

history as a state. Moranda begins by discussing the early consensus, shared by the state and the conservation bloc, that active landscape management could maintain ecological health while also fostering economic growth. This consensus grew out of widespread belief, dating to the early twentieth century, in the need for authoritarian nature management. Moranda also explores the language of conservation, particularly how the conservation bloc called for “Erholung,” or outdoor recreation for workers, as a rhetorical strategy to tie landscape care with the state’s productivist goals. The term “Landeskultur,” or land management, also replaced “Naturschutz,” or nature conservation.

Yet this consensus collapsed by the 1970s. At this time, the state, concerned with political legitimacy, began to neglect nature conservation to focus instead on providing citizens with access to private nature pleasures as reward for compliance. “Erholung” came to refer only to tourism, detached from its original tie to conservation. Moranda discusses how some members of the conservation bloc, concerned by air pollution and dying landscapes, joined newly emerging environmental groups in the 1980s. A popular environmentalism also emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, reflected in citizen petitions (Eingaben), which viewed accessible, clean, unpolluted nature as a scarce commodity denied them by an unpopular state. Moranda shows how environmentalists and tourists sometimes found themselves at odds. Many tourists desired expanded access to pleasant landscapes, whereas many environmental activists rejected a consumption-based approach to nature, emphasizing the damage wrought by unchecked recreational use of natural landscapes.

One might have expected more discussion of East Germany’s actual landscapes from a study of landscape. Nonetheless, Moranda’s highly nuanced and important monograph, by moving past a dichotomous view of state versus citizen, foregrounds new ways to look at East German socialist modernity. Moreover, Moranda grounds his well-written, if at times repetitive book, in a broad range of historiographies, incorporating scholarship on tourism, nature, and state-society relations in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Germany, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. *The People’s Own Landscape* would be an excellent resource for upper-level undergraduate and graduate students and scholars in these fields.

MOLLY WILKINSON JOHNSON

The University of Alabama in Huntsville

Student Politics in Communist Poland: Generations of Consent and Dissent. By Tom Junes. Lanhan, MD: Lexington Books, 2015. xxxiv, 293 pp. Bibliography. Index. \$100, hard bound.

This well-researched monograph by Tom Junes provides a historical overview of student politics in Poland from 1944 to 1989. He organizes the book into four sections, with the chronological breaking points of 1957, 1968, and 1980. As indicated in the title, Junes’ focus is on the student milieu, which he disentangles helpfully from a larger understanding of the intelligentsia. He also effectively examines politics within the milieu, including involvement of the party, the church, student self-government, and oppositional and counter-cultural activity. Throughout, he deploys an excellent source base that includes much archival documentation, student and non-student press publications, and around 50 interviews, with a variety of students including well-known individuals such as Adam Michnik and Karol Modzelewski.

In perhaps the strongest section of the book, and the one that most challenges our understanding of postwar Polish history, Junes examines the key years of protest

from 1968 to 1970. In the commonly accepted narrative of the time, students and intellectuals were not supported by workers in 1968, while the reverse happened two years later. The mythic origin story for Solidarity arises from the two groups coming together in the second half of the 1970s to found that all-important movement. Junes convincingly complicates this narrative by showing that many young workers were in fact involved in the events of 1968, and that some students took part in the protests in December 1970.

The great theoretical and organizational principle on which this book turns is that of “generations.” Junes claims to identify eight generations, with the monikers: the lost, the great leap forward, ‘56, small stabilization, ‘68, socialist complacency, ‘81, and ‘89. But except for a brief paragraph or two in the introduction, with a perfunctory footnote to some relevant scholarly literature, the concept is never satisfactorily defined. Confusingly, “generational units” within a particular generation are also invoked, which, while different from and even antagonistic to other generational units, are nonetheless part of the same generation. Some generations, for example the generation of ‘56, seem to have only lasted a few years, or even perhaps even less—the time frame for this generation is particularly murky. The longest generation seems to be that of the small stabilization, which is described as lasting for about a decade.

But there is so much overlap going on here that the waters become impossibly muddied, and the period from 1956 to 1968 is a particularly good example. Junes talks about October 1956 as a “generational event,” one that spawned the generation of ‘56. But that generation would seem to have somehow disappeared almost immediately, to be replaced by the more conformist generation of the small stabilization. And yet Junes writes of a “generational unit” within small-stabilization generation that he sees “originating in fact from the ranks of the generation of ‘56” but which then was replaced by yet another, different generational unit—within the same small-stabilization generation—that “would precipitate the birth of the generation of ‘68” (256). Put more concretely, Jacek Kuroń and Karol Modzelewski are placed in the generation of ‘56, but play an essential role in the years of the small-stabilization generation and also in inspiring the generation of ‘68 (74, 93). The repeated evocation of generations here unnecessarily and unhelpfully distracts from the author’s otherwise excellent research.

Indeed, throughout the book the use of the category of generations obscures more than it reveals. Instead of trying to recount this history on the Procrustean bed of generations, the study would have been much better served through a different organizational and analytical scheme. Junes has numerous, rich themes swirling throughout this book—traditions of opposition and rebellion, the role of the church, the situation of youth in a communist society, historical precedents, counter-cultures, the role of the state—but these fail to cohere effectively in the analytical framework chosen by the author.

Junes’ retelling the history of People’s Poland through the prism of the student milieu provides important new insights. The use of information taken from many interviews is a particular strength of this book, which deserves a place on the bookshelves of all those interested in postwar Polish history.

DAVID G. TOMPKINS
Carleton College