

transition from mandating to enticing resettlers” (80, 88). One wonders to what extent this transition was conceptual, and whether broader shifts in politics and ideology, known as the Thaw, played a role in producing a less coercive migration regime. The authors also indicate commonalities between migration trends in the postwar Soviet Union and Europe, such as the emptying out of the countryside and the growth of cities (99). It is worth examining further where such commonalities placed the Soviet Union vis-à-vis other European societies.

On the issue of social inclusion and exclusion, the authors vividly describe how the migrants viewed themselves and how they were received by indigenous populations. Here the evidence reveals much tension, be it in the capitals or the provinces. Thus, the chapter on wartime evacuation shows bitter opposition between Muscovites and Leningraders on the one hand, and the (especially rural) provincials on the other. Twentieth-century violence and struggle for resources appear to have deepened the rifts between the city and the countryside, to enhance rather than help overcome mutual alienation and hostility. The authors note similar hostility, this time toward non-Russian migrants, during the post-Soviet era. Future scholarship may place such phenomena in a broader context, comparing them to dispositions in western European and North American societies.

Addressing these and many other important questions, this major work shows both the diversity and the significance of migrations in twentieth-century Russia. A thought-provoking read, the book is recommended to all students and scholars of modern Russian history.

DENIS KOZLOV
Dalhousie University

Innocent Weapons: The Soviet and American Politics of Childhood in the Cold War. By Margaret Peacock. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014. xiv, 286. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. \$34.95, hard bound.

Until recently, the study of American Cold War culture has very much been a one-sided affair, examining the experience of Americans and their understanding of the conflict in isolation. In her fascinating book *Innocent Weapons*, Margaret Peacock demonstrates the fundamental shortcomings of such an approach. The author takes a dialectic view of Cold War propaganda that differentiates between the producers of images and the intended consumers. Combining it with a comparative analytical framework, Peacock’s study shows that despite their opposing ideologies, leaders, individuals and institutional actors on both sides of the divide used visual and rhetorical discourses on children in very similar ways to legitimize and defend their respective worldviews.

The study of the image of youth provides an excellent analytical tool to examine the belief systems and anxieties of nations and empires. Since the 19th century revolutionaries, politicians and military leaders frequently invoked the notion that the strength of a nation lies in its youth. Peacock’s study, which focusses on the period between 1945 and 1968, shows how central the image of the child (intentionally not defined by a set age range in this study) was in the cultural competition between the superpowers.

In the first part of the book, Peacock examines the construction of the ideal of the happy and defensively mobilized child in the 1950s as well as the counter-ideal of the “Other” child. The latter was used by political elites in both countries to legitimize the status quo and demonize the enemy. Through careful and skilful comparison, the author convincingly demonstrates how the image of the “Other”—brainwashed,

robotic Soviet kids and U.S. kids living in destitution and hunger, respectively—was increasingly undermined by a recognition of the qualities of the adversary’s youngsters and by anxiety about the inadequacies of its own youth. In the USA, Sputnik shock led to some serious soul-searching. The recognition of the efficiency and discipline of the Soviet education system resulted in important changes to public education, while at the same time in the Soviet Union, not without irony, destalinization led to the adoption of some progressive child-centred approaches, many of which had come under attack after the Sputnik shock in the USA. The image of the threatened child, under attack by the harmful influences from “over there” and from within through supposedly weakening social control, produced widespread anxieties about deviancy and delinquency on both sides of the Iron Curtain. As Peacock shows, these fears directly raised questions over the security and defence needs of each country. The complex and bifurcated vision of the child emerging in the 1950s made it a “symbol for the nation’s mission and plight in the Cold War” and led, in both states, to shifts in youth policy that sought an active mobilization of the young in the waging of cultural Cold War (93). This process is explored by the author in the final chapter of part one, where she reveals some intriguing parallels about the ways Boy Scouts and Soviet Pioneers were used to form an “active crusade for peace and freedom” (120).

In the second part of the book, the focus changes from those who actively tried to construct the Cold War consensus to those seeking to challenge the normative image of youth. Peacock demonstrates how Soviet filmmakers and organizations of the anti-nuclear movement in the USA, like Women Strike for Peace, had surprisingly much in common. Both re-appropriated the image of the child and presented alternative visions that undermined the official discourse. The final chapter juxtaposes the contradictions, shifts, and changes to the image of the child during the Vietnam War. In the messy propaganda battles in Vietnam and at home, both superpowers, but particularly the USA, found it increasingly difficult to control the figuration of the visual and rhetorical image of the child. It led, as the author convincingly argues, to the collapse of the conceptual borders that defined the boundaries of the Cold War.

Overall, the book succeeds in presenting a thought-provoking and original history of the Cold War, one of cultural competition in which the “battle for visual and rhetorical preeminence” was paramount (14). This book is not about real children, as Peacock admits early on. But real children and youth have agency and are not passive actors in history. It will remain for future research to gain a better understanding of the ways children themselves understood their role in this cultural war, how they actively shaped the discourse, and how increasing transnational contacts between youth in the later stage of the Cold War challenged deeply entrenched stereotypes about communist east and the capitalist west. Peacock’s excellent book makes a very strong case for further integrative and comparative research of the cultural history of the Cold War.

MATTHIAS NEUMANN
University of East Anglia

Peredaite ob etom detiam vashim, a ikh deti sleduiushchemu rodu’: Kul’turnaia pamiat’ u rossiiskikh evreev v nashi dni. By Elena Nosenko-Shtein. Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniia Rossiiskoi akademii nauk, 2013. 575 pp. Bibliography. Index. Tables. Paper.

“Does one need to be registered as a Jew in legal documents to be considered Jewish?” (535); “Does one need to go to the synagogue to be considered Jewish?” (537); “Is it necessary to circumcise one’s son?” (538); “Did your relatives ever explain to you, when