anorgasmia as a neurological, psychological, or sociological phenomenon that could be corrected. Whether treating infertility or sexual dissatisfaction, Czechoslovak doctors and sexologists centered their work on the heterosexual, married couple. The ultimate goal was a stable family structure that supported society's next generation of children.

Lišková's study shows, however, that the state's goal to increase population failed. During the 1960s and 70s, Czechoslovak experts retreated into a more traditional discourse that emphasized a patriarchal gender hierarchy. Leaders began to fear that 1950s liberal divorce laws, legalization of abortion, and dramatic rise of women in the workforce had slowed population growth to a standstill. As Lišková explains, "motherhood became more valuable than women as producers and wage earners." (36) Scientists began to focus research on the necessity of mother-child bonding, and a 1963 television documentary, *Children without Love*, profiled children whose emotional problems stemmed from institutional rather than parental care. Maternity leaves lengthened, and images of dutiful mothers abounded. In the 1970s, the state put tremendous resources into marital counseling and parental education.

The final chapter investigates Czechoslovak experts' views on male sexual deviance. Lišková shows that sexologists began to view homosexuality as a sexual variation rather than a deviance and argued for decriminalization. However, male violence towards women, homosexual prostitution, and other forms of deviance garnered increasing attention. While Lišková ties this phenomenon to the declining population rate, this chapter does not cohere as well to the rest of the book's focus on marriage, family, and women's changing roles. Despite this, Lišková raises intriguing topics about male sexuality that future scholars can pursue and expand.

The book's focus on scientific and expert literature will appeal to graduate students and academics, rather than an undergraduate or general audience. Gender scholars will appreciate Lišková's attention to the intersection of state socialism and population politics. East Europeanists will welcome her nuanced depiction of communist Czechoslovakia.

Cynthia Paces
The College of New Jersey

Liquid Nationalism and State Partitions in Europe. By Stefano Bianchini. Cheltenham, Eng.: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017. 349 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Maps. $150.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2019.285

Stefano Bianchini, professor at the University of Bologna and a long-standing specialist on Yugoslavia and east central Europe, has written a masterful synthesis of the European experience of state partitions and nation-building from the early twentieth century to the present day. His particular emphasis is on the problematic relationship between the aforementioned historical processes and democracy, which he places in the broader context of (mostly) European geopolitics.

The book is divided into two broad parts: 1) a historical part that details the impact of twentieth-century geopolitical tectonic shifts (World War One, Wilsonian and Leninist self-determination, the rise of irredentism and Hitler's new order, post-World War Two "ethnic cleansing," and the ways in which it affected national questions, the Cold War and the consequences of German unification, and the

dissolution of multinational communist states (the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, with the Czechoslovak case discussed in the book's second part); 2) a contemporary history of post-1989/1991 Europe with a particular emphasis on the lessons of new state partitions, the rise of neo-nationalism, and the ways in which the tension between the political economy of globalization, international institutional frameworks, social networks, migrations, and unprecedented individual mobility affect "solid" nation-states and trans(national) democratic aspirations. Theoretically, Bianchini draws inspiration from Zygmunt Bauman's concept of "liquid modernity" in order to illustrate—using an unprecedented number of cases—the historical contingency and fluidity of both state frameworks and national identities.

A singular merit of Bianchini's book is his positioning of eastern Europe (including the Baltic States) at the center of European history. Rather than seeing the region as a "semi-periphery" or the passive recipient of imperial geopolitics ("bloodlands"), Bianchini shows—with great erudition—how the intellectual crosscurrents of European history enabled historical actors to impact both national and international politics. Along the way, Bianchini explodes many stereotypes: thus, rather than seeing Gavrilo Princip just as a pan-Serb nationalist, we should take note of the affinity of his actions with those of Italian anarchists and Russian populists (56); the centralized and unified nation-state may have been an inadequate model for eastern Europe after World War One, but the fear of irredentism, revolutionary subversion, and geopolitical instability practically forced state authorities to impose a unitary state on recalcitrant minorities (101); the Lithuanian "forest brothers" may have been "freedom fighters" for some, but many of them were either Nazi collaborators or enlisted as conscripts by the occupiers (129); the tragedy of Hitler's new order lay not only in its devastating immediate results, but also in the fact that it fostered long-term suspicions about the loyalty of minorities, while other fascist precedents (the Italian policy of linguistic assimilation in Istria, South Tyrol, and elsewhere) anticipated Zhivkov's campaigns against the Turks in Bulgaria in the 1980s (141). Already these select examples demonstrate that Bianchini eschews moralistic judgement in favor of Robert Merton's "sociological ambivalence": the simple if not yet fully assimilated idea that "the unintended consequences of social action" play a more important explanatory role than simplified narratives of "good and evil."

This is not to say that Bianchini is "value-neutral": his preference for European integration, cosmopolitan "fluidity," and transnational checks on nation-state policies are made obvious at various points in the book. It is precisely because of his interest in preserving the European project that Bianchini devotes a chapter to the "lessons not learned from the Yugoslav dismemberment" (Chapter 10). As Bianchini convincingly argues, the combination of prolonged economic crisis, "austerity measures without investments for growth" (188), confederal decentralization, and ineffective governance opened the road for emotional nationalist appeals that led to the country's inglorious denouement. A similar fate awaits Europe—despite its economic strength—if it continues along the path of exacerbating the divisions between the developed northwest and "backward" south. To be sure, as Bianchini demonstrates, the social forces for integration are by now so strong (256–57) that a full-blown return to the nineteenth-century model of the nation-state seems unlikely. But to those of us who lived in Yugoslavia in the year 1985, the idea that the country would collapse violently a mere five years later also seemed unlikely. Bianchini's strength lies precisely in his appreciation of history as a field of open possibilities in which (European) leadership (or lack thereof) can make all the difference between prosperity and tragedy.

It is impossible to do justice to the intellectual wealth of Bianchini's magisterial survey in a short review. Suffice it to note that the vast terrain covered contains

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2019.285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

many valuable particular lessons, while the exposition of the contradictions of western policies in the region should serve as welcome check on technocratic smugness. If "historia" is indeed "magistra vitae," Bianchini shows us just why the Latin proverb may still ring true.

Veljko Vujačić
The European University, St. Petersburg
Oberlin College

Mass Media in the Post-Soviet World: Market Forces, State Actors, and Political Manipulation in the Informational Environment after Communism. Ed. Peter Rollberg and Marlene Laruelle. Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society. Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2018. 446 pp. Illustrations. Figures. Tables. $50.00, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2019.286

The dramatic transformation of media landscapes in post-communist countries has attracted a fair share of scholarly attention, and the general patterns of change—ranging from the introduction of commercial media and the initial relaxation of state control to technological changes and the intensification of political and ownership pressures in recent years—are by now well known. This is not to say that these patters have been uniform across the region, or that scholars agree on how to interpret them. Indeed, as Peter Rollberg and Marlene Laruelle rightly point out in the introduction to their edited collection, media in post-communist societies "present a moving target, influenced by complex geopolitical and cultural factors," which "make it hard, if not impossible, to arrive at a lasting analytical consensus" (8). Rather than seeking to establish an analytical consensus, or to develop an overarching argument about major trends in the region, this collection offers a set of loosely connected but insightful snapshots drawn from across the post-Soviet media landscape.

As one might expect, a significant portion of the book—five out of seventeen contributions—focuses on Russia. Yet this is balanced by a range of in-depth studies examining other post-Soviet countries that less often feature in English language publications: Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, and Tajikistan. Despite the mention of "mass media" in the title, the collection ranges well beyond traditional print and electronic media, and considers the wider "informational environment," including digital media, and covering both information and entertainment genres. The contributions are divided into three sections. The first section, entitled "National Trends," opens with a thought-provoking critical assessment of international media freedom rankings, focusing on rankings provided by Freedom House, Reporters without Borders, and the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX). While commending the rankings for their reliability, the authors (Tudor Vlad, Lee B. Becker, and Jack Snyder) raise fundamental concerns about their validity and highlight the rather dated and one-sided conceptualization of freedom they rely on. Echoing earlier criticisms of media freedom rankings, the authors call for more robust empirical testing of the link between free media and democratization—not least in light of the fact that a sudden increase in media freedom may well be hijacked by populist leaders championing illiberal values. This is followed by two contributions (Maria Lipman, Jonathan Becker) that focus on Russian media but use this as a basis for tackling the wider issue of continuities and discontinuities between Soviet and post-Soviet media. Becker argues that the current Russian media landscape has more in common with its counterparts in