

tischen Literatur als Warner vor den Folgen der Perestroika, die zur Stärkung des chinesischen Bewusstseins instrumentalisiert wurde. Das Werk enthält eine Fülle von Informationen und Anekdoten, die das Lesen angenehm gestalten. Ein wenig störend sind die zahlreichen Einschübe in Klammern, die zusätzliche Informationen liefern, aber auch lakonische Kommentare: [...] Yao Wenyan (one of the loudest to proclaim Mao Zedong thought as an ideological weapon). Neben diesen Detailinformationen würde eine allgemeine Einführung die Auswahl der vorgestellten Personen in einen Gesamtkontext stellen und mithin nachvollziehbarer machen. Der Anmerkungsapparat ist umfangreich ebenso wie die Bibliographie, die Literatur in den westlichen Sprachen, auf Chinesisch und Russisch enthält. Trotz der engen Verbindung zwischen China und der Sowjetunion gibt es in der westlichsprachigen Sinologie bisher nur wenige, die über Kenntnisse in beiden Sprachen verfügen. Somit ist dies ein willkommener, noch ausbaufähiger Beitrag.

**Christian Peterson: Globalizing Human Rights. Private Citizens, the Soviet Union and the West, New York: Routledge, 2012, 279 S.**

Rezensiert von  
Umberto Tulli, Bologna

Over the last decade, historians have been investigating the rise of human rights in international relations.<sup>1</sup> Christian Peter-

son's "Globalizing Human Rights" considerably expands this field of research and clarifies the role that human rights activism played in the last decade of the Cold War. In a very unconventional way – the 12 chapters alternate between the analysis of diplomacy and grassroots activism – the book offers a history of human rights in bipolar affairs, which goes beyond the traditional analysis of the so-called "Helsinki Effect". Not only the author does not discuss the role of the so-called "first" and "second baskets" of the Helsinki agreement, but he also discusses some human rights issues (such as the problem of Jewish emigration from the USSR) which are not contemplated by the agreements. Peterson points out the importance of Western private citizens and NGOs, the American Congress, Soviet and Eastern European dissidents, Jimmy Carter's devotion to human rights and his shortcomings, Ronald Reagan's firm stance toward Soviet violations of human rights and Gorbachev's pivotal role in transforming the USSR. On this background, the book has several positive features. For the sake of synthesis, I will focus on the five major ones:

First, the book has an ambitious goal, which is to bring together human rights and the Cold War, as well as States' diplomacy and transnational movements. As the author contends, "private citizens played an important role in shaping how the United States and Western European Governments used the issue of human rights to challenge the legitimacy of Soviet internal behavior. [...] they used the Final Act to globalize the issue of Soviet human rights behavior and convince governments to adopt an approach to détente that linked respect for human rights to the

strengthening of international security” (p. 182).

Second, the book reinvigorates the debate on what historian Jussi Hanhimäki called the “paradox of détente”, a policy with “conservative goals” and “revolutionary outcomes”. At the same time, it contributes to our understanding of the end of the Cold War. While not directly addressing this question, Peterson offers a possible contribution to understand why the Cold War ended in the late Eighties and why in Europe.<sup>2</sup>

Third, from a methodological perspective, the book contributes to an innovation in the field, which aims at intertwining transnational and international politics. Peterson’s history of human rights in the Cold War aspires to trace a truly transnational history.

Fourth, the author engages himself in a coherent and detailed discussion of the existing secondary literature, of American and Soviet governmental sources (at least, those Soviet documents which are available in English), and an analysis of the flyers and pamphlets written by Eastern and Soviet dissidents as well as by Western activists.

Fifth, the analysis of American foreign policy under Carter and Reagan is original and to some extent unconventional. Indeed, as the author contends, on the issue of Soviet violations of human rights, Carter and Reagan were more similar than usually thought. The former “was not always less confrontational on the issue of Soviet internal behavior than Reagan” (p. 183); the latter “embraced the Helsinki process for the same reason that Carter had [...] Reagan had little choice but to recognize that the U.S. Government only had a lim-

ited ability to shape Soviet domestic developments” (p. 184).

But these strengths are balanced by a number of weaknesses. Each praiseworthy point is also questionable and not completely convincing. There is a hiatus between the expectations created by the title and the actual content of the book. Rather than discussing the “globalization of human rights”, the author engages the issue of human rights in bipolar affairs with a strong and correct focus on the European theatre, neglecting those human rights crisis in Third World Countries which affected bipolar affairs, too.

Further, the author refers to early attempts to raise the issue of human rights in American foreign policy only briefly, although human rights activism did not occur in a vacuum. In this sense, the author does not engage with the vast, and mostly recent, literature on the rise of human rights in American, international and transnational politics during the Seventies.<sup>3</sup>

Next, although the CSCE was a multilateral process with a strong Western European role, Peterson does not consider the debates which developed in Western European countries over the role of human rights in bipolar affairs. The focus remains on the superpowers, while European governments, European political parties and European-based NGOs seem to be minor players. The contradiction between the attempt to “globalize human rights” and the actual focus of the book affects the bibliography, too. It is peculiar that a book on the globalization of human rights ignores non-English (or not translated) primary and secondary sources.

Lastly, the conclusion of the book is quite traditional. As many historians before him

have argued, everything depended on Gorbachev's reforms or, in Peterson's words, "Carter and Reagan could not have done much more to promote human rights in the USSR before he became General Secretary in 1985" (p. 11). In addition, the focus on the human dimension of the Helsinki agreement is not balanced by an adequate discussion of the other issues which complicated bipolar affairs and the end of the Cold War (arms control, the Ogaden War, Afghanistan, Reagan's star wars, just to mention the most known).

Nevertheless, Peterson's "Globalizing Human Rights" remains as a first-rate piece of scholarship and an important contribution both for our understanding of the role of human rights in late Cold War and for those researches aiming at intertwining diplomacy and grassroots activism.

Notes:

- 1 J. Ikenberry, Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War, in: *Foreign Affairs* 91 (2012), 1; D. C. Thomas, *The Helsinki Affect. International Norms, Human Rights, and the Demise of Communism*, Princeton 2001; S. Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War. A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network*, Cambridge 2011.
- 2 J. Hanhimäki, Conservative Goals, Revolutionary Outcomes: the Paradox of Détente, in: *Cold War History* 8 (2008) 4, pp. 503-512.
- 3 Among many others: C. Upodaca, *Understanding U.S. Human Rights Policy. A Paradoxical Legacy*, Routledge 2006; S. Moyn, *The Last Utopia. Human Rights in History*, Cambridge 2010.

**Alexander J. Schwitanski (Hrsg.):**  
**„Nie wieder Krieg“. Antimilitarismus**  
**und Frieden in der Geschichte der So-**  
**zialistischen Jugendinternationale (=**  
**Archiv der Arbeiterjugendbewegung,**  
**Schriftenreihe Bd. 21), Essen: Klartext**  
**Verlag, 2012, 136 S.**

Rezensiert von  
 Gerd Callesen, Wien

Aus Anlass des 100. Jahrestages der Gründung der Internationalen Verbindung sozialistischer Jugendorganisationen (IVSJ) 1907 organisierte das Archiv der Arbeiterjugendbewegung eine Tagung. Ihr Anliegen bestand u. a. darin, Anregungen für weitere Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der Jugendinternationale zu geben. Einige der Referate liegen nun in überarbeiteter Form vor.

Einleitend werden große Forschungslücken konstatiert, die einer Gesamtübersicht über die verschiedenen Arbeiterjugendinternationalen entgegen stehen. Die Tagung konzentrierte sich aus diesem Grund auf ein Teilthema, den Antimilitarismus. Auch hier beansprucht die Veröffentlichung nicht, alle Aspekte dieses Problems der Jugendinternationale auszuleuchten, sondern lässt den Autoren freie Hand, um ihre Fragestellung und evtl. Forschungslücken aufzuzeigen. Das letztere Problem steht allerdings nicht im Zentrum der Ausführungen.

Eine Ursache dafür könnte sein, dass wesentliche Quellentext-Ausgaben und Bibliographien den Verfassern unbekannt