The chapters devoted to local studies in various parts of Moravia by Kladiwa and Pokludová offer particularly interesting insights into the issue of agency in the processes of politicization and the spread of political ideas and national ideology among peasants. Kladiwa points to the interplay between governmental and popular initiatives for social change and modernization in the particularly poor, underdeveloped region of Wallachia (Valašsko). Clergy and schoolteachers often provided leadership, cooperating with each other in some places while at odds elsewhere. Pokludová also affirms the role of government in furthering social and economic change. She focuses on clergy and schoolteachers as change agents in northeastern Moravia and finds much cooperation between them as well as many instances of friction. Pokludová points out that Catholic clergy often played notably progressive roles in furthering the development of agriculture and credit institutions even while opposing much in liberal ideology.

The various chapters here repeatedly note the primacy of practical concerns among the peasantry and their keen sense of difference from urban elements. Frequently, educated elements, whether teachers, clergy, lawyers, or journalists, played a critical role in putting a national cast on the peasants' sense of community. One must regret that this volume offers only two chapters on the lands of the Kingdom of Hungary and southeastern Europe, since less has been published in English, French, or German on the development of civil society and rural political action in those territories during the late nineteenth century than for Poland, Bohemia, and Moravia. John Swanson's chapter treats the relationship between locally and internationally based efforts to defend German culture and loyalties among Hungary's German-speaking peasant population, touching on some issues he addressed in his 2017 monograph and earlier publications. The sole chapter on Romania, authored by Sorin Radu, addresses the primary concerns of this book only marginally. He summarizes debates among Romanian national party leaders and political thinkers about popular voting rights and the representation of peasant interests between 1866 and 1918 without examining the development of civil society and political action among the peasantry. It is to be expected, of course, that the contributions in such a collection will vary in their originality and value. Here readers will find much, though, that casts new light on the development of civil society and modern political life in the countryside of east central Europe during the nineteenth century that will invigorate further historical research on the region.

Gary B. Cohen
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Neudobnoe proshloe: Pamyat o gosudarstvennykh prestupleniyakh v Rossii i drugikh stranakh. By Nikolai Epplee. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2020. 574 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. ₽600, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.193

Publication of Nikolai Epplee's book (*An Inconvenient Past: Memory about State Crimes in Russia and Other Countries*), about dealing with past repressions has become a cultural event widely discussed by Russian intellectuals.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Not belonging to a community of Memory scholars by training, Epplee did not use the language of the rapidly growing discipline but dared to offer a broad comparative view of the problem and to suggest political steps to proceed from the current "inconvenient" situation. He aims to help create a common language for the national conversation about the legacy of the repressive Soviet regime that should open the door for the condemnation of state crimes and reconciliation.

The book consists of three parts. First, "Anamnesis" provides an exposition of the history of Russia's dealings with Stalin repressions and memory of Gulags in the USSR and in post-Soviet Russia. Epplee lists and describes the attempts of "reconciliation" from above and from below, and points out the problems of dealing with the difficult past from the contemporality where the state inherited a lot from that past.

In the second part, the author explores the cases of six countries that had to deal with their own difficult pasts, namely Argentina, Spain, South Africa, Poland, Germany, and Japan. The comparative perspective, which here also considers the Russian case, is especially important for the Russian debate, as it shows that some of the rhetorical constructions or real fears that the post-Gulag discourse produces in Russia are not unique, and many such problems have been successfully dealt with in other countries. Epplee demonstrates that the tactic of "forgetting the Past" did not work, that there is a difference between the guilt and responsibility, that the appeal of the comparison of the Russian case to the Nuremberg trials of the Nazis misses the point, and that there is no reason to be afraid of the conflict between the "grandchildren of victims and grandchildren of executioners." In this part, Epplee provides details of the emergence and development of the political and social institutes dealing with the need to overcome the past of the criminal regimes that perpetrated torture and murder of political opponents and independent leaders, practiced segregation, abduction, and intimidation towards their own citizens.

The third part of the book, "Synthesis," consists of the author's recommendations on how to deal with Russia's difficult past. He emphasizes the need to draw the line between today and the past; he uses the metaphor of "dead water" from the Russian fairytales, which can make zombie-like creatures existing between the two worlds finally dead, thus taking the first step toward its cure with the "water of life." Russian society needs to look at the repressions as past that cannot and should not be forgotten, but also as a part of history that society has overcome. To do that, the whole truth of the past must be made available. Epplee also suggests starting "bargaining" about the past. Unlike in the "Nuremberg model," the process must begin within Russia, focus on responsibility and not guilt, and should involve as many social and political actors as possible. To ensure wide participation, the process must include compromises and "bargains." The best model, according to the author, is the South African "Truth and Reconciliation Commission." The work of reconciliation should include opening all archives and the creation of a "memory infrastructure" comprised of social institutes and groups interested in ensuring the process's success. Even if some of the author's suggestions look hardly achievable, and some raises questions, this book offers

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a good starting point as it takes a first step from analysis to the discussion of possible steps forward.

Such an ambitious book inevitably leaves room for questions and doubts. I would be particularly interested to learn who would act on behalf of the victims in the suggested national bargaining about the past. Epplee demonstrated the existence of such societal groups in Argentina and South Africa, but it is unclear who in Russia could play a role similar to mothers and grandmothers demanding truth in Argentinian case. Moreover, the author correctly points out that in many cases in Russia descendants of victims and perpetrators are the same people. The distance of two generations made the Russian case different from most of the countries the author analyzes in the book. Indeed, it deals with the victims of the Soviet (mostly Stalin) regime, and Epplee seems to understand the difference between the task of immediately publishing the truth and the subsequent reconciliation after the fall of the criminal regime following the loss of past decades and generations. Incidentally, this is why the German experience seems relevant, since generations there have changed since the Nuremberg trials, and the contemporary dealing with the past is no more a result of foreign pressure.

This last comment also suggests another possibility: the more we know about the contemporary Russian state, the more we think that the models analyzed in the book could be used in Russia after the end of the current regime. The link between democratization and overcoming the difficult past was a key feature of all the cases in the monograph, with each process facilitating the other. Russia will face a double challenge of dealing with its past, and we will see whether this fact will weaken or empower its future democratizing surge.

Ivan Kurilla
European University at St. Petersburg

Unity in Faith? Edinoverie, Russian Orthodoxy, and Old Belief, 1800–1918. By James M. White. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020. ix, 271 pp. Appendixes. Bibliography. Index. $75.00, hard bound; $35.00, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.194

Drawing on a wide range of rare printed and archival sources, James White has written an important book about the Russian Orthodox institution of *edinoverie* (unity in faith), an effort to heal the seventeenth-century schism provoked by the liturgical reforms of Patriarch Nikon (Nikita Minin, r. 1652–58) of Moscow. The Old Believers (*staroobriadtsy*, *starovery*), who had refused to accept the reforms, were anathematized at the Moscow Council of 1666–67. Separated from the state church, which they regarded as heretical, the Old Believers formed their own ecclesiastical communities that continued to follow the pre-Nikonian rituals and books. Initially, state and church severely persecuted all religious dissent, but by the mid-eighteenth century, Russian authorities tried more tolerant policies to govern their large numbers of Old Believer subjects. *Edinoverie* represented one of the most long-lasting of these policies. Formally created in 1800 by Emperor Paul (r. 1796–1801) and Metropolitan Platon (Pëtr Georgievich Lëvshin, r. 1775–1812) of Moscow,

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.193 Published online by Cambridge University Press