Russian Orthodox civilization whose borders expand beyond post-Soviet Russian territory, is used to cover the annexation of Ukrainian territories under the guise of the "return of sacred ground" (p. 81). In contrast, Starobin brings forward the story of Father Oleg Batov, a priest who paid a high price for not following the Russian Church's orders to remain silent about the war. Father Batov had to leave his home, his church, and even had to switch his profession to taxi driving to support his family in exile.

The last chapter discusses "Putin's most important exile" (p. 94) – Alexei Navalny, the Kremlin's most perplexing and persistent adversary. Starobin argues that Navalny was an exile since banished political prisoners represent a traditional form of exile in Tsarist and modern Russia. The concluding chapter contends that despite the diversity of the political elite in exile, figures such as Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Garry Kasparov, and Ilia Ponomarev, Navalny remains the main threat to Putin's regime. Starobin ends his book with a glimmer of hope, arguing that each generation of exiles has had a different fate, but maybe, just maybe, Putin's exiles are destined to triumph. *Putin's Exiles* was published sixteen days before Alexei Navalny died in prison. Nonetheless, Starobin's argument remains relevant, as Navalny's legacy, now overseen by his wife Yulia Navalnaya, continues to threaten Putin's regime.

Putin's Exiles is a book for anyone interested in learning more about Russians who oppose Putin's regime and the Russian intervention in Ukraine. The book might not be suited for someone looking for a nuanced analysis of racial, class, or gendered dynamics of Russian lives in exile. By focusing mainly on male elites, new forms of collective female leadership, such as Feminist Anti-War Resistance (FAR), skip Starobin's attention. In addition, the book does not address Russian exiles who left their homeland but remain loyal to Putin's regime. However, *Putin's Exiles* is a great starting point to explore the potential Russian exiles hold in changing the Russian future and, by extension, the post-Cold War global order.

Richard Bourke and Quentin Skinner, eds., *History in the Humanities and Social Sciences* (Cambridge University Press, 2023), 416 pp.

Reviewed by
Mitchell G. Ash, Vienna

The fact that a number of humanistic disciplines, such as art history, music history, or the history of science, have "history" in their names should give us fair warning that a volume that purports to discuss such a topic cannot be limited to the academic discipline called history. As the editors make clear in their introduction, this volume actually takes the opposite route, excluding both the discipline and its relations with other fields. Although reference is made in a few chapters to the thinking and research practices of actual historians, the topic here is the role of historical thought in disciplines other than history. The editors advance the claim that historical thinking in the broadest sense

formed the common ground of social and humanistic knowledge until around 1920, when Ernst Troeltsch claimed that historicism had reached a crisis point due to the impossibility of grounding the validity of value judgments on historical knowledge. Following the rise of American hegemony after World War II, the editors continue, the social sciences in particular fell under the sway of positivism, trying to achieve general causal explanations at history's expense. The volume's expressed aim is "to redress the balance by illustrating how the cultivation of historical understanding can enrich and improve a range of social-scientific as well as humanistic disciplines" (p. 13), while also acknowledging the "misuse" of such thinking in a number of cases. Given the potentially enormous breadth of this topic, a certain selectivity is to be expected, but the imbalances in this volume are striking. Ommitted alongside history itself are the very fields with history in their names mentioned above. In contrast, nearly half of the chapters address law, political thought, political science and international relations. Other chapters discuss economics, sociology, anthropology, philosophy and literature. The range of contributors, however, is rather narrow; of the 16 authors, seven come from Oxford or Cambridge, four from London, two from Chicago, and two from Columbia.

Richard Bourke clearly demonstrates the impoverishment that results from purely normative reasoning in the case of John Rawls' theory of justice. In this case, however, it seems unclear whether it is historical thinking or empirical reference of any kind that is lacking. Hazem Kandil is closer to the topic when he pleads for more narrative and less causality in sociological explanation, in order to make more space for excluded actors and contingency. Quentin Skinner and Michael Lobban show how legal theory fails to acknowledge that its categories have undergone changes in meaning over time, or to consider what has been gained and lost in the process. Stathis Kalyvas and Daniel Fedorowycz offer a trenchant critique of economists', sociologists' and political scientists' efforts to overgeneralize from selected historical cases in order to develop policy-relevant predictions for the future. They offer persuasive examples of the disastrous results of such cherry-picking without context, but ironically fail to situate them historically. Well-known cases such as Samuel Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations* (1999) or Thomas Picketty's *Capital* (2014), are mentioned only in passing or not at all.

Jennifer Pitts and Mira Siegelberg rightly criticize studies of international politics and international relations theory, respectively, for continuing to treat modern nation-states as the primary actors in these fields despite the obvious relevance of non-state actors past and present. They might have paid more attention to the increasing importance of multi- and transnational organizations as well as global networks of experts addressing climate change, environmental policy and related issues. On the positive side, Adam Tooze shows how economist Paul Krugman came to realize that the failure to correctly analyze the crisis of 2008 resulted from economists' ignorance of the great depression. However, the fact that economist and Federal Reserve Bank chairman Ben Bernanke's historical work on the depression provided the rationale for the policies actually enacted at the time suggests that Tooze's critique

may not apply to the discipline as a whole. Also on the positive side, Sheilagh Ogilvie shows how historical and economic analysis can enhance one another in the case of serfdom, by explaining in tandem how it arose, why it flourished in some places and not others, and why it ultimately ended. In the second part of his chapter, Joel Isaac discusses the encounter of ethnology with post-colonial politics exemplified in Clifford Geertz's *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973). As Isaac shows, Geertz overcame the distinction between (British) "social" and (American) "cultural" anthropology by focusing on the issue of how groups achieve and maintain social and cultural cohesion without a central sovereign state, while living in a post-colonial nation-state (Indonesia) that was struggling to gain and maintain authority, ultimately by force, in the face of persistent ethnic and regional particularisms. Unfortunately, Isaac does not say how Geertz's work actually led to a "historical" turn in anthropology, or how the alliance of anthropologists with the "young turks of social history" (p. 379) mentioned at the start of his chapter actually worked.

Turning to the humanities, Pamela Clemit accuses American "new historicism" in literary studies of actually being so selective that its analyzes are indistinguishable in the end from discourse analysis. A reading of Stephen Greenblatt's richly situated work on Shakespeare, *Will in the World* (2004), might support dissent from such denunciations. In contrast, Clemit praises British new historicism for being rooted in archival work. Focusing on the Romantic period, she shows how an "editorial turn" driven partly by scholars but mainly by publishers, made formerly forgotten or politically left-wing authors from Mary Shelley to Mary Wollstonecraft or William Godwin more visible. Noting correctly that such enterprises are themselves historical, she argues that such work has expanded the literary canon and also produced new knowledge that has fed back into work on canonical authors. Cathy Shrank complements Clemit's critique by arguing that criticism focused entirely on "close readings" of texts, long dominant in English departments, makes it impossible to understand the richness of historical allusion in the poems of Thomas Wright. Such claims seem exaggerated; study of such historical and other references has hardly disappeared from scholarship on literature in any language. Susan James argues plausibly that philosophy falsely presents itself as the analysis and justification of timeless universal truths while relegating history of philosophy to discussion of particulars. Hannah Dawson makes the by now rather well-worn argument that philosophy locates its subjects in a fantasy realm of supposedly universal normativity outside the worlds of gender, race or class.

We can praise the quality of many of the analyzes in this volume, with certain qualifications, but we might also ask whether the thesis the editors propose about the predominance of historicism before the twentieth century is actually correct. Equally plausible is the suggestion that the social sciences emerged in the eighteenth century on the basis of ahistorical assumptions about human nature as such, *viz* "the reasonable man" (now "reasonable person") of legal theory or *homo oeconomicus*, which have proven impervious to empirical refutation until very recently because their acceptance was foundational to the existence

of those disciplines. A similar claim might be made for philosophy, which has consistently been expressed in an abstract semantics of being, knowing, judging or ethics as such, and has been allergic to claims that its knowledge claims are or should be historically situated. We might also ask whether the editors were wise to exclude the discipline of history, which has greatly expanded its subject matter, methodology, and geographical range during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. By failing to consider these radical changes in historical scholarship, the editors reduce the term "history" to a vaguely defined black box with no history of its own, and miss the opportunity to consider whether and how historical thinking and research practices in other disciplines co-evolved, or failed to co-evolve, with thought and research practices within the discipline.

Francesca Bray, Barbara Hahn, John Bosco Lourdusamy, and Tiago Saraiva, *Moving Crops and the Scales of History* (Yale University Press, 2023), 352 pp.

Reviewed by
Corinna Unger, Florence

In recent years, many historians have become interested in the past of agriculture, the environment, and natural resources. Much of this interest has been inspired by discussions about the Anthropocene, while some of it is anchored in debates about materiality and global history. *Moving Crops and the Scales of History* brings those different research interests together. It is written collectively by four authors representing history, historical anthropology, history of technology, and science and technology studies. The book aims at overcoming some of the perceived shortcomings of global history by focusing on movement and change across time and space.

As its title suggests, *Moving Crops* focuses on a variety of crops, from dates to rice, coffee to yams, cotton to tea. The authors argue that studying these—and other—crops allows historians to understand not only their movements, but also their rootedness in the specificity of place and of the social (more-than-human) life that surrounds and shapes them. This is in line with their effort to take the materiality of things seriously and to incorporate it more fully into global histories of commodities. Relatedly, the authors emphasize the importance of paying close attention not only to human actors but also to the nonhuman world and its "actant" qualities. The underlying idea is to overcome the sense that plants can just be moved and reproduced anywhere by humans who have mastered their biology. Rather, the book insists on plants, animals, and soils as "living beings" that "act on us as we act on them" (p. 19). *Moving Crops* is informed by the notion of 'cropscapes,' which ties all of these elements together. Presented as both a tool and a concept, cropscapes is defined as the "*assemblage formed around a crop*: the heterogenous elements or actors brought together in a specific place and time that make and grow a crop." The authors argue