

The book's wide geographic scope is a welcome addition to the historiography of the Soviet borderlands and our understanding of Stalin; it conveys the need to transform the borderlands (on both sides of the USSR's borders), or at least to influence what was going on on the other side in buffer states that were seen as key to the security of *all* Soviet frontiers and ultimately to the Soviet state. At the same time, the treatment of some regions appears cursory: Stalin's approach to the Caucasus and western borderlands are dealt with in great depth, while the Central Asian and Far Eastern borderlands receive much less attention. That, however, is a relatively minor fault and a sheer by-product of a comparative study.

Finally, just as Rieber highlights the importance of border security as a central theme in Russian (tsarist and Soviet) history, reading this book in 2016 reminds one of the similarities of today's Russia with its Soviet and tsarist predecessors. Although Rieber ends his study long before the Soviet collapse, one can see that Putin's increasingly aggressive policies since 2014 are not simply expansionism for expansionism's sake. Rieber's book provides some insights and historical background to the current Kremlin's profound and clearly long-standing fear of hostile states on its periphery, and the belief that a ring of friendly buffer states around Russia are vital to the security of the state.

PAUL STRONSKI

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

The High Title of a Communist: Postwar Party Discipline and the Values of the Soviet Regime. By Edward Cohn. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2015. xvii, 268 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. Figures. Tables. \$49.00, hard bound.

Why is an American historian of the 21st century interested in the behavior of Communist Party members in the Soviet Union after World War II? Edward Cohn could have mentioned the obvious fact that the protagonists of his book are the parents of the current Russian ruling class surrounding President Putin. As far as we know the young Vladimir has been secretly baptized by his mother without permission of his politically active father. In the past, a generation of Soviet historians had undertaken efforts to retell the achievements of the CPSU after the October Revolution and to envision the falsifications of Western historiography. Therefore, post-Soviet historians today are reluctant when it comes to researching a formerly canonized utopia. Nevertheless, their scientific predecessors may be forgiven for their limited and controlled access to archival sources and propaganda literature. As an irony of history, people from "outside" have to shed light on the inner development of Soviet Communism by pointing to the sins of Putin's ancestors.

Using archival resources, including the records of the Committee of Party Control in Moscow, the files of central party institutions, and the protocols of party organizations at the provincial level, such as from Kyiv and Saratov as well as from Tver' (Kalinin) and Perm' (Molotov), Cohn without doubt has written an excellent book on "Postwar Party Discipline and the Values of the Soviet Regime." Regarding the Moral Code of the Builders of Communism announced by the Twenty-Second Party-Congress in October, 1961, the main title of the book could rather be: "He who does not work does not eat." As mentioned in the introduction of the book, during the twenty years after World War II the Communist Party of the Soviet Union expelled more than 1.7 million of its members for not corresponding with "communist morals" in their everyday life, in private as well as in the professional sphere (3). The twelve com-

mandments of the Party in 1961 go as follows: love for the socialist motherland, labor for the good of society, preservation of the public domain, consciousness of public duty, collectivism, mutual respect, honesty, high esteem for the family, intolerance of injustice, brotherhood of all peoples, intolerance toward the enemies of communism, and solidarity with workers of all countries (30). Chapter 1 discusses the system of internal discipline; Chapter 2 the expulsion of POWs and communists who lived on occupied territory; Chapter 3 purging and politics in postwar expulsion cases; Chapter 4 corruption and administrative misconduct; Chapter 5 family troubles and marital infidelity; and Chapter 6 the struggle with alcoholism. As a mirror of official campaigns against different forms of public misconduct, the cases presented in these chapters indicate a continuity of measures from Late Stalinism to de-Stalinization in favor of “moral education” (4). Consequently, the price delinquents had to pay for not fulfilling their obligations was no more than a career setback (3).

As Cohn points out, after the war the party was frightened by the growing passivity of its members (5, 56), while on the other hand, it was more interested in their personal lives (6, 142). In contrast to Stalinism, under the reign of Khrushchev, mobilization was based on the construct of a hero society, in which every communist could find relief in the role of a “fighter for a socialist everyday life.” Consequently, the focus of official discourse shifted from political loyalty to personal behavior (5–6): “The party was less likely, then, to discipline a Communist who had flirted with Trotskyism or whose father had been a kulak, but more likely to drag alcoholics and philanderers before their peers to discuss the most intimate details of their private lives (6).” Does it really mean that the “collective leadership” after Stalin distanced itself from “punishment” and instead preferred “persuasion” (10, 94, 138)? Or had physical terror upon Soviet society in general been replaced by the force of the collective?

In the conclusion of the book, the reader would have expected a few provocative theses. The author speaks of a “crucial transitional period in Soviet history, from the revolutionary prewar era to the conservatism and corruption of the Brezhnev years and late socialism,” but he only emphasizes that the communists had failed to establish behavioral standards for all (195). Although this well-written and convincing book provides deeper insights into the mechanisms of de-Stalinization, it does not offer new definitions or further perspectives on the topic

THOMAS M. BOHN

Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen

Vasily Zhukovsky's Romanticism and the Emotional History of Russia. By Ilya Vinitsky. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015. xiv, 386 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$39.95, paper, \$120.00, hard bound.

In *Vasily Zhukovsky's Romanticism*, Ilya Vinitsky has taken as his central subject the conventional material of literary biography—the “life and times of a famous writer”—and more the self-conscious record of Zhukovskii’s emotional world as manifested in the poet’s work. Vinitsky defines his project as a “psychological biography” in which he examines the literary prism through which Zhukovskii represented his life; here we have a fine-grained portrait of a life scripted in accordance with prevailing Sentimental constructions of feeling and narrative. Zhukovskii is hardly the only example of an individual whose life was significantly shaped by the interplay of literary modes and texts; however, Vinitsky’s masterful study reveals the extreme extent to which Zhukovskii and many of his intimates engaged in the practice of *zhiznetvorchestvo* (life work). In so doing, Vinitsky provides a thought-provoking and insightful investi-