the chapters simply present rather well-known evidence that shows the discrepancy between nationalist rhetoric and the real historical record. Of course, the goal of publicizing this discrepancy is praiseworthy; as in several nation-states, the official versions of national history fail to conform to the actual historical record. Having said that, though, it is necessary to observe that in several chapters authors largely reiterate existing knowledge or add very little that is fresh or advancing regional scholarship. In other words, it is debatable whether the volume as a whole ultimately succeeds in truly advancing historical knowledge. While individual chapters sketch alternatives *against* the dominant national narratives, there is no theoretical strategy that goes *beyond* church, mosque, and state. In this regard, the title appears to exaggerate the actual objectives realized in the book's pages.

If one looks upon the volume in terms of its positive contribution to knowledge (as opposed to merely destabilizing dominant versions of various local national narratives), then it is fair to say that the volume's chapters demonstrate the processes through which several agents of the Balkan nation-states have engulfed a multitude of local identities in order to obtain the much-cherished objective of national conformity or homogeneity. But that is not different from what has been done everywhere else in the world. Lamenting nation making is pointless: after all, the entire globe is organized on such a basis. The theoretical relationship between the region's route to modernity and ethnic conflict—an issue I have sought to explain in my 2001 book—remains outside the authors' scope. In all fairness, this failure reflects the broader marginality of Balkan studies and an inability to break with the methodological nationalism that informs the shared worldview of so many scholars in the region. One of the pervasive features of the post-1989 era is the failure of the entire field of Area Studies *as such* to come to terms with the post-Cold War realignment and the critical challenge of globalization for the field. Over the last few years, this issue has been a topic raised in ASEEES presidential addresses; and this journal's readers should be sufficiently familiar with the overall problematic. Therefore, this is not an issue that concerns solely or exclusively this volume, but of course, that by no means suggests that one should turn a blind eye toward these matters.

Victor Roudometof
University of Cyprus

Karl Marx: Greatness and Illusion. By Gareth Stedman Jones. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016. xii, 750 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Plates. Photographs. Maps. $35.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.20

Why would a specialist in Russian and east European history feel the need to read a biography about Karl Marx? First and foremost, presumably, because of the immense influence of Marx's ideas on Russian history. If this is our motivation, Gareth Stedman Jones tells us we are deeply mistaken: Marx had barely any influence at all on the Social Democratic movement prior to World War I, either in Germany, Russia, or anywhere else. The widespread impression to the contrary is the result of efforts by German Social Democrats at the end of the nineteenth century to give themselves a respectable pedigree by constructing a cult of Marx. In reality, their "Marxism" consisted mostly of the scientism of Friedrich Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and a desire to imitate Charles Darwin. The canon of Marx's texts created after the Russian revolution of 1917—including the *Communist Manifesto*—is an ahistorical fake: "It was only in the twentieth century, as a result of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the foundation of the Comintern,

CrossMark
https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.20 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that the pronouncements of the *Manifesto* acquired an actuality which they had never possessed in the previous century" (677). The discussion of the *Manifesto* in the present biography is short and dismissive of any coherent impact of its "impossibly self-contradictory" and "politically unsustainable" strategy (234–6, 240–1).

The political ideas of Marx's youth as expressed in the *Manifesto* soon proved irrelevant, although Marx had a hard time realizing this. True, *Capital* was a genuine accomplishment, although only "in the area for which he affected to have least regard[:] he became one of the principal—if unwitting—founders of a new and important area of historical enquiry" (430). Stedman Jones strengthens his case for Marx's political irrelevance by interpreting his remarks on the Russian commune as a repudiation of his earlier outlook. In the final paragraph of his book, Stedman Jones turns the later discovery of his letter to Vera Zasulich into a parable:

> We cannot know why in 1923 the former leaders of the Group for the Emancipation of Labour *forgot* Karl's 1881 letter urging them to support the village community rather than follow the supposedly orthodox "Marxist" strategy of building an urban-based workers' social-democratic movement. But this only reinforces the point that the Marx constructed in the twentieth century bore only an incidental resemblance to the Marx who lived in the nineteenth (595).

Stedman Jones also maintains that the cult of Marx created by German Social Democratic leaders painted a falsely heroic picture of him personally, and he clearly sees it as his duty to chip away at this picture. Thus, this biography has much to say about Marx's boils, both physical and moral—for example, the repellent racist comments in his correspondence get much play.

This book is a great disappointment. Its central thesis is misguided: Marx remained loyal to the vision of the *Manifesto* until the end, and the *Manifesto* and its ideas had a massive influence on pre-World War I Social Democracy, including the Russians. The author does not make a stimulating argument in support of a provocative thesis, but simply overlooks the relevant facts of the case. The heart of Marx's "self-contradictory" political strategy in the *Manifesto* was to prepare the working class through "united action and discussion" (from Engels' 1890 preface to the *Communist Manifesto*) for its great world-historical task. Among other immense consequences, the imperative of educating and organizing on a national scale meant that a large and growing section of the socialist movement had a vital interest in political freedom (free press, right of assembly, and so on) and therefore in the revolutions against absolutism needed to acquire it. In Karl Kautsky's immensely influential words from 1892, political freedom was "light and air for the proletariat." Russian Social Democracy took these words to heart, and the 1905 Revolution cannot be understood apart from this commitment.

While Stedman Jones is a distinguished specialist in mid-century English social history, he has, on the evidence of this book, very little knowledge of or feel for the pre-World War I Social Democratic movement in Germany, Russia, or anywhere else. His caricature of German Social Democracy and particularly of Kautsky is decades out of date. Although the narrative of "the late Marx" burning his Eurocentric bridges and leaving his dogmatic and self-deceiving followers behind is increasingly popular lately, it rests on a strawman version of "the early Marx" on the one hand and exaggerated claims about the implications of Marx's investigations into the commune on the other.

The final paragraph quoted above exemplifies the book as a whole. It is factually careless: both Georgi Plekhanov and Zasulich had died earlier and so could not forget anything in 1923 (Stedman Jones himself gives a more accurate account in preceding

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.20 Published online by Cambridge University Press

paragraphs). The argument is opaque: what exactly is "this" and why does it "reinforce" Stedman Jones's point? The text of Marx's letter to Zasulich provides no basis for the claim that Marx urged rejection of "the supposedly orthodox 'Marxist' strategy of building an urban-based workers' social-democratic movement" (595). Finally, the author decided for unexplained reasons to refer to his subject throughout the book exclusively as "Karl," right up to this final paragraph. At first, I thought this was unpardonably familiar on Gareth's part, but I finally realized that the strange procedure expresses well the biographer's desired tone of hostile condescension.

Lars T. Lih
McGill University

Understanding and Teaching the Cold War. Ed. Matthew Masur. The Harvey Goldberg Series for Understanding and Teaching History. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2017. xi, 354 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. $34.95, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.21

This is an important book on a subject which is generally slighted in scholarly literature—namely, the relationship between pedagogy and historical research. The Cold War is not the only field of history that has experienced exponential growth in the volume of sources in the last two decades, but it must rank high given the impetus provided by the end of the Cold War itself. How to integrate this material into the undergraduate curriculum is the main focus of the book. It is worth starting with the closing section of the book which contains excellent essays by Christian Ostermann on the heroic and invaluable Cold War International History Project (CWIHP), by Marc Selverstone on presidential recordings, and M. Todd Bennett on the Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) series. All offer invaluable advice on use of these rich bodies of sources, mostly now available on line.

The coverage is wide (with a couple of caveats discussed below) and the approach generally practical in that the contributors are keen to show how their chosen topics can come alive in the classroom. After some general reflections on the Cold War by Carole Fink and Warren I. Cohen, there is a section on traditional topics (origins of the Cold War, the nuclear arms race, the end of the Cold War), including thoughtful reflections by high school teacher David Bosso on "Teaching the Cold War to the post-9/11 Generation." Anthony D'Agostino's essay on the Soviets' Cold War is one of only two essays in the book specifically on the eastern bloc, the other being Philip Pajakowski's superb chapter on Poland, with special reference to the novel and film *Ashes and Diamonds*. This is a must read, as is Kenneth Osgood's analysis of Cold War propaganda that examines in some detail Dwight D. Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" speech. Part Three on the Cold War and American Society contains excellent essays on "fear and anxiety" in the Cold War, popular culture, civil rights, and the relatively under-studied field of sport. Part Four on the Global Cold War includes important and, especially in the case of Ryan Irwin's essay on Africa, revealing essays on the impact of the Cold War on the wider world. In addition to essays on East Asia, Latin America, Africa, and eastern and western Europe, neutralism and the Non-Aligned Movement is well covered by Mary Ann Heiss. All in all, editor Matthew Masur is to be congratulated on putting together an impressive collection of essays.

A few caveats and reflections. First, it is a pity there is not greater representation of Soviet and east European topics. Westerners need to work harder to understand "the other" in the Cold War. Second, the absence of coverage of intelligence

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.20 Published online by Cambridge University Press