

nism,” Pons argues, was not European from the start. All these neat assertions can be contested in the light of recent historiography and recent archival findings.

Pons explores well the impact of World War II, particularly the vicious experiences of the Balkan and Russian campaigns. The war against fascism gave communism a long-term attractive identity, in comparison to local liberals and conservatives. Pons argues persuasively that the Cold war prolonged the lifespan of communism, substituting a bipolar geopolitical logic for declining ideological credibility. Pons links the decline of global communism to the rise of an American version of global liberalism. In the 1980s, the “socialist camp” led by the Soviet Union became, ironically, an outcast of the globalizing mainstream, economic and cultural. The Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev attempted to jump on the bandwagon, but he had little to contribute except for the well-meaning slogans of “new thinking” and “Common European Home.” Gorbachev’s policies led to an unexpected and spectacular dissolution of the Soviet Union as a state. According to Pons, those policies were doomed from the start by the fantastic gap between their promise of a “third way” and the nature of the system they meant to reform. His failure “laid bare the insurmountable contradictions inherent in the attempt to reform Soviet communism, and the impossibility of re-legitimizing it as a universalist project” (315). China’s leaders proved much wiser, when they relinquished universalist pretensions and focused on reforming the economy under the control of the authoritarian state.

What one does not find enough in the book is a cultural history of international communism: its remarkable ability to mobilize intellectual resources in Europe and elsewhere for producing millenarian social myths in the 1920s–40s, and the rapid end of this ability in the fifties. The “return of utopia” during the 1960s was promising but brief. It was brutally killed along with the “Prague Spring.” Pons argues that international communism perished under the blows of liberal modernity. One would expect more attention to such features of this modernity as mass consumption and mass culture, particularly the latter. In the book’s index we find Bertold Brecht, but not Sergei Eisenstein, Bernard Shaw, and Gabriel Garcia Marquez. More talented poets, writers, and filmmakers contributed to the myth of communism than to the anti-communist effort.

Some skeptics would say that the collapse of the Soviet Union happened when the global communist movement was already in effect dead for two decades. The history of globalization continues, and Pons is quick to remind us that international communism was a major competitor, contributor and stabilizer with regard to the winner of this process—global liberal capitalism. The latter, currently much more powerful than communism had ever been, is not immune to the specter of decline, caused by its own self-generated crises and, ironically, by ideological vacuity left by the communist collapse.

VLADISLAV ZUBOK
London School of Economics

Broad Is My Native Land: Repertoires and Regimes of Migration in Twentieth-Century Russia. By Lewis Siegelbaum and Lesley Page Moch. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014. xviii, 421 pp. Notes. Index. Bibliography. Illustrations. Tables. Maps. \$75.00, paper.

This work by Lewis Siegelbaum and Lesley Page Moch is a major contribution to the field. The volume ambitiously engages and rigorously structures the vast theme of migrations in twentieth-century Russia. Until now there was little scholarly effort to bring the variety of these migrations together and conceive them as a manageable,

although complex, host of research problems. This book accomplishes much of that. The result is an important historical synthesis and an introduction to the field that still awaits many scholars. It shows twentieth-century Russia as a country on the move, where geographic mobility played a prominent part in human lives. Significantly, the volume places Russian migrations in a transnational context and historiography of western and non-western societies.

Throughout the book we see a dialogue between what the authors call “regimes” and “repertoires” of migration—on the one hand, government ideas and policies regulating migrations, and on the other hand, strategies and devices employed by migrants themselves. The impulse of state authority to control movement and resources had been strong in Russia for centuries, but the twentieth brought this impulse to its peak. From World War I and the Revolution, the militarized ethos of social mobilization and exclusion by class, ethnicity or other grounds subjected major groups to forced resettlement in various forms. Where resettlement was voluntary, it was also governed by tight regulations of movement and residence, including officially endorsed residential hierarchies, from the privileged capitals to remote provinces. The regimes of migration were harsh and prescriptive, perhaps more so in Russia and the Soviet Union than in other modern societies.

At the same time, the authors emphasize the population’s agency in adapting to and interacting with those regimes. The “repertoires” of migration, devices people employed to move or stay in a given place, were imaginative and flexible. Moreover, the regimes and the repertoires were mutually constitutive. Individuals learned the rules of social mimicry and evasion, skillfully manipulating government policies to their advantage. Family ties remained important both for the migrants as a survival and adjustment mechanism, and for the authorities who relied on that mechanism to bring policies into effect. Geographic hierarchies also emerged from within the population as much as they were imposed from above.

The book is structured by increasing degrees of government intrusiveness—or, as the authors themselves put it, from least to greatest external compulsion. Each chapter examines a separate form of movement, proceeding chronologically from the early to the late twentieth and sometimes into the twenty-first century. The last chapter takes an exception to this logical crescendo of government intrusion, examining several groups that were constantly on the move, often by choice: the Roma, the nomadic pastoralists of Kazakhstan, orphans, and vagrants. Here as well, we see a salient presence of government authority, which struggled to impose upon the itinerants a regime of forced sedentarization.

The chapters speak to each other, presenting all groups of migrants as overlapping. The same individuals often fell into several categories and resurfaced, as many do in the book, in various capacities, at different moments counting as peasant “resettlers,” seasonal migrants, migrants to the city, career migrants, refugees, evacuees, exiles, prisoners, military and draftees. The authors acknowledge the overlap, and yet it is their accomplishment to structure the myriad migrations into such logical groups. Moreover, until now several of those groups remained underexplored. Historians knew little about migrants to the cities after World War II, or about postwar career migrants. Nor has it been common to treat military draftees within the paradigm of migration. And the itinerants have rarely been the focus of systematic attention, although a few groups have been examined separately, such as the Roma people, Kazakh nomads, and orphans.

The volume indicates rich opportunities for future research. The authors intentionally focus on domestic movement, leaving emigration and immigration outside the scope of their work. Borderlands and cross-border transactions also remain to be studied, as the authors acknowledge. The book also suggests important questions for further examination: during the early 1950s “the resettlement regime underwent a

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,