records provide critical demographic, occupational and judicial data, offering an indispensable resource for future researchers. And not only — they are a memorial for all Roma who perished during the Stalinist epoch.

Stalin vs Gypsies is a meticulously researched, theoretically informed and morally urgent work. It bridges a major gap in the historiography of Soviet repression and significantly expands the scope of Romani Studies. Written in an accessible yet sophisticated style, it is suitable for advanced undergraduate and graduate audiences alike. Above all, this book is essential reading for anyone seeking to understand the complexity and totalizing reach of the Stalinist Terror, and the place of the Roma within it. It deserves to become a foundational text not only in Romani Studies, but in Soviet history and political anthropology more broadly.

University of Silesia Huseyin S. Kyuchuk

doi:10.1353/see.00143

Hofmeister, Karin Rogier. *Remembering Suffering and Resistance: Memory Politics and the Serbian Orthodox Church*. Memory, Heritage and Public History in Central and Eastern Europe. CEU Press. Budapest, 2024. ix + 272 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. €129.00; €128.99 (e-book): £118.00.

This is an excellent book dealing with the mnemonic agency and engagement of the Serbian Orthodox Church (SPC) in the production and transformation of Second World War public memory. Its greatest contribution lies in the exploration of the encounter of memory production in the national dimension and at a transnational level of memory work, as exemplified by Holocaust memorialization, and the extent to which the SPC appropriated its 'highly developed and globally appealing symbolism and vocabulary' (pp. 90–91).

As Socialist Yugoslavia decomposed in the second half of the 1980s (breaking apart in 1991), the highly institutionalized Serbian Church played a central role in reconstructing and transforming the collective memory of Serbs, with martyrdom and victimhood at its core. Hofmeister's timely research tackles this highly sensitive and vital topic because, as has been well documented in the scholarship, those who see themselves as victims often tend to feel at ease in violating the rights of those they view as their oppressors. Hofmeister provides ample evidence supported by a robust theoretical framework in arguing that the SPC's primary motivation in entering the mnemonic fields of World War Two memory production was the long-term goal of (re)establishing its position of power and (re)asserting its legitimacy in the public sphere, which is what took place in post-2000 Serbia and post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Church's public engagement took liturgical and non-liturgical forms,

often fused together, from the construction of memorial churches and sacral buildings to broader mnemonic activities such as research, education, museum exhibits and media representation. Due to its convergence with Serbian political elites over the last couple of decades, the SPC became the so-called mnemonic magnate, taking a firm stance against competitive liberal and left-leaning mnemonic actors, whose interactions Hofmeister explores in detail. Mnemonic fields are scrutinized using post-socialist, post-conflict and post-secular frames to describe how the SPC has reshaped World War Two public memory, using the typology of Michael Bernhard and Jan Kubik, whereby the SPC acts as a 'mnemonic warrior' ('A Theory of the Politics of Memory', in *Twenty Years after Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration*, New York and Oxford, 2014, pp. 7–34). In her analysis, Hofmeister further relies on the significant correlation between religion, ecclesiastic institutions and memory, based on Danièle Hervieu-Léger's concept of religion as a chain of memory. Her research combines multi-sited ethnography with reconstructive and context-generating history, drawing on primary sources from official documents, media representations and interviews with a variety of mostly non-church mnemonic actors, to participant observation. Clearly lacking among the sources, as highlighted by the author herself, are the voices of the SPC hierarchy, such as Bishop Jovan (Ćulibrk), a key figure in its mnemonic endeavour. The leadership of SPC has since the 1990s been reticent with (Western) scholars, often accusing them of bias, while at the same time restricting the powers of the lesser clergy to communicate with the public, but we still miss *audiatur et altera pars*.

Hofmeister provides a historical overview that chronologically sketches the contours of SPC engagement since the 1990s, encompassing all the major political, legal and symbolic changes, before its focus on key memorial sites like Jasenovac and Ravna Gora (the former being the death camp for Serbs, Jews and Roma in Fascist Croatia and the latter the site where the royalist Chetniks, or Ravna Gora movement, was founded). Along with this attention on the suffering and genocide of Serbs during World War Two, the SPC has been a major actor in revising Second World War resistance in the former Yugoslavia, commemorating the Chetniks as heroes who defended Orthodox Christian virtues against fascists and communists, subsequently becoming victim to post-war retribution by the Yugoslav Communists, who condemned them as collaborationists. This reviewer wishes there was more contextualization of the pre-1991 period, which would have helped to explain some of the features and agency of SPC's mnemonic engagement. The author, in my opinion, wrongly attributes the current SPC lack of transparency and openness to their exclusion from the evolution of the modern public sphere and the recent degeneration of the public sphere. But prior to 1945 there was much more debate and open (self)

criticism both within the Church and between clerical and secular authors. Therefore, I believe that despite being oppressed during the forty-five years of Communist rule, the ideological monism and negative selection of SPC clergy influenced the Church to mimic the same lack of transparency and debate and to interiorize conspiratorial modes of thinking and acting. Any further evaluation would benefit from stronger contextualization within the already well-studied post-socialist mnemonic transformation across the rest of Eastern Europe, and with comparison to other religious bodies in the former Yugoslavia.

UCL SSEES Bojan Aleksov

doi:10.1353/see.00144

Radchenko, Sergey. *To Run the World: The Kremlin's Cold War Bid for Global Power*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 2024. viii + 760 pp. Maps. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliographical essay. Index. £30.00; £19.99: $34.95 (e-book).

The past twenty years have seen major changes in historians' understanding of the Cold War. 2005 marked a major pivot point, as Odd Arne Westad's *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge, 2005) urged historians to see how the superpower conflict had its most dramatic effects in the decolonizing Global South. Westad and historians like Vladislav Zubok, Chen Jian and Shen Zhihua mined newly accessible Russian and Chinese archives to illuminate how Moscow and Beijing acted during key episodes like the Korean War or the Cuban Missile Crisis. Sergey Radchenko, already a well-regarded scholar of Cold War history for his books on the Sino-Soviet Split and Soviet relations with Asia, has made a major contribution to this scholarship with *To Run the World*, which draws on reams of Cold War-era documents that Russian archives declassified in the 2010s, as well as copious materials from the Chinese Foreign Ministry Archives, which were open to researchers until 2013. The empirical work behind the book is truly impressive and unlikely to be surpassed anytime in the foreseeable future.

Radchenko's impressive archival research — including access to the personal papers of Soviet leaders — offers an unprecedented glimpse into the psychology of those who governed the Kremlin. Drawing on this material, he challenges conventional interpretations that emphasize Marxist-Leninist ideology or Russian imperialism as the primary drivers of Soviet foreign policy. Instead, Radchenko foregrounds the role of legitimacy. He argues that Moscow craved recognition as a superpower, and only one country — the United States —