



*Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*

EDITORS

VICTORIA FREDE  
University of California, Berkeley

STEPHEN LOVELL  
King's College London

PAUL W. WERTH  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

SERGEI BOGATYREV  
University College London

LIUDMILA NOVIKOVA  
Higher School of Economics

EKATERINA PRAVILOVA  
Princeton University

SUSANNE SCHATTENBERG  
Universität Bremen

MARTINA WINKLER  
Universität Bremen

Bloomington, Indiana

---



*Kritika* gratefully acknowledges the support of the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, the Department of History, and the Center for Eurasian, Russian, and East European Studies of Georgetown University and the Department of History, University of California at Berkeley.

ISSN 1531-023X

This issue was published in July 2014.

Indexing and Abstracting: *American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies, Arts and Humanities Citation Index, Current Contents/Arts and Humanities, Historical Abstracts, ISI Alerting Service, International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly Literature on the Humanities and Social Sciences, International Bibliography of Periodical Literature on the Humanities and Social Sciences, Modern Language Association, Scopus, Wilson Humanities Full Text, and Wilson OmniFile Full Text*

Each contribution © 2014 "Kritika" and its author. All rights reserved.

Articles from 2000 onward also available online through Project MUSE (<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/kri>).

Subscriptions to *Kritika* should be ordered from Slavica Publishers. Annual rates (4 quarterly issues): \$95 institutions and libraries; \$40 individuals; \$30 students and gifts to Russia & Eastern Europe. Back issues (New Series only) are sold only as complete volumes at the institutional rate. Payments may be made by personal check or credit card (Visa, MasterCard, Discover, and their European equivalents).

Slavica Publishers  
Indiana University  
1430 N. Willis Drive  
Bloomington, IN 47404-2146  
USA

[Toll-free] 1-877-SLAVICA (752-8422)  
[Tel.] 1-812-856-4186  
[Fax] 1-812-856-4187  
[Email] [slavica@indiana.edu](mailto:slavica@indiana.edu)  
[WWW] <http://www.slavica.com/>



Volume 15, Number 3 (Summer 2014)

Contents

Special Issue  
**In the Shadow of the Holocaust**  
Soviet Jewry on the Eastern Front

<b>From the Editors</b>	
Soviet Jewry and Soviet History in the Time of War and Holocaust	471
<b>Articles</b>	
ANNA SHTERNISHIS	
Between Life and Death	
Why Some Soviet Jews Decided to Leave and Others to Stay in 1941	477
VLADIMIR SOLONARI	
Hating Soviets—Killing Jews	
How Antisemitic Were Local Perpetrators in Southern Ukraine, 1941-42?	505
ANIKAL WALKE	
Jewish Youth in the Minsk Ghetto	
How Age and Gender Mattered	535
ARKADI ZELTSER	
Differing Views among Red Army Personnel about the Nazi Mass Murder of Jews	563
<b>Reaction</b>	
JAN T. GROSS	
A Colonial History of the Bloodlands	591
<b>History and Historians</b>	
VICTORIA SMOLKIN-ROTHROCK	
"The Confession of an Atheist Who Became a Scholar of Religion"	
Nikolai Semenovich Gordienko's Last Interview	597

**Review Essays**

MARK GAMSA

Cities and Identity, War, and Memory in the Baltic Region

621

POLLY JONES

Socialist Worlds of Dissent and Discontent after Stalinism

637

**Reviews**

PAUL BUSHKOVITCH

The Testament of Ivan the Terrible

653

ELISE KIMERLING WIRTSCHAFTER

Power and the 18th-Century Nobility

657

YANNI KOTSONIS

Citizenship in Russia and the Soviet Union

665

HIROAKI KUROMIYA

Stalin's Rule of Terror

670

Contributors to This Issue

676

April 1739. Günther Stökl believed that the comments were the work of A. A. Kurbatov, a former Sheremetev serf who made an administrative career under Peter. The problem is that Kurbatov died in 1721, and Stökl's evidence for his interest in the text was thin (168–80). Yet Soldat admits that Tatishchev at least once referred to a testament of Ivan IV in the 1750s (200–8), and her attempt to dispute other references in his works is not convincing. It looks as if the text did exist by the first half of the 18th century at the very latest.

Finally, Soldat believes that the confessional section, an innovation among Russian princely testaments, is dependent on the sermon of the 12th-century Kirill of Turov (Sermon for the Fourth Sunday after Easter) and the *Paleia*, the Old Slavic summary of the Pentateuch (280). This conclusion does not support her claims, as the *Paleia* was unpublished until the late 19th century, and Kirill's sermons circulated in many manuscripts by the 1570s. At least one manuscript of the sermon in question was in the Kremlin's Chudov Monastery collection.<sup>9</sup> The texts were also included in Metropolitan Makarii's *Velikie Minei Chet'i*. The author of the Testament did not have to use the 1821 *editio princeps* of Kirill, as Soldat implies.

Soldat's work is more useful in its criticism of her predecessors than in its own claims. Ultimately her proof of forgery rests on the textual comparisons and a cultural argument about the early 19th century, which is far from certain. Perhaps the most useful aspect of Soldat's work is simply to call attention to the text and to attempt to find its evolving cultural context.

Dept. of History  
Yale University  
P.O. Box 208324  
New Haven CT 06520 USA  
paul.bushkovitch@yale.edu

<sup>9</sup> I. P. Eremin, "Literaturnoe nasledie Kirilla Turovskogo," *TODRL* 11 (1955): 358.

## Power and the 18th-Century Nobility

ELISE KIMERLING WIRTSCHAFTER

Ol'ga Glagoleva and Ingrid Shirle [Schierle], eds., *Dvorianstvo, vlast' i obshchestvo v provintsial'noi Rossii XVIII veka* (Nobility, Power, and Society in 18th-Century Provincial Russia). 656 pp., indices. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. ISBN-13 978-5867939748.

N. N. Petrukhintsev and Lorents [Lorenz] Erren, eds., *Praviashchie elity i dvorianstvo Rossii vo vremia i posle petrovskikh reform (1682–1750)* (Ruling Elites and the Nobility in Russia during and after the Reforms of Peter the Great [1682–1750]). 455 pp., indices. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2013. ISBN-13 978-5824317176.

Although from the perspective of readers (and reviewers) single-author books always are easier to assimilate, evaluate, and critique, in post-Soviet Russia the production of monographic essay collections has become a mainstay of historical scholarship. These volumes can be difficult to digest—filled as they are with thematically broad and empirically narrow essays that often seem too brief or too long—but in this era of Russian intellectual ferment, they serve an important purpose. Essay collections make possible rapid dissemination of the voluminous research that is going on in Russia today, and they introduce to Russian and foreign publics the labors of scholars working in cities and towns across the Russian Federation. Time-consuming as it can be to work through hundreds of pages of disparate microstudies, there is simply no better way to become acquainted with the breadth of research and the explosion of information currently becoming available. Although such collections cry out for review by scholars who specialize in the specific areas covered, rather than by someone such as this reviewer who is broadly familiar with the period and issues at hand, there simply are not enough reviewers outside Russia to do justice to the massive amount of research being produced.

Turning to the books under review, it also appears that the end of communist-era disdain for the governing classes of imperial Russia has led to a revival of interest in the history of elites, who now can be viewed through a more objective, nonideological lens formed out of the historian's natural empathy for his or her chosen subject. The collections discussed below represent stunning examples of the possibilities at hand, and both belong to a growing list of monographs sponsored by the German Historical Institute (DHI) in Moscow, which has set as its mission sustained support for Russian scholarship and for collaboration between Russian and foreign scholars.

*Praviashchie elity i dvorianstvo Rossii vo vremia i posle petrovskikh reform (1682–1750)*, edited by N. N. Petrukhintsev and Lorenz Erren, consists of 18 articles by 18 authors, including one of the editors. The articles are grouped into four sections devoted to (1) the nobility and the exercise of power (four contributions), (2) individual personalities within the elite (six contributions), (3) questions of collective *soslovie* consciousness (four contributions, among them my favorites), and (4) the relationship between local elites and the state (four contributions). All the articles address the broad subject of how the Russian elite should be defined—how its organization, power, and patterns of development should be understood, with special attention to the impact of the Petrine reforms.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, although the individual articles provide much fuel for thought and much information on sources, there is no general concluding essay that explains what it all means or how the different themes that have been covered interrelate. The individual essays are left to stand on their own legs, which they do quite well, but it is hard to know what the general scholar-reader should take away from the deluge of encyclopedic information.

The articles in the first section, dealing with the structure of the nobility and its relationship to the monarchy and/or state power, cover a variety of traditional issues that need to be addressed in any discussion of the nobility as a ruling elite. What in fact is the ruling elite: the bureaucracy, the court, or the monarchy? What was the relationship among these entities or institutions

<sup>1</sup> Of course, ever since the reign of Peter I, historians, poets, and policy makers have debated the impact of his reforms. For an overview, see Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *The Image of Peter the Great in Russian History and Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985). For summary histories, see James Cracraft, *The Revolution of Peter the Great* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); and Lindsey Hughes, *Peter the Great: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998). Among the Russian classics familiar to historians, see P. N. Miliukov, *Gosudarstvennoe khoziaistvo Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka i reforma Petra I* (St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1905); B. I. Syromiatnikov, *Reguliarnoe gosudarstvo Petra Pervogo i ego ideologiya* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1943).

in the 17th century, during the reign of Tsar Peter I, and after the Petrine reforms? How did the noble service ranks (the numerous *chiny*) of Muscovy, including the most powerful boyars and their families, become integrated into an agglomerated *soslovie* of Europeanized nobles, and how did all these social groupings, however defined, relate to the monarchy and bureaucracy? (It should be noted, and this is not a criticism, that none of the articles discusses the ruling elite as the masters of Russian peasants: the coverage is strictly devoted to questions of political power.) To answer the questions just outlined, the authors discuss the development of terminology in the Petrine era, particularly the meaning of and changes to Muscovite terminology; institutional continuities between the 17th and 18th centuries (across the Petrine divide); the relationship between lineage and service in structuring the “new” elite; and above all, the role of military reforms and manpower needs (the question of cadres) in defining patterns of change.

The second part of the collection delves more deeply into personnel questions, with studies devoted to the composition of the Senate and to the individual careers of Peter Shafirov, Heinrich Fick, Boris Kurakin, Ludwig Gruno von Hessen Homburg, and Artemii Volynskii. The biographical information provided is inherently valuable for researchers, who never know if the information they obtain from biographical dictionaries and encyclopedias is accurate, and the individual studies also illuminate more trendy conceptual aspects of Russian elite formation. First are questions of subjective experience, individual identity, and self-fashioning as they relate to making a career in Petrine Russia, a place that offered many dangers but also new opportunities for social advancement and personal development, both for members of the established elite and for newcomers from abroad or from the lesser service classes. Second are questions relating to the individual in a social context—patron–client relations, formal and informal mechanisms of mobility, and internationalization of the ruling elite. Taken as a whole, these articles show that talent and skill, family and client networks, and a personal relationship to the monarch all played a role in elite formation. As the discussion of power in the first section also emphasizes, continuity and change can be difficult to distinguish in the study of early 18th-century Russia.

The third section broadens the examination of social identity, moving from the experiences of ambitious individuals to the collective self-consciousness (*samosoznanie*) of the noble *soslovie*. Arguably the most theoretically sophisticated contributions to the volume, the articles by Dmitrii Polonskii, Nikolai Petrukhintsev, Mikhail Kiselev, and Sergei Pol'skoi return to questions of terminology, with reference to epistolary etiquette and self-identification,



the language of *soslovie*, the distinction between magnates or lineal nobles (*famil'nye*) and lesser service nobles (the *shliakhetstvo*) during the political crisis of 1730, and the formation and political significance of "court society" (*pridvornoe obshchestvo*) in the post-Petrine era. Self-abnegation in forms of address, the perennial question of what it meant to call oneself a "slave" or "servant" (*rab, kholop, rabotnik, sluga*), the introduction of European titles and forms of address by Peter I, and eventually Catherine II's insistence on the use of "loyal subject"—these developments in social vocabulary are said to express an appreciation for the value of the individual (*dostoinstvo lichnosti*) and a sense of belonging to "a single cultured society" (*kul'turnoe obshchestvo*, 254).

Also in the genre of *Begriffsgeschichte* (the history of concepts or *poniatiia*) is the discussion of how the term *dvorianstvo* came to represent a unified noble *soslovie*—a concept that elite nobles resisted, preferring instead the term *shliakhetstvo*, because in Muscovite usage *dvorianin* referred to a lesser service noble. The most original research presented in this section touches on the question of social organization and its offshoot, the long-standing problem of corporate identity within the Russian nobility. The limited (and short-lived) use of the elective principle in organizing the Russian elite during the reign of Peter I, a mechanism usually identified with the legal-administrative reforms of Catherine II, deserves further investigation, as does the functioning of the court and post-Petrine "court society," a topic that situates Russia in pan-European discussions of absolutism and the "civilizing process."

Similarly original and deserving of further elaboration are the articles contained in the final section of the collection, all devoted to local elites both in Russia proper and in borderlands or incorporated territories such as Ufa and Ukraine. The question of the Petrine divide is again on display, this time in connection with bureaucratic development in western Siberia and Novgorod. Two authors examine the complicated process of implementing the Petrine administrative and military reforms at the local level, a story of how Petrine innovations interfaced with established Muscovite practices, offices, and institutions. Two additional articles touch on questions of empire building or colonization, one by discussing relations between service nobles in Ufa and officials sent from the center and the other through a study of the Hetmanate of Ukraine, the relations of individual hetmans to the Russian monarchy, and the eventual penetration of Muscovite power into local practices and institutions. Taken as a whole, these articles remind historians of how tenuous the center's administrative hold could be and of the need to look at how in concrete local contexts officials and populations received and adapted specific reforms.

In *Dvorianstvo, vlast' i obshchestvo v provintsial'noi Rossii XVIII veka*, edited by Olga Glagoleva and Ingrid Schierle, local conditions likewise take center stage. The work of 19 German and Russian authors, including the editors and some contributors to the volume already discussed, this collection contains four sections devoted to (1) political power and service (five contributions), (2) noble aspirations and attitudes (four contributions), (3) violations of the law and political conflict in the provinces (three contributions), and (4) culture and everyday life (five contributions). The product of an ongoing project devoted to the 18th-century provincial nobility (see the database and other materials being collected at <http://adelwiki.dhi-moskau.de>), the book is rich in empirical information that can be difficult to integrate into a single analysis (or review). Olga Glagoleva makes a valiant effort to set parameters in her introductory essay (identified as section 1), which centers on methods for studying the nobility in relation to state power and the concept of society. Glagoleva also discusses long-standing prejudices against "the provincial," and she grapples with the problem of how to define local history (by region, province, or locality), noting in the process that while Russian historiography tends to produce locally oriented empirical scholarship, "Western" historiography is more conceptual and theoretical. Finally, and not always convincingly, Glagoleva and many of the authors represented in this collection hope that their work will challenge historiographic images of noble alienation from the local milieu—images that, according to Glagoleva, are in current academic discourse most commonly associated with the work of Marc Raeff and Iurii Lotman.

The first section of essays (part 2 of the book) following Glagoleva's introduction picks up the theme of the nobility's relationship to state power and the concept of society. The contributions here are of uniformly high quality, and whether they deal with long-studied or long-understudied questions, all provide original and pertinent information from local archives. Focusing on the nobility's relationship to and participation in local government throughout the 18th century, the authors cover a broad range of debated and debatable issues: corruption and the effectiveness of local government, the relationship between military and civil service, the consequences of the 1762 emancipation from obligatory service, the social profile of local officials, the powers of voevodas and governors, the local elective offices introduced by the reforms of Catherine II, and the nobility's attitude toward local elections and elective institutions. There is much to ponder based on the infusion of local data represented by these articles, which also require synthesis and integration into what is known from existing scholarship. With respect to questions

about noble separation from the local milieu or about the effectiveness of administration and justice, it is clear that established interpretations remain worthy of consideration. Beneficial as it may be to reassess what historians mean by "separation" or "alienation," and to reconsider the nature of the alienation and of administrative arbitrariness and corruption, the "traditional" issues remain. As Aleksandr Kupriianov concludes in his study of election practices among the nobility of Moscow province at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries, it would be difficult to describe the activities he documents as anything more than the prehistory of Russian civil society.

The second cluster of essays (part 3 of the book) focuses on the needs and aspirations of provincial nobles—their views on local government, peasant–landlord relations, economic development, and European culture. The topics covered include understandings and expectations of education, instructions to the Legislative Commission from the Orel region (provincial boundaries changed repeatedly during the 18th century), noble intellectuals who represented the "rational pragmatic" and sentimentalist periods of the Russian Enlightenment (Shcherbatov and Karamzin, respectively), and how the Ukrainian poet Vasili Kapnist used Horace's rules of living to model his life as noble estate owner. Again, while each of these articles presents valuable research, they do not together comprise a thematically integrated section, and their connections to specifically provincial or regional history are not always evident. In fact, as Claus Scharf suggests, his study of Kapnist reveals less about provincial noble life and more about how nobles across the Russian Empire adopted European cultural models and made them their own.

Part 4 of the collection likewise illustrates how, in a centralized state system and absolutist political culture such as that of 18th-century Russia, it can be difficult to distinguish provincial from central or empirewide themes. In this and other parts of the book, local perspectives on national/imperial themes and patterns of development tend to dominate the discussion. This is not the same thing as study of locally generated questions. Devoted to deviant behavior, political rumors, and military justice, the essays in this section nonetheless provide a glimpse into some of the most exciting research being conducted in post-Soviet Russia, by both foreigners and Russians. Although studies of deviant behavior and the use of judicial sources are well represented in the historiography of Russian society, just how rich, extensive, and diverse the judicial sources are is only now coming to light.<sup>2</sup> So while limited to three

<sup>2</sup> The use of judicial (or more accurately, legal-administrative) sources has become very popular since the end of the communist era, thanks to more open access to archives—so much so that it is impossible to provide a handful of representative titles. Two additional volumes that are forthcoming from the DHI's provincial nobility project will include articles based on this type

articles by Angela Rustemeyer, Evgenii Rychalovskii, and Bulat Aznabaev, that are not necessarily focused on the provincial nobility, the section offers a glimpse into innovative work in progress.

The last section of the book returns to the sphere of culture and provincial mores already introduced in part 3. The first article also continues the use of legal-administrative sources with a discussion of provincial noble life derived from the documents, not always laws strictly speaking, published in the *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* (Full Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire, *PSZ*). The subjects touched upon in the *PSZ* include the 1762 emancipation from obligatory service, conditions of acceptance into service, promotions in rank, the General Survey and related litigation, the government's image of the ideal noble serviceman, and noble involvement in the liquor trade. A more suggestive contribution by Denis Zherebiat'ev makes innovative use of information technology, in this instance Google Earth and MapInfo Professional, to reconstruct images of the provincial capital Tambov in the late 18th and early 19th century. Two additional studies devoted to the cultural sphere of provincial noble life cover estate theater and travel habits, both seen as evidence of Europeanization in the later 18th century. As can be said about every article in this monographic collection, the essays grouped in this last section invariably provide original and interesting information. Collectively and individually, the research is impressive. But just how all this information is interrelated, and how it relates to bigger questions such as the development of social ties among the provincial nobility or the relationship of provincial noble society to state power, is not explicated with any consistency or analytical rigor. Nor is there a single article devoted to religious teachings, practices, or beliefs. The reader must connect the dots for him/herself. While this is surely a worthwhile endeavor for a scholar who is working (or teaching

of source material. Finally, it should be noted that from the 1960s into the early 1990s, the era of the "new social history," historians inside and outside Russia made broad use of judicial sources, along with statistical data. Cultural historians then continued the study of judicial materials. Numerous references can be found in Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997); Christoph Schmidt, *Sozialkontrolle in Moskau: Justiz, Kriminalität und Leibeigenschaft 1649–1785* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996); and many other books and bibliographies. Recent Russian examples include Aleksandr B. Kamenskii, *Povednevnost' russkikh gorodskikh obyvatel'ei: Istoricheskie anekdoty iz provintsial'noi zhizni XVIII v.* (Moscow: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi gumanitarnyi universitet, 2006); Elena B. Smilianskaia, *Volshebnyi. Bogokhul'niki. Eretiki: Narodnaia religioznost' i "dukhovnye prestupleniia" v Rossii XVIII v.* (Moscow: Indrik, 2003); and Evgenii Akel'ev, *Povednevnaia zhizn' vorovskogo mira Moskvy vo vremena Van'ki Kaina* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 2012). See also the dossier "Pratiques du droit et de la justice en Russie (XVIIIe–XXe siècles)," edited by Sandra Dahlke and Michel Tissier, with contributions by Evgenii Akel'ev and Galina Babkova, Aliona Brewer, Viktoriia Efimova, Sandra Dahlke, and Michael Kogan, in *Cahiers du monde russe* 53, 1 (2012).

a graduate seminar) on the 18th-century nobility or on provincial/regional history, it is more than the general specialist reader will want to do.

Within the European framework that defines the thinking and research of most Russian studies scholars outside Russia, the task of finding the most accurate language and categories of analysis to describe Russian history—to translate that history for our own audiences—remains a work in progress. Now that Russia's own scholars have been liberated from the need to employ a Marxist vocabulary alien to all but a small segment of imperial Russian sources, we increasingly can rely on their research and mastery of the Russian language to lead us to better articulations and understandings of their history, which we study. Judging by the collections reviewed here, and despite the difficulties hinted at throughout this review, the process of interaction has reached an unprecedented level of maturity that eventually will lead to new Russian-produced perspectives, interpretations, and conceptualizations. These volumes are by no means game changers: they lack the integrated presentation of data and the coherence of argumentation needed for deep historiographic impact. But they do point to a future in which the cumulative effects of new empirical information will produce more nuanced, refined, and/or innovative interpretations of Russian history. Equally important, they document what anyone who has grown up or made a life in a provincial place instinctively knows—that national and large-scale historical narratives often distort the realities of local life. Thanks to ongoing research and critique, the ideological certainty that for decades colored Russian-language scholarship has given way to the acceptance of multiple perspectives, local and elite perspectives among them.

Dept. of History  
California State Polytechnic University  
3801 West Temple Avenue  
Pomona, CA 91768 USA  
ekwirtschaft@csupomona.edu

## Citizenship in Russia and the Soviet Union

YANNI KOTSONIS

Eric Lohr, *Russian Citizenship: From Empire to Soviet Union*. 278 pp. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012. ISBN-13 978-0674066342. \$59.95.

Anyone who has worked with Russian and Soviet primary sources will have noticed the regular influx of foreign-born or foreign-subject persons. The phenomenon has not been studied systematically. Setting aside some of the emperors and empresses, we find ministers from Serbia, the Ionian Islands, Moldova, the German states, and Britain. We find specialists and lower-level bureaucrats, officers, soldiers, and sailors from Scandinavia, the Ottoman Empire, and Bulgaria. In the private and semi-private sectors we find foreign-born entrepreneurs, industrialists, bankers, and academics in abundance. Russia, it seems, was a real career option. On a larger scale, every conquest brought new populations into the empire, every loss of territory brought refugees and stimulated expulsions (which are well studied in recent years, by Eric Lohr in particular).<sup>1</sup> In the Soviet period, foreign-born persons left their imprint on the sources. We find Communists and sympathizers who were not from the Russian Empire or the USSR, and we find engineers and laborers seeking work in the booming construction site that was the Soviet Union. Russians, in turn, populated the cities of the world and occupied places high and low, the more visible ones as refugees and émigrés, and many more combining a prosaic desire for higher living standards with quests for liberties of one sort or another. The historiography has already provided some good starts on the question of mobility, and an abundance of works on the post-

<sup>1</sup> Peter Gatrell, *A Whole Empire Walking: Refugees in Russia during World War I* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000); Eric Lohr, *Nationalizing the Russian Empire: The Campaign against Enemy Aliens during World War I* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).