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can still provide a solid starting point for undergraduate students wishing to engage with this very important topic.
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In their introduction, Frédéric Bozo, Marie-Pierre Rey, N. Piers Ludlow, and Bernd Rother explicitly state that this is not another book on the end of the Cold War. Rather, it is an attempt to understand how different key figures imagined a possible end to the Cold War. The editors have assembled a blockbuster list of authors — all specialists in the areas of their contributions. In 21 succinct chapters, the authors focus on key individuals such as Willy Brandt and Charles de Gaulle and their visions for ending the Cold War. The chapters, however, are not always cohesive, and the ways in which they diverge raise larger interpretive questions.

First, the extent to which the authors have a shared definition of the term ‘vision’ varies. The editors could have offered a clear definition at the outset and sought to ensure more uniform use. For example, Geoffrey Roberts’s interesting chapter on the Soviet ‘campaign’ against the Cold War focuses more on tactics, such as the negotiations Soviet leaders hoped to hold, rather than their desired outcomes. Similarly, Martin Brown’s chapter on the early British role in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) does not offer a British vision of the end of the Cold War; instead, Brown describes the British government as making calculated decisions in order to avoid being left behind by détente. Jussi Hanhimäki is the only author to argue explicitly that his subject, National Security Advisor and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, did not have a vision for the end of the Cold War. One question that could fruitfully have been raised in relation to Kissinger and George H. W. Bush is: why are we so hesitant to see conservatives as potentially visionary?

Second, in some chapters, such as Jaclyn Stanke’s, the visions analysed are not always for an ‘end’ to the Cold War. The authors might have wrestled more explicitly with the distinction outlined in the introduction between evolutionary and revolutionary visions. Many of the chapters implicitly raise an important and recurring question: what is the relationship between détente and the end of the Cold War? Or, put another way, did de Gaulle have a vision of the end of the Cold War or just for
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reducing East–West tensions? In the volume, the phrases ‘overcoming the Cold War’ and ‘end of the Cold War’ are used interchangeably, but there are important nuances that could have been explored more fully. A number of the essays do not sufficiently demonstrate that their subjects genuinely offered a conception for a post-Cold War world rather than just a way to live within its framework.

The collection is strong on high-level, individual visions, but there are fewer efforts to grapple with lower-level or group actors. Although challenging to execute, the book would have been enhanced by a contribution that looked at non-elite visions of the end of the Cold War.

Finally, the collection would have benefited from a conclusion that raised some of these larger questions.
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The end of the Cold War was not only an opportunity to reflect on the decades of political and military conflict and coexistence, but also on the cultural and ideological competition between capitalism and communism. The opening up of archives and the accessibility of officials for research and interviews has enabled a depth of analysis that has shed new light on the working of the Soviet system. Kristin Roth-Ely has taken full advantage and produced an interesting work based on in-depth research. Her monograph looks at Soviet film, television, and radio during the Cold War and their bizarre contradictions – that an aim of Soviet film was to enhance the cultural content of people’s lives, yet its creativity was limited by the system. The author cleverly points out how the communist system actually produced a film industry that was opposed to the values of Hollywood, yet was able, because of the audience’s insatiable desire for films, to make substantial sums for the Soviet state.

The book sets out in great detail – at times too much detail without sufficient organisation and analysis to make it digestible – the working of the film, radio, and television industries. But what is lacking throughout is an examination of the ideological purposes or the content of the media, a major drawback in a work looking at the cultural conflict between ideological systems. The name Lenin only crops up three times in the book, and there is no exposition or analysis of the basic Leninist concepts of ideology, agitation, propaganda, and their cultural content. In the...