

for the need to address the power dynamics of sexual capital in order to create a more equitable and just society. In conclusion, the book provides an excellent grounding for research, both theoretical and empirical, about sexual capital.

Jelena Krpan
Faculty of Political Sciences,
University of Zagreb

Book Review

Mark A. Wolfgram
Antigone's Ghosts: The Long
Legacy of War and Genocide
in Five Countries

Bucknell University Press, 2019, 304 pp.

In *Antigone's Ghosts* Mark Wolfgram offers that without a correct accounting for the past's violence, the ability to mourn and metaphorically bury the dead, societies that have suffered events of mass violence and genocide will remain divided; the wounds of the past will fester, infecting the present through unreconciled interpretations of history. Like in the play *Antigone*, our inability to agree on what to do about the dead will lead to further tragedy. The main contribution of the book is the comparative framework the author identifies and details in the introduction. It is through this framework that we can account for how each of the countries ex-

plored in the book has dealt with its genocidal past. These countries are: Germany, Spain, Japan, Yugoslavia, and Turkey.

The first piece of the framework are psychological and social-psychological processes. Here, the author identifies 'the ethnocentrism of death' and the 'externalization of blame' as phenomena that afflict and distort the remembering of every society. The first involves nearly every group's proclivity to see itself as the victim or to emphasize their victimhood, thereby ignoring or minimizing other victims, including their own. The best example of this is seen in post-war Germany, both East and West, when the narrative focused on German victims of Fascism, subsuming and ignoring the victims of the Holocaust. Moreover, the author details the way in which German society was largely able to overcome these social-psychological barriers and begin coming to terms with its own past and its victims.

'The externalization of blame' is a society's ability to look outside in order to account for the perpetration of mass violence or genocide. External factors can range from other agents, to forces of nature, to fate that account for the occurrence of atrocities. The book's primary contribution is how it explores these phenomena in conjunction with a country's culture, political system, internal politics, and international relations. For example, the author finds that a society is more committed to 'the externalization of blame' if it has a more collectivist culture than an individualistic one.

I will focus on the chapter where this framework is used to explore contested memories of the Second World War and *Goli Otok* in Yugoslavia. In a comparative

sense, Yugoslavia differs from Germany and Japan, as the atrocities carried out during the Second World War were part of a civil war within the country, and unlike West Germany and Japan, Yugoslavia was not a democracy. It therefore fits more in line with Turkey and Spain.

Wolfgram begins by exploring the psychological and social-psychological processes in Yugoslavia. 'The ethnocentrism of death' in the Yugoslav case is particularly interesting as there were two accounts within the society, the official and unofficial versions of who killed and who perished. The official version, especially in the first decades after the war, attempted to avoid the ethnocentrism of death by focusing blame for the genocide, particularly at Jasenovac, on the external agents of Germany and Italy, thereby obscuring the ethnicity of the Ustaša perpetrators and their largely Serb victims. This was done in order to avoid ethnic strife within the country. The victims and perpetrators were left purposely vague with their ethnicity unspecified. When the perpetrators were mentioned, the crimes of the *Ustaša* and *Četnik* were portrayed as being equally savage and brutal, while Partisan crimes were largely ignored altogether.

At the same time, among the populations that had experienced first hand the genocidal policies of the NDH, stories were shared and memories made about who was responsible for the mass murder and who the victims were. These stories and recollections first emerged in the 1960s, but were suppressed only to emerge again in the 1980s, just as the country was plunged into leadership and economic crises, which helped lead to the violent dissolution of the country.

Wolfgram engages in an analysis of the plays, novels and films produced throughout Socialist Yugoslavia's existence and uses their themes as a window into the discourse of the populace's collective memory. Part of his framework is to understand how the cultural production of memory is influenced by the market. Novelists, playwrights, television production, and artists need capital to produce their work, and are therefore influenced by the market. In the case of Yugoslavia, the decentralization of the country's censorship laws allowed this market and the access to both private capital and state funding for the production of art to vary among republics. This presented varying spaces for the emergence of views dissenting from the official narrative. In the 1960s, the variance among republics created a discordant discussion of the past. Yet, this discussion failed to resolve the differing memories and interpretations of the country's violent history.

It is in looking at the trend in one country and comparing it to the events in another that the book as a whole matters. In comparing the Yugoslav case to what occurred in the other case studies we see how the political system matters when a society seeks to uncover the truth and find reconciliation with the past. For example, West Germany's democratic system and norms allowed for civil organizations to emerge, along with cultural productions, that called into question the events of the Second World War, the Holocaust and the German public's complicity in the perpetration of the Holocaust. Alternatively, Yugoslavia's authoritarian system quashed a similar development of civil organizations and public debate. According to Wolfgram's analysis, just as Yugoslavia's de-

centralized political system seemed to be allowing space for a public discussion of the past, the regime grew alarmed at where this discussion could lead and silenced dissenting views.

If there is one limitation to the chapter on Yugoslavia, it is the absence of an exploration and discussion of post-war repression and reprisals carried out by the Partisans and Communists. Wolfgram briefly mentions the massacre at Bleiburg, but does not discuss in any detail how it or the so-called *Križni put* or Death Marches were remembered or even acknowledged by the regime, the victims or their relatives. This feels like quite an oversight, as both events became central to the idea of Croat victimhood which was often served (and serves) as a counterweight capable of contradicting, undermining and contesting both the Communist regime's narrative and those of the NDH's victims about events in the Second World War, including the crimes committed at Jasenovac. As I am not as familiar with the histories of the other cases, I wonder if there could be similar oversights among them.

Antigone's Ghosts is a bold undertaking, and a book that should inspire the field to engage in a more comparative approach towards collective and social memory. The book's framework is an especially valuable method to understand how societies remember their crimes and their victims, and it should become a regular tool in the discipline's methodological toolbox.

Cody McClain Brown
Faculty of Political Science,
University of Zagreb

Book Review

Mykola Davydiuk
Як працює путінська
пропаганда? (How Does
Putin's propaganda work?)

Smoloskyp, 2019, 208 pp.

Putin's hybrid war in Ukraine is being waged not only by using weapons and military equipment. Russia has fought against Ukrainians for decades with specially created technologies – fakes, disinformation, propaganda, and bots. Since 2014, Ukrainian researchers have systematically studied Russian propaganda technologies. They are discussed in detail in the book by Ukrainian political scientist Mykola Davydiuk *How Does Putin's propaganda work?*

Davydiuk opens the book with the chapter called Ideology, which is critical to understanding the Kremlin's war against Ukraine. The author begins his research by asking, "Did Putin plan to attack Ukraine?". Moreover, he gives answers consistently, revealing the concept of the "Russian world" with the specifics of the preparation of actions, and the calculation of weak points in Ukrainian society. According to the author, preparations for war began after the joint meeting of the Security Council and the State Duma of the Russian Federation, which took place on the 25th of December, 2008. From that moment, narratives created in the Kremlin began to penetrate the information field of the Russian Federation and Ukraine. These