

authors concentrate on the representations of Cold War, often referring to works made during the Cold War, or the “golden age” of Polish cinema. The last part of the book focuses on sexuality: the seventh chapter analyzes several movies that depict female sexuality generally in progressive, not puritan ways, and the final chapter revolves around the images of male homosexual relationships that are described mainly on a basis of films directed by women.

All the chapters can be read independently of each other and may easily engage in dialogue with international scholarship on issues here analyzed on the example of Polish cinema. The fact that detailed and generally well-contextualized analyses are based on extensive literature gives the readers the possibility to get acquainted with Polish film criticism that could otherwise be difficult for the non-Polish speaking audience. The accent on a trend to “combine... continuity and change” (287) in regard to production from the period of state socialism enables the authors to convincingly sketch the evolution of Polish cinema while simultaneously imposing certain limitations on the scope of the book.

Readers of *Polish Cinema Today* could benefit from a careful explanation of the motivations behind choices regarding both themes that structure the book and films that have been chosen as exemplifications. The omissions are highly interesting. Given the limitations of this review, I will name only one example. The authors excluded many popular genre films—as for instance romantic comedies whose renaissance has been visible at the beginning of the twenty-first century—that seem in their opinion “hardly contribute... anything significant to Polish cinema in the long term” (176), thus resigning from drawing the broader picture of Polish film production (even if it were to serve as a context for analyses and interpretations) and concentrating on creating a new film canon instead.

All things considered, the overview of Polish cinema offered by Gosciło and Holmgren is an insightful and thought-provoking read, even though the promise to present “a bold new era in film” has been only partially fulfilled.

DAGMARA RODE
University of Łódź

What Will Be Already Exists: Temporalities of Cold War Archives in East-Central Europe and Beyond. Ed. Emese Kürti and Zsuzsa László. Bielefeld, Germany:

Transcript Verlag, 2021. 198 pp. Notes. Bibliography. \$55.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.44

This is a long overdue collection of essays that examines archives and the phenomenon of self-archivization by artists in east central Europe. While self-archivization is not unique to the region, there are aspects to it that are unique to this context. As it is widely known, much of the contemporary, experimental art that developed in the region did so independent of major institutions. There was no real art market to speak of, so any independent gallery that existed was usually set up by the artists themselves—for example, Ewa Partum’s *Galeria Adres*, established in 1972 in Łódź, Poland, which is discussed in this volume. The publication takes the 2020 conference “Artpool 40—Active Archives and Art Network” at the Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest as its point of departure. Artpool is also an archive that was set up by artists. Founded in 1979 in Budapest, its purpose was to preserve the avant-garde activity taking place in the country at the time, which was not recognized by the state. This text examines a range of examples of other “active archives” and artist archives across the region.

What Will Be Already Exists features a range of texts from scholars across the globe, creating comparative studies between archival practices in east central Europe and the rest of the world, between artists in the region, or honing the focus on one particular case study. These texts provide a much needed overview of the various ways in which artists in east central Europe have created or engaged with their own archives, how they have self-historicized, and self-archivized. This analysis is a much needed addition to the discussions on institutional critique insofar as many of these artists craved the institution in one way or another, and this is evident in the fact that they sought to preserve and maintain records of their work for some imagined future. As Zsuzsa László noted in the introduction, many of these artists were “fighting not against but for socialist modernization” (18).

The texts in the volume demonstrate how many of the artists in east central Europe active in self-archivization saw the archive much like Artpool, taking a dynamic approach to history “as an open artwork and as an activist art practice” (11). In the introduction, László notes how Artpool’s mission was “not only to preserve collected documents but also to feed them back into projects that circulate information internationally and provoke yet-to-be-realized ideas” (11). It is perhaps the necessity of preserving their work that drove them, but the uncertainty about the ultimate destiny of the archives created a situation that supported the creativity to create more than an archive; rather, a self-reflexive practice that includes the process of documenting, preserving, and later using those art works. This was certainly the case with Polish artists KwieKulik, who were discussed in Tomasz Załuski’s chapter “The Alternative Official?” KwieKulik not only thought consciously about the archival preservation of their work, but also the documentation of their performance art practice, which they referred to as *działanie*, or activities.

While it is clear that the artists from east central Europe discussed in this work were not operating within the context of an art market in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, in the 1990s, many of them became exposed to international markets, and what had once been a folder full of A4 sheets suddenly came to have monetary value attached to it. It would have been useful to hear more about the impact of that collision between artist and artwork with the market, and how that changed—or did not change—their perception of the documentation, or the purpose of the archive.

It was also refreshing to read Lina Džuverović’s feminist re-reading of the Yugoslav collective group OHO. It will not surprise the reader to learn that despite the context of lived socialism, women in east central Europe experienced as much subjugation to the patriarchy as women elsewhere. It may, however, surprise the reader to learn that these patriarchal structures were repeated in dissident, alternative, and avant-garde art groups. Despite their progressive agendas, they were blind to their own misogyny. This revisiting of OHO is a long overdue one, and it will be great to see such re-evaluations further, as there are many art groups and collectives for whom we are in need of such a reading.

It was disappointing, then, to see that aspect missing from many of the essays, because there is much work to do with an archive that is administrative, tedious, and requiring great care—the type of work that is often left for women to do. It would have been great to hear about the wives of the male artists who managed their partners’ archives, during their lives or after their death (for example, Marilena Koželj, Raša Todosijević, Branka Stipančić, and Mladen Stilinović, respectively). And it would have been instructive to hear about the division of labor with KweiKulik, and how much of the “manual” labor fell to Zofia Kulik as opposed to Przemysław Kwiek, as the artist herself described the events they hosted in their Warsaw apartment as very labor intensive.

That said, this is one of the first publications to address this very specific issue of the self-archivization of the artists’ work and life in east central Europe. As such, it is

not only long overdue but also makes a welcome contribution to the field and will be a valuable resources for years to come.

AMY BRYZGEL
Northeastern University

Urban Protest: A Spatial Perspective on Kyiv, Minsk, and Moscow. By Arve Hansen. Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2021. 281 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Figures. Tables. Maps. \$46.00, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.55

Arve Hansen's aim in *Urban Protest* is to illuminate "how mass protests are affected by urban public space" (19). Specifically, the author seeks to create a model that will help researchers take spatial factors into account in studies of urban protests. The author develops his perspective in the course of three main case studies of urban protests—in Kyiv, Minsk, and Moscow. A "trial run" of the perspective follows as Hansen assesses a "Yellow Jacket" protest in Paris.

Approximately the first half of the study is devoted to theory and methodology, along with occasional comments on how the project took shape. Having identified a lacuna in the political-geographic literature on urban protests, the author follows convention and provides relevant definitions and clarifies terms while drawing selectively on various works. Although Hansen notes in passing that the social sciences "tend to be overly focused on theory and methodology" (81), nevertheless he continues discussing those topics for another forty-five pages. *Urban Protest* began as a dissertation, so perhaps the length of the theoretical/methodological discussion is a result of the need to satisfy the author's examiners.

In order to conduct a social-scientific analysis, the author had to break up urban space into definable components. His starting point is Kevin Lynch's research into how people perceive the space around them (*The Image of the City*, 1960). Lynch found five common elements of spatial perception: paths, nodes, landmarks, districts, and edges. Hansen deems these elements independent variables, and in the course of the study he adds another twenty-one to form a list of "elements of the city" (113–19). In this section, in my view, the author goes astray by trying overly hard to fit the study into a conventional social-science mold. Hansen divides the list into three main categories: "perceived (subjective) elements," "physical elements," and "social elements" (114). Whereas all the "physical" and "social" elements are held to be "measurable," an additional sub-division in the "perceived" category distinguishes between "measurable" and "abstract." Hansen includes "history," "ideological symbols," and "history of protests" among the "measurable" factors. Perhaps these elements can be measured—Seven Years War—but what is crucial is their subjective meaning.

The author claims to have discovered "that non-physical elements—such as the history of a space, people's relation to the space... can affect protests" (104). In his narrative account of interviews with protesters, Hansen indeed seems aware that it matters what places mean to people. But his "model" does not, and perhaps cannot, deal with this basic fact apart from nudging future researchers to inquire about it. In contrast, historians have been able to weave meaning and motivation into studies of place-based protests (for example: Orlando Figes and Boris Kolonitskii, *Interpreting the Russian Revolution: The Language and Symbols of 1917*, 1999, 30–70).

More useful are the author's "intermediary factors": accessibility, mobility, "defensibility / policeability," sense of safety, visibility, symbolic value, and