

itineraries in ways that nuanced official Soviet narratives. Chapter 4, by Karin Hallas-Murula and Kaarel Truu, is the first to focus specifically on preservation practices and follows how experts in Soviet Estonia were professionally shaped by their many travels and contacts outside the Iron Curtain and among other socialist states, leading to the definition of an Estonian historical identity.

Chapter 5 by Eszter Gantner focuses on a single building, which is a welcome counterpart to the other more general contributions. It describes the debates and international exchanges around the reconstruction of the Castle Hill and Royal Palace in Budapest in the 1950s. In 1952, even a team of Polish experts were invited at the site before the government decided to turn the monument into a cultural center. In Chapter 6, Liliana Iuga looks at the ideas and writings about the preservation of historic city centers in the first decades of socialist Romania. She describes how architects made a distinction between medieval towns in Transylvania, founded by German settlers, which they saw as worthy of being preserved, and towns in Wallachia and Moldavia where the international principle of “selective preservation” was deemed suitable. In Chapter 7, Čeněk Pýcha describes the evolution of the concept of heritage in Czechoslovakia by focusing on monuments and preservation in the town of Duchov, in northwest Bohemia. The author uses mostly official documents to trace how authorities promoted both historical sites and a contemporary socialist monument commemorating the deadly worker strike of 1932. Finally, Chapter 8 by Nele-Hendrikje Lehmann examines the protection of industrial monuments in East Germany to argue that the process was less a result of Marxist ideology and more a continuation of trends from interwar Germany as well as a response to similar international trends. A concluding chapter by Geering provides an excellent summary of the whole book as well as some valuable thoughts on future research avenues.

The volume covers a diverse range of themes but mostly employs the term heritage in the narrow sense of built architecture, ignoring the whole range of intangible cultural properties to which the promotion of the past is closely connected, for example folk traditions or literary production. The contributions could have been enriched also by more detail on the type of architecture and history of the fascinating heritage sites discussed, such as the town of Duchcov, Transylvanian towns, Suzdal, and others, which would help readers have a specific sense of what type of heritage was deemed worthy of preservation. The volume is nevertheless an excellent addition to the cultural history of the Cold War period, is informed by cutting-edge theoretical approaches, and will surely be a road-opener for further exploration of heritage practices in socialist eastern Europe.

COSMIN MINEA
New Europe College, Bucharest

Warschau gegen Moskau: Prometeistische Aktivitäten zwischen Polen, Frankreich und der Türkei 1918–1939. By Zaur Gasimov. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Ostlichen Europa. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2022. 371 pp. Appendix. Notes. Index. Tables. €64.00, paper.
 doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.302

Today Poland plays an extraordinarily supportive role in Ukraine’s existential war against an invading Russia. Although this may surprise some historians (given the many difficult historical issues that still divide Poland and Ukraine), it should not surprise anyone familiar with Polish history. When Ukraine declared independence in December 1991, Poland, along with Russia (!) and Canada, was the first to recognize

it. In fact, Poland's support for Ukraine's independence traces all the way back to the 1920s. It is certainly wrong to assume, as many western scholars of Russia under the influence of persistent propaganda by Moscow seem to, that Poland maintained a historical claim to its former *Rzeczpospolita* lands, including Ukraine. In fact, after the Soviet-Polish war of 1920–21, Warsaw devised an ambitious political plan to help the non-Russian national groups to break up the Soviet Union and to liberate themselves from the Soviet yoke, a goal that Warsaw deemed essential to Poland's survival. Ukraine occupied the most important place in the plan, which came to be known as Prometheanism (*Prometeizm*). This excellent book by Zaur Gasimov examines the history of Prometheanism from its inception to its demise.

Extremely jealous of its independence achieved in 1918 after 123 years of subjugation to Russia, Germany, and Austria, Poland sought to protect itself from the future menace from without, especially from the east and the west. It was not without reason, as in 1939 Poland was once again destroyed by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. In 1926, Warsaw, under Józef Piłsudski, designed a scheme whereby Poland would be able to protect itself from the Soviet menace by assisting non-Russian minorities (“oppressed or conquered peoples in the Soviet Union”) to become independent (in other words, the destruction of the Soviet state into independent states along ethnic lines). Although similar ideas had long existed in Poland, it was after Moscow crushed the independent states of Ukraine, Belarus, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and other national movements (including Crimea, Central Asia, Tatarstan, and Kalmykia) and reconstituted the Russian empire as the Soviet Union in 1922 that Warsaw made a fundamental shift in its geopolitical strategy. In the Polish scheme, the east free from Russia, in particular an independent Ukraine, would become a buffer state and a guarantor of Polish survival. Many representatives of the oppressed peoples of the Soviet Union, in turn, found the most reliable political support in Warsaw, which both France and Great Britain implicitly supported.

Poland financially and organizationally provided the underpinning for the Promethean activities, including the publication of periodicals and the academic studies of the non-Russian lands controlled by Moscow. Warsaw became a “mecca for Sovietology” (211) in the 1920s and 1930s. The Prometheanists set up three major centers in Warsaw, Paris, and Istanbul, and its activities spread across Europe (Prague, Bucharest, Helsinki, Berlin, and beyond: Tehran and Harbin, for example). Gasimov convincingly demonstrates that Prometheanism was not only anti-Russian, but also anti-imperialist, anti-communist, anti-totalitarian, and pro-liberty (symbolized by its slogan, “For your freedom and ours”). It fostered transnational political and intellectual dialogue and mutual influence.

Within this larger framework, as might be expected, controversy, rivalry, and conflict plagued the Prometheans. In the 1930s Poland, France, and Turkey explored cooperation with the Soviet Union against the rise of Germany and Italy, and Prometheanism began to lose momentum and direction. From the very beginning, the Soviet secret services engaged in subverting it from within and without (324). Moscow was always “one step ahead of Warsaw” (119) and had some key Promethean figures (such as the Georgian émigré politician Noe Ramishvili) assassinated, and recruited some others (like Tadeusz Kobylański, a Polish diplomat) as Soviet agents. After Piłsudski died in 1935, Poland tried to reconstitute Prometheanism (including closer links with Japan) but failed to compete successfully with rival movements (the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, Haidar Bammammat’s “Caucasus” group, and others). With the destruction of Poland in 1939, Prometheanism itself dissolved.

Although Prometheanism failed, its long-term goals were partially realized with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. In emigration after WWII, former Prometheanists and affiliated Polish “Orientalists,” such as Jerzy Giedroyc, carried

the torch of Promethean ideals. It was they who worked to prepare Poland for eventually accepting the loss of Galicia and Wolynia to Ukraine in 1945. Without hesitation Poland promptly recognized Ukraine in 1991. In this and many other respects, Prometheanism was critical to the generally peaceful collapse of the Soviet Union. Now Moscow has resumed its fight against Prometheanism by challenging the establishment of an independent Ukraine that it recognized in 1991. Gasimov's rich and timely work should be read widely if we are to understand the pivotal role Poland plays in countering Vladimir Putin's unprovoked and relentless attack on Ukraine's sovereignty today.

HIROAKI KUROMIYA
Indiana University

Survivors: Warsaw under Nazi Occupation. By Jadwiga Biskupska. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2022. xiii, 296 pp. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Maps. \$99.99, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.303

To those familiar with the course of the Second World War, a monograph dedicated to the study of one city will not be surprising. Still, Warsaw's fate needs explaining because it was exceptionally tragic. The wartime history of the city and its inhabitants encapsulated the full horrors of German Nazi policies upon the population and on the city, a place in the geography of occupied Poland where race defined policies were imposed. Warsaw experienced the full horrors of aerial attack in September 1939; it was then systematically looted of its cultural wealth by the occupation forces. During the course of the war, its inhabitants were exposed to the horrors of occupation with no distinction being made between combatants and civilians. Civilians were shot on a constant basis in retaliation for every German who died in the town. The two uprisings completed the picture of wanton and gratuitous destruction. In August 1944, Warsaw witnessed what was the largest urban confrontation, only matching Stalingrad for the sheer destruction of the physical features of the town.

Jadwiga Biskupska states at the outset that it is her aim to explain how the elites, the professional and cultural leaders, were targeted by the occupation forces, the purpose of which was to destroy the nation. In the process, the city as a place that they inhabited, administered, and in which they organized resistance to the German occupation, was to be likewise eliminated from the map. The debate on Warsaw's fate started with the September 1939 campaign when the government, the army leadership, and the Catholic hierarchy left the city. Warsawians were left to fend for themselves. The city fought until September 28. According to Biskupska, the city's elites stepped into the political vacuum left by the departed government leaders. The sense of responsibility for the city and its citizens never left them for the duration of the war.

The book meticulously traces how the Nazi authorities systematically eliminated those whom they viewed as the nation's leaders. As a result of operation Tannenberg between September 1939 and January 1940, over 20,000 Polish men and women, those who were perceived to represent the Polish nation's cultural and political capital, were systematically murdered in planned operations. That and following *actions* destroyed the city's intellectual strata. Biskupska traces each of the stages when the Nazi's accelerated the process of elimination; from operation Tannenberg, through the separation of the Jewish people and their imprisonment in the ghetto to the systemic destruction of the educational system and of all forms of cultural expression. The fate of the Warsaw Jews merits a separate chapter but the author frequently stresses the