

reflects on the ways in which the memory of the Holocaust enters white-power music of more recent generations, including that of the twenty-first century. Works by Arnold Schoenberg and Krzysztof Penderecki provide narrative templates for essays by Ralph Buchenhorst and Joanna Postuszna. The essays in the third category combine ethnography with theory, and in so doing they attempt to unravel music's relation to genocide more critically, calling into question music's phenomenological capacity and limitations. A long set of theoretical reflections on the path to genocide in German music history, inevitably leading to the Holocaust, provides the substance for the opening chapter by M. J. Grant and her colleagues, Mareike Jacobs, Rebecca Möllemann, Simone Christine Münz, and Cornelia Nuxoll. Matt Lawson seeks to understand the limitations of musical language in Hanns Eisler's score for Alain Resnais's 1955 documentary film on Auschwitz, *Nuit et brouillard*. In the volume's "Afterword," Lawrence Kramer searches for a possible return path for music from acts of devastation, violence, and genocide to the European tradition that, for Kramer, has always afforded music with meaning.

The diverse methodological and disciplinary approaches in *Music and Genocide* notwithstanding, it is the paradox of the volume that the contributors remain constrained by the subjects announced by its title. Few essays really examine the details of genocide, keeping it at theoretical arm's length and accepting the claims about the difficulty of naming it. Even the essays that more ambitiously approach theory withdraw from analysis. In different ways, music is kept at a distance. In the aesthetic essays there are moments of wonderment about music's power to enchant and change the listener, and too often such generalizations seem sufficient to justify juxtaposing music and genocide. In many instances, the authors are simply talking past each other, leading one too often to question why certain chapters even appear in the book. What does belong together, however, is a serious challenge to the difficulty with which music and genocide are connected in the history of ideas, in the past and in our own day. Adorno got it wrong, and his pronouncements about impossibility remain a source of injustice. It was Walter Lindemann, instead, singing in the concentration camp, who truly got it right: and the music plays along.

PHILIP V. BOHLMAN
University of Chicago

Historical Legacies of Communism in Russia and Eastern Europe. Ed. Mark R. Beissinger and Stephen Kotkin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. ix, 247 pp. Notes. Index. \$90.00, hard bound

With *Historical Legacies of Communism in Russia and Eastern Europe*, a leading political scientist (Mark Beissinger) and a top historian (Stephen Kotkin) bring together an all-star group of academics to help crystallize a growing research agenda on historical legacies in countries that have made transitions from communist regimes. With some of these countries more than a quarter century since their transitions, the time is certainly ripe for this agenda to mature.

Perhaps the volume's core argument is that it is harder than it sounds to identify what actually is a legacy and what any such legacy's effects are. In an introductory chapter that should become a standard reference point for future research, the editors argue that just because something looks and "quacks" like a legacy does not mean that it actually is one. Sometimes the present looks like the past for reasons that do not actually connect the two. Timothy Frye's excellent chapter, for example, shows that Gazprom's poor corporate governance cannot simply be ascribed to its status as

a Soviet holdover; a comparison with its main Mexican counterpart reveals that its pathologies more likely result from its role in the political system and “global market forces” (105).

Accordingly, Beissinger and Kotkin define “legacy” not as an observed similarity with the past, but as a relationship with it. This puts the burden on researchers to establish the specific processes by which the legacy works. One of the volume’s most interesting contributions is a typology of legacies that the introductory chapter lays out and that each chapter does a nice job of referencing. *Fragmentation* is when fragments of a formerly united whole survive intact; *translation* involves old forms surviving but gaining new purpose; *bricolage* means that multiple bits of the old are recombined in new ways (perhaps with new elements as well); *parameter setting* refers to limitations that the past can put on the present; and *cultural schemata* are “embedded ways of thinking and behaving” that result from earlier socialization.

The editors recognize that this is not a comprehensive list. For example, Eugene Huskey’s chapter observes that the Soviet practice of a “cadre reserve” (nomenklatura) system was abolished after communism’s demise but was restored by Vladimir Putin in Russia, showing that its revival was not something that would have happened without the Soviet experience. Jessica Pisano’s chapter further complicates the typology with a fascinating close reading of an episode of multilayered *pokazukha* (window dressing) involving one of Putin’s nationwide televised call-in shows, pointing out that the past can be intentionally invoked in myriad ways, for specific contemporary political purposes, in ways that may or may not meet the editors’ definition of “legacy.” I would also have liked to see in the book’s framework a treatment of the power of history to create focal points that can later be invoked by people to resolve important coordination problems, or that can come to be seen as “natural” solutions to concrete organizational problems that any society might face; this, it seems to me, is actually one of the most important forms of legacy, one that could probably have shed additional light on some of the episodes presented by the chapter authors. Nevertheless, this book provides a very useful set of conceptual tools to which others might fruitfully be added.

The chapters following the introduction nicely illustrate the utility of this toolkit. The fact that the book is not organized by legacy type, but instead by substantive topic, presumably reflects one of the larger lessons one learns from the chapters: on any given topic where legacies are likely to be at work, multiple legacies may well be laboring at the same time. The book thus follows the introduction with an impressively broad-ranging chapter by Grigore Pop-Eleches that traces a democracy deficit in the postcommunist world largely to specific patterns of education that were typical of communism, especially an emphasis on vocational-technical training and political indoctrination. A central lesson he draws is that while economic development may promote democracy, we must pay attention not only to the level of development but the type of development.

The book then proceeds with three chapters on communist economic legacies: Clifford Gaddy’s analysis of cold-climate development, Béla Gretskovits’ on patterns in post-Soviet industrial development, and Timothy Frye’s warning against seeing legacies wherever we see economic similarities with the past. Next are three chapters on legacies shaping state institutions and behaviors: Eugene Huskey’s examination of Russia’s overweening executive, Brian Taylor’s study of institutional and cultural continuities in the realm of law enforcement, and Alexei Trochev’s documentation of the dramatic pro-prosecution bias that has continued across the post-Soviet space despite a great deal of judicial system reform. The following chapter is Anna Grzymala-Busse’s argument that recent legacies can combine powerfully with older ones, a phenomenon she uses to explain why the Catholic Church became much more powerful

in politics in some postcommunist countries (such as Poland) than in others (such as Czechoslovakia). Volodymyr Kulyk's penultimate chapter considers what he sees as a Soviet legacy of divergence between linguistic and ethnic identity in Ukraine, and Jessica Pisano wraps up the volume with her challenge to researchers to be aware of how the past is used and performed, often ironically and purposively.

Perhaps the only (very minor) shortcoming of the book is that it lacks a concluding chapter. While the introduction nicely summarizes each chapter's main contribution to the whole, I would have been very interested to reengage with the editors after having been enriched by the ten substantive chapters. Nevertheless, this is an important volume that will likely leave an important scholarly legacy of its own.

HENRY E. HALE
George Washington University

Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union. By Michael David-Fox. Pitt Series in Russian and East European Studies. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015. x, 286 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Plates. Figures. \$28.95, paper.

Michael David-Fox's new book, the title of which is partly a historical description and partly a call to historiographical action, is a set of essays critically examining scholarly debates in Russian and Soviet history and their comparative and theoretical contexts. His focus, chiefly concerning the 1920s and 1930s, revolves around thorny questions of Soviet "modernity," the long struggle by the intelligentsia and the state to bring a particular vision of modernity to the masses, and the nature and role of ideology. This densely written and erudite book is less, however, a synthesis of scholarship on "modernity, ideology, and culture in Russia and the Soviet Union" than a critical deconstruction to yield a methodological argument. In David-Fox's words, he seeks to "open up a set of desiderata" for this history (16).

Not everyone will agree with David-Fox's scholarly assessments or choices. Indeed, one could write a very different book focusing on topics and approaches in the field that he pays only passing notice to, including gender, ethnicity, religion, emotion, memory, spaces, bodies, sex, nature, and the like. But there is coherence in David-Fox's interests and approach, which lean political culture, broadly understood. And he has done a great deal in his work over the years to illuminate this.

The most well-developed and sustained critical effort is against simplification and reductionism, especially when these are built upon rigid boundaries and binaries. Of course, it has become something of a cliché for humanities scholars to deconstruct every boundary and binary. But David-Fox demonstrates their persistence and he offers a strong argument in support of work that resists the entrenched "polarizations in the field" (21), not least around the binary opposition of shared modernity and Soviet exceptionalism (a key theme in his book). No less, as he probes into questions of ideology, culture, and political practice, he warns against seeing "rigid" interpretive "boundaries" (79) between intention and implementation, structure and agency, circumstance and ideas, state and society, or elite and popular (also key themes). Chronology is among the borders he questions, emphasizing the interplay of both rupture and continuity across the boundaries dividing War Communism, NEP, the Great Break, the Great Retreat, and the Great Terror—categories nurtured, he comments, by "historians' mysticism of the subperiod" (111).

An alternative approach, he argues, must be multifaceted (acknowledging, for example, "multiple modernities" and the many different "faces of ideology"),