhoe does not regard this as a seigneurial reaction involving the imposition of new dues, but rather as an attempt to squeeze every possible penny from their land. Nevertheless, the traditional view that seigneurial courts served the need of lords is clearly and vigorously refuted. The author describes how seigneurial courts ensured protection of property and honour, the smooth functioning of village politics and the transfer of property between generations. This explains why only a few parish cahiers de doléances suggested the abolition of seigneurial courts. A crucial distinction was made between seigneurial justice as a judicial institution and as a seigneurial institution, explaining why country-dwellers did not want to see the courts abolished.

Hayhoe’s book shows that justice, like religious and economic practices, was a part of the way of life of communities in France under the old regime. This is why this book, very
pleasant to read, will also be very useful for anyone who wants to understand the world of pre-revolutionary France.

JÉRÔME LOISEAU. University of Burgundy

Anselm Heinrich, *Entertainment, Propaganda, Education: Regional Theatre in Germany and Britain Between 1918 and 1945.* University of Hertfordshire Press/Society for Theatre Research: Hatfield, 2007; xvi + 271 pp., 25 illus.: 9781902806747, £25.00 (hbk); 9781902806754, £14.99 (pbk)

Research into the history of the theatre in Nazi Germany has made considerable progress in recent years. The encyclopedic work on the topic by Henning Rischbieter and his collaborators (*Theater im 'Dritten Reich',* 2000), which draws on a wealth of research from numerous German dissertations, provides much evidence of this. This new work by Anselm Heinrich is welcome for a number of reasons: its comparative perspective, analysing parallel developments in Germany and Britain; its time-frame, which allows him to ground his examination of wartime developments in an analysis of the earlier history of the theatres in question; and the detailed research into the records of provincial theatres — Yorkshire in the case of Britain, Westphalia in the case of Germany. This approach results in a genuinely original and interesting study.

Heinrich’s work has a simple and straightforward structure: he reviews, in turn, the history of theatres in Yorkshire and Westphalia up to the Second World War, then he analyses theatre repertoires in the two case studies, looking at change and continuity from the 1920s into the wartime years. The historical background of the two case studies shows some expected differences between Britain and Germany. For example, theatres were very much commercial enterprises in the British province, while there was a relatively greater emphasis on education (*Bildung*) and public subsidy in Germany. The reasons for this different trajectory could have been analysed more closely: they included the premium Germany’s urban bourgeoisie put on *Bildung* as a qualification (or substitute) for an increased political voice for itself, as well as the legacy of German *Kleinstaaterei*: multiple regional capitals, each with its own claims to cultural prestige.

The main emphasis of Heinrich’s work is that, within the limits implicit in the distinction between the regimes of British democracy and the National Socialist dictatorship, there was considerable convergence between the theatres of Yorkshire and Westphalia as they entered the Second World War, an avowedly revisionist argument. Commercially minded Britons discovered the benefits of state-sponsored cultural policy in wartime (as shown by the development of ENSA and CEMA). In neither country had the provincial theatre embraced the avant-garde in the interwar period. In both cases, the theatre lent itself to propaganda, but, even in Nazi Germany, not to the exclusion of entertainment aimed at keeping paying customers happy. An overdose of overt party propaganda, as Goebbels well understood, could be box-office poison. (This last finding will not be new to scholars of the Nazi cinema or theatre.)

Given the lack of systematically comparative work on the British and German theatre, and Heinrich’s exemplary use of local and regional archival sources, this is a valuable work. Nonetheless, comparison does not necessarily mean that the two cases are alike. Heinrich may overstate his conclusion that ‘regional theatre in Britain and Germany during the later stages
of the war could be seen as all but interchangeable’ (232). Heinrich tends to play down the power wielded by the Nazi authorities (notably the Reich Dramaturge’s office) over German theatre repertoires. This was not diminished by the fact that the Nazi regime did not publish explicit blacklists. Instead, the Reich Dramaturge’s office reserved a veto power over repertoires, successfully fostering a culture of self-censorship and pre-emptive compliance. Nazi zealots may have been in a minority among German theatre directors, but most sought to stay out of trouble and avoided conflict with the authorities. The archaic prerogatives of Britain’s Lord Chamberlain were not quite on the same level, and the censorship powers acquired by Home Secretary Herbert Morrison in 1942 were not, as far as Heinrich can show, actually exercised. (Ironically, the Lord Chamberlain’s ban on disrespectful portrayals of foreign leaders extended protection from lampooning on stage to Adolf Hitler, even after the outbreak of war.) By contrast, Goebbels’ cultural functionaries even censored the German classics. Heinrich states that G.E. Lessing’s Nathan der Weise was ‘clearly avoided’ after the first weeks of the dictatorship (191). In fact, in 1934, Eberhard Wolfgang Möller, Nazi playwright and one of the Reich Dramaturge’s subordinates, was more direct than that, boasting that the office had seen to it that the play was no longer performed. Even the much-praised ‘Germanic poet’ Friedrich Schiller was subject to censorship, with Wilhelm Tell banned in 1941. At one point, Heinrich writes that ‘the Nazis tried . . . at all costs’ to avoid the image of ‘a dictatorial police state’ (91). One sees what he is driving at, but one may still have reservations about how hard they were actually trying.

If some historians in the field of Nazi theatre and cultural policy will place different emphases than Heinrich, this does not detract from the extent to which his work is a useful contribution to it, and the kind of comparative regional research in evidence here could well be a model for other such studies.

Andrew G. Bonnell, University of Queensland


In this book, Leonid Heretz argues that, on the eve of the Russian revolution, the Russian peasantry believed, thought and acted in accordance with a traditional worldview, and that military service, education, urban life and law did not result in rural cultural transformation, as the peasantry continued to abide by pre-modern, Russian Orthodox beliefs and practices. He contends that the First World War represented a ‘great turning point’, breaking down barriers and bringing traditional peasants into contact with the broader world. This, he argues, resulted in a decisive crisis of traditional peasant culture, and ‘introduced a highly excited and volatile psychological condition among the great peasant mass’ (233). Heretz refers throughout to an undifferentiated peasantry, and makes no reference to regional, social, economic, cultural or gendered distinctions among them.

The study is divided into two sections. The first outlines a generalized traditional worldview of the Russian peasantry, its relationship with Orthodoxy, and looks at the belief systems of Old Believers and other Sectarians as extreme manifestations of ‘traditional Russian culture’. Heretz argues that these religious sects are valuable illustrations of traditional popular belief, as they reflected and influenced peasant hostility to the forces of
modernization, albeit in more extreme forms. The final chapter of the first section covers folk eschatology, and argues that peasants were essentially anti-rational and anti-technological, and that there was a distinctive dualism between the insular ‘peasant world’ and the ‘outside world’ of modern, educated Russia.

The second section outlines traditional peasant understandings of history, with case studies of particular events from the assassination of Alexander II to the First World War. Heretz stresses throughout the endurance of folk Tsarism up until 1917. A second theme is the existence of a gulf between the modern Russian elite and the peasant population. In particular, Heretz argues that the peasantry sought to be left alone, and to remain free of outside interference. This approach has been challenged by a number of recent works, which are not referred to, including, for example, work on the courts by Burbank and Gaudin. In his evaluation of 1905, Heretz seeks to demonstrate aspects of continuity with pre-revolutionary mentality, and argues that the 1905 and 1917 revolutions were the work of an organized elite and did not reflect a broad popular movement. On the 1917 revolution, he refers to Pipes and to John Keep’s valuable 1976 study, but chooses to ignore the wealth of recent research on the period, including surveys by Chris Read and Rex Wade, and regional studies by, among others, Retish, Raleigh, Karsch and the current reviewer.

The sources for this study include written texts produced by Old Believers and Sectarians, ethnographic materials purporting to record peasant culture, and contemporary journalism and memoirs. He also utilizes published collections of soldiers’ letters for the sections on 1905 and the First World War, his only source emanating directly from the peasants themselves. No archival materials are used in this study. Heretz reads his sources ‘straight’; he regards the ethnographic work collected largely by folklorists as reliable expressions of peasant culture, and assures his readers that ‘they were collected by professional scholars with the express intention of recording manifestations of peasant culture on its own terms and as accurately as possible’ (11). Heretz has no interest in textual critique or analysis, as evidenced by his sharp dismissal of the ‘post-modernist’ bent of Andrew Verner’s analysis of peasant petitions in 1905 (162). Throughout this work, ethnographic, diary or memoir materials from intelligentsia observers or foreign visitors are used without critical analysis to develop and illustrate the book’s key arguments.

Heretz’s argument and approach stand in direct contrast to the vast majority of recent historiography studying rural Russia in the late Imperial and revolutionary periods. He argues that the work is ‘intended as a corrective to the Revolution-induced analytical fixation on change’ (7), but chooses not to refer to the vast majority of this work. For example, Heretz’s analysis of peasant interaction with urban spheres refers to Burds’ 1998 study only to dismiss it. Chris Chulos’ monograph on peasant religiosity is also ignored. Heretz comments that the war’s impact on soldiers has not been evaluated in the historiography, but does not refer to a number of recent and seminal works on the wartime experience, including works by Holquist, Seregny and Sanborn. Olga Porshneva’s book on popular mentalities during the First World War comes closest to Heretz’s approach, but again, this work is not referred to.

There are some interesting aspects to this study: it offers a useful insight into the Old Believer and Sectarian mentalities, and includes some engaging anecdotes of peasant popular culture. It does not, however, engage meaningfully with the methodological and substantive approaches of recent historiography on the Russian peasantry.

Sarah Badcock, University of Nottingham

Hertz begins her well-written book with a narrative of discovery. Some years ago, she came across a collection of fascinating documents in the Protestant Central Archive in Berlin. The files, compiled at the behest of Nazi officials, contained the names of every infant born into a Protestant family and baptized in the German capital, going back all the way to 1645. A separate *Judenkartei* included entries of all individuals who had been born into another faith and subsequently entered the church by baptism. This material prompted Hertz to embark on a scholarly study of conversion and assimilation in Berlin.

Somewhere along the way, however, the promising project became a conventional history of famous Jewish converts between 1770 and 1833. Not only does the story terminate well before full emancipation in 1871 — a limitation that is nowhere explained — it also fails to offer new theoretical insights into assimilation and acculturation in German-Jewish history. Instead, *How Jews Became Germans* has all the hallmarks of a personal account, with good Jews and bad Jews vying for the author’s sympathy, and with language that occasionally turns the book into a communitarian tract rather than a work of history.

Hertz’s starting point is the following conundrum: ‘how to balance freedom with belonging’ (ix). ‘Freedom’ for her means the freedom of the individual, ‘belonging’ the attachment to an ethnic minority. Because the project is such a personal one, the author is forced to pit ‘pro-assimilation’ and ‘anti-assimilation’ scholars against each other, as if this juxtaposition reflected current historiography. It doesn’t. Hertz fails to engage with recent work on the subject by younger scholars such as Till van Rahden or Samuel Moyn, amongst others. Rather, she examines past Jewish behaviour like a political activist to find out whether conversion or assimilation ‘could ever be an honorable way to achieve emancipation’ (16).

*How Jews Became Germans* is laced with (anachronistic) comments on men and women of a bygone age. We encounter late eighteenth-century marriages that were strangely lacking in ‘passion’ (46), ‘lucky’ females whose lovers were ‘attracted to older women with strong characters’ (50), ‘liberal’ France and ‘national’ Germany (75–6), ‘cruel’ bureaucrats, rightly ‘outraged’ intellectuals (149), ‘problematic’ pietists (180), ‘shockingly high’ levels of infant conversion (194), or ‘craven style(s) of assimilation’ (216). As Hertz informs us, she occasionally lost ‘her sympathy and became disappointed with episodes of apparent hypocrisy, self-hatred, and crass self-promotion’ (217). Finally, on the penultimate page of *How Jews Became Germans*, the author decries contemporary ‘assimilated’ Jews who take ‘advantage of the pleasures of living alongside a vibrant Jewish tradition’. These Jews she calls free riders. At this stage the reader has come full circle: Hertz’s concern is not with historical or contemporary people who happen(ed) to be Jewish but with the identity that is their Jewishness. It is the identity, not the people, that she is worried about.

The author’s censorious remarks undermine those sections of her book that offer the reader important new material. Hertz is able to show how conversion was especially an option for poor Jews in the eighteenth century: how at the turn of the century conversions by wealthy Jews threatened to deplete the community of funds; how the Prussian bureaucracy feared that this depletion would also entail less financial income for the Exchequer: how female conversions decreased as the Jewish salons were eclipsed; how there was a much tighter connection between female conversion and female intermarriage than there was for men; and how men
usually converted for career reasons or to attain a German identity which was closely tied to Lutheranism. Although Hertz thus admits that many converts simply wanted distinguished careers, loving marriages, an interesting social life, or a German identity at a time and in a country that did not allow for multiple identities, she cannot leave it at that – to the detriment of the work.

**Anthony D. Kauders, Keele University**


The term *Sonderweg* connotes certain nations having a ‘special path’ in their historical development, and recently some historians of Scandinavia have argued for a model of Nordic exceptionalism. They suggest that the Scandinavian nations successfully reconciled Enlightenment opposites of equality and liberty, and it is this proper balancing of respect for the individual with collectivism which characterizes modern Scandinavia. Mary Hilson rejects the *long-term* Scandinavian *Sonderweg* as being too teleological, noting that ‘in Scandinavia, as elsewhere, historical change was contingent and unpredictable’ (16). She accepts, however, the more recent concept of the Nordic Model, which originated between the two world wars. In this model, Scandinavia came to be defined by its ‘middle way’ approach, including a mixed socialist and capitalist economy, dedication to parliamentary democracy, and the welfare state, especially since the end of World War II. Hilson’s *The Nordic Model*, therefore, is a transnational history of a more limited Scandinavian *Sonderweg* since 1945.

In Chapter 1, she analyses the Nordic political model, which is consensual and seeks evolutionary rather than revolutionary solutions. She locates its genesis in the 1930s when the ‘red’ Scandinavian socialists crafted coalitions with ‘green’ agrarian parties. This arrangement allowed for the long-term success of the Social Democratic parties, and it has been the success of social democracy that has been most unique politically to Scandinavia. Despite challenges to the model since the 1970s, Hilson concludes that the Nordic political model remains a valid reality. The Nordic economies are covered in Chapter 2 and Hilson addresses the question of whether there is a particular Scandinavian economic model — based on a combination of state regulation and intervention with private enterprise — or if Scandinavia has simply benefited from conditions favourable to Europe in general since 1945. She observes that the Scandinavian countries have generally been successful in maintaining high growth and full employment, though less so since the 1970s, and that their economies have been highly centralized owing to heavy union membership and the state’s role. She concludes, however, that there is no single Nordic economic model but several, including Danish ‘flexicurity’ (flexibility and security), a Finnish one based on information technology, and Sweden’s efficiency model.

Hilson analyses the Nordic welfare model in Chapter 3, which she regards as the most integral part of national identity in the Nordic countries. She maintains that they share similarities with the rest of Europe, but that they have been unique in their ambition: the Scandinavian welfare states aimed to create a better society and were linked to notions of economic efficiency. In effect, the Nordic welfare model derives from a strong sense of Scandinavian egalitarianism. Chapter 4 discusses international relations. Despite the fact that Denmark, Norway and Iceland are NATO countries, Hilson identifies a ‘Nordic Balance’.
the idea that the Scandinavian states, despite their small size, should take an active role in promoting peaceful relations and not side with the USA in every instance. A related development, she notes, has been the strong emphasis on cooperation between the five Scandinavian states, such as the Nordic Council, a common Nordic labour market, or even, more informal cultural exchanges. Hilson gives a qualified endorsement to the Nordic Model in foreign policy owing to its high idealism and not being tainted by colonialism.

In her final chapter, Hilson engages with perhaps the biggest myth surrounding the Nordic Model, namely that Scandinavia is ethnically and culturally uniform. She correctly observes that the post-1945 Scandinavian states often conflated equality with assimilation and there was insensitivity towards ethnic minorities such as the Sami or more recent immigrants from Asia and Africa. The recent influx of immigrants has not only challenged Scandinavian ideas concerning identity but has shown that Scandinavians are not immune to racism. The immigration debate has also raised questions about the proper way to integrate newcomers into the Scandinavian countries. Although right-wing populism has appeared, Hilson contends that its appeal remains blunted and the mainstream political parties have not endorsed the same anti-immigrant rhetoric. Yet, the appearance of the right-wing parties seems to undermine the traditional image of Scandinavia as tolerant and progressive and in this regard, the Nordic Model, she claims, may not be valid anymore (175–6).

Overall, Hilson acknowledges that Scandinavian ‘distinctiveness’ might be due to broader European trends or that the Swedish model has been substituted for a wider Nordic model. Despite these concerns, she concludes that the Nordic Model has shown resilience and stability, remaining a ‘most valid’ concept (186–7). The author offers a careful, balanced assessment of the validity of the Nordic Model, demonstrating that it remains a useful, albeit qualified, concept in defining modern Scandinavia. She recognizes that the mystique of Scandinavia to outsiders has legitimated the model. Well researched, Hilson’s book is a most welcome English-language addition to Scandinavian history. In particular, she has shown that Scandinavia holds great promise for future transnational history.

Daron W. Olson, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale


Paul Hockenos’ biography of Joschka Fischer neatly fits into the burgeoning literature which sees the chief, if not sole, achievement of ‘1968’ as having made western societies more agreeable, relaxed and tolerant compared to earlier post-war decades. It is the familiar success story of a cultural revolution sweeping the land, propelled by student rebels who had set out with rather more radical aims, but who were — in the eyes of Hockenos, thankfully — prevented from obtaining their destructive goals. The author’s ideological blinkers are obvious: ‘Although the young radicals called themselves Marxists and touted revolution, ultimately . . . they were exploring democracy’ (7), the author avers, apparently not even suspecting that Marxists and/or revolutionaries could possibly be ‘democrats’ as well. Thus, contrary to their best intentions, radical activists gave Germany ‘a ‘democratic push’, which, paradoxically, helped transform it into a more stable, genuinely liberal republic’ (92). What renders the book under review a bit odd in this respect is the author’s apparent conviction that Germany’s
earlier alleged illiberalism made Germany somehow stand apart in the community of nations in the western world. For, Hockenos affirms, the democratic 'jolt' supposedly 'would prod the Bonn Republic in the direction of the western mainstream and set it on a more modern path' (93). Does he have in mind the McCarthy era in the United States or the authoritarian regime of General De Gaulle in France as models of 'western liberalism'? Comparative analysis is not Hockenos' forte, and thankfully this is not the remit of his book.

In the end, despite this reviewer's initial fears based on the aforementioned conceptual flaws, the narrative produced by the author constitutes an often entertaining, sometimes even stimulating, recapitulation of West German history in the four decades between, roughly, 1965 and 2005. Two strands of argument structure the book. Hockenos alternates between the standard features of conventional biographies on the one hand, and a more wide-ranging reconstruction of German history on the other, with an emphasis on the relevant social movements and political organizations which shaped Fischer's political itinerary. Thus, the reader learns not only about the personal and political twists and turns of Joschka Fischer, but also many pertinent details about the social movements which shaped the future German Foreign Secretary in crucial ways. Indeed, the central chapters, in which Hockenos portrays the movement against civilian nuclear power plants, the early years of the German Greens, and the movement against Reagan-era nuclear weapons, count amongst the very best pages of this volume. Here, Hockenos manages to draw on (amongst other sources) a series of interviews with well-placed contemporary participant-observers, amongst them Fischer's first love interest, Ede Fischer.

One of the crucial chapters in the book covers Joschka Fischer's key involvement in the Frankfurt Sponti Szene, which Hockenos covers with some empathy and a solid grasp of key moments in the political itinerary of Fischer's and Cohn-Bendit's group, Revolutionärer Kampf. Later chapters are more colourless as the higher his subject rose in the hierarchy of, first, the Greens and, later, German politics, so the author's ability to adumbrate the public story of Joschka Fischer with relevant insights from well-chosen interview partners diminishes. It is not quite as easy to have intimates from the later stages of Fischer's life, such as the ex-German Chancellor, Gerhard Schröder, or the hawkish ex-Foreign Secretary of the United States, Madeleine Albright, agree to open up to an investigative reporter. Hence, the two most recent decades in Fischer's life are portrayed in a rather superficial way, for the most part relying on rather humdrum information available in the public domain. It is probably all to the good that these final chapters on Fischer's ministerial career are less detailed than earlier portions of this book, for this is also the moment when the former street-fighting man turned into a national and, then, international statesman. It was a time when the formerly anti-hierarchical and anti-authoritarian Greens became firmly ensconced in the political establishment, when Green Party conferences, such as the 1999 Bielefeld venue, became targets for political protest movements rather than staging grounds for the launching of emancipatory campaigns. 'The tables had turned 180 degrees. Hundreds of riot police ringed the congress hall to protect the party leadership from Germany’s disgruntled left' (271).

The claim for this book to be an 'alternative history of post-war Germany' is certainly an inflated claim. For the period 1970–1985, the text comes close to providing an outline of what such a history might look like; but this is definitely not the case for the earlier and later years. It is an enjoyable book, up to a point, but not a very serious one.

GERD-RAINER HORN, University of Warwick
Among the large ghettos set up by the Nazis as part of their 'Final Solution', Łódź was the longest-lasting and is probably the best known among later historians. It was also unique in that it, alone among major ghettos, was located within the boundaries of the Reich, not in the Generalgouvernement or eastern territories. The tragic story of the Łódź ghetto is, among specialists anyway, familiar from The Chronicle of the Łódź Ghetto published some years ago by Lucjan Dobroszycki and many other books. The figure of the chairman of the Jewish Council (Judenrat) in the city, Mordechai Chaim Rumkowski, with his carriage drawn by white horses, has passed into legend (not entirely fairly) as the embodiment of the phrase 'power corrupts'. Why, then, another book on Łódź? The easy answer is that there remains much to be told, and that the city deserves meticulous and thorough research due to its importance within the twisted Nazi universe of death. Yet, there is another, equally compelling reason, which Horwitz refers to in his subtitle. Łódź was not just a ghetto through which countless thousands of Jews passed on their way to death. It was also to be, once 'cleansed' of Jews and their traces, a model Nazi city bearing the name of a World War I hero, General Karl Litzmann. Horwitz's book alternates between the Jewish ghetto and the newly-emerging (at least rhetorically, but also to some extent on the ground) Nazi city of Litzmannstadt. The result is a book that is very readable, very informative, and exceedingly disturbing in its implications as to the ability of human beings to ignore the sufferings of their neighbours.

Ghettostadt proceeds chronologically, from the taking of the city in September 1939 to its abandonment by the Nazis in January 1945 as the Red Army moved in. The ghetto was set up already in 1940 and existed until late August 1944. In heartbreaking detail, Horwitz describes the techniques by which the Nazis brutalized the ghetto and removed tens of thousands to the death camps, while after each wave of deportations (allegedly to 'work in the east') reassuring the desperate survivors that this deportation would be the last. We know, of course, about these techniques, but the narrative here helps us understand just how and why they worked quite so effectively. As Horwitz points out. Rumkowski almost certainly knew fairly early on the fate of the 'deportees' – as did most who cared to think about it. But, of course, most did not wish to believe the evidence that their loved ones had simply been shipped to a gas chamber. Horwitz's careful documentation and use of archival, memoir and periodical sources come together to show that, while the physical obstacles to resistance were huge, the psychological barriers were greater still.

As Jewish Łódź was being wiped out, German Litzmannstadt was taking shape. Horwitz follows an Ufa film crew in summer 1941 and in 1942 as they shot a film, 'From Lodz to Litzmannstadt', showing the new German city, with happy families, amusements and cultural events (124). In every chapter, the normality of German life – films, visits to the zoo, new parks, performances of 'Hänsel und Gretel' and other musical works – is contrasted with the brutal suffering of Jewish Łódź next door. In the end, however, these glimpses into Litzmannstadt remain rather superficial (though extremely interesting): the book is primarily concerned with the life and death of Jewish Łódź. This story is extremely well told, scenes from everyday life alternating with figures on industrial production in the ghetto, Rumkowski's interactions with the German authorities, and the constant menace of death by hunger, individual brutality, or transport. All the same, one major aspect of Łódź in these years is entirely neglected: the hundreds of thousands of Poles living there. To be sure, this
is a book mainly about the Łódź ghetto, but the naive reader would not even realize that the majority of the population in 1939 and in 1945 was neither German nor Jewish, but Polish. Obviously, there would be no place for Poles in the future Litzmannstadt, but were plans already being discussed for the fate of the present Polish population? How did Poles survive (or not) in these horrible years? We get no answers here. This is particularly regrettable, because Horwitz uses a number of Polish-language sources and surely could have included Poles in this tragic story.

Nevertheless, one cannot do everything in a single book and the positive achievement of this book far outweighs any faults. The narrative is compelling, well organized, and engaging – for all the horror of its content. The source base is rich, with published sources in numerous languages (though not, that I noticed, in Hebrew), with detailed use of sources at the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington and from Łódź archives. This is a major book which will be read with interest (and a shudder) by anyone interested in European history in its darkest hours.

THEODORE R. WEEKS, SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY


Having recently completed a tripartite study of the intellectual universe of German millenarian and encyclopedic innovator, Johann Heinrich Alsted, Howard Hotson’s latest work examines one of early modern Europe’s more complex topics, the controversial practice of Ramism. Seminal early twentieth-century works on Ramism by Perry Miller and Walter Ong have discouraged successive generations of students in North America from further investigating the life and teachings of the Frenchman Petrus Ramus, while German historians during the same era found little room for studies of Ramism within their nationalist historiographies. Recognizing these gaps, Hotson provides a detailed analysis of the career of Ramus, the basic precepts of Ramism, and the social, political and religious environment from which it spread throughout the central European landscape.

Hotson begins by giving an account of Ramus’ rise from peasant stock to the rank of regius professor at the University of Paris in 1551. From this position, Ramus set about reforming the university curriculum with the aim of teaching a wider range of disciplines in a shorter amount of time than had traditionally been ascribed to humanist pedagogues. More provocative, was Ramus’ anti-Aristotelianism. Ramus complained of the inadequacy of Aristotle’s works for pedagogical purposes and sought to provide students with a more efficient and practical approach to philosophical instruction by abandoning the difficult and obscure commentaries on Aristotle which were typical of Renaissance humanist teaching. In place of this tradition, Ramus reorganized the logical principles of Aristotle using simplified definitions and divisions, often through the use of bifurcating tables, which he believed could be applied to any discipline.

The backlash against Ramus by leading Aristotelian humanists ensured Ramism’s failure in major continental locales such as Basle, Geneva and Paris. However, central to Hotson’s study is the idea that Ramism, as a useful pedagogical practice, spread outward from the lower rung of the academic hierarchy. Instead of finding immediate acceptance in
the more prominent institutions of higher learning across Europe. Ramus’ teachings succeeded in the quasi-university environs of German civic gymnasia and territorial gymnasia illustria. In Dortmund and Herborn especially, the popular institutionalization of Ramism provided students with a more affordable and efficient education across a broader curriculum than Europe’s larger universities offered. Subsequently, as Hotson explains, Ramus’ teachings flourished in north-west Germany, largely because they gained the support of lay rulers who sought to improve, on a limited budget, the status of the less recognized academies within their territories. Not only did Ramism play a key role in the developing social and political environment of the Hanseatic cities and imperial counties of Reformed Germany, but Ramist textbooks became ‘confessionalized’, thanks largely to the work of Johannes Piscator. Ramism was the driving force behind Piscator’s exegetical theology and led the Heidelberg scholar to complete the first vernacular translation of the Bible since Luther. Here, the once secular Ramist method made the transition to the spiritual realm of theology. Previously, historians have mainly linked Ramism with the Calvinist faith. Against this view, Hotson demonstrates how Ramism crossed confessional lines by identifying the overtly anti-Calvinist University of Giessen as the most open and persistent centre for Ramist instruction.

To best exemplify what Hotson views as a ‘coherent tradition’ of Ramist pedagogy, the author thoroughly examines the enormous encyclopedic project of Johann Heinrich Alsted. The Herborn professor’s Encyclopaedia, published in 1620 and expanded in 1630, was the culmination of the Ramist tradition in Germany. In accordance with the steadily evolving work of his semi-Ramist predecessors, Bartholomäus Keckermann and Clemens Timpler, Alsted utilized contemporary texts as the source base for more than half of his encyclopedia, while ignoring Aristotle and other classical authorities entirely. Later editions of the Encyclopaedia suffered from Alsted’s incorporation of an ever-widening range of disciplines and inclusion of more exotic subject material. As a result, the meticulous attention to order so characteristic of Ramism unravelled at the height of its success in Germany.

Commonplace Learning is certainly a valuable addition to the history of the Ramist movement in central Europe because it is one of the first to provide a detailed account of Ramism within a national context. Taking a page from Ramus’ book, Hotson’s work tackles a difficult topic in an orderly and methodical fashion, simplifying Ramism for a new generation of scholars. However, one must be careful when attempting to gauge the level of success Ramism enjoyed during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. We must remember that Ramism failed to take hold in Europe’s leading academic institutions at this time, and, as Hotson acknowledges, it was rejected in the major continental centres of Reformed theology. Ramism was a movement which triumphed on the margins of European intellectual life. Further insights into the expansion and success of the Ramist method outside of fragmented north-west Germany will doubtless be provided in Hotson’s forthcoming treatment of Ramism in the later seventeenth century.

ANDY DRINNON, University of Saint Andrews

This book, which is the first of four planned volumes collecting a selection of Cobden’s c. 7000 extant letters, publishes 378 of the over 1600 letters he is known to have written before 1848 (a web-based edition of all letters is projected). The exclusion of routine business letters makes for lively reading: each item of this collection is relevant to Cobden’s life and career, or has literary merit, or deals with major events and figures of the times. The letters overlapping with Cobden’s published travel diaries have been omitted. There are copious explanatory notes immediately following each letter, while the footnoting is excellent and effectively aids in identifying people and issues.

An exhaustive ‘Editorial procedure’ is followed by Howe’s ‘Introduction’ (xxi–lx), consisting of two parts. The first part, ‘The letters’, traces the vicissitudes that hindered the attempts by Cobden’s daughters to publish their father’s correspondence, and which eventually led to their decision to let John Morley include hundreds of letters in his famous biography (1881). Remarkably, Howe’s intensive searching of archives in continental Europe and the United States resulted in the discovery of a substantial number of letters besides the bulk of the correspondence now housed in the British Library and the West Sussex Record Office. The second and more substantial part of the introduction, ‘Reinterpreting Cobden through his letters, 1815–1847’, provides the background to the correspondence. Howe’s excellent summary of Cobden’s life, activities and culture is effectively enriched by constant reference to the correspondence.

The volume is a mine of insights. Apart from the numerous details of the struggle for repeal of the Corn Laws which these letters may help to clarify, many of them contain lengthy judgements on domestic politics, foreign policy, and the many countries Cobden was visiting. He associated a keen perception of political oppression – a ‘patrician power’ imposing its interests on the nation – with the moralistic perspective characterizing Victorian Britain. Granted that improving the world was a necessary task to Cobden (145), the struggle for repeal rested on a desire to enhance the competitive edge of British manufactures as well as on a quest for justice and peace (e.g. 125–8, 137–43). When victory was secured, however, he stressed the moral and political consequences of free trade throughout the world: peace and mutual forbearance (419).

There emerges a fully fledged portrait of an extraordinary man. At the age of 28, busy setting up his own business, he felt himself imbued with a ‘Bonapartian feeling’ that made him confident in his ability to overcome all obstacles (41). His ambitions were ‘boundless’, to the point that ‘all this yearning’ sometimes gained a ‘painful and harassing ascendancy’ over him (43). Typically, Cobden developed strong views on peoples and countries on presumption, his subsequent sojourns invariably confirming the previous judgements (xxxvii, 102). It is perhaps a reflection of his middle-class origins that, since the early 1840s, he came to suffer from a ‘conflicting sense of rival duties’ between public and private life (421), feeling guilty for neglecting his family. He wrote to Earl Grey that he became involved in free-trade agitation ‘almost unconsciously’, only gradually understanding the importance of the principle he was struggling to assert (430). He felt as if he were being carried into a ‘vortex’ from which he could not escape. On 26 June 1846, he wrote to his wife: ‘Hurrah! hurrah! the corn bill is law, and now my work is done’ (438). Badly in need of a break, he refused to take office and
embarked on a long European trip, which actually turned into an effective way to disseminate free trade: ‘Every place I visit increases the number of my engagements’ (471). In the editor’s words, Cobden became ‘a new type of moral diplomat, sent by the British people’ (lvi). In Italy, Cobden’s tour was particularly successful, helping to shape public opinion at a critical juncture of the Risorgimento.

Cobden’s struggles for free trade and universal peace, carried out by pacific means, have a contemporary ring, which accounts for much of their enduring interest. This volume offers more specific hints as well. In a letter to George Combe of November 1847, for example, Cobden laments that ‘there is a haughty feeling of supremacy in the mind of the nation’ to the effect that ‘we are always intent upon regulating & reforming & patronizing all the world persuading ourselves that we stand upon the vantage-ground of security, with nothing to do but lift other nations up to our fancied level’ (496). Two remarks are in order. Firstly, Cobden himself was not above suspicion as far as patronizing was concerned, as some letters from abroad suggest. Secondly, it comes to mind that superpowers tend to develop similar attitudes, in the twenty-first as in the nineteenth century.

ROBERTO ROMANI, Università di Teramo


With Germany’s Other Modernity, Leif Jerram has produced a sophisticated analysis of how Munich responded to the anxieties and opportunities galvanized by modernity. Furthering Lefebvre’s understanding of the ways in which spatial practices, representations, values and beliefs shape our experience of being in the world, Jerram’s study rescues space from abstraction by focusing, in his own words, on ‘the transition from imaginary space into real spaces’ (8). and, in the context of Munich at the turn of the twentieth century, on the role that people, ideas and policies play in enabling that process. By focusing on Munich’s experience of modernity, albeit within a German and European context, and examining the creation of unspectacular, non-iconic architecture, Jerram reframes the study of German modernity in terms of both character and meaning.

The choice of Munich over Berlin is significant as it draws attention to the complex nature of German responses to modernity. Indeed, the widespread adoption of Berlin as a showcase of German modernity bypasses competing discourses and their impact on policy making by implying, as Jerram remarks, a ‘centralised culture, economy and polity’ (12) that did not exist at the time. Equally important is the book’s contextualization of German approaches to modernity. Distancing himself from the notion of a German ‘special path’, Jerram explores the concerns of German city planners and administrators within an international context, and shows how they responded to analogous concerns in similar ways to their counterparts in other modernizing countries. While I share Jerram’s view that early German responses to modernity need to be extricated from the overwhelming shadow of National Socialism so as to appreciate their mainly constructive nature, I am not yet convinced that, as he argues, we are looking at ‘a different German mainstream . . . who attended [the reformers’] schools, lived in their social housing, visited their exhibitions and sought cures in their hospitals’ instead of ‘committing themselves to antidemocratic political philosophy or radical racism’ (192).
In my view, there is not enough evidence to suggest that we are not observing one German mainstream responding to different sets of circumstances. Finally, Jerram’s focus on schools, hospitals and homes stabilizes a debate unsettled by years of academic fixation on iconic architecture. Indeed, such buildings are all too often neglected by scholars, despite the fact that our lives are mostly lived in and shaped by unspectacular architecture.

In the context of these main concerns, Jerram’s study of the Frankfurt and Munich Kitchens is particularly illuminating. On the one hand, these designs addressed a specifically German preoccupation with creating spaces of socialized production which were neither geared to stimulate and organize consumption nor to increase productivity, concerns which at the time dominated spatial design in the United States and the Soviet Union respectively. On the other hand, the Frankfurt and Munich Kitchens offered contrasting responses to modernity, generating two different domestic spaces where the work and social life of the woman at home became dissociated (Frankfurt) or integrated (Munich). By focusing on the construction of these contrasting domestic spaces, exposing the role they played in framing the relation between the individual and the state at a micro level, and relating this process to larger urban interventions, the book reveals in a nutshell the ideological complexity of place-making in early twentieth-century Germany.

With impressive conciseness and clarity, Jerram illuminates a very complex subject from a sophisticated perspective. This thoroughly enjoyable book is an incisive addition to the study of German modernity and it will satisfy the interest of both scholars and general readers.

Mónica Riera, University of Portsmouth


The February Revolution of 1917 transformed Russia’s political life, providing socialist parties with unprecedented freedom and influence. Francis King’s excellent book focuses on the group that quickly emerged as the most popular, the Socialist-Revolutionaries (SRs). The party was formed in 1901, but their roots lay in the peasant socialism (or populism) of revolutionaries in the 1860s and 1870s. Their belief that the peasantry could be a revolutionary force and should be considered on a par with industrial workers, enabled them to cultivate mass support among peasants in 1917, whilst retaining a significant presence among workers, many of whom retained strong links to the countryside. Yet, by October, their supporters were divided and the party proved unable to combat the Bolsheviks’ seizure of power.

King has assembled 47 documents which chart this turnaround in the party’s fortunes. Using programmes, appeals, speeches and records of meetings, King assigns primacy to the SRs themselves, limiting his input to judicious comments which contextualize the sources. Most of the documents are from newspapers (with some from archives) and are largely from the collections produced by the Russian publisher, ROSSPEN, in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Specialists will be aware of most of this material, although King does track down a few obscure documents from elsewhere and provides brief biographies of all the individuals mentioned. The intention of this book (and its great value) is that it translates the vast majority of these into English for the first time, thereby introducing the SRs to a new audience. For
students, in particular, this is an unparalleled resource, particularly alongside King’s own comments on the party, which never seek to idolize the SRs.

The documents cover all of the crucial areas: the party’s attempts to influence popular unrest in February; its debates over whether to continue the First World War; its decision to join a coalition government of liberals and socialists in May; its policies on the land question; and its arguments on how to combat growing government ineffectiveness. Ultimately, the centre of the party, led by Viktor Chernov, was sucked into following conciliatory policies which alienated its supporters. The book finishes with the October Revolution and the ill-fated Constituent Assembly in January 1918, at which point, arguably, the revolution turned into civil war. Where the documents excel, however, is in highlighting the huge divisions within the party and the socialist movement, and here they provide a salutary reminder to specialists. The SRs had spawned sympathetic but independent groups prior to 1917, such as the People’s Socialist Party, whilst during the revolution, the SRs split into left, centre and right factions, all of which advocated different positions on contentious issues. In early April, for example, a discussion of a report advocating a ‘defencist’ war clearly demonstrates sharp disagreements over strategy (23–26). Elsewhere, King deliberately uses documents which reflect the diverse strands of thinking that fell under the generic banner of the SRs (32–43, 58–63). It is notable how all factions were capable of bluntly analysing their problems, but proved unable to forge a unified and effective response. Indeed, when the left SRs did establish their own party after the October Revolution, it seems surprising that a formal break took so long to occur.

Overall, King’s work represents fantastic value for money in the context of today’s inflated prices for academic books. As such, and given its intention to appeal to non-specialist readers, it seems churlish to criticize, but I would venture two comments. Firstly, more could have been done to direct readers to existing literature on the SRs. King mentions Oliver Radkey in detail and refers to Maureen Perrie and Michael Melancon in passing, but there are other studies, especially articles, and a bibliography at the end could have directed interested readers to a select list, as well as to memoirs by SRs. Secondly, the left faction SRs played an important role in helping the Bolsheviks to govern until the summer of 1918. King outlines this in his epilogue, but sources on their decision to join the Bolshevik government in December 1917 would have greatly complemented other documents. As it is, the book provides material on the mainstream SR reaction to the Bolsheviks and the left SR critique of this reaction, but does not highlight, in their own words, how the left SRs viewed their coalition with the Bolsheviks. Nevertheless, none of this is meant to detract from what is an invaluable collection. This book helped to sharpen my understanding of the socialist response to the revolution and will be assigned as essential reading to my students. The author is to be congratulated for the huge amount of effort that has clearly gone into this project.

MATTHEW RENDELE, Aberystwyth University

Steven King and John Stewart, eds, Welfare Peripheries: The Development of Welfare States in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Europe. Peter Lang: Bern, 2007; 267 pp.; 9783039101764. £33.00 (pbk)

What kind of countries can be defined as peripheries? The editors of this book write that, firstly, they are geographically on the edge of northern and/or western Europe. Secondly, they
have relatively small populations, that is, they are ‘societies where the alternative organisation that flowed from public debate had a better chance of being taken seriously’ (25). Thirdly, they have ‘an unstable history as an independent, autonomous polity’ (26). As systematic as it is, such a definition is problematic, because it seems more dictated by the choice of the countries examined in this book (Denmark, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Scotland, Wales) than by a theoretical approach. For example, Switzerland does not fit entirely with that definition of ‘periphery’, but it has a very different history of welfare from, let’s say, England or France, the countries which seem to be at the core of this rather centralistic approach to welfare. Nevertheless, it is very interesting to read a book dedicated to welfare states rather forgotten by the mainstream of historical research, and the 11 contributors to the book are able to discuss the evolution in their chosen countries in relation to the main theoretical debates about welfare states (e.g. the theories of Peter Baldwin about the role of the middle class in the development of welfare states or Esping-Andersen’s typology of welfare states). The volume allows us to reconsider the general pattern proposed by these theories and complements very well the questions raised by researchers in other countries.

The first chapter, written by the editors, gives a good overview of the book and of the contributions which follow. In Chapter 2, Chris Nottingham and Piet de Rooy show that the creation in the 1960s and 1970s of a rather generous Dutch welfare state was not the result of a long and uncontested process. On the contrary, they demonstrate that, until the 1960s, relief was given by municipalities only *in extremis*. Virginia Crossman explains in Chapter 3 the evolution of the Irish poor law system at the end of the nineteenth century and how poor relief became part of a broader welfare state. She shows that ‘during the post-famine period, the Irish Poor law system developed in ways that its architects had never envisaged and would not have endorsed’ (80). Aasmund Arup Seip traces in Chapter 4 the centralization of the welfare system in Norway between 1814 and 1920. He criticizes Baldwin’s analysis of welfare states resulting from the agrarian elites’ desire to include themselves in a state-financed welfare system, explaining that ‘welfare has been shaped in interaction between private actors . . . local communities; and the state’ (123). The next chapter sees Andreas Gestrich and John Stewart discussing aspects of unemployment and poor relief in areas of the West of Scotland between 1870 and 1900. They show that local authorities were confronted with a very harsh Scottish Poor law, in an economy very sensitive to world trade conditions and with high levels of immigration. In Chapter 6, Jørn Henrik Petersen and Klaus Petersen come back to the emergence of the concept of social rights in Denmark, questioning ‘a common assumption, namely that the 1933 Social Reform Act was the breakthrough for the concept of social rights’ (177). From a rather evolutionist perspective, they argue that social rights were developed gradually, at first only on the local level. Neil Evans then discusses in Chapter 7 the link between urbanization and social welfare in Wales, Scotland and Ireland. He argues that the character and scale of urbanization had a key impact on how welfare developed. Finally, Pirjo Markkola, in the last chapter, examines the case of Finland, suggesting that ‘the relations between the centre and the periphery were crucial in the formation of its pattern of welfare. Major reforms on the periphery were often preceded by a thorough investigation on the state of affairs in the European centre’ (228).

It can only be hoped that this book will motivate scholars from different countries to undertake more comparative work on the history of social welfare throughout Europe. It would, for example, be very interesting to document and compare the links between citizen-
ship and social welfare or the influence of social welfare on gender relationships in different countries.

**Jean-Pierre Tabin, Ecole d’études sociales et pédagogiques, Lausanne**


This sumptuous, beautifully written book argues for the Valois court of the ‘long’ sixteenth century to be considered as a distinct institutional and cultural phenomenon in the history of France. Robert Knecht is eminently well suited for such a project, given his past books on Francis I, Catherine de Medici, and the French Wars of Religion. Like those earlier studies, his new book synthesizes much recent scholarship and uses a wide range of printed primary sources — ambassadorial reports, memoirs, and letters — to invoke the splendours, controversies, and eventual implosion of the royal court during this tumultuous age. Even where the book occasionally falls short, it leaves the reader with questions and problems to ponder — always the sign of a good book, which this one is indeed.

The author faced a real conundrum of how best to meld a synchronic analysis of the court in its totality and a diachronic analysis of its evolution over time. He solves this problem by sensibly treating the Valois court in two distinct phases, one in a ‘golden age’ from 1483 to 1559 and the other in ‘crisis’ from 1559 to 1589. Chapters 1 and 2 situate the court historically in terms of the successive reigns from Charles VIII to Henry II and the court’s place in the governing structure and social makeup of the kingdom. A peripatetic institution by tradition and necessity, given its size and the complexity of ruling such a sprawling realm, Knecht contends that the Valois court was a dynamic microcosm of French society. The next 10 chapters then examine in a topical fashion relevant aspects of court life and culture. These topics include courtiers, sundry pursuits and activities, and patronage. He highlights in particular the important roles played by women at court. Readers will find these chapters very rich and suggestive. Court life became increasingly regimented and subject to rules of etiquette and ceremonial intended to reinforce prevailing social and political hierarchies. The lavish expenditures to sustain this moving spectacle of royal power were staggering, especially for a society where scarcity remained very much the norm for the vast majority of people. Knecht rightly points to signs of the court’s slow transition toward a more fixed life, first in the new châteaux constructed along the Loire River and then eventually to a refurbished Louvre and residences around Paris, such as Fontainebleau and Saint-Germain-en-Laye. The section on the formation of the royal library is particularly fascinating.

The transitional chapter on ‘heresy’ sets up the second half of the book. Here, the emphasis is on religious politics and the monarchy’s increasingly confused and ineffectual efforts to deal with the spread of Calvinism and the rise of militant Catholicism. Scholars familiar with the work of Denis Crouzet, Nicolas Leroux, and Jacqueline Boucher will recognize the lines of argumentation that Knecht takes in the six chapters that conclude the book. The court per se recedes from view as the narrative instead recounts the complex factional strife between noble cliques and confessional camps. In a bid to calm the kingdom, Catherine de Medici and her young son, Charles IX, undertook the last major royal tour of the kingdom in the mid-1560s. Its failure and the ensuing upsurge of violence in the 1570s set the stage for Henry
III’s novel but ill-fated attempts to reform the court and create new, more dependent hierarchies based on his favourites, the mignons. Mounting financial problems limited the late Valois court’s ambitions to continue expensive building projects and patronage of the arts, though Knecht does underscore new directions in theatre and dance introduced by Henry III and his mother. Divisions at court and the king’s unpopularity eventually culminated in the Day of the Barricades, which chased him out of Paris, and the assassination of the Guises at the Estates in Blois in late 1588. Henry III’s own murder in August 1589 brought the Valois dynasty to an ignominious end, but not the court, which the new Bourbon king – Henry IV – inherited and eventually began to transform into an even more effective instrument of royal rule in the next century.

Knecht largely construes ‘Renaissance’ in relation to influence of new trends from Italy; little, if anything, is said about exemplars and practices from the flourishing Burgundian court which Valois arms brought to an end (and then co-opted) in the fifteenth century. Another question concerns the relationship between the king and his court. At times, Knecht seems to equate them, at others he distinguishes them, while elsewhere he focuses almost exclusively on well-established tropes of these royal personalities. This is especially the case with Francis I and Henry III. Finally, the author could perhaps have profitably drawn on recent scholarship on clientage and affinities when discussing the links between the court and wider French society. That said, scholars, students and the broader reading public will find this an engrossing and most enlightening study, suitable for classroom use or as a companion when visiting sites in France that still hark back to the Renaissance.

MICHAEL WOLFE, St John’s University


The collapse of communist governments in east-central Europe in 1989 was generally viewed as being the end of communism, despite the continuing existence of one-party communist states in China and Cuba, and communist parties which receive substantial votes in multi-party, free parliamentary elections – notably in Russia, France, the Indian state of Kerala and the Czech Republic. Since the fall of the Berlin wall, a steady flow of journalists and academics have published confident evaluations of communism’s rise and fall. Few of the early efforts stood the test of time; they were typically triumphalist, and exuded an optimism which has proved misplaced. Additional temporal distance and the psychological impact of the turn of a century have provided a more neutral perspective from which historians and social scientists can now contemplate what feels like the real past. Unlike Catholicism, communism has proved unable to effect its own counter-reformation. No one seriously expects the Chinese communist party to return to a revolutionary road.

Bolshevism. Stalinism and the Comintern is part of this second wave of more sober, and productive, re-appraisal. As a specialist, I would highly recommend it to non-specialists who are interested in developments in communist historiography. Its three editors specialize in the British CP (Morgan and Worley), and the German CP (LaPorte). They are also committed to a comparative approach. Their preference for going beyond national history is reflected in the
The number of national communist parties considered. Eleven of the book’s 15 chapters have a geographic focus, ranging from New Zealand through the Balkans to Finland. Three chapters are explicitly comparative. The CPNZ is compared to the CPGB by Kerry Taylor and Matthew Worley. Andreas Wirsching compares the impact of bolshevization and Stalinization on the French and German communist parties. Morgan and LaPorte consider the cult of leadership in the British and German CPs, with particular reference to the hagiographic uniformity imposed by a Stalinized party culture.

The national communist parties considered include the principal western European ones and the CPUSA. There are lapidary case studies of the CPUSA, Chicago’s foreign language-speaking communists, by Randi Storch and an analysis of the significance of syndicalism in the American party’s formation by Edward P. Johanningsmeier. The breadth of coverage means that readers are able to make their own comparisons across both nations and time. I was fascinated by the ineffectual Comintern supervision of the Finnish and New Zealand parties. (Tauno Saarela provides a comprehensive account of Finnish cadres’ consistent failure to implement Comintern directives.) Geographic proximity was evidently not a determinant of the intensity of Comintern scrutiny. Nor, apparently, was size. Emmet O’Connor discusses the Comintern’s focus on the communist party in Britain’s oldest colony, as well as its intermittent changes of policy towards the IRA. Although there was hardly a constant channel of communication and instruction from Moscow to Dublin, there was apparently a keen desire to determine the Irish party’s policy and conduct.

A chapter by Peter Huber provides an invaluable guide to the Comintern’s power structure and its personnel. Based on painstaking archival research, his chapter will enable non-specialists to understand better the operation and orientation of an institution which is too often merely demonized and dismissed as Stalin’s poodle. Two chapters deal with theoretical issues. Hermann Weber re-states his analysis of the KPD up to 1933. Because so little of his work has been translated from German, his chapter provides a valuable opportunity for non-German reading historians to assess his views, which have shaped the historiographical debates about the KPD for nearly 50 years. Brigitte Studer offers a thoughtful and subtle analysis of the concept of Stalinization. She adds a new dimension to Weber’s hypotheses, by focusing attention on the need to,

conceive of a model of multiple anchorages and contexts rather than of homogeneity or, conversely, of fragmented spheres . . . The history of communism . . . is a world, like court society, for which it is a case of . . . knowing the manner and degree of the interdependencies which bring people and groups of people together and bind them. (51)

Most authors concentrate their analyses within the period 1921–1939. Their decision to work within a shorter time-span than the book’s sub-title is understandable. The essential features of what is conventionally described as ‘Stalinization’ can be identified first during the Russian Civil War, even though Stalin was not in sole control of the CPSU(B) until c. 1929. Whilst there is still a lively debate about whether Lenin would have ‘Stalinized’ the Soviet party and the Comintern to the same extent as Stalin, most participants on both sides acknowledge that the roots of a one-party centralist state can be detected by 1920. (Jean-Francois Fayet’s chapter, ‘Paul Levi and the Turning Point of 1921: Bolshevik Emissaries and International Discipline in the Time of Lenin’, provides a forensic analysis of this move away from an open democratic culture.)
Precisely because communism-as-history is a largely unexplored terrain, the reader will be left reflecting about important unanswered questions. This is, however, a measure of the merit of *Bolshevism, Stalinism and the Comintern*, rather than a deficiency. Its contributions demarcate landmarks and possible pathways through the territory for researchers in sociology, economics and history.

**NINA FISHMAN,** Swansea University


In this book, Danish historian John T. Lauridsen deals with a period of Austrian history which has received far less attention than the period under the Habsburg Monarchy (up to 1918) and the period of National Socialism (1938–1945). For the years between the end of the First World War and the political abolition of Social-Democrats and National Socialists by the Christian-Socialist chancellor Engelbert Dollfuß in 1934, Lauridsen’s purpose is to compare the conservative *Heimwehr* (Home Defence League) with the National Socialist movement in terms of their social composition and background. The author tries to connect the economic and social evolution in Austria during the interwar period with the respective political forces and ideological positions of the *Heimwehr* and National Socialism. He also takes into account foreign influences, especially from Germany and Italy.

The author’s obvious predilection for statistical analysis suggests that research started in the 1970s, and indeed most of the literature used dates from the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. Nevertheless, the impressive bibliography (nearly 50 pages) also contains more recently published literature on the history of the First Austrian Republic and the rise of rightist movements. Although Lauridsen hardly makes use of archive material, his work offers important insights into the role played by the radical and extreme right in Austria during a period of economic, social and political instability. Contrary to quite a lot of historians, Lauridsen does not consider the *Heimwehr* to be a fascist movement, but a radical right one. Its ideology was mainly characterized by anti-parliamentarism, anti-monarchism, anti-Semitism and antibolshevism. It was linked to rural conservatism, and — apart from an extremist Styrian branch under the leadership of Walter Pfrimer, or the occasionally expressed admiration for Italian fascism by some *Heimwehr* leaders — most members of this highly decentralized organization were prepared to cooperate with the Christian-Social governments; in fact, the power apparatus of the state used the *Heimwehr* for the fight against the Social Democrats. The National Socialists, in contrast, aimed at abolishing the Austrian Republic and implementing their own political and social system. Unlike the *Heimwehr*, they gained more support in the cities than in the countryside. Finally, the comparison between the extreme and the radical right leads to the conclusion: ‘There are such deep and striking differences between the Nazis and the *Heimwehr* that it seems meaningless to encompass them in a common conceptual or political formula’ (443).

From this basis, it would be interesting to learn more about how other conservative organizations in the interwar political landscape might be embedded into the fabric of the First Austrian Republic, e.g. the *Großdeutsche Volkspartei* (Greater German People’s Party) or the *Landbund für Österreich* (Agrarian League of Austria). In this context, Lauridsen should
have taken greater account of the impact of Austria’s long history as part of the Habsburg Monarchy on the formation of its political identity. In other words, it would be worth discussing how far the authoritarian orientations of rightist movements might be considered as part of the longue durée of the monarchical legacy. In addition, further research could analyze in greater depth the dynamic interaction between the radical and extreme right on the one hand and the Social Democrats on the other. With regard to these and other questions, Nazism and The Radical Right makes a valuable contribution to the debate.

Johannes Koll, Economics University, Vienna

Jeff Lipkes, Rehearsals: The German Army in Belgium, August 1914, Leuven University Press: Leuven, 2007; 815 pp., 22 illus.; 9789058675965, €49.50/£33.00 (pbk)

For a long time, historians neglected the history of the First World War in Belgium, as the weight of the Second World War seemed to overshadow the Great War completely. During the last decade, however, Belgian historians, most notably Sophie de Schaepdrijver, have joined in the historiographical renewal of the study of the First World War. Outside the country, a revived interest in the Belgian experience of 1914–1918 has been clear as well. In particular, the fact that Belgium underwent a German invasion and occupation during the Great War has attracted the attention of historians looking for continuity and change in German war practices during the first half of the twentieth century (implicitly in the light of the Sonderweg debate). In recent years, a number of important books have been published on different aspects of the occupation: cultural politics (Ulrich Tiedau), forced labour (Jens Thiel) and policing (Benoît Majerus). The invasion itself has attracted even more attention, particularly the ‘German atrocities’ – the killing of 6000 Belgian civilians by the German military in August 1914. These were a focal point of political controversy during both the war and the post-war years, and nowadays too historians debate the origins and nature of these crimes. Only a few years ago, a well-balanced book by John Horne and Alan Kramer was widely hailed as the definitive study on the issue, because it seemed to have settled the old controversies by documenting the undeniable reality of the ‘atrocities’. Moreover, Horne and Kramer offered a powerful explanatory model. They interpreted the killings as the result of a form of delusion, namely the unfounded belief on the part of the German military that they were being attacked by Belgian franc-tireurs (civilian sharpshooters), a belief partly based on older experiences like the Franco-Prussian War.

The publication of a new book by Jeff Lipkes on the ‘German atrocities’ is once again proof that there is (luckily enough) no such thing as a definitive study in history. Lipkes formulates relevant critiques of Horne and Kramer, although he tends to reduce their interpretation to the impact of the legacy of 1870. Lipkes proposes a completely different explanation, seeing the executions in August 1914 as ‘part of a deliberate campaign of terrorism ordered by military authorities’ aimed at forcing Belgium to surrender. As the title clearly suggests, Lipkes denotes this terror campaign as constituting ‘rehearsals’ for the mass killings under Nazi Germany during the Second World War. As such, this book undoubtedly has the great merit of stimulating historical debate through some interesting and challenging theses, which are intrinsically worth testing. Lipkes rightly stresses relevant elements like the importance of timing for understanding the killings. Unfortunately, the way in which the research has
been carried out is not always equally convincing. In the absence of a ‘smoking gun’, a clear order by the German military command to unleash a terror campaign in invaded Belgium, Lipkes has to make use of a detailed description (over 542 pages) of looting, killing, raping and burning to make his point. Thick description is in itself an established method for unveiling the meaning and function of violence, but by restricting himself to a highly descriptive approach, Lipkes does not make use of its full analytical potential. A more in-depth analysis of the empirical material presented would have contributed to the strength of his central thesis. The author points also to some intriguing regional differences in the atrocities, as he suggests that the Germans’ attitude was harsher in French-speaking Wallonia than in Dutch-speaking areas. However, he does not offer an explanation for this difference.

Lipkes’ blunt central question – ‘why did the Germans engage in terrorism in 1914 and after?’ – already anticipates his answer: he sees the fundamental explanation for the German army’s behaviour in the specificity of German intellectual and cultural history. Militarism, nationalism, materialism and paganism supposedly formed a particularly dangerous cultural cocktail in nineteenth-century Germany, which then exploded for the first time in August 1914 in Belgium. This Sonderweg-style argumentation is well-known, but not unproblematic. By stressing the uniqueness of German, and especially Prussian, culture, it risks obliterating the potential for violence in other European national cultures.

Antoon Vrints, Ghent University


The study of early modern Catholicism has boomed in popularity in the last few decades. Revisionist work by scholars such as Michael Questier, Alexandra Walsham and Alison Shell has reinvigorated a once dormant historiographical landscape, evident in the proliferation of monographs concerned with the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Miola’s excellent anthology of primary sources on English Catholicism in its European context fills an important gap in the available literature, offering a variety of sources in printed form which challenge more traditional views of Catholicism as introspective, stagnant and politically quiescent.

The anthology opens with a 38-page introduction which offers a succinct discussion of early modern Catholic historiography. Having noted that early modern Catholicism had far more vitality that the traditional Reformation/Counter-Reformation dichotomy suggests, Miola goes on to give a brief history of the papacy during this period (recognizing the important links between English Catholics and the Vatican) and the history of English Catholicism from the Reformation to the mid-seventeenth century. Setting a scene for the sources presented is a nuanced view of religious identity in the early modern period, which holds that:

any assessment of Catholicism in the period has to be flexible enough to accommodate pluralities; it must be inclusive rather than exclusive in order to represent the ordinary as well as the extraordinary, the lukewarm, hidden, and halfway believers who lived beneath official noise. (29)

This approach accounts for the wide range of primary sources that Miola has included, making a decisive move beyond a sole focus on recusancy.
The sources in this anthology are separated into eight sections. ‘Controversies’ presents sources which engage broadly with political and religious issues of national and international significance. One of the most challenging is William Allen’s broadside, to have been distributed in the event of Spanish success in 1588, which details a plan to return England to Catholicism by force. The section ‘Lives and Deaths’ provides primary sources which offer insight into the lives of individual Catholics, including Edmund Campion’s Letter to Mercurian (1580) and extracts from Mary Ward’s autobiography. Miola succeeds in this section and others in presenting material related to Catholic women, as well as men, noting of individuals such as Mary Ward that ‘such figures challenge regnant clichés about Protestant emancipation and empowerment, reminding us that Catholic women... gave varied, courageous witness to their faith while actively reshaping its ministries’ (37). The next five sections are categorized by genre, under the titles ‘Poetry’, ‘Instructions and Devotions’, ‘Drama’, ‘Histories’ and ‘Fictions’. This short review cannot do justice to what appears here, beyond stating that Miola has incorporated a huge breadth of material, from poems by Robert Southwell and Ben Jonson to The Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola and excerpts from the histories of Robert Persons and Richard Verstegan. In offering a broad range of sources from these fields, Miola challenges the ‘inertia and ignorance [that] continue to distort the reality of Catholic presence and to silence Catholic voices, warping understanding of early modern English literature and culture’ (56). A section entitled ‘Documents’ offers a selection of Papal Bulls which had an impact on Catholics in England. Finally, there are 17 illustrations which are approached in a similar manner to the textual sources and offer further insight into early modern English Catholicism.

*Early Modern Catholicism* makes significant strides in challenging the neglect of its topic in mainstream historiography. The title is misleading, however, as it does not imply geographical limitations, while the book’s chronological coverage ends at 1640. As Miola states in his introduction, ‘*Early Modern Catholicism* aims to recover the Catholic origins and expressions of the English Renaissance (c. 1520–1640)’ (1). Nonetheless, the book is essential reading for all who work on early modern Catholicism. It is clearly written with a breadth that will satisfy theologians, historians and scholars of English literature. The sources that appear in the anthology cover a wide cross-section of issues related to English Catholicism: male and female, lay and religious, recusant and conformist Catholics are all discussed. The genres of sources considered is also varied, including letters, political writings, religious instruction, poetry and fiction, as well as manuscript (some of which appear in print for the first time) and printed sources. This excellent range of sources, supported by informed discussion and comprehensive footnotes, is an essential resource for those teaching on courses that explore religion in early modern England and Europe, while even the most experienced researchers in this field are likely to find new material here.

Geoff Baker, University of Nottingham

Michelle Mouton, *From Nurturing the Nation to Purifying the Volk: Weimar and Nazi Family Policy, 1918–1945*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2007; xvi + 310 pp.; 9780521861845, £47.00 (hbk)

Michelle Mouton’s monograph, based on her doctoral dissertation, is a welcome addition to
the growing body of literature on German family policy in the early twentieth century. It is one of very few books which explore aspects of social policy in both the Weimar and Nazi periods and the author is, therefore, able to contribute to wider historiographical debates about continuities in German history as well as the nature of the Nazi state and women’s agency within it. The strength of Mouton’s work lies in her wide mixture of primary sources, which enables her to assess the implementation of national family policy at a local level, specifically in Westphalia. These sources include national, state, municipal, church and court archives. These are supplemented by interviews with 48 women, which are used primarily to explore the impact of Nazi policy.

Mouton divides her book thematically, with six chapters exploring marriage, divorce, the promotion of motherhood, welfare programmes for mothers, and – in two final chapters which add significantly to the existing literature – single mothers, and foster care and adoption. In each chapter, Mouton explores national policy and its implementation at a local level, firstly during the Weimar Republic and then, in more detail, in Nazi Germany. While both the Weimar Republic and Nazi Germany wished to increase the birth-rate, reduce infant mortality and improve the nation’s health, Mouton is at pains to stress the lack of continuity between Weimar and Nazi policy. Indeed, she stresses that Nazi policy departed radically from anything preceding it. Mouton notes the lack of a coherent, uniform family policy at national level during the Weimar Republic as politicians, feminists, health officials and the Churches failed to agree on the reasons why the German family, the foundation stone of German society, was in crisis, on the means of restoring a healthy German family life, on the application of eugenics, or on the state’s right to intervene in family matters. She argues forcibly that only under the Nazi regime did family policy become, at a national level, monolithic, imbued with racial ideology and willing to intrude into private family concerns. However, Mouton’s case studies at a local level vividly demonstrate how judges, doctors, social workers and local officials mediated national policy, in both the Weimar Republic and Nazi Germany, adapting it to fit local circumstances and their own personal standpoints. They thereby undermined any Nazi attempt not only at imposing a uniform family policy, but also at implementing a consistent application of their racial guidelines. Mouton also traces the way in which the Nazis themselves adapted their policies to the changing circumstances brought about by war and notes the lack of priority they gave to enforcing the consistent implementation of their family policy. Mouton’s case studies reveal, as have others before her, women’s willingness to benefit from those Nazi policies they liked, avoiding those they did not care for, and their ability to use Nazi ideology both to further their own causes and to challenge official decisions. She concludes that ‘many women found ample opportunities to challenge, negotiate, manipulate, or, most frequently, evade Nazi policy altogether’.

Mouton’s well-researched study, though slightly marred by some minor factual inaccuracies such as the date of the Law to Reduce Unemployment, gives a fascinating insight into how national policy was implemented at a local level and deserves a wide readership, not only among those interested in German social policy but also among those wishing to know more about daily life under the Nazis and the nature of Nazi rule.

HELEN L. BOAK, University of Hertfordshire
Gerald Parsons, The Cult of Saint Catherine of Siena: A Study in Civil Religion. Ashgate: Aldershot, 2008; xi + 185 pp., 8 colour, 21 halftones. 9780754656456. £55.00 (hbk)

‘Civil (or civic) religion’ has been a major theme of Gerald Parsons’ œuvre. The term, as originally developed by American students of politics from the mid-1960s, referred to what would be conventionally regarded as secular ideologies and rituals, primarily in a US context. In an earlier work, Siena, Civil Religion and the Sienese (Aldershot 2006), beginning with the medieval cult of the Virgin Mary and of Sienese tutelary saints and ending with the contemporary pageant-cum-horse-race of the Palio, Parsons sought to establish a continuity between modern civil religion as defined above and the ‘civic religion’ of medieval and Renaissance city states as highlighted in recent scholarship.

In the present work, yet another long-range study, he examines ‘the various ways in which devotees of Catherine of Siena, and other advocates of her significance, have promoted, deployed and exploited her cult as a means of seeking to cultivate a shared sense of history and destiny, and to promote particular values, as Sienese, as Italians and as Europeans’. An initial account of Catherine’s life (1347–80) leads to an examination of the different readings to which it has been subjected on the part of both hagiographers and scholars. Parsons then examines her emergence as a local tutelary saint from the late fourteenth century, the promotion of her canonization (1461), primarily by the Sienese alongside the Dominicans, and the process whereby she and St Bernardino came to dominate the pantheon of Sienese saints in the early modern period. Coverage of the nineteenth century is brief. The book gives intensive treatment to the development of the saint’s cult in the twentieth century, a period only really covered hitherto in secondary literature by Italian local historians. It shows how, during World War I, Catherine’s preaching of a crusade could be seen as relevant to Italy’s ongoing eastern Mediterranean campaign.

In the Fascist era, her cult was further linked to the Italian nationalist cause; she was billed as a leading Italian saint, indeed as the very quintessence of ‘Italianness’ and ‘Romanness’. In Siena, the cult provided a bond between the Church and conservative elements in the regime. In 1930, largely as the outcome of a campaign by the archbishop of Siena, Pius XII proclaimed Catherine and St Francis joint patrons of Italy. Catherine had even become in effect patron of the Italian armed forces. Her blessing was invoked upon the Italian military effort in Ethiopia and during World War II. By mid 1943, however, as the adventure turned to disaster for Italy, Catherine came to be invoked as protectress amid the horrors of the conflict. In the post-war era, with Italy bitterly divided internally, Catherine, with the focus on her role in the factional and inter-state struggles of her own time, was celebrated by churchmen and Christian Democrat spokesmen as a promoter of peace, justice and unity. This supported an ideological redefinition of the role of the army in a peaceful democratic republic. It also laid the basis for a long campaign, ultimately successful in 1999, for her to be proclaimed co-patron of Europe (alongside St Benedict). Not all had been sweetness and light, however. A militantly anti-communist message from the Christian Democrats could also be conveyed through the commemoration of the ‘civic’ Catherine.

A fuller attention to the cult of St Catherine in the liberal era, on which there is a discrete Italian historiography, would have enhanced the value of this study. Catherine had been celebrated then not only by hard-line clericals, in particular for her loyalty to the papacy, but also by leading conciliatoristi who wished to heal the schism between the Church and the political community, namely the philologist Nicolo Tommaseo (here briefly mentioned).
and the Neapolitan Oratorian Alfonso Capecelatro, archbishop of Capua. These first developed the image of Catherine, not just as a conventional spiritual and ascetic figure, but as a peacemaker and an active exemplar of civic ideals, an image later taken up by the Catholic nationalist Piero Misciatelli, whom Parsons examines in some detail. Notwithstanding such lacunae, this book is a work of impressive range whose theoretical significance extends well beyond the field of Italian studies.

Oliver Logan, University of East Anglia

Antje Pieper, Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture: A Comparative History of Nineteenth-Century Leipzig and Birmingham, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2008; xix + 214 pp., 7 figs; 9780230545137. £45.00 (hbk)

The increasing presence of historians among those studying musical culture — long primarily the domain of musicologists — suggests that the cultural significance of musical practice is beginning to receive long overdue attention. William Weber’s path-breaking work on the social structure of concert life has been followed by stimulating studies taking a variety of perspectives, by historians including James Johnson, Michael Steinberg, Jolanta T. Pekacz, Celia Applegate and Tim Blanning. Even within this growing body of historical work on musical culture, however, explicitly comparative studies remain the exception rather than the rule. Given the traditional predominance of work on German music, particularly in the nineteenth century, then, the appearance of a study like Antje Pieper’s, promising to place one of the dominant centres of German musical culture in comparison with a much less familiar English one, is welcome. The narrative of the rise of classical music, particularly in Germany, is a familiar one; a comparison between one of the central institutions in that narrative (the Gewandhaus concert series) with a far less familiar, but also long-lived English institution (Birmingham’s Triennial Festival) could provide a valuable perspective on what has too often been treated as a natural, or at least inevitable, development. The topic, then, is well chosen, and the introduction promises a plausible approach based on journalistic and institutional sources interpreted within a framework informed by the history of aesthetics, the social history of music, the extensive literature on the history of the bourgeoisie, and critical work by both Germanists and sociologists.

However, although Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture draws attention to a number of salient parallels and contrasts in the histories of these two institutions and the values that they at least partially expressed, in the end it relies too heavily on the familiar narratives to which it might have provided alternatives. The author’s avowed goal is to make sense of each local phenomenon within a context of its respective national culture, with an emphasis on how ‘basic aesthetic ideas, religious stipulations and resultant conceptions of cultural propriety’ (xix) shaped and helped give meaning to music’s role within bourgeois culture. However, instead of beginning with the specific practices of the institutions and those active within them, it draws on relatively unnuanced sketches of basic cultural orientations. So, for example, Romanticism is unproblematically presented as the central aesthetic tenet of the German bourgeoisie in the early nineteenth century (see especially 40–1), without any suggestion that substantial elements of this movement developed directly out of dissatisfaction with what were considered to be bourgeois values, or that concert life might not be
a direct reflection of ideals propounded by aestheticians and music critics. The book’s discussion of English society is no more nuanced; we read, for instance, that ‘every Victorian spectator and listener was still equipped with an impeccable moral sense which was essential to comprehend the moral and religious ideals portrayed in a work of art’ (148). Such generalizations oversimplify both intellectual and social history, and are echoed and exacerbated by a sometimes uncritical approach to sources: with respect to musical culture in particular, for example, the author takes the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (whose first editor was known not as ‘Johann’ [45] but rather Friedrich Rochlitz) and the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik as straightforwardly representative of Leipzig’s bourgeois ideals in music, despite the former journal’s manifest (and impressively realized) ambition of becoming the recognized national voice of German music and the latter’s often explicit rejection of what it took to be complacent bourgeois culture. Essential nuances such as the careful differentiation of different strands of criticism, apparent, for instance, in Sanna Pederson’s work on German music criticism are not to be found here.

This is not to say that Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture offers no insights into the institutions it studies; its comparative framework allows the author to draw attention, for instance, to the remarkable and not strictly equivalent prominence of Mendelssohn before mid-century in two very different contexts, or the contrasting roles of two exceptionally long-lived directors in the later nineteenth century (Carl Reinecke in Leipzig and Michael Costa in Birmingham). However, because it never undertakes a close and differentiated study of the musical and social practices of its two locations, Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture asserts rather than demonstrates the link between values and institutions that it sets out to investigate, and in the process overlooks the variety and internal tensions which characterized not only the bourgeoisie as a class but also their public musical practices and institutions.

David Gramit, University of Alberta

Paul Reitter, The Anti-Journalist: Karl Kraus and Jewish Self-Fashioning in Fin-de-Siècle Europe, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2008. 254 pp.; 9780226709703, $35.00/£24.00 (hbk)

Karl Kraus is one of the great satirists, but also one of the most controversial, one of the least known outside of the region (or even outside of Vienna), and, on the evidence of Paul Reitter’s interesting book, one of the least understood and most abused. To a large extent this is a fate that Kraus brought upon himself, concentrating as he did on the microcosm of the world of Viennese journalism, and on topics that only contemporaries and latter-day Krausian cognoscenti could find of interest. For all that, he is still one of the major figures of early twentieth-century Central European modernism, and Reitter’s book gives ample evidence why.

Reitter’s initial starting point is to confront the charge levelled against Kraus by what he claims is the predominant part of modern Kraus scholarship, of Jewish self-hatred. Reitter remains studiedly ambivalent about this, and many of the strongest words he has against the ‘self-hatred school’ when it comes to Kraus are tucked away in the extensive and rather verbose endnotes. The extent to which Reitter himself feels uncomfortable in challenging the self-hatred hypothesis is evidenced by his devoting, apparently in the interests of being ‘fair and
balanced’, a large amount of space in the endnotes to attacking Allan Janik for his critique of the self-hatred hypothesis. Reitter particularly targets Janik’s critique of Peter Gay’s dismissal of Otto Weininger as a self-hating Jew who shot himself because of his ‘indelible’ Jewishness. Reitter claims that Janik’s attack is misplaced, because Gay was referring to Weininger’s own view of his Jewishness rather than his (Gay’s) own view. What Reitter, however, in turn, does not see, is that Janik’s point about the pitfalls which the self-hatred hypothesis leads us into is valid, whether Gay was putting his own view forward or Weininger’s. For it is crass speculation, based on no firm evidence, and contradicted by Weininger’s own claims, that Weininger ever acknowledged any ‘indelible’ Jewishness. Rather than this overly circum-spect approach (too intent on avoiding treading on relevant toes), Reitter would have been much better served in this case, as in the rest of his book, in simply acknowledging Janik’s central point, namely that the concept of Jewish self-hatred has been a hindrance rather than a help to understanding the dynamic of the participation of Jews in early twentieth-century Central European culture and thought.

Setting aside Reitter’s obfuscatory apologetics about self-hatred, his book possesses many intriguing insights into Kraus, and the furure and inspiration he caused. The Kraus that emerges is, to be sure, a person with a strong dislike for much of what was viewed as ‘Jewish journalism’. Yet – and this is Reitter’s main point – what Kraus was protesting against in Heine and the Consequences was not ‘Jewishness’ or ‘Jews’ as such, nor even ‘Jewish’ reproductive mimesis rather than ‘German’ original creativity, but rather the (in Kraus’ view) craven attempt by Jewish writers to ape their German counterparts, and outdo them, in the originality stakes. In other words, Kraus’ main target was, in the parlance of the time, the form of Jewish assimilation in nineteenth-century German-language literature and journalism, symbolized by the feuilleton, which conflated creativity and factual reporting in such a way that abused both. In contrast, Kraus’ own chosen method was a form of reproductive ‘mirroring’, through quotation and mimicking of others’ language, which, as Reitter points out, was seen at the time as the epitome of the Jewish approach to culture, both by anti-Semites and Jewish writers. Kraus, in effect, took the epithet cast in his direction by Franz Werfel, of being a ‘mirror-man’, as a point of honour.

Reitter buttresses this central insight with interesting excursions on Kraus’ appreciation of Offenbach, Yiddish theatre, and Jewish writers such as Peter Altenberg, as well as on appreciations of Kraus by those luminaries of American-academic discursive discourse, Franz Kafka, Gershom Scholem and Walter Benjamin. It is a little unclear why this is such a key part of Reitter’s argument, except perhaps in emphasizing that if the demi-gods of Weimar literary studies had such a high opinion of Kraus as a Jewish writer, then he cannot have been as bad as the ‘self-hatred’ school think he was. Kraus himself appears to have been unenthusiastic and uncomprehending of Benjamin’s extremely esoteric essay on him, and one can perhaps understand this reaction in reading Reitter’s own exegesis of Benjamin. Reitter has some way to go, further than he thinks, before he lives up to his subject (assuming that it is Kraus, and not Benjamin). That said, this book contains much of interest, both in terms of material and insight. It certainly explains, in its many intricacies, why Kraus remains an obscure and neglected figure, but also why he remains one of the key individuals in Central European modernism.

Steven Beller, George Washington University, Washington, DC
Isabelle Rohr, The Spanish Right and the Jews, 1898–1945: Antisemitism and Opportunism, Sussex Academic Press: Brighton, 2007; xviii + 211 pp., 11 illus.; 9781845191818. £45.00 (hbk)

In 1944, as the Second World War in Europe moved towards its conclusion in terms quite different from those long envisaged by Franco, the regime in Madrid initiated a major public relations enterprise to change its fascistic image. One of its major arguments was the contention that the Spanish regime had never been anti-Semitic and was playing a significant role in rescuing Jews from Hitler’s clutches. This position was further elaborated in the immediate post-war period and achieved a certain amount of acceptance in some circles. The truth of the matter, however, was considerably different and much more complex.

Scholarly literature on the Jews and anti-Semitism in modern Spain and on the Spanish policy towards the Holocaust has developed only slowly. It began with Haim Avni’s Spain, the Jews and Franco (1982), followed by the broader work of Antonio Marquina Barrio and Gloria Inés Ospina, España y los judíos en el siglo XX (1987), achieving a new level with the systematic research presented by Bernd Rother in his Spanien und der Holocaust (2001; Spanish translation, Franco y el Holocausto, 2003). The issue of anti-Semitism was broadly addressed by Gonzalo Álvarez Chillida, El antisemitismo en España: La imagen del judío (2002). In the introduction to this published dissertation, Isabelle Rohr takes note of the accomplishments of this recent literature, and argues for the special significance of her own work in terms of its contribution to the understanding of the interplay between modern Spanish imperialism and anti-Semitism. Though this dimension was not totally ignored by Álvarez Chillida, who concentrated on the study of literary, as distinct from more directly political, expressions of anti-Semitism, Rohr’s work deals especially with politics and ideology, and is most original particularly in its analysis of the influence exerted by the new Spanish imperialism in northern Morocco. That the Spanish right was generally anti-Jewish is not, of course, a new finding, and such an orientation was partially contested by the new, early twentieth-century trend of ‘philosephardism’ on the part of some Spanish nationalists, who held that Sephardic Jews were superior to other Jews in having been ‘purified’ by Spanish culture. Rohr does an able job in sorting out these only partially contradictory trends, and contributes more than a little primary research in Spanish archives to present a more complete account.

The most important part of the book deals with the role of Spanish Morocco, which contains the highest proportion of new data. As Rohr emphasizes, there has been a considerable amount of recent literature in Spain on Spanish policy and actions in the Protectorate, focused almost exclusively on relations with and attitudes towards the Moroccan population, while generally ignoring the place of the once significant Jewish population in northern Morocco. In this regard, the book fills a notable gap. One wishes only that a bit more attention had been paid to the other side of the coin, for the single paragraph devoted to the support for Franco by Jewish bankers and businessmen in north Morocco does not do full justice to that aspect of the problem. By this point the peculiar relationship between modern Spain and the Jews, together with the policy of the Franco regime, has been effectively demythologized. Racial anti-Semitism was weak in Spain, compared with other forms, and the Franco regime never instituted any measures of anti-Semitic discrimination against its tiny Jewish population, to the outrage of German diplomats. But Spanish policy was not really pro-Jewish, as legend has it, nor, despite certain undeniable achievements, was there any systematic Spanish interven-
tion to rescue Jews, save at the very end. This new study further helps to clarify a complex situation.

STANLEY G. PAYNE, University of Wisconsin-Madison


These incredibly well-researched and persuasive volumes contribute to our understanding of Bolshevism in general and of Stalin and Stalinism in particular in several respects. The extent to which Stalinism represented a continuation of Leninism-Bolshevism has been much studied and disputed. For Rosenfeldt, one of Bolshevism’s key features, even in the pre-revolutionary period, was its emphasis on conspiracy, not so much for the attainment of goals but as an activity that was valued in and of itself (I, 104). Little surprise, then, that under Lenin and Stalin there was a concentration of resources on special departments in which all sorts of issues were treated as secret. Indeed, a hierarchy of secrets had to be defined in which the most sensitive information was available to only a very narrow circle. As a general rule, information was controlled on a strictly need-to-know basis. Furthermore separate layers of the bureaucracy, including the special departments, operated in isolation. Only the uppermost echelons of the hierarchy, and in particular Stalin’s personal chancellery, could sift information coming from a variety of sources. In this respect, Khrushchev may not have been masking his own responsibility for Stalin’s Terror when in the Secret Speech of 1956 he claimed that only Stalin possessed the full picture. Comrades found it difficult, if not impossible, to oppose Stalin when they were deprived of information.

Rosenfeldt is right to trace Stalin’s rise to power to the establishment of a special section system in which all the threads met in departments controlled by the leader. Stalin thus had unique access to data and a network of agents within institutions that could check individuals or monitor the implementation of orders. This ‘bureaucracy within the bureaucracy’ helps us to understand how periodic purges of party and state personnel were undertaken. In a society in which everyone was a potential spy, the need for vetting was constant. In this context, it is worth noting that serving in the special sections was not without its risks. Of the 213 brief biographies of members of the special sections (II, 345–71), 51 were executed or died in prison. If one cannot therefore understand Stalinism without knowledge of the special secret apparatus, then Rosenfeldt can be congratulated for offering as detailed an account as is currently possible of the numerous personal and institutional ‘special sections’ which were littered across the Soviet party, state and Comintern structures. Rosenfeldt is meticulous in establishing when particular sections were created, how they changed, and what functions they performed. This is a particularly complex task given the level of secrecy and the fact that naming is often obscure both in official documents and in reminiscences. Helpful diagrams present a very clear summary of the main secret institutions and their functions in their various guises and how they interacted with party and state bodies (II, 325–44).

The secret sections were clearly of vital importance in Stalin’s personal role in the Soviet government. Stalin intervened in incredible detail and liked to know his brief better than
anyone else. He lacked trust in ordinary officials to provide accurate summaries and relied upon his own hidden networks. He had the upper hand over the elite and was able to block leading figures, important sections of the bureaucracy, and ultimately the ordinary citizenry from forming effective opposition. No one knew when a compromising file might be produced against them. However, the fact that the special departments served Stalin’s need for power did not make for the most effective and efficient form of government. Rosenfeldt is all too aware of the flaws and problems of the special apparatus. It placed a tremendous burden on the administration, which was inevitably clogged up by the demands of excessive verification. This was felt with particular force in a system characterized by heavy government intervention. Furthermore, how could the bureaucracy formulate sensible policy proposals when it was kept in the dark about relevant data that may have been housed in another institution? In this way, the special system not only kept Stalin and Stalinism in business, it also contributed to its demise.

Rosenfeldt’s work can be recommended not only for its insights into the history of the Russian revolution and government under Stalin. It is also fascinating as an insight into the process of research. The introduction has an honest evaluation of the value and limits of archival materials and how they need to be placed in the context of previous publications, including the émigré literature. Even flawed and one-sided memoirs can still give accurate insights. The introductory chapter could easily be set as required reading for a seminar on the historian’s craft. It is also interesting to read the author’s account of how previous endeavours have been misunderstood or misrepresented. The debate with the scholarly literature runs to a consideration of key works published after the conclusion of this manuscript (II, 500–5). One concludes with a feeling that this remains a ‘live topic’ on which the author still has much to contribute.

IAN D. THATCHER, Brunel University

Guido Ruggiero, Machiavelli in Love: Sex, Self, and Society in the Italian Renaissance, Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD. 2007; 286 pp.; 9780801885167, £30.00/$45.00 (hbk)

With this work, Guido Ruggiero explores the interrelationship between personal and sexual identity in Renaissance society, both in terms of formation and perception. The sources and methodologies employed here distinguish this work from his earlier offerings. Previously, he relied on archival sources from criminal and civil courts, notaries and inquisitional records. Ruggiero now combines these with the discourse found in three literary genres: novellas, comedies and letters. The additional dimension to Ruggiero’s critical, if occasionally deeply theoretical, analysis of literary and historical sources, is the awareness they provide of his focal concepts of self and sexual identity as understood and constructed by specific audiences, authors and groups in Renaissance Italy.

Ruggiero begins with a literary analysis of Pietro Aretino’s comedy Il marescalco, which seemingly promoted the acceptance of sodomy and homosexuality as a part of the natural development of Renaissance identity. One must wonder, however, if any work by the infamous Aretino could be considered normative, or a direct commentary on socially acceptable behaviour. Unlike his previous work, which centred on sexual offenses, and particularly sodomy. Ruggiero has constructed a Renaissance society where both men and women pass
through prescribed stages of sexual development, in establishing their personal and societal identity. In the following section of the book, Ruggiero continues his literary analyses, but juxtaposes these with records from the Venetian branch of the Holy Inquisition. Using the well known account of seduction in the guise of blasphemy in the story of Rustico and Alibech from Giovanni Boccaccio’s *Decameron*, Ruggiero connects the concepts of sex, play, and the Devil as a segue to the criminal case of the Venetian nun Suor Mansueta’s affair with the Devil. In both examples, the Devil provides a focal point for forbidden passion, taking the desire and sin outside the individual, and outside their identity. This is followed by a similar comparison in the third chapter with the case of the abbot Alessandro Ruis before the Holy Office of Venice, on accusations that his former concubine employed love magic. The development of this case dominates the chapter, evolving to encompass issues related to gender identity, prostitution and the relative powers of custom and ecclesiastical authority. The literary dimension of this section also has a treatment of Francesco Andreini’s performance of Captain Fear and the Amazons, which satirizes both male and female sexual stereotypes, in particular reversing them by making the comedic figure of the Captain into a male concubine.

Ruggiero continues his literary programme, but moves away from comparisons with judicial sources, with a tale recorded by the Florentine Antonio Manetti, and a correspondence between Machiavelli and Francesco Vettori. With these, he creates a narrative constructing masculine identity amidst the virtù-dominated landscape of Renaissance Florence through the medium of play, specifically the practical joke or beffa. In the case of Manetti, the identity played with in his story of Brunelleschi’s practical joke is not specifically the sexual identity, but more the public persona, of Grasso the woodcarver. Ruggiero makes much of the male control of the public and private spaces of Florence and the development of a realm of virtù, which seems to imply by extension an all-male sexual identity as well. The complementary source by Machiavelli, recounting the sexual exploits of the Florentines, Guiliano Brancacci and Filippo Casavecchia, sustains the suggestion of the previous piece about the social and sexual identities of men. With this section, Ruggiero adds the fascinating idea of gendered space to the discussion. Machiavelli returns to centre-stage in the concluding chapters, his identity portrayed within the sexualized rhetoric of his letters to Francesco Vettori and in his two comedies, *La Mandragola* and *La Clizia*, appropriately set against the backdrop of Renaissance virtù. It is with this concept of virtù as a centralized, defining maleness that Ruggiero concludes the work, bringing the argument full circle from the chronologically and socially dependent definitions of sex and identity established by Foucault, to the Renaissance idea of virtù.

With so many personalities, sources and ideas brought into this work, it is difficult not to question if Ruggiero’s gamesmanship does not ultimately overreach. With a mix of genres and artists spanning almost three centuries and sources concentrated almost exclusively on Florence and Venice, how much of the subtleties comprising Renaissance society, life and identities is lost through this generalizing? Surely, identity of any sort, whether sexual, social, literary or historical, differed greatly from one Italian city to another, and especially, alters over time. That aside, however, with this work, Guido Ruggiero succeeds in his stated goal ‘to suggest much but claim little’ (18) about a host of subjects, and ultimately makes a remarkable case for the integration of individual and societal identity within an understanding of the Italian Renaissance.

*Jason Hardgrave, University of Southern Indiana*

Surely as daunting as the heights of Chimborazo is the number of publications graphed onto the ‘histogram’ in Nicholas Rupke’s first chapter: some 5000 writings on the life of Alexander von Humboldt had appeared by early 2000, and that number has only increased in the ensuing years. The graph vividly illustrates the wealth of material facing the researcher, with astounding peaks forming in anniversary years, some 20 to 50 books at a time. What Rupke chose to do in the face of this formidable range of biographical information, rather than generate yet another biography, might serve as a lesson to any scholar overwhelmed by the modern explosion of information. Like any good mountaineer, he chooses to re-assess the well-worn approaches, and the result he calls a ‘metabiography’. Rather than attempt to recover an authentic life behind the Humboldt myths (since there isn’t one to recover in any case), Rupke looked to the reception of Humboldt over time, particularly in each of the modern German regimes. By focusing on the German material, thus making a practical concession to challenge only one peak at a time, Rupke sets reasonable limits on an unwieldy project, leaving the other peaks to future climbers.

The new paperback edition from Chicago adds to the original edition of 2005 a brief preface and one note describing the metabiographical approach in greater detail. The Humboldt who emerges from metabiographical analysis is complex and fragmented. Although a brief chronology of his life prefaces the book, the reader is expected to know something about the famous scientist, traveller and author in order to appreciate the way that his memory is manipulated. Indeed, his fame is a given, and without this premise, the book would not make sense. Metabiography will only work where the individual’s eminence has generated sufficient comment. Drawing on the work of historian of science Steven Shapin, among others, Rupke defines metabiography as:

> not merely writing about predecessors and the strengths or weaknesses of their interpretations of a scientific life. It is a hermeneutic of biography that understands the biographee as a composite construct of different memory cultures and so recognizes the essential instability of modern lives. (214)

Rupke is sympathetic to postmodern analyses but he does not depend on them: rather, he selects the most useful elements of modernist, postmodern and social historical criticisms, cobbling together a pragmatic approach to what he sees as an ultimately political choice of a Humboldt for each regime (214–18). Where there is fame, there is hagiography; where there is hagiography, there are political commitments.

Rupke argues that each regime got the Humboldt that suited its needs, but the continuities between these regimes make for quite ironic symbioses. Humboldt lived a large part of his adult life in France, wrote primarily in French, and when he returned to Germany, he was a Prussian civil servant. And while he had achieved the ‘first’ of climbing Chimborazo before any other European, as a scientist he had ‘failed’ to make his mark in any one field or by creating a single, systematic study. All of this presented obstacles to the first generation of biographers, the 1848-ers, proto-nationalists and scientists who wanted to honour Humboldt as a progenitor of pan-German science. Wilhelmine Humboldt ardour found adherents among cultural imperialists as well as cultural nationalists, who as late as 1945 were invoking Humboldt as the ambassador of German values to Latin America. The Nazis were not the
only ones to white out Humboldt’s formative friendships with Berlin Jews, which were then ‘discovered’ by the West Germans. East Germans, predictably but also defensibly, found a reliable socialist, but interestingly also the abolitionist almost universally ignored by earlier biographers. Humboldt’s name was persistently linked with Goethe’s, creating a dual apotheosis of German culture, and yet the meaning of this duo alternated like electrical current between cosmopolitanism and German national identity. After the unification of 1990, a green Humboldt, forerunner of modern globalism, has emerged.

While Rupke’s elegant solution to source overload is stimulating, there is one drawback to metabiography: the totalizing of each epoch’s Humboldt raises the obvious question of whether there were no dissidents. Was there no right-wing Humboldt appreciation prior to 1870? No neo-liberal thereafter? Must all biographies fit into the metabiographical mould? Yet in this rendering, aspects of Humboldt’s life emerge non-chronologically, which makes for entertaining reading since new biographical elements surface as priorities under each regime. And if anyone ever harboured doubts about historical scholarship’s ability to reach ‘that noble dream’ of objectivity, Rupke convincingly offers Humboldt biography as the case study par excellence of the omnipresent political commitments which continually inhabit it.

Susan A. Crane, University of Arizona


There has been a distinct absence of significant historical works providing new insights into European decolonization. Here, Martin Shipway goes some way to bridging this gap by accounting for the process and impact of decolonization at the level of the ‘late colonial state’ from a comparative perspective. By drawing together various strands of the top down ‘imperial’ and ‘nationalist’ theses, Shipway’s explications confirm to a large degree what some have long known, that disengagement from empire was activated by the Second World War because it challenged the sustaining ideologies of the colonial powers towards empire and altered the dialectic with their colonial subjects (234), eventually bringing down the curtain of imperial rule long before leading European policy makers had anticipated. Ultimately, the change in European attitudes towards empire heightened the expectations of ordinary colonial citizens and political leaders who increasingly made demands of the colonial state, which it was not at liberty politically, or economically, to deny (116).

Overall, Shipway has provided an extensive, lively and informed view of the end of European empires, engaging with important theoretical approaches and selecting carefully chosen case studies in order to support his arguments. His account is delicately balanced between the opposed schools, which cite either nationalist pressure or colonial enlightened and self-interested policies as the prime movers in this massive sequence of transfer of sovereignty. A particular advantage of the author’s comparative approach is that it enables him to challenge the prevailing assumption that decolonization experiences of major European powers were essentially dissimilar, especially in Africa. Although the pattern of colonial politics worked out differently within the British and French systems, the plans of both powers coincided, not least in their timetable for decolonization (237). Also remarkably similar were
the ways in which the development of colonial politics forced leading European politicians to diverge from plans to lead the colonies to self-government and to envisage their role within wider imperial systems instead.

Occasionally, however, the book suffers from tunnel vision; the focus is primarily political and, as a result, important economic factors and some of the more difficult international issues tend to receive less attention than they deserve. A brief discussion on the declining economic value of empire and even the growing lure of Europe, particularly to France, would have done much to expand the scope of the book. There is also an evident bias towards the British and French experiences, with a majority of case studies devoted exclusively to these colonies. Whilst this says much about the importance of Britain and France in the historiography of decolonization, the reader is deprived of key examples from the Belgian, Dutch or Portuguese experiences, which might well have provided a more illuminating picture of colonialism’s overall impact. Ultimately, these oversights prove to be the book’s major drawback, since this reviewer cannot help but feel that, in spite of its many merits, Shipway misses an opportunity to produce a work with genuine comparative reach. The chronological approach to examining the impact of decolonization significantly narrows the scope for cross-comparative case studies, which might have revealed some of the more intricate similarities and differences between the experiences of each major European colonial power rather than the broad patterns that seem to emerge. Only in the conclusion is an explicit cross-comparison made between the experiences of European powers in the decolonization of South East Asia and Africa and, unsurprisingly, these final pages serve to be the most insightful in the entire book.

The end of empire traced in this book is overwhelmingly that which was perceived and experienced by European governments, ministers and civil servants. Shipway’s conclusions thus tend to reflect the prevailing historiography on the subject. Whilst more research is needed in this field, it can be hoped that this work will be the last of a particular genre of political and bureaucratic narrative. While the author, an expert on French imperialism, has attempted to provide a new overview of decolonization by adopting a comparative approach, the lack of detailed scholarly research on the comparison of decolonization experiences admittedly makes his task a difficult one and perhaps a more collaborative approach is needed in future. In brief, the shortcomings of this book are almost certainly an indictment of the existing literature and this is only one of a few books published recently which seeks to unravel the complexities of decolonization by comparing the experiences of the major colonial powers. As such, the book will prove a useful resource for students and scholars alike. Hopefully, it will also stimulate further work, as much remains to be done to amplify this complex subject.

ROB POWER. King’s College London

Willa Z. Silverman, The New Bibliopolis: French Book Collectors and the Culture of Print 1880–1914. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2008; 312 pp., 60 illus.; 9780802092113. $75.00/£48.00 (hbk)

This beautifully illustrated and impressively researched study of French book collectors at the fin-de-siècle draws readers into the little-known world of elite, male bibliophiles. Filled with rich details about the lives and views of a handful of collectors whose tastes and values shaped the worlds of books and art, Willa Silverman’s interdisciplinary study demonstrates the inter-
related nature of literary and artistic production and consumption. As patrons who often commissioned or even produced the books they collected, these men had a profound impact on the genres of symbolism and art nouveau, just as these movements shaped their tastes and aesthetic choices. Unlike earlier book collectors, the new bibliophiles, who included aesthetes, publishers, critics, and dandies such as Octave Uzanne and Robert de Montesquiou, did not focus their efforts on acquiring valuable old books, but rather new ones whose value came from the artistic and technical experimentation expressed through them and from their extremely low production numbers—some even one of a kind and often with personal inscriptions by the authors. The covers and pages of these books were literally works of art created with the most cutting-edge technology, which also made use of daring and controversial styles. Silverman’s research into these men’s correspondence and publications, along with the books themselves and even images of the libraries and furniture owned by these men, provides convincing evidence for her argument about the significance of this world of elite collectors. ‘Through their role as mediators among printers, engravers, book and print dealers, review directors, and of course authors and artists, collectors such as Uzanne and his fellow denizens of the new bibliopolis became important agents of cultural change’ (140). Their choices and passions stimulated elite cultural production and even had an impact on the mass-produced books they so disdained.

While I thoroughly enjoyed my immersion into this world that Silverman so engagingly describes, I found myself wishing she had done more to connect her examples and analysis to broader social and cultural themes. The book purports to be situated ‘at the juncture of the overlapping disciplines of book history and French sociocultural history’ (6), and as such, more needed to be done to broaden the scope of analysis beyond the worlds of books and art. The book also needed a stronger analytical framework. The logic of the book’s organization is often unclear, as I struggled to find a larger point beyond the implicit argument that this world of fin-de-siècle bibliophiles deserves to be recognized for its important cultural impact.

The most successful chapter is the last one, on women and the strong prevalence of misogyny among these men, who simultaneously viewed women as antithetical to book collecting and yet used metaphors equating books to women. One book lover described their approach as ‘carnally bibliophilic’: they would begin by caressing the volume to appreciate ‘the perfection of the casing, the firmness of the back, and the softness of the skin and its polish, and the adornment, and the lace, and the virginal freshness’ (174). One notorious and sadistic bibliophile from London, Frederick Hankey, supposedly even had books bound in female skin. In addition, many of these collectors included erotica in their libraries, placing them ‘harem-like, behind curtains or a triple lock’ (178). Here, Silverman connects her analysis to the emergence of sexology and of the homosexual as a social type, as book collectors sought to create a world of male bonding that was not tinged by homosexuality. This chapter’s engagement with issues related to sexuality, journalism, feminism, and other broader concerns, make it relevant to scholars interested in a wide range of topics beyond the history of the book and the decorative arts.

Along with its incredibly thorough and imaginative research, the most impressive part of this book is the illustrations. The books these collectors had produced, along with the libraries and furniture they created in which to house and appreciate their collections, are beautiful works of art, which deserve greater recognition among scholars of art history, history and literature. Only someone as well-versed in these various disciplines as Silverman could have
conceived of a project such as this one, and the book deserves a wide readership. Scholars interested in the genres of art nouveau and symbolism, and the culture of fin-de-siècle France more generally, will enjoy reading this book, both for the rich details it includes and the insightful analysis it offers of this fascinating world of bibliophiles.

Denise Z. Davidson, Georgia State University

Matthew Stibbe, British Civilian Internees in Germany: The Ruhleben Camp, 1914–18. Manchester University Press: Manchester, 2008; 224 pp., 18 illus.: 9780719070846. £55.00 (hbk); 9780719070853, £14.99 (pbk)

Recent years have witnessed an upsurge of scholarly interest in captivity during the First World War. Historians such as Uta Hinz, Jochen Oltmer, Alon Rachamimov, Rainer Pöppinghege and Heather Jones have shed considerable light on the organization and ordeals of military prisoners between 1914 and 1918. Comparatively little attention, however, has been given to the over 700,000 civilians forcibly deported or imprisoned worldwide during the hostilities. The aim of Matthew Stibbe’s detailed study of the German internment camp for British civilians at the Ruhleben racecourse, near Berlin, is to open up investigation into this important new area of research.

Stibbe’s book is organized into six chapters. In the first, he examines the politics of internment in Germany, explaining why just over 4000 British males of military age living or stranded in the Reich at the war’s outbreak were rounded up and imprisoned in early November 1914. He shows that this was not the German government’s preferred policy, but that the measure was enacted in response to British refusal to agree to a reciprocal exchange of civilians and the internment of German subjects in the United Kingdom. The second chapter investigates the administration of Ruhleben and conditions inside the camp which, although initially grim due to poor preparation, improved after a visit from the US ambassador in the spring of 1915. The third chapter recounts how the inmates coped with imprisonment. Although racial and class divisions did exist, a genuine community based around a vibrant associational life developed quickly within the camp. Prisoners put on concerts and plays, organized sporting competitions, a debating society, an Arts and Sciences Union and even a mock by-election. In the fourth chapter, Stibbe considers relief, punishments and reprisals inside Ruhleben. The inmates were doubly fortunate compared with other prisoners: large amounts of aid, especially from private sources but also, grudgingly, from the British state alleviated much hardship and the reprisals conducted by German authorities on French and Russian captives were very rarely inflicted upon British internees. During the second half of the war, as Chapter 5 explains, pressure mounted to close Ruhleben. An `all-for-all' exchange of civilian prisoners was offered by the Reichstag in the autumn of 1916 and a campaign began in the United Kingdom to end internment and bring imprisoned civilians home. However, although some old and ill inmates were released, only the war’s end brought about the camp’s dissolution.

Finally, the sixth chapter studies Ruhleben in British memory. It examines why the camp, having featured prominently in both German and British wartime propaganda, disappeared so quickly from public discourse after hostilities and explains how ex-prisoners were denied compensation and marginalized in official commemoration during peacetime.

Stibbe’s work not only gives a very comprehensive account of the Ruhleben camp and its
inmates’ experiences, but also provides particularly valuable insight into the mechanisms which ensured their largely good treatment. Extremely important was international oversight: the camp’s proximity to Berlin facilitated inspections by neutral powers. The interest taken in Ruhleben by prominent figures and non-governmental organizations within Germany itself also protected the internees from harsh measures. Perhaps even more crucial was the imprisonment in British internment camps of 26,000 German male civilians. Although the imbalance in the numbers of internees held by each side hindered exchange negotiations, the presence of so many German civilians in British hands, and the fact that they were generally kept in almost exemplary conditions, deterred maltreatment of the Ruhleben inmates. Nonetheless, the exceptional nature of conditions in Ruhleben, where internees were not forced to work and were actually fed better than German civilians, as well as the comparatively small size of its prisoner population, limits the amount which Stibbe’s book can reveal about wider issues of German internment policies during the First World War. Jens Thiel’s recently published Berlin doctoral dissertation on Belgian forced labour in 1914–18 (surprisingly absent from the book’s bibliography) has shown how another, much larger group of civilian prisoners suffered severely at German hands from harsh disciplinary regimes and economic exploitation. It is to be hoped that other historians will follow Stibbe’s and Thiel’s lead in further broadening understanding of civilian internment in the world’s first ‘total war’.

ALEXANDER WATSON, Clare Hall, Cambridge University

William N. Still, Crisis at Sea: The US Navy in European Waters in World War I. University Press of Florida: Gainesville FL, 2006; xix + 741 pp., 29 illus., 7 maps; 9780813029870, $100.00 (hbk)

The United States played a crucial role in shaping the outcome of the First World War. William N. Still Jr’s magisterial study of the US navy in European waters in World War I explores the maritime dimension of American military pursuits in Europe between the US declaration of war against Germany in April 1917 and the armistice in November 1918. This is a subject that has not attracted the attention it deserves in recent scholarship. Presented by its author as the middle part of a trilogy on the US navy in Europe between 1865 and 1941, Crisis at Sea is a panoramic study of the wartime activities of the US Navy and its personnel in Europe which is comprehensive in its coverage, ranging from overall strategy, leadership and operations to matters of logistics, technology and personnel policy, and the social history of officers and enlisted men. Organized in 20 chapters, the book combines a superb command of the available literature with extensive research in US and British archives and libraries while also utilizing some French and Italian documentation. No doubt, Still’s extraordinarily rich monograph is now the authoritative study of its subject matter and the point of departure for any subsequent scholarship.

The book, which eludes any effort at real summary because of its encyclopedic orientation, presents the US naval war effort as a rather successful, even if tension-ridden, exercise in coalition warfare. In this exercise, US naval commanders, led by Admiral William S. Sims, the top officer in the European theatre, willingly placed their forces in Europe under Allied command on both the strategic and operational levels. Sims’ policy of amalgamation set the navy apart from the US army, which insisted on a maximum degree of independence; it also
sat atop the myriad professional and social encounters and interactions between the more than 60,000 men that the US navy eventually deployed to Europe and the allied soldiers and civilian populations they encountered. Reviewing this plethora of relationships, Still stresses what he calls the ‘commendable association’ that the US navy maintained ‘on all levels’, from senior officers to the bulk of the enlisted force, ‘with the Allies in the war zone’ (514).

Central to the monograph, then, is the analysis of the military operations of the US navy as they contributed to the Allied war effort. The entire gamut of these operations comes into full view. Escort work for supply and troop convoys was the principal activity of the US navy. Its forces also engaged in submarine patrolling and chasing (which yielded little results, but led to plans to attack German naval bases by air) and in the laying of ill-conceived mine barrages in the North Sea and Mediterranean. In addition, a squadron of battle ships served with the British Grand Fleet. Throughout, Still pays a considerable amount of attention to the actual practices and technologies of the US war effort at sea and the ways in which the Americans worked out the military protocols of convoy escorting and anti-submarine warfare (including its ever-expanding aerial component) in a piecemeal fashion. Much of Crisis at Sea is devoted to a ground-breaking exploration of operational logistics, the ever-sprawling material infrastructure of bases and facilities, and the personnel policies underwriting the overseas employment of naval forces in Europe. Still deftly explores the many ways in which the US navy tackled the logistical challenge it faced in the European theatre and attained, to a considerable degree, its own objective of self-sufficiency in terms of materials, supplies, medical service and fuel. An important enabling part of the entire overseas deployments were the efforts directed at the morale and welfare of servicemen and women (the latter receive brief mention but not much attention in the book). Recreation became an important part of the navy’s overseas business of war, demonstrates Still, with the navy working in tandem with a number of specially accredited organizations such as the YMCA with their distinct moral reform agendas.

If there is one theme that runs through all the chapters, it is the ever-expanding scale and scope of the activities of a US navy that was not specifically prepared to take on the military roles it assumed in Europe in 1917–1918. The US navy’s European war pursuits were a continuous exercise in both large-scale improvisation and the expansion of maritime military capabilities (including massive new naval construction) on the sea and ashore, which were then by and large dismantled after the end of the war. Still concludes his fine book by noting that the US navy derived only a very few lessons from its experiences in the European war zone and condemned itself to relearn ways of war it had practiced to great effect in 1917–1918, even as the navy’s leadership grasped the importance of logistical support in general. It took the Second World War for the US navy to turn wartime mobilization and warfare into more sustained projections of maritime force.

DIRK BÖNKER, Duke University


Norman Stone’s short history of the First World War is certainly just that: short. Not quite 200 pages of prose is divided into seven chapters, one dedicated to each year of the war, flanked by
one on its origins and an extremely brief chapter dedicated to its aftermath. It is impossible not to admire Stone’s wit and ability to present in a highly readable format a multi-faceted picture of the war, albeit with a largely Eurocentric (including, altogether aptly of course, Turkey) and military focus. Each chapter homes in on the military events of the particular year in review, especially major battles and military developments, including changes in leadership, technology and tactics. Stone also offers his opinions on such themes as the origins of the conflict, the Russian revolutions, the entry of the United States into the war in 1917, and the role of finances and economics.

Stone, himself no stranger to inviting controversy inside and outside of the historical community, pulls no punches in presenting his take on who was responsible for the outbreak of war (Germany), to what end the war was ultimately fought (empire), where and when mistakes were made and by whom, and the consequences of the conflict for the origins of the Second World War. He presents what are undoubtedly contested (and often intensely debated) historical views as irrefutable facts, which – to the unwary – may go down as accepted history. Still, I did not find myself disagreeing with all of Stone’s opinions, particularly his acknowledgement of the importance of neutrals to sustaining the German war effort and his analysis of the Brusilov offensives in 1916, where he illustrates both Brusilov’s genius and subsequent mistakes. Stone’s interpretations of certain events and key personalities are not only enlightening but also entertaining, in part because of his stark realism and unwillingness to be taken in by the public rhetoric of leading statesmen. Hence, he argues that, in 1917, Germany had no intention of restoring Belgium, nor did Britain and France have any intention of paying anything but lip-service to the notion of self-determination, instead eyeing up the potential gains of victory to their already unwieldy empires. The American President, Woodrow Wilson, the Austrian emperor, Franz Joseph, and Pope Benedict XV are passed off as individuals who wished to end the war by pretending it had ‘all been a giant mistake’ (117), while the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, Germany’s General Ludendorff and France’s Robert Nivelle are presented as radical leaders seeking an all-or-nothing end to the war.

While one can read this history with an eye to disagreeing with its author, it is undoubtedly a good read, and in that respect, some historians could learn a lot from Norman Stone. He has mastered the art of writing pithy history. Still, there is little new history presented here, although it should prove very useful in stirring up debate in undergraduate classes. From my perspective, the book also offered up the welcome bonus of providing me with a swathe of new essay questions for my students, of the kind: ‘Do you agree with Norman Stone that the building of the German navy to rival Great Britain in the years 1890–1914 was the “greatest mistake in the history of the twentieth century” (11)?’ ‘Do you agree that the battles for Verdun and Douaumont in 1916 were “France’s last moment as a Great Power” (96–7)?’ ‘Was “Arthur Zimmerman’s telegram Germany’s suicide note, written in farce” (125), as Norman Stone posits? Discuss’. For this reason alone, the book offers a valuable teaching aid in leading students to question and interpret the First World War.

Maartje Abbenhuis-Ash, University of Auckland
One of the most memorable images of the Renaissance is of the Italian courtesan lounging elegantly in her finery amid cultivated and highborn male protectors. In Tessa Storey’s imaginatively researched study of prostitutes in Rome in the 150 years following the Renaissance, we learn that, far from demolishing this model, the Counter-Reformation permitted its broad dispersion within city society. The kind of sociability once associated with the elite courtesan and her clients ‘appears to have infiltrated the social practices of men lower down the social spectrum’ (114). Of course, this was not the aim of the popes who in the first three decades after the Council of Trent tried exiling, rounding up and segregating all the Roman prostitutes in a special zone, the Ortaccio. The Jesuits too targeted ‘fallen’ women in Rome, creating houses of refuge and collecting funds to tempt them to give up their sinful ways. Sermons and popular prints and verses publicized widely the evils of carnal commerce both for women and for men. Yet, the number of prostitutes in Rome (c. 1000–1200 in a population of around 100,000) actually increased in the first half of the seventeenth century, until it reached the figure of 3.5 per cent of the city’s adult females.

Storey’s primary goal is to ask what the effects of the Counter-Reformation’s new disciplinary regime on prostitutes were and to test precept against the evidence of a wide range of archival sources (especially judicial and notarial documents). Yet, in the interstices of her book we can glimpse the forces that may have been responsible for this unexpected outcome. Census data (which becomes available around 1600) shows what Storey calls a surplus of between 20,000 to 30,000 men in Rome’s population, a sex-ratio that was unusual for any city of the time, but which was a fixed characteristic of the papal capital. Indeed, between 1600 and 1640 the gap in the numbers of males and females was at a historic high. Rome’s people were mobile. Storey finds that two-thirds of the prostitutes whom she has identified were immigrants from elsewhere, mostly from Tuscany or the Papal States; although the sources do not allow us to confirm this hypothesis, two-thirds of the adult males in Rome may also have been incomers. Many did not marry and settle down, but lived with other men in large and small households characterized by a good deal of transience.

This is the background for Storey’s fascinating picture of the way Roman prostitutes worked and lived between 1560 and 1650. These young women could set their own price for services, secure in the knowledge that the courts would back them up if a client failed to pay. She finds evidence that prostitutes, though not rich, were a good deal better off than the average Roman in their neighbourhood. Notwithstanding internal hierarchies in which those at the bottom took whichever man came along, many courtesans seem to have developed stable relationships with small groups of male ‘friends’ who paid their rent, furnished their lodgings, and provided regular meals. Storey describes the furniture, decoration and activities that went on in the homes of prostitutes, spaces which were filled with chairs and musical instruments as well as a bed, where men routinely gathered to sing, eat, and talk with their friends. What is astonishing is the social range of these practices among the city’s male population, from stable hands and barbers to the chief of police himself (and, indeed, probably much farther up the status ladder). Clearly, the courtesans’ houses were key sites of urban sociability in a city in which men dramatically outnumbered women. Sex happened too, but it was by no means the only function of Roman prostitutes. The papal government cooperated by outlawing, not prostitution, but transporting prostitutes in carriages (obviously headed toward the
palaces of elite clients), the carrying of weapons around prostitutes (lest the occasional bout of jealousy lead to a fight), or parties with prostitutes (the louder version of those common musical evenings). The police did their part to facilitate a general lifestyle by making only a miniscule number of arrests on such charges.

Storey has benefited from a rich historiography on courtesans in Rome and has added significantly to it. She is sensitive, however, to the nuances of carnal commerce, noting that many working women who took money or gifts occasionally in exchange for sex would not have identified themselves as prostitutes at all. It will remain for other historians to tell the story of those women, the majority, perhaps not young or beautiful any longer, perhaps more burdened or less resourceful, who could not make their fortunes in Rome by becoming the life of the party.

Laurie Nussdorfer, Wesleyan University


It has to be said, in the first instance, that Crises of Empire is a very overdue attempt to provide an up-to-date, high-quality handbook on European decolonization. This attempt has been successful: the study by Butler, Thomas and Moore sets new standards, and replaces older works from back to the 1980s, such as Robert Holland’s European Decolonization. In their respective contributions, all three authors manage to revise substantially the existing knowledge on the decolonization process in different world regions. Indeed, given the scope of the task, some of the book’s larger parts are masterfully elaborated. Butler’s discussion of the British evolution is impressive because the author manages to give the reader a concise interpretation of key aspects of the British decolonization process: the concentration of the whole British imperial defence effort on the Singapore base and its fall as a profound shock; the second shock through India’s rapid independence; the British imagining that entire zones could, after 1945, still be organized as ‘informal empire’, and the failure of respective initiatives, as in the case of the Baghdad Pact. The Suez disaster of 1956 would persuade British politicians and colonial planners that unilateral actions were no longer possible, while the scandals of Mau Mau repression made it more difficult to pursue a course in Central and East Africa which allowed for open protection of settler populations. In 1965, as Butler demonstrates very clearly, the reduction of British overseas investment would terminate a process that had already long been dominated by the scarcity of British financial resources.

Also, the discussion of North African decolonization is highly convincing. Martin Thomas characterizes the transfer of power in Morocco and Tunisia as relatively successful, given that both nationalist movements had the capacity to take a moderate position in the decisive moments, and that the French side at least started to negotiate rather early. For Algeria, Thomas analyses the radicalization of the Front de Libération Nationale, the impact of settler ideology, and, in particular, the effects of growing unconcern from the French public in the North African war. Public alienation from the war effort is pointed out as a decisive factor for French retreat, although, at the same time, the public did not really gain an idea of the atrocities committed on the ground by French troops. The chapter on the Indochinese evolution is
neat and useful, as is the one on Madagascar – although its grouping with the Togolese experience seems adventurous. Finally, Moore’s description of the Dutch experience in Indonesia and the Caribbean as mainly driven by domestic issues, and by subsequent misinterpretations of the proper colonial *marge de manoeuvre*, is also very well elaborated.

From the point of view of the scholar seeking a manual of comparative perspectives, some decisions the authors took are, however, regrettable. It is difficult to understand why, in an overview of the different European experiences of decolonization, the Portuguese case (which includes countries of high contemporary importance, like Angola) figures with only 15 pages, while the chapters on Dutch South-East Asia and the Dutch Caribbean – doubtlessly an interesting area, but highly over-represented in this manual – take up a generous 100 pages. Moreover, the picture of Portuguese Africa is relatively flawed: the part on Portugal’s violent African decolonization relies too heavily on the book by Norrie MacQueen (which does not use a single Portuguese archival source). Unfortunately, the authors do not take into account the literature (mainly in Portuguese) of the last 10 years, which shows that Portugal was, although poorer and being an authoritarian state, not that fundamentally different from other European metropoles; liberal attitudes became more frequent between 1945 and 1961, as did the search for alliance partners among the African populations. Furthermore, while Bob Moore in his contribution on Dutch Indonesia, demonstrates that the Dutch colonial administration completely misunderstood the impact of nationalism, the notion of misunderstandings as an important part of the process is elsewhere not clearly highlighted. This weakens, for example, the chapter on decolonization in France’s colonies in sub-Saharan Africa. There especially, the whole process before the vote of the *loi-cadre*, was full of misunderstandings, paranoid anti-Communist fears, and the continuing belief in a *modus vivendi* with African partners as junior partners in councils of the governor. Regrettably as well, in this particular case, the account concerning *Afrique Equatoriale Française* is extremely short. The experience of Cameroon’s *Union des Populations du Cameroun*, the party becoming a rebel movement, is uncritically taken as representative for French Equatorial Africa (or even for French sub-Saharan Africa as a whole).

Nonetheless, these shortcomings, while showing the necessity for still broader studies, do not in the end really weaken this book’s immense usefulness. Future research will rely on its fundament of well-elaborated conclusions on the larger trends of European decolonization. Moreover, this book will be of essential value for students of imperial history.

**Alexander Keese, University of Portsmouth**

Annette F. Timm and Joshua A. Sanborn, *Gender, Sex and the Shaping of Modern Europe: A History from the French Revolution to the Present Day*, Berg: Oxford and New York, 2007; ix + 244 pp; 9781845203566. £50.00/$94.95 (hbk); 9781845203573. £15.99/$27.95 (pbk)

In this nuanced and highly accessible survey text, Annette F. Timm and Joshua A. Sanborn explore the integral role played by gender and sexuality in the development of modern Europe. The authors’ stated aim is to ‘make a case for the necessity of including gender in any comprehensive survey of modern (or any other) history’, and in this they have succeeded. They follow a familiar chronological trajectory of themes (revolution, industrialization, urbaniza-
tion, imperialism, war, etc.), but cast these political and social changes in new hues as issues of gender and sex are brought convincingly to the fore. Timm and Sanborn historicize gender, and effectively illustrate why gender history should not be considered peripheral or irrelevant to any general picture.

The text is organized thematically into five chapters. The first examines ideas of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, with the authors showing how challenges to political and social structures from the late eighteenth century onwards implicitly and explicitly questioned gender roles as the traditional patriarchal order was contested. They show how the republican rhetoric of ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’ was not, in fact, so inclusive, given women’s struggle for equal citizenship and young men’s for power. In a cogent analysis of ‘Fraternity’, we are made to see how the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods saw the rise and cementation of the young military officer ready to sacrifice himself for the nation. In effect, Timm and Sanborn bring masculinity and manliness centre stage. The second chapter addresses changes to sexual relations and gender roles generated by the Industrial Revolution. Quick to point out that industrial change was not experienced in the same way all over Europe, the authors support this by offering an interesting snapshot of 1790s Kurland, a Russian Baltic province, where traditional work practices and social arrangements endured. The chapter also traces the ways in which capitalism fed the ideology of separate spheres, which in turn affected political views of gender equality. Finally, the authors examine the increasing urbanization of Europe and argue that the anonymity this spawned opened up prospects for the expression of alternative sexual practices, including homosexuality.

Chapter 3 addresses the relationship between imperialism and gender. The authors demonstrate how Europeans’ view of themselves, their social structure and sexuality were challenged as a result of encounters with non-European peoples. Europeans maintained a sense of order by categorizing indigenous peoples as ‘different’, which said at least as much and probably more about Europeans’ ideas of themselves as it did about non-Europeans. Timm and Sanborn trace Europeans’ frequently ambiguous perceptions of colonized people – for example the ‘Oriental’ woman as both submissive and devious, the colonized man as both emasculated and extremely masculine. The fourth chapter, ‘Brothers and Sisters at War’, looks at the effect of the two world wars on gender roles and sexuality, and examines the connected rise of the state in private life through state paternalism. The authors’ engaging exploration of masculinity is further pursued in this chapter, as they look at how a new, considerably younger masculine ideal emerged at the end of the Great War. Certain readers may be somewhat troubled by the way the authors downplay the role of feminist activism in achieving women’s emancipation, as voting rights are represented as resulting primarily from women’s transformed roles in wartime rather than from focused agitation. In the final chapter, the authors examine sexuality, bringing their study up to the present day. Following Foucault, they challenge the assumption that the 1960s marked a sudden awakening of interest in sexuality, arguing that the nineteenth century was not simply a time of prudery and sexual repression. Rather, it was a period of increasing professional authority over sexual norms. The authors demonstrate how sexuality, far from a universal constant, is historically contingent and socially constructed. The central place given over to sexuality in contemporary times concerning ideas about personal identity, they argue, can be readily traced back to sexology. This is not to suggest, however, that they ascribe a constant linear progression to history – quite the opposite.
The entertaining writing style, which is in no way at the expense of scholarly rigour, should make this book a popular introductory text for the undergraduate students for whom it is intended. Gender, sexuality and politics have been smoothly and skilfully interwoven here along with key historiographical debates. The bibliography provides very useful references to current scholarship in the field for students wishing to pursue further study on particular issues. The brief index is perhaps a little less helpful, but nevertheless offers a general guide. The frequent reference to lesser known examples certainly makes the book anything but a stodgy compendium of well-worn themes, but might necessitate another more general textbook accompanying it, so as to ensure students are more fully acquainted with the events of the period.

**Briony Neilson, University of Sydney**


Eric Weitz’s *Weimar Germany: Promise and Tragedy* is an impressive work, interesting, well researched and creatively written. Weitz places the factors that ultimately led to the failure of the Republic into the context of the creative energy that defined the period. He includes many important observations on Weimar politics and economics, but the greatest strength of the book is its treatment of Weimar culture and particularly the crucial place of Berlin in that history. Through the clever device of a walking tour of Berlin, Weitz describes the life of the city, its culture, and the history of Weimar Germany.

Observing the high level of Weimar creativity, Weitz declares:

> It is impossible ever ‘to prove’ why at a particular time and place, a culture flourishes, and artists, writers, and philosophers break through one boundary after another and create innovative forms of expression – whether on stage, printed page, or canvas – that are immediately discussed and debated and resonate for decades afterward. (292–3)

Among Weimar intellectuals, Weitz highlights Ernst Bloch, Hans Jonas and Martin Heidegger. ‘Bloch and Heidegger and a young Jonas’, Weitz notes, ‘[were] Weimar at its best, a deep search for the meaning of the present and a belief in the possibilities of the future’ (252). In a section that may lose readers with little background in philosophy, he focuses on Martin Heidegger, whom he considers the most important modern philosopher. While acknowledging Heidegger’s support for the Nazis and criticizing the philosopher’s later unwillingness to apologize for, or confront, his role during the Nazi years, Weitz looks clearly at Heidegger’s acceptance of some of the most barbaric Nazi leaders and his insensitivity and lack of moral concern in the post-war years.

Weitz makes a strong case for the accomplishments of Weimar architects and city planners. Thanks to the inventiveness of Taut, Mendelssohn, Gropius and others, 135,000 new housing units were constructed in Berlin between 1921 and 1929, and 15,000 new dwellings were constructed in Frankfurt between 1924 and 1933. By 1930, 14 per cent of the population lived in new housing, a considerable accomplishment. Weitz’s critique of Siegried Kracauer’s essay, ‘The Little Shopgirls Go to the Movies’, replaces the disdain of some Weimar intel-
lectuals with a more nuanced view of working women. 'Kracauer's sneering contempt is unsettling', Weitz observes:

What, one may ask, was so terrible about a few hours' diversion from the unrelenting supervision of the foremen and bosses on the shop floor, at the sales counter, or in the office, and the poor pay and cramped living circumstances that defined the lives of so many German women? (275)

Had such left-wing Weimar intellectuals as Kracauer shown more empathy for these women and other workers, they might have had more political influence and helped the Republic. In a section called 'Sex and the Body', Weitz recognizes that the Weimar years brought change in sexual behaviour and views of the body. He argues that, although there was much progress during the Weimar years towards creating a more open and humane society, progressives as well as conservatives advocated limits to sexual freedom. He argues that sex was never a private matter for either conservatives or reformers, and all parties believed that good sex 'had to have a social and political purpose'. The greater freedom in avant-garde art, fashion and sexual behaviour clearly alarmed traditionalists and became a powerful propaganda weapon for the political right. Weitz notes that lower birth-rates and increased numbers of abortions and condom sales indicated that a change had indeed taken place. Yet, the major political parties supporting the Weimar Republic never confronted the fact that a million women per year had abortions and 50,000 women had health complications from them, while between 4000 and 12,000 women died from 'back alley' and other abortions.

Weitz argues that the strength of the political right and the inability of the Weimar leaders to crush it were ultimately fatal to the Republic because only a complete defeat of the right could have saved the state. Conversely, Weitz concludes, the radical left was never strong enough to threaten the Republic, and its suppression in the early days of the Republic opened the door for the right to survive and grow. While this argument has some merit, it neglects the question of how much leeway the new Republic had in appeasing the left before the victorious powers would have intervened. Weitz presents anti-Jewish images typical of the Weimar years as revealing indicators of racist anti-Semitism, which the radical right fostered and utilized. The book's impressive illustrations in black-and-white and colour add a great deal to its appeal. It is a significant addition to the literature on Weimar Germany and should be read by everyone interested in the period.

Paul Bookbinder, University of Massachusetts Boston

John Alexander Williams, Turning to Nature in Germany. Hiking, Nudism, and Conservation, 1900–1940, Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA, 2007; x + 354 pp.; 9780804700153. £37.50 (hbk)

In the words of Goethe's Sarastro, 'Only the wanderer comes to know the sublime language of nature, the tones of needy mankind'. In Turning to Nature in Germany, John Alexander Williams offers more than organizational histories of the three movements of hiking, nudism and conservation. He explores the intertwined understandings of nature and human nature in twentieth-century Germany and how these were spurred on by understandings of — or concerns over — the ramifications of modernity. Williams shows that, despite the diversity of
the organizations, they had in common ‘ideal narratives of turning to nature’ which shared a basic pattern: the identification of a social crisis (or multiple crises); the advocacy of a solution through turning to nature; and a vision of improvement which would expand from the individual, to the organization, to the entire nation (15).

Williams organizes his cogent text into three sections: Part 1 covers ‘Socialists and Nature’, exploring the subculture of the Social Democratic labour movement and the socialist tourist association ‘Die Naturfreunde’, as well as the nature of attacks from conservative politicians and moralists. The discussion of the Koch schools is one of the most interesting sections of the book. Part 2, ‘Youth Hiking’, takes the reader from the turn of the century and the Wandervogel to the Hitler Youth, in an exploration of the leisure organizations of the educated middle class. Part 3 examines ‘Conservation’ (Naturschutz), a movement largely dominated by educated middle-class male elites. Gender dimensions are not overlooked in the discussions, however. The conclusion summarizes the similarities and differences between the pre-1933 movements, and addresses the important question of continuities and ruptures between Wilhelmine, Weimar and Nazi-era naturism. Some aspects of the discussion will be familiar to those cognizant with Williams’ previous publications, but the strength of this text lies not least in the juxtaposition and interplay of the different organizations.

Although hiking, nudism and organized conservation differed in many ways, they were all galvanized by a new ideology, which Williams terms ‘naturism’ (not be confused with nudism, which is only one dimension of this study). Williams explains the importance of this current as deriving from an unusually strong perception of crisis. Naturists were thus inspired by the purported consequences of industrialization and urbanization, but were primarily concerned with social and cultural crises:

Naturist movements believed that Germany was beset by a number of crises, including the threat of urban living conditions to the body, psyche, moral character, and political consciousness; the capitalist exploitation of industrial workers; the moral and sexual waywardness of adolescents, particularly young males; and the decline in popular devotion to the regional and national ‘homeland’ (Heimat). (2)

Naturist activities could be seen as a pathway to freedom or to discipline; liberation or authoritarianism: anarchy or citizenship; individuality or collective sociabilities and identities. As we find in other European countries in the 1920s and 1930s, contemporary fears about change were mapped on to class, generational and gender tensions, and on to the body and sexual identities (encapsulated in the concept of ‘health’), as well as providing a battleground across the political spectrum. The solutions lay in reform, however, rather than outright rejection of urban modernity. The occasional rare glimpses of how individual members perceived their membership and activities offer tantalizing hints of both ideological commitment and more pragmatic approaches to organized activities and high principles. The other frequent absence in the text is nature itself: despite paying attention to the relationship between regionalism and nationalism in conceptions of Heimat. Williams includes little detail of how the variations in Germany’s topography were construed within these movements. Nonetheless, these minor frustrations should not detract from this refreshingly well written and argued exploration of the ideologically-charged interplay between nature and human nature, and of visions for the future rooted in contemporary despair, or hope.

Corinna Peniston-Bird, Lancaster University