criminality, and scarcity, "the survivors' joy at liberation and hopes of finding their loved ones and rebuilding" soon "collided with a wall of human indifference, dislike, and often enmity. Disillusionment quickly gave way to fear" (p. 61)—or even violence, as the second chapter shows. Throughout the first months after liberation, Jews—as "the most defenseless and most vulnerable inhabitants in the postwar city"—suffered violence that was abetted by local authorities and Catholic clergy (p. 79). Cows grazed on the Jewish cemetery, and Poles often destroyed the gravestones of their Jewish victims the very night after a body was interred.

While most Jews had already fled in August 1945 in response to hateful flyers, as the third chapter recounts, Radom's heavily armed remnant banded together as "ghost citizens—physically present, but socially nonexistent for the majority of the city's inhabitants. At the same time, in their closed communities the survivors undertook efforts to rebuild life under new conditions, in a reality whose every aspect was marked by the Holocaust" (pp. 135–136). The unveiling of a Holocaust monument in August 1950, comprised of rubble from Jewish tombstones on the site of the former synagogue, marked "the symbolic conclusion" of Jewish life in Radom (p. 203).

As it contrasts postwar legal codes with actual behaviors, the fourth chapter offers repeated cases wherein Jews surrendered property claims as the "price" of attempting a postwar life in Poland, while the state seized enterprises classified as "post-Jewish" (pp. 233, 241). Survivors often had to buy back old personal effects "such as a mother's sugar bowl" as dear heirlooms they took with them (p. 255). The end result, K. concludes, is that "the transfer of Jewish property into non-Jewish hands and the surrender of private property to the state," which had started "in the period of German occupation," seamlessly "continued afterward" (p. 264).

Through his intimate reconstruction of complex human lives in post-Holocaust Radom, K. not only reinforces an incontrovertible scholarly consensus but also delivers a hard-hitting admonition to his fellow Poles to wake up to "the bitter fact that they live in a post-genocidal land," in which the "heavy moral baggage" of complicity in the Holocaust yielded "indifference, dislike, enmity, and outright violence" against its few survivors (pp. 266–267). Although the text has been deftly translated, the citations are hard to follow, as Harvard University Press has once again mandated endnotes in shortened form without a bibliography. Given its scholarly audience, one wishes the press would allow bibliographies in its books. Despite this deficiency, *Ghost Citizens* will hopefully inspire other dedicated scholars to research the "ghosts" who left few documents, but whose inclusion in local history deeply informs the larger context of how to comprehend victims and perpetrators after genocide.

Washington, DC Andrew Demshuk

Slavomír Michálek, Michal Štefanský: Age of Fear. The Cold War and its Influence on Czechoslovakia 1945–1968. (Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society, Bd. 201.) ibidem. Stuttgart 2019. 400 S. ISBN 976-3-8382-1285-2. (€ 45.–.)

In this volume, the Slovak historians Slavomír Michálek and Michal Štefanský tell the history of the first few decades of the Cold War through the lens of Czechoslovakia. The book is organized into four roughly chronological chapters that concentrate on major Cold War flashpoints. The first chapter considers how the Cold War began, discussing events such as the 1945 San Francisco Conference, the Marshall Plan, and the Berlin Blockade. The second chapter considers military events in the 1950s, including the Korean War and the formation of the Warsaw Pact. The third chapter tackles moments of instability in the Soviet bloc in the 1950s and 1960s, including the Polish and Hungarian crises of 1956, the building of the Berlin Wall and the Prague Spring, while the final chapter analyzes the Vietnam War. Throughout, the authors do not simply consider these events from the vantage point of Czechoslovakia. Instead, they embed the history of Czechoslovakia's

participation in the Cold War within a general history of the period that takes multiple national perspectives into account. For example, the first two-thirds of the chapter on the Vietnam War considers the American and Soviet sides of the conflict. The remaining third discusses Czechoslovakia's role in the war, including its diplomatic relations with North Vietnam and its economic and military assistance to the country.

The authors take a traditional approach to their subject; this is a "great man" history that concentrates on high politics and diplomacy. Although the title of the book is *Age of Fear*, fear is not an object of analysis in the text. Even within the context of elite politics, the authors seldom explicitly consider how fear motivated world leaders or how leaders used fear to mobilize their populations. The book leaves a whole host of unanswered questions: to what extent was the Cold War the product of different fears? How might we compare the ways fear worked in different countries around the world? Can we see fear shaping a Cold War masculinity that paradoxically bound world leaders together? Might we outline a common Cold War emotional economy in which fear was the driving force? The authors are not interested in these kinds of issues, preferring simply to state what happened according to their sources.

While one of the goals of the book is to place Czechoslovakia in the history of the Cold War, the book seldom portrays Czechoslovakia as an independent actor. Instead, it concentrates on how Czechoslovak leaders reacted to circumstances created by the superpowers. This is a result, at least in part, of the authors' choice to center the book around well-known Cold War flashpoints in which Czechoslovakia seldom played a starring role. For example, they discuss how Czechoslovakia clandestinely sent a military hospital to North Korea during the Korean War and how, following the Soviet recognition of socialist Cuba in 1959, Czechoslovakia used its prior business relationships there to spearhead economic relationships between Cuba and the Soviet bloc. These things are certainly worth knowing. Yet it would have also been enlightening to learn more about how Czechoslovakia may have tried to forge its own path during the Cold War, whether through arms sales, other economic relationships, cultural ties or other forms of contact with countries around the world. Including this element would have allowed the authors to conceptualize the Cold War as a truly global, rather than a bipolar, conflict.

Outside of these major events, the authors' rationale for what to include and what to exclude from the text is not always clear. This is particularly the case in the second chapter, which is titled "The Militarization of the Cold War" and examines how Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries expanded their militaries in response to Cold War tensions during the 1950s. This chapter is the only one to move beyond the realm of high politics. Yet the authors do not include topics closely related to the militarization of society, such as civil defense in schools or the use of military types of discipline within factories or efforts to mobilize the population to march in parades and the like. Instead, they discuss at some length the stories of individuals who tried to commandeer planes or trains to flee the country in search of a better life elsewhere. They also relate how the Czechoslovak government tried to limit the free flow of information to its population and cracked down on the activities of the Western media and Western cultural organizations within its borders. While censorship and travel restrictions were certainly an important part of everyday life in Cold War Czechoslovakia, the authors imply that Czechoslovakia was under a total "information blockade" (p. 192) and completely cut off from the rest of the world, ignoring the ways in which information did still travel to the country, through both legal and illegal channels. The authors' insistence on Czechoslovakia's isolation in this chapter actually clouds one of the book's most significant contributions, which is to point out how Czechoslovakia was actively involved on the global stage during the 1950s and 1960s.

It is wonderful to see the work of two Slovak historians appear in English; this does need to happen more frequently. That said, it is hard to see who might constitute the ideal audience for this book. The sections of the book that do not consider Czechoslovakia are generally smoothly written and quite accessible. They provide a good picture of what

American and Soviet (or Chinese, Korean, East German or Vietnamese) leaders were thinking and doing at different moments in the Cold War. But the authors do not add very much that is new to the history of these moments. The real value in the book for most English-language readers is the material about the Czechoslovak or Slovak experience of major Cold War events: this is something that has been lacking in the English-language literature so far. Yet these sections are paradoxically the least accessible for the non-specialist. They tend to include a great deal of extraneous detail and assume much knowledge on the part of the reader. This renders the book less useful to scholars of other countries who might hope to understand how Czechoslovakia fits into the larger picture of the Cold War.

New York Melissa Feinberg

Uta Karrer: Ambigues Polen. Diskurse zu *sztuka ludowa* und *polnischer naiver Kunst* in der Volksrepublik Polen und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. (Münchner Beiträge zur Volkskunde, Bd. 47.) Waxmann. Münster – New York 2020. 416 S., Ill. ISBN 978-3-8309-4136-1. (€ 39,90.)

Uta Karrer widmet sich der „polnischen naiven Kunst", einem scheinbar „uncoolen", überholten Thema. Dabei kommt K.s Analyse gerade zur rechten Zeit, denn noch leben viele Akteure und Zeitzeugen, die sie umfangreich befragt hat. Dank ihrer Sprachkenntnisse erschließt sie polnische Quellen mühelos und in kluger Auswahl. Man kann den Universitäten in Basel und München nur dankbar sein, dieses Dissertationsthema vergeben zu haben.

K.s Untersuchung beschränkt sich auf den Zeitraum der sozialistischen Volksrepublik Polen und endet mit deren Zusammenbruch 1990. Zunächst arbeitet sie die Begrifflichkeiten der in Polen *sztuka ludowa* (Volkskunst) und in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland „polnische naive Kunst" genannten Phänomene heraus. Beide bezeichnen dieselben in Polen entstandenen Kunstwerke, jedoch aus unterschiedlichen Blickwinkeln, die K. als diskursive Formationen bezeichnet. Sie gibt einen Überblick über die Akteure und ordnet dann die *twórcy ludowi* (Volkskünstler:innen) in das Zeitgeschehen ein. Immer im Blick hat sie das Machtzentrum Sowjetunion, die beiden deutschen Staaten und die Kirche. Eigentümlicherweise blieb das Interesse an diesen Werken auf die BRD, die DDR und Polen begrenzt. Warum Volkskünstler:innen anderer sozialistischer Länder nicht von Interesse waren, führt die Vf. leider nicht aus.

In Teil I erfolgt zunächst eine Diskursanalyse, die sich auf postmarxistische Theorien von Ernesto Laclau und Chantal Mouffe stützt. In Bezug auf die Volkskunst in Polen jener Zeit scheint deren Theorie der leeren Signifikanten – als entgegengesetzte, sich jedoch gegenseitig bedingende Elemente – schlüssig. Mit ihrer Analyse zeigt die Vf., wie linkspopulistische politische Theorien als Untersuchungsinstrument in der Volkskunde eingesetzt werden können. In Teil II betrachtet sie dann die *sztuka ludowa* in der VR Polen. Dieser Abschnitt ist für des Polnischen Unkundige besonders aufschlussreich, weil die hier dargelegten Fakten bislang weitgehend unbekannt gewesen sind. So berichtet K. von staatlicher Förderung der *sztuka ludowa*, von der Auswahl der Künstler:innen aus abgelegenen Dörfern, von der Rolle der Wettbewerbe und Auszeichnungen sowie von staatlichen Verkaufsinstitutionen und deren Beteiligung an kommerzieller Vermarktung. Die *sztuka ludowa* war Ausdrucksform nationaler Kultur und zugleich mit dem internationalen Kunstmarkt verschränkt. Die Kunstobjekte ermöglichten mehrdeutige Lesarten, die sich staatlicher Kontrolle entzogen. Von dieser Ambiguität profitierten damals alle: die staatlichen Institutionen Polens, die Kunstschaffenden und die Sammelnden, die dadurch gesellschaftliches Ansehen genossen. K. zeigt, dass die Werke auch als Ausdruck eines Widerstands gegenüber dem sozialistischen System zu lesen sind. Zu Recht räumt sie diesen Objekten daher eine ethnologisch-kulturhistorische Sonderstellung ein.

Teil III umfasst die Deutungen der Kunstobjekte in der BRD sowie grenzübergreifende Aspekte der „polnischen naiven Kunst". Die Vf. benennt die wichtigsten deutschen Samm-