

traditional path of judging the Nixon-Kissinger initiative as a success story, giving them both credit for this monumental shift in global relations.

Shadow Cold War is a useful and enjoyable book, and even though it fails to pay sufficient attention to the intelligence/espionage angle of the Split, or to concerns over China's nuclear program and, most notably, to Soviet military fears of potential war in the East, these omissions do not detract from its strong historical research and a treasure chest of rare archive material.

VASILY V. GATOV

University of Southern California
Annenberg School of Communications and Journalism

Paul Hanebrink, *A Specter Haunting Europe: The Myth of Judeo-Bolshevism*. Cambridge, MA & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018.

The idea that Communism represented a Jewish conspiracy was one of the deadliest of the twentieth century: it fueled hatred, incited pogroms, and formed the backbone for Nazi anti-Semitic ideology. The idea still resonates in our time and age: nationalists in Central and Eastern Europe use it to promote their policies and demonize those whom they perceive as enemies of their nation. One only has to think of the claim that investor-turned-philanthropist George Soros, who happens to have a Jewish background, undermines Hungarian and Polish sovereignty. Likewise, right-wing extremists throughout the Western world harbor anti-Semitic and Judeo-Bolshevik sentiments and use catchcries such as “*Jew will not replace us.*” Much like Communism supposedly represented an “Asiatic” and “Jewish” threat to the “West,” structurally similar ideas fuel anti-Muslim rhetoric today.

In his book, Paul Hanebrink does not study Judeo-Bolshevism as an incarnation of the (medieval) myth of Jews subverting Christian societies. Instead, he stresses that Judeo-Bolshevism served as a marker of identity, and he asks: how did the idea

transform in various political contexts and serve the interests of specific groups and actors? In this effort, Hanebrink conceives of Judeo-Bolshevism as located both in various national contexts and as a transnational phenomenon.

Hanebrink therefore starts his study with the cauldron in which Judeo-Bolshevism came to fruition: early-twentieth-century Central and Eastern Europe. In this region, various revolutions at the end of the First World War triggered anxieties that allowed the reinvention of ancient anti-Semitic tropes. Bolshevism was perceived as a revolutionary Jewish threat to traditional society. Judeo-Bolshevism also started to reflect anxieties about “Jewish” communism as an internal threat to the sovereignty of the various nation states that arose from the ashes of empire.

The Nazis were the most destructive users of the myth of Judeo-Bolshevism. After coming to power, they quickly eliminated the German Communist party and subsequently transformed Judeo-Bolshevism into a symbol of defense against external threats. The Nazi regime envisioned European nations, united by German example and leadership, in a common struggle against a Communist enemy. In the 1930s, some radical European nationalists found a common language in the Nazi crusade against “Jewish” Bolshevism. The Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union only raised the stakes further, releasing the full destructive potential of the Judeo-Bolshevik myth.

After the Second World War was over, the Judeo-Bolshevist myth transformed yet again. In a Europe divided by the Cold War, the Soviet Union spearheaded the creation of Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe. To ensure their power, new regimes often chose to mitigate the memory of Jewish suffering during the war, sometimes even resorting to state-induced anti-Semitism (often recycling structural features of Judeo-Bolshevism). Consequently, Central and Eastern European societies largely forgot the memory of the Holocaust. In Western Europe, a new theory of totalitarianism equated Nazism and Communism as equal threats to humanity. For centuries, Judaism was the outlier in European societies: within this new framework they framed it as part of the Judeo-Christian core of Western Civilization. Although originally Western societies were not greatly concerned with the memory of

the Holocaust, from the 1960s it almost became the central element in historical consciousness, fueling liberal ideas, multiculturalism and other social transformations.

West and East dealt very differently with the history of the Second World War and all the death and destruction during it. This created new problems after the 1989 collapse of communism. In Central and Eastern Europe right-wing populists and nationalists combined the theory of totalitarianism with Judeo-Bolshevism. Their societies were supposedly victims only and supposedly oppressed by the Nazis and “Jewish” Communists. The latter mitigated, or served to minimize their own crimes (especially collaboration in the Holocaust).

The Western European insistence that the Holocaust was the seminal crime of human history only further fueled the rise of yet another incarnation of Judeo-Bolshevism, that nowadays undermines the ideas of liberalism, multi-cultural toleration and human rights that Western European societies built upon Holocaust memory. This is a prospect that frightens Hanebrink, especially because of the simultaneous rise of anti-Muslim sentiments.

The Judeo-Bolshevist myth is hardly new to scholars of Central and Eastern Europe, Germany, Nazism and antisemitism. Nevertheless, as the first monograph devoted to it, Hanebrink’s well-researched study represents an important contribution to these and other fields of study. Nevertheless, like every scholarly work, Hanebrink’s is not without its minuses: First, the study focusses mainly on Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania. Although Hanebrink is aware that Judeo-Bolshevism influenced other countries and communities, he does not discuss their incarnations of Judeo-Bolshevism at length. This is a pity, since today the idea is much alive elsewhere, for instance in Ukraine and Russia. The inclusion of these and other countries in Hanebrink’s analysis would have given a fuller picture of the Judeo-Bolshevist myth.

Hanebrink’s choice to study Judeo-Bolshevism only as a myth is a more fundamental issue. Of course, the idea that Jews were overrepresented in Communist movements needs no fact checking; various scholars have falsified it. However, does this mean that Jewish participation—and leadership—is irrelevant for the study of

Judeo-Bolshevism? Hanebrink objects to this way of analysis because it imposes rigid ethnic categories upon people of Jewish descent who did not always identify as Jewish. Indeed, scholars should refrain from such ontological simplicity. Notwithstanding this, by disregarding the Jewish background of some important Communist leaders, Hanebrink inadvertently fails to consider an important question: what and who defined Jewishness in the complex region of Central and Eastern Europe?

Hanebrink's engaged scholarship is a final issue: That right-wing activists and nationalist politicians still use the Judeo-Bolshevist myth rightly concerns Hanebrink. Likewise the structural similarities between Judeo-Bolshevism and anti-Muslim sentiments are striking. Nevertheless, is it justified to see anti-Muslim sentiments as a new incarnation of the Judeo-Bolshevist myth? This might just stretch his analysis beyond the limits of what a comparative method allows: Communist regimes throughout the twentieth century were not Jewish; terror groups, such as ISIS and Al-Qaida are in fact Islamic.

These caveats notwithstanding, Hanebrink's study represents an important opening: it will help to shape future studies about Judeo-Bolshevism. Likewise, it can serve as a teaching aid in University seminars. Because it is written accessibly, it can also inspire debate beyond the confines of academia.

NICOLAAS A. KRAFT VAN ERMEL
Netherlands-Russia Centre
University of Groningen

Keir Giles, *Moscow Rules: What Drives Russia to Confront the West*. London: Chatham House, 2019.

After a period of uncertainty, economic instability, and socio-political disarray associated with the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia, under the presidency of Vladimir Putin, has transformed into an increasingly assertive, if not aggressive at times, foreign policy actor. This transformation often seems to puzzle world leaders and governments as illogical and odd. *Moscow Rules*