

on the Habsburg Monarchy (and after 1867 the Austrian half) analyzes a telling example where the successful administrative, economic, social, and cultural integration of diverse territories and peoples depended on imperial principles of legal equality and economic integration and not on efforts to achieve increased linguistic or ethnic homogeneity. When nationalisms of all kinds developed as political forces in Habsburg central Europe, thanks largely to Habsburg language policy, they depended intimately on empire and its institutions (schools, bureaucracies) for their coherence and political persuasiveness. In turn, the Habsburg Monarchy came to justify its imperial existence increasingly in the late nineteenth century as an effective protector and mentor of those small nations who would otherwise be consumed by their large voracious neighbors.

A second difficulty is more typical of ambitious collections of essays like this one. The quality of the essays is mostly high. Those that are less than excellent stand out in their inability to fit the intentions of the volume. Several of the authors engage fruitfully with each other—or with literatures outside of their national fields—but some, unfortunately, do not. These complaints should be taken as a spur to further research about the relationship between nationhood and empire. Perhaps we can soon move beyond these two traditional categories altogether—especially that of nation—in favor of less teleological understandings of political organization and ideologies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

PIETER M. JUDSON
European University Institute

Behind the Divide: Entangled Histories of Cold War Europe. Eds. Simo Mikkonen and Pia Koivunen. New York: Berghahn Books, 2014. ix, 325 pp. Bibliography. Index. Figures. Illustrations. Tables. \$120.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.195

This volume bores fourteen holes in the Iron Curtain in an effort to dispel a distortive image of Cold War Europe. It is time for historians to acknowledge that “[s]ocieties in the East and the West” were neither “fundamentally different” nor “fully separated during the Cold War,” (4) write the editors in their introduction. More theoretically-inclined chapters like Anna Matyska’s eloquent study of Polish lives in Finland in the 1970s and 80s take the idea further, arguing that Winston Churchill’s “iron” and György Péteri’s “nylon curtain” project a false stability and homogeneity onto the eastern bloc (273). Communist governments signed cultural, economic, and scientific agreements with western governments based on historical affinities and present-day circumstances, and capitalist states did similarly. The chapters’ methodological and geographic orientation toward Europe’s margins calls attention to these nuances and contingencies. The book takes place far enough away from traditional centers of power to see where and how experiments happened, and far enough from conventional archival sources to consider the responsible parties from multiple vantage points.

Regarding geography, it is hard to find any volume on Cold War Europe’s “entangled histories” in which a German republic appears in just one of fourteen chapters, and even then as one of three case studies. The United States appears in two in passing. Add to this Britain’s starring role in one chapter and minor part in another, and the familiar western landscape recedes from view. Granted, France and the USSR are the most conspicuous countries, with four chapters apiece. One of the Soviet count concerns Estonia, however, and as Nicolas Badalassi reminds us in the lone

traditional diplomatic history in the volume, Gaullist France rejected the two-camp concept of postwar Europe out of hand. It is hard to imagine a western power more suitable to a book about gaps in the Iron Curtain than France. As for the exemplars of “positive neutrality” in western Europe, as the Soviets defined it, Finland occupies three chapters, and Austria none.

All told, nine of fourteen chapters narrate relations between two countries, among them Francesca Rolandi’s empirically rich analysis of Italian popular culture’s influence on Yugoslav youth at the turn of the 1960s, and the Yugoslav Communist Party Ideological Commission’s feeble attempts to restrain it. Václav Smidrkal employs quantitative data regarding films screened and books published to illustrate the gradual “instrumentalization” (177) of French culture in postwar Czechoslovakia. Anssi Halmesvirta sees Hungarian scientists’ trips to Finland as a window onto the stifling effect that bureaucracy and technological stasis had on research and development there. Three more chapters address NGOs as propaganda platforms, most notably Sonja Grossmann’s impressive, multi-archival chapter on how west European governments handled Soviet friendship societies differently, by boycott or cooperation. Lars Lundgren documents a clear head-to-head rivalry between capitalist- and communist-sponsored broadcasting organizations, this one culminating in the *détente* of April 1961, when Soviet television transmitted Yuri Gagarin’s spaceflight to the United Kingdom via the BBC. The remaining two chapters limit their geographic scope to one western country, the Netherlands for Giles Scott-Smith and Switzerland for Matthieu Gillibert, while expanding their view beyond a small clump of institutions to account for the high, broad uptick in east-west publications and conferences in both across the 1960s.

Methodologically, the question that hangs over at least half of the contributions to this volume is one that Scott-Smith broaches in its opening chapter. Where should we situate nongovernmental and semi-governmental institutions in the history of Cold War international relations? For state-subsidized institutions, the answers presumably lie in the archives. In one of five chapters on “person-to-person” diplomacy (as opposed to five others about media and technology, and four that treat both), Marianne Rostgaard cites a 1972 meeting between Danish and Polish diplomats, where both sides cited a seven-year-old, bilateral youth leader seminar as proof of how well bilateral contacts and exchanges can work. The statements signaled the union of “formal and informal diplomacy,” (56) writes Rostgaard—the Danish state with the autonomous youth organization that it supported. Sampsa Kaataja, by contrast, questions how reliable state archives are as gauges for transnational exchange. His comparison between Finnish state documents, which say little of substance about meetings between Finnish and Estonian computer specialists from the 1960s to the 1990s, and the meetings’ participants, who recall a great deal, is telling. Helsinki might have sponsored a meeting and supplied its visas, Kaataja suggests, but the first-hand, three-dimensional “expertise” that Estonians took home with them were outside its scope.

Kaataja’s skepticism toward official archives brings us to Giles Scott-Smith’s quandary with respect to “non-state” organizations. It is difficult to attribute any influence to “non-state” activists and research institutions on Dutch diplomacy, despite their wishes to the contrary. The Dutch Foreign Ministry dismissed advocates of east-west dialogue as nags at best, and spies at worst. Hence, the need for a “parallel diplomacy” reserved for institutions that published policy papers, attended conferences, and talked to the press, writes Scott-Smith, but generated little to no debate among policy-makers. There are loose strings to this argument, foremost the role of the press as mediator between institutions and diplomats. Nevertheless, the sheer number and variety of nongovernmental and semi-governmental institutions cited in this

volume call for a macroscopic, quantitative complement to its case studies. Vaclav Smidrkal's, Matthieu Gillibert's, and Ioana Popa's chapters all demonstrate the utility of comparative data in a book as expansive as this one, Popa's in her exhaustive study of books-by-mail into eastern Europe and manuscript extraction out of it, all at the hands of Geneva's Foundation for European Intellectual Cooperation (FEIE). Were we to compare the dates and locations of the conferences that such organizations held, for example, then the contests between them might provide a proxy for the public-private debates that Scott-Smith has not found.

The volume's concise introduction and chapters, none of which exceeds twenty pages (including footnotes), are well suited to seminar discussions along the lines drawn above, one through the Iron Curtain, and another toward, through, and around the institutions above it.

NICK RUTTER
Fairfield University

Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas. Ed. Holm Sundhaussen and Konrad Clewing. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2016. 1102 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. Maps. €80.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.196

This is the second revised and expanded edition of the highly successful *Lexikon*, published in 2004. As a genre, the *lexicon* occupies an important place in German academe that does not have an exact counterpart in the English-speaking world. Somewhere between vocabulary and encyclopedia (but closer to the latter), it offers concise, summarizing entries, adjusted to contemporary scholarship. Closer then to the genre of encyclopedic dictionary, it also differs from the *Handbuch*, which (at least in theory) is more focused on a particular theme. It is also different from the *Keywords* of Raymond Williams that has its counterpart in the *Begriffsgeschichte* compendia of Reinhardt Koselleck.

This new *Lexikon* has 603 entries and has swollen from the previous 770 pages to 1102. It is supplied by ten excellent maps as well as by a detailed, cross-referenced index that immensely facilitates work with this enormous tome. The *Lexikon* takes the broader meaning of southeastern Europe that is dominant in the German space, thus encompassing also Hungary and Slovakia. Accordingly, it has two *lemmata*, both for southeastern Europe and for the Balkans. Its chronological span is from the early modern period to the present. Its coverage of special terms is comprehensive: empires (Byzantine, Ottoman, Venetian, Habsburg, Russian, Holy Roman), states (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Hungary, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Yugoslavia), as well as a huge number of sub-regions (Rumelia, Dobruzha, Oltenia, Vojvodina, Bačka, Thrace, Dalmatia, Lika, Moravia, Carpatho-Ukraine, Srem, Epiros, Styria, and so forth).

It has first-rate *lemmata* on large abstract concepts with region-wide significance in which the authors excel in their comparative approach: absolutism and neo-absolutism, enlightenment, reformation, feudalism, capitalism, imperialism, colonization, fascism, populism, socialism, communism, and many others. It covers important historical events: wars, (both world wars, the Crimean war, the Balkan wars, the so-called Turkish wars, and others); revolutions and uprisings; treaties and pacts; international relations concepts, like the Eastern Question, the Berlin congress, the Congress of Vienna, the Little Entente, and many more. It pays close