

the tsars came back to life in learned studies during the Soviet period. But as this anthology shows so well, the Russian picture of the West was anything but uniform, and the attitudes of Russians, even nationalists, were complex and often ambivalent. Russians were captivated by Napoleon even after they had turned against him. The Catholic Church, which attracted Peter Chaadaev and Vladimir Pecherin, was seen as the devil's work by Dostoevsky. The greatest "Westernizer" of nineteenth century Russia, Alexander Herzen, gave up on the West after 1848. Even the Slavophiles of the 1830s and 1840s were steeped in European culture and admired it: it was in Germany, reading Hegel and sitting at the feet of Schelling, that Ivan Kireevsky (who called his first journal *The European*) learned the value of indigenous cultures.

This anthology captures these complexities. It also plausibly presents Danilevsky's *Russia and Europe* (1869) both as "the Bible of Russian nationalism" and as an anticipation of multiculturalism and post-colonial studies (p. 449). It explores in all its varieties the debate over Russia's "backwardness" and evokes fascinating episodes such as the controversy engendered in revolutionary Russia by the publication of Spengler's *Decline of the West*. At the same time it underlines the importance of continuities and moments of revival and renewal. These continuities are most evident in the thought of conservatives; many readers will be particularly interested in the text and commentary of the final chapter, where a full account is given of the response to Mikhail Gorbachev's call to Russians to return to their "common European home," and the ensuing revival of Slavophilism and Eurasianism in the entourage of Putin. Professor Niqueux notes the irony that, initially at least, it took perestroika to give voice to conservative and nationalist ideologies opposed to perestroika. He goes on to explore the roots of the "vituperative conservatism" of Alexander Dugin and Alexander Panarin, and to argue that the current "conservative revolution" in Russia, with its denunciation of the decadence of the West, cannot be understood without going back to the debates of the first generation of Westernizers and Slavophiles.

Both the format of the book and the complex nature of the topic make it hard to produce an integrated account of the way Russia's image of the West has evolved. What we are offered is a series of thematically defined episodes, or snapshots. But the subject is so central to an understanding of Russian history, and so many related themes are explored with imagination and sensitivity in the annotations and the choice of texts, that this book can be considered as more than a collection of texts but as in itself a major contribution to Russian intellectual history.

Jonathan Beecher, University of California, Santa Cruz

Sabol, Steven. *"The Touch of Civilization": Comparing American and Russian Internal Colonization*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2017. xii + 298 pp. \$65.00. ISBN 978-1-60732-549-9.

This book compares what the Russian Empire and its agents did to the Kazakhs and the Eurasian Steppe to what the United States did to the Sioux and the North American Plains. Focusing on the nineteenth century, it also compares Russian and American colonialisms, using the Kazakhs and the Sioux as case studies, to the overseas colonialisms of the contemporary European empires. This kind of broad comparative endeavor, sustained over the length of a monograph, inevitably involves a variety of historiographies, combined in novel ways. Advances in colonial studies, and the increasing willingness of Russianists and Americanists to engage them—witness the variety of historical studies of Russians in Central Asia, and white traders and settlers on the Great Plains, that have appeared in recent years—have laid the groundwork for such a comparison to be deeper and more fruitful. Steven Sabol seizes this timely opportunity to craft an ambitious book.

The book's structure—beginning with analyses of Kazakh and Sioux pre-contact and early contact societies (chap. 1), and ending with their (partial) assimilation and/or integration (chap. 6) around the end of the nineteenth century—emphasizes chronology and privileges the interpretive framework of settler colonialism. Sabol examines different tools of Russian and American empire-building and gives pride of place to policies that pushed nomads toward more sedentary ways of

life. He demonstrates how Russian and American colonizers articulated biases about nomads to justify their actions. It is impossible to argue with the overarching point that, despite what their citizens may have thought or said, the colonialisms practiced by nineteenth-century Americans and Russians had much in common with the colonialisms of European empires. Indeed, one of Sabol's achievements is that he effectively deploys the tools of comparative colonial history to deflate some of the tropes of both American and Russian exceptionalism.

Yet the particulars of the case studies chosen by Sabol to make his argument, as he himself readily acknowledges, do not always line up. There are important differences between the Kazakhs and the Sioux and their colonial situations, including, first and foremost, the demographic fact that there were simply many more Kazakhs than Sioux: about 4.5 million Kazakhs in the Russian Empire in 1897 and a little more than 30,000 Sioux in the United States in the 1880s (p. 45). The two peoples were different types of nomads: Kazakhs were primarily pastoral nomads, with large herds of sheep, goats, camels, and horses, whereas the Sioux were migratory hunters with a heavy reliance on the buffalo, an animal whose fate was intricately tied to theirs. The Russian penetration of Kazakh lands began much earlier and took much longer than the American conquest of Sioux territory, which was much more rapid once it was initiated in the second half of the nineteenth century (pp. 101–2). Sabol acknowledges these differences, and some other. But there are also other potential lines of analysis that would have complicated the comparison further had they been included: for example, the Russians' strategic sanction, and even encouragement, for the spread of Kazan- and Orenburg-based (and Russian Empire-friendly) Islam among the Kazakhs in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. (Sabol discusses religious proselytization, albeit briefly, on pages 209–12, but only from the Christian angle.) Moreover, it was surprising to see a work that deals with Russian Steppe colonization completely bypass any analysis, or even mention, of Michael Khodarkovsky's work.

On a different note, this reader at least found the use of the term *internal* colonization throughout the book to characterize contiguous colonization somewhat misleading. The problem is less that the analysis does not address Alexander Etkind's interpretation, which is about a different kind of internal colonization, but that in Sabol's work "internal" is used ahistorically to reference colonial situations of societies that were not, in the beginning, inside the United States or the Russian Empire. Sabol justifies this usage in the Sioux case by arguing that the United States "had resolved its boundaries with Mexico and British Canada by 1848" (p. 102). Of course, this resolution did not involve the Sioux and, from the vantage point of even the mid-nineteenth century, much remained to be negotiated. And, in the case of Kazakh lands, when the Russians reached them several centuries ago, no one could foretell that they would someday be inside the Russian Empire and the USSR and later reemerge in the form of an independent nation-state. Colonization over contiguous space—over what for the Russians and the Americans had been characterized as a frontier—is not necessarily internal.

An important problem with a comparative framing is that, while emphasizing meaningful similarities, it almost inevitably downplays differences. Sabol's book demonstrates that the processes and rationalizations of American and Russian expansion shared features that were also present in European-based overseas empires. Yet from the colonists' and the colonized points of view, the results of American penetration of the Northern Plains and Russian penetration of what is today Kazakhstan have been drastically different. All that being said, Sabol's comparative study is a pioneering effort that will be of great benefit and inspiration to scholars of Russian, American, and colonial history for years to come.

Ilya Vinkovetsky, Simon Fraser University

Kumar, Krishan. *Visions of Empire: How Five Imperial Regimes Shaped the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017. xviii + 576 pp. \$39.50. ISBN 978-0-691-15363-6.

I began to read sociologist Krishan Kumar's *Visions of Empire* with some trepidation, as the author is not by trade an expert in matters Russian, and his book's subtitle seemed rather grandiose. My