

antisemitism, opposition to Freemasonry, Obscurantism, and so forth (see also Mirel Bănică, *Biserica Ortodoxă Română. Stat și societate în anii '30*, 2007).

Simultaneously, the author makes the point that some of the Csángó intellectuals were misled into accepting state policies towards Romanization, believing they would thus save the Catholics in Moldavia from what they thought to be the peril of Magyarization. In this manner, some curious theories concerning the origin of the Csángós emerged. Essentially, they depicted them as Romanians (turned into “Székelys”), who came from Transylvania to Moldavia around the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries (see particularly D. Mărtinaș, *Originea ceangăilor din Moldova*, 1985). The volume also deals distinctly with Roman Catholic clergymen in Moldavia and Bucharest, as they represented the intellectual and political elites of the Csángós and, thus, produced historiographical, philosophical, and literary texts. This topic deserves further study, as some Csángós were active in Romanian extreme right organizations during the entire interwar period, as well as throughout World War II. Some of the Roman Catholic priests from this community encouraged their flock to abandon Hungarian identity by taking up Romanian names and share in Romanian nationalist ideals.

To sum up, this is a book of genuine erudition on ethnically-obscure minorities of southeastern Europe. From 1920 to 1944, the Csángós were an additional reason for academic tensions between Hungary and Romania, as territorial disputes were in the limelight. Davis emphasizes the significance of the part played by various historical and cultural components for the formation of ethnic and national groups. His extensive knowledge on the Csángós helps the book greatly: the author lives up to the challenge of decoding the genealogy of this marginalized group. In an approach that has obviously taken distance from the idea of “pure” peoples or cultures, *Hungarian Religion, Romanian Blood* is a key cross-disciplinary contribution to our understanding of the Csángós.

LUCIAN NASTASĂ-KOVÁCS
Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj, Romania

Babyn Yar: History and Memory. Ed. Vladyslav Hrynevych and Paul Robert Magocsi. Trans. Marta D. Olynyk. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera, 2016, 327 pp. Bibliography. Plates. \$25.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2019.276

This volume, produced for the 75th anniversary of the Babyn Yar massacre, consists of three sections, covering its background, the tragedy itself, and its aftermath.

Following a preface by Norman Naimark and an introduction by the editors, the opening chapter by Mykhailo Kalnytskyi reaches all the way back to the ravine’s geological formations and the first settlements in paleolithic times. Igor Shchupak covers the period on the eve of the tragedy. The contributions by Karel Berkhoff, Vitaliy Nakhmanovych, and Vladyslav Hrynevych on the massacre and its memory constitute the core of the volume. Assia Kovrigina Kreidich and Gelinada Grinchenko offer two original chapters on personal accounts and on the oral history of Babyn Yar, respectively. Grinchenko’s contribution, utilizing taped survivors’ testimonies in the USC Shoah Foundation Institute and the USHMM is particularly noteworthy. Iryna Zakharchuk’s “Babyn Yar in Belles Lettres,” Karel Berkhoff’s “Babyn Yar in Cinema,” Iryna Klimova’s “Babyn Yar in Sculpture and Painting,” and Natalia Semenenko’s “Babyn Yar in Music,” offer new perspectives on the depiction of the tragedy in the fine arts. A second essay by Nakhmanovych focusing on Babyn Yar in memory, is

followed by two short post scripts by Shimon Redlich and some rather esoteric philosophical musings by Myroslav Marynovych. The result is an intelligently organized, well-translated collection on various aspects of the tragedy, its role in memory, society, and culture. The volume illustrates the magnitude of the long-suppressed trauma of Babyn Yar on Ukrainian society.

The volume's contributions, the editors write, "are based on documentary sources and academic research" (12). Unfortunately, there are serious shortcomings in the volume that fail to meet the standard of academic publications: no foot notes, no index, and no bibliography. This does the authors a disservice by diminishing the value of their contributions.

Norman Naimark notes in the introduction that "there is no agreement on how to represent the collaboration of Ukrainian police auxiliaries in the mass murder of the Jews" (10). Indeed, the role of local collaborators, and their agency and responsibility in the extermination of Ukrainian Jewry remain among the most difficult aspects of Ukrainian memory. One of these controversies regards the role of one collaborationist formation, the so-called Bukovinian Battalion, set up by the more conservative Melnyk wing of the far-right Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, (OUN-M). In his chapter "Ukraine under Nazi Rule," Berkhoff takes to task "some writers who say that they have established beyond doubt that the men and women of the Bukovinian Battalion were not in Kyiv during the Babyn Yar massacre—and therefore could not have been involved in it in any way" (61). Berkhoff's research compellingly shows that members of that unit arrived in Kyiv in September, corroborating this by Jewish survivor testimony. These findings also concurs with current scholarship by other scholars, working independently of one another. The claim that that unit was not in Kyiv during the massacre comes from Nakhmanovych, who contributed two extensive articles (of forty and twenty-four pages, respectively) to the volume. Unfortunately, as the volume lacks footnotes, the survivor testimony is not referenced. Nakhmanovych's now-obsolete 2007 article, however, appears as suggested "further reading" (105). An unfortunate result of the absence of references is that the volume misses the chance to address—and conclude—a historical controversy of key importance.

Co-editor Hrynevych's 48-page article "Babyn Yar after Babyn Yar," does a fine job illuminating Soviet suppression of memory, but is less successful in keeping a distance from the instrumentalization of memory in contemporary Ukraine. Mirroring the official Ukrainian government rhetoric, he refers to the OUN as "the Ukrainian liberation movement" (153)—an argument supported neither by the output of the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory (UINP) nor by Ukrainian academia at large. Hrynevych denounces, in normative language, the "disgraceful concealment" (144) of the Holocaust during Soviet times, but has little problem with the so-called "history laws" rushed through parliament on April 9, 2015, which criminalizes "disrespect" for the OUN. "Despite some shortcomings," he contends, "this packet of laws is of strategic importance for Ukraine's future. Today the Holocaust, which was suppressed for so long in the USSR, occupies an important role in Ukraine's politics of history" (153), and Nakhmanovych (99, 300-1), an argument again hardly supported by UINP and much of Ukrainian academia.

Another spurious claim that has entered the new Ukrainian national(ist) canon is the martyrdom of the OUN-M-affiliated poet Olena Teliha (1906–1942), who, the Ukrainian government claims, was shot in Babyn Yar. This unsubstantiated claim, which first appeared in nationalist émigré circles the late 1960s, is repeated by Hrynevych (150), Zakharchuk, (230), and Nakhmanovych (300–1). That both OUN wings called for the destruction of the Jews in 1941, that Teliha was an enthusiastic admirer of Adolf Hitler, and that the OUN-M continued its collaboration with the Nazis until 1945 is somehow overlooked by all three contributions that recall her martyrdom.

In 1992, Ukrainian Nationalists set up a memorial in Babyn Yar, claiming that 621 “members of the anti-Nazi underground” of the OUN-M were shot there. In his rendering, the Nazis regarded Ukrainian nationalists as their enemies (66), depicting them, rather reductively as their victims (68). In fact, the innocence of the Bukovinian Battalion and its parent organization, the OUN-M, the martyrology of Teliha and the other 620 supposedly anti-Nazi OUNites are all components of a national mythology—well deserving of the same critical scrutiny as Soviet distortions.

Legislating history is unlikely to provide closure. Addressing the Verkhovna Rada on the 75th anniversary of the massacre of Israeli president Reuven Rivlin explicitly recalled the role of the OUN in the Holocaust and cautioned its rehabilitation and glorification.

Babyn Yar is a welcome addition to the literature, in particular in regard to culture, oral history and memory. The volume reflects that Ukraine has come a long way since the Soviet era. What is missing is a section on the airbrushing of the Babyn Yar tragedy in post-1991 Ukraine. Regarding the complexities of local perpetration, not least the role of the “Ukrainian liberation movement,” much of this discussion still lies ahead.

PER A. RUDLING
Lund University

Center for Baltic and East European Studies (CBEES), Södertörn University

The Jewish Revolution in Belorussia: Economy, Race, and Bolshevik Power. By

Andrew Sloin. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017. Xiv, 325 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. Maps. \$90.00, hard bound; \$38.00, paper. doi: 10.1017/slr.2019.277

This brilliant collection of essays focuses on Jewish working-class politics in 1920s Belorussia. By concentrating on Jewish workers’ experience, Andrew Sloin offers a nuanced account of the experiences of pre-revolutionary Jews that moves beyond the wholly negative portrayal of Jewish life under the Soviet regime that dominates current historiography. He discusses various aspects of what he calls the “Jewish Revolution,” an activist, positive program for total economic, social, and cultural integration into a post-capitalist order devoted to social and national equality. The “Jewish Revolution” was based on Bolsheviks’ anti-racism and their notion of labor as the primary gateway to active citizenship in the new society. In practice, the new policies entailed a dramatic elevation in the status of Jewish workers, previously discriminated against due to their ethnicity as well as their poverty. As laborers, they became the most respected members of the new society, developed a deep sense of belonging in that society, and assisted by the new anti-racist state, created their own proletarian Jewish culture. The author also addresses the Soviet turn to less savory policies towards the Jews, in particular the gradual racialization of Soviet policies and blaming the Jews for the failures of Soviet economic policies, both during the NEP and following the Stalinist turn. Such racialization was never translated into racism per se, as happened in numerous other countries during the period between the two world wars. The state, however, continued to blame the “wrong” kind of Jews for the regime’s failures, while encouraging active participation of the “right” kind of Jews—the communist Jewish workers.

In multiple essays, the author discusses the regime’s establishment of certain groups of Jews as “wrong.” These were always reactions to a particular economic policy failure that pushed some Jews into socially undesirable economic or political roles. The government then blamed these Jews for its policy’s failures. Self-employed