

REVIEWS

Acta Poloniae Historica
115, 2017
PL ISSN 0001-6829

Niklas Lenhard-Schramm, *Konstrukteure der Nation. Geschichtswissenschaftler als politische Akteure in Vormärz und Revolution 1848/49*, Waxmann, New York and Münster, 2014, 352 pp., bibliog., 2 tables

This book is a study of the interconnection between historiography and politics in the period before and during the Revolution of 1848–9, as represented in the writings and activities of six German historians: Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann, Johann Gustav Droysen, August Friedrich Gfrörer, Karl Hagen, Georg Waitz, and Heinrich Wuttke. It is clearly and elegantly written, well documented, and – like it or not – quite typically conceptualized, as it stresses nationalism as the most characteristic, and indeed dominating, feature of the ideology they all shared and promoted in their writing, teaching, and in their political involvement.

The political engagement of nineteenth-century German historians has been no secret to any student of German history. Indeed, their passionate inclination to get involved in contemporary politics and make some impact on the changing course of political life appears as one of the most characteristic attributes of their activities. At the same time, this inclination has greatly contributed to the dismissal of their scholarly achievements by subsequent generations, as the values they most often promoted were deeply rooted in Romantic and post-Romantic nationalism. However, if we take a closer look, and particularly if we approach their activities in a comparative fashion, the picture becomes more complicated.

Firstly, political engagements were not a uniquely German passion for nineteenth-century historians. In both Britain and France eminent historians occupied governmental positions at that time. The Polish historiography also provides illustrative examples of historians (such as Joachim Lelewel or Michał Bobrzyński) who successfully combined the two occupations; that of a scholar with that of active politician. USA President Woodrow Wilson can serve as the last, and the most spectacular, example of such a career in the age when historians had their say in the making of history. Needless to say, all over Europe and America historians frequently considered it their duty to be ‘useful for the country’, which typically meant promoting some sort of nationalist values, be they coloured more liberally or more conservatively.

Eventually, some German historians even looked with jealousy at their foreign colleagues, as none of them were ever raised to the post of a minister or a chancellor. This jealousy had its methodological as well as historical background. It was believed at that time that a historian, in accordance with the numerous ancient examples, such as Herodotus and Thucydides – so dear and appealing to the classically-educated nineteenth-century academics – should have some ‘practical’ experience, preferably that of a statesman. Obviously, the idea that history is written according to the evidence gathered in archives was already present, but the classical concept emphasizing the ‘know-how’ that could have been obtained exclusively by decision-makers or from witnesses, was not over yet. Hence, the desire to actively participate in contemporary politics had two independent sources: to make history; and to get to know how it is made.

Even though the German historians’ impact on actual decision-making in the nineteenth century remains problematic, they enjoy the dubious reputation of having exercised a great influence on the public opinion of the time – mostly as advocates of modern nationalism and the German unity under Prussian leadership. The special term of ‘political professor’ was coined for those most intensively engaged in the contemporary debates. A number were elected to various German parliaments at the time, and particularly the famous Frankfurt parliament of 1848/49 in which, as Lenhard-Schramm’s book informs us, sixteen history professors served as deputies. But what was actually most characteristic for the German historians’ political engagement was that they acted as professors – and the title of this book perfectly mirrors this – profiting from the particularly German respect for this title.

Regrettably, the analysis does not go beyond 1849, so from the book we only learn the background of their involvement in the Frankfurt parliament’s activities, but do not get to know its consequences for their subsequent scholarly careers (as all of them returned to the academia after the exciting, albeit fruitless, attempts of the parliament to decide upon Germany’s future). Such information would be telling as far as the nature of the ‘political professor’s’ involvement is concerned. In the post-1945 era, as well as in Lenhard-Schramm’s book, it has often been quite critically assessed: firstly because of the implications of the ideology they promoted; and secondly because of their refusal to separate scholarship from politics. As far as the latter point is concerned, however, it might be claimed that the German model was actually more modern than the contemporary British or French ones – as it represented a step towards the modern ‘public intellectuals’, who make use of their authority as academicians in public life rather than make use of their political experience in their scholarly activities. In short, as far as this kind of engagement is concerned, Droysen stood much closer to Foucault than Guizot, no matter how they would have hated each other if they met in the public intellectuals’ chamber in hell.

As has been noted, the German historians' inclination for promoting nationalism has become standard information to be found in all histories of historiography, be they German – where it was assessed as a merit up until 1945 – or foreign, where it has always been approached with suspicion (it is often believed that German nationalism bore some particularly chauvinistic traces). Thus in this respect Lenhard-Schramm is hardly original, so his book constitutes more of a solid footnote than a breath-taking new chapter in the history of German historiography. In recent decades the field has become dominated by politically-oriented biographies of German historians, stressing, as Lenhard-Schramm also does, the connection between the scholarly and the political activities of the protagonists. Thus one of the chief merits of this book lies in Lenhard-Schramm's attempt to present a comparative analysis of six chosen historians' achievements – an analysis that not only emphasizes the links between scholarly and political involvements, but also between the content and the rhetoric of their writings.

I believe this is so because the 'historian-and-politician' analytical formula seems to be a simplification to me, at least insofar as the former capacity is concerned. To be sure, we can see a direct relationship between the writings of Wuttke, who had been an ardent enemy of the Poles and all the things Polish as an author, and the fact he actively opposed the idea of any pro-Polish decisions in Frankfurt. And there is a parallel relationship between the reverential presentation of Prussia and the Hohenzollerns in Droysen's writings and his vehement support for the idea of promoting the Prussian King to the rank of German Emperor by the parliament, as well as between the sympathy for the Habsburgs in Gfrörer's writings and his objection to this idea. But the relationship is all too straightforward and simple, so it is enough to read the first part of the book, which discusses the writings by the authors in question, to guess how they actually voted as deputies in Frankfurt. Obviously, it does not work the other way around that easily: their political involvements say little about the content of their writings.

Unfortunately the author does not trace the careers of his protagonists after 1849, which was the peak of their political engagement and which profoundly changed the attitudes of some of them – proving that the Ancients were right and that statesman-like experience can have a great impact on historians' minds. In the case of these professors, their political experience was actually a bitter disappointment. Frankfurt was a draw, which was perceived as a failure by all the parties involved.

What the book does demonstrate, however, is that regardless of the political inclinations of the discussed historians, their writings already before 1848 represented a quite militant version of German nationalism. The Romantic era is typically associated with a more idealistic, perhaps even juvenile trend in European nationalism; one which emphasized the brotherhood of all nations in their attempts to emancipate themselves from the reactionary absolutism

of the Holy Alliance system. The Frankfurt parliament is supposed to mark a turning point in the history of German nationalism; as the moment when 'sacred egoism' – understood as the sense of rivalry against the other nations, particularly the Poles and the Danes – prevailed over Romantic sympathies towards one's neighbours. However the book indicates that the year 1848 marked no major shift in historiography: the historians had advocated the idea of national antagonism against neighbours already before 1848, and continued to do so during the so-called 'Revolution', greatly contributing, for example, to the anti-Polish decisions of the initially pro-Polish inclined Frankfurt parliament.

Another problem the book actually shows is that nationalism as an analytical tool has its limitations as far as the nineteenth-century historiography is concerned. This is not to say that nationalism did not matter that much. To the contrary: it mattered enormously, and it was so ubiquitous that it fit in nicely with any other ideology. This may seem to be an interpretative key that opens all doors, for we can trace nationalist ideology in virtually all the writings of historians of the epoch. An inevitable consequence of employing it, however, is the simplification that comes with placing all of them in one room, and locking it once and for all with our universal key. As the book demonstrates, they eventually differed significantly – as presumably historians of all times do – regarding a number of issues that at first glance may seem of secondary importance today, but seemed very worthy of polemical fervour for them at the time. These issues, which the book covers in insightful detail, predominantly concerned Germany's constitution: the role of the monarch, citizens' rights, and the sources of sovereignty. All this was to be decided arbitrarily in 1871 – later to be reassessed by subsequent generations of historians.

proofreading James Hartzell

Adam Kozuchowski

Johannes Remy, *Brothers or Enemies: the Ukrainian National Movement and Russia, from the 1840s to the 1870s*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto and Buffalo, 2016, 329 pp.

Penned by Johannes Remy, this is the Finnish historian's second monograph on the emergence of modern national communities in the Russian Empire. The study discusses some essential findings regarding the activities of the Ukrainian national movement and the authorities' policies with respect to the people of Southern Rus' /Little Russia/Ukraine. The chronology spans between the smash of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius in 1847, through the circular issued by Minister Petr Valuev in 1863, to the Ems Ukase (Decree) launched by Tsar Alexander II in 1876. By highlighting the errors of the policy of throttling the Ukrainian movement, Remy demonstrates that the tsarist rule did not efficiently oppose the national question, which

was the most central challenge posed to it in the western provinces in the nineteenth century. Following up his conclusion, it can be added that this counterproductive policy took its revenge against Russia in 1917: the monarchy collapsed and the country was exposed to a loss of not only the Empire's territorial gains (incl. Poland, northern Baltic territories, Caucasus, Central Asia), but also the lands on the central Dnieper considered to form part of the Russian nation's motherland.

I should think that this book will gain a larger significance than Remy's first study on the nation-formation processes in East Central Europe. The previous one, published sixteen years earlier, dealt with the activities of Polish students in the Empire between the 'November' and 'January' Insurrections (1830/1 to 1863/4).¹ There are three reasons to support this view. First, Polish nineteenth-century independent movements had been better explored before the year 2000, their impacts on Russia's transformations having been discussed deeper than those of their Ukrainian counterparts before 2016 – with contributions of, especially, scholars from outside Poland, Ukraine and Russia. Second, the Ukrainians' strivings for detachment from Russia were potentially much more of an issue for the Empire, since such ideas and actions struck at the core of historical and dynastic legitimisation of Russian rule over the entire Eastern Europe. Third, investigation of both movements paved the way open for the author to consider Russia's command of the western lands within a triangular political relation(ship)s involving the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Poles.

The study under review is based on analysis of private letters, press and book publications of the participants of the Ukrainian movement, whether released or not by the censorship, as well as documents showing the incentives behind the decisions made by the censors, administrators, investigators and judges – and these very decisions – at the centre of the state and in the country's south-western guberniyas. Presented are the convictions and beliefs of the movement's leaders and the assumptions of the state's policy oriented toward elimination of illegal activities in the Ukrainian lands – and the ways in which this policy was carried into effect.

The book has an introduction, six chronologically arranged chapters, and a conclusion describing the consequences reaching beyond the year 1876. Extensive source notes and a list of reference literature are attached.

The fundamental argument of this book poses a challenge not only for the Soviet Russian but also Ukrainian historiography. In Remy's opinion, the "idea of independence did not enter the Ukrainian national discourse in the end of the nineteenth century, but in the late 1850s and early 1860s" (p. 5). The Author questions the customarily assumed thesis that independence was supported

¹ Johannes Remy, *Higher Education and National Identity: Polish Student Activism in Russia 1832–1863* (Helsinki, 2000).

only by the works of the radical leftists Yulian Bačynsky and Mykola Mixnovsky in the last years of the nineteenth century.² Whilst the idea gained support amongst some members of the Kiev Hromada as a potential solution, but rather distant in time, they nonetheless pursued short-term collaboration with the General Governor of Kiev Ilarion Vasilčikov, who sought to attract the local intelligentsia into offering resistance against the claims posed by the Poles with respect to the lands east of the Bug River, Remy argues. He has identified four instances of expressing Ukraine's right to independence and detachment from Russia as unattainable at the then-present stage: three in private letters and one in a pseudonymised publication. According to him there must have been more such utterances. Such views were expressed by important figures in the period's Ukrainian movement, Pantaleimon Kuliš and Volodymyr Antonovyč among them, which adds to their importance.

Remy points out to the other manifestations of the movement's political maturity, such as the projects (generally well known to scholars) to detach Ukraine from the Russian state in a federation with Poland, as voiced by Ukrainophiles who participated in the Polish conspiratorial organisations and joined the January Uprising of 1863–4 (the commanders of the uprising only recognised the right to use the Ukrainian language in the south-eastern territories of what had been the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). In parallel, postulates appeared to establish an all-Slavic federation that would include Ukraine and Russia (Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius) or consist of three nations, including Poland (the circle of the Petersburg magazine *Osnova*, 1861–2). Another option would have welcomed a federation extending to all the nations living within the borders of Russia, providing that the Empire be constitutionalised and democratised (Myxailo Drahomanov, 1875).

In parallel, Remy observes that while the political imagination of the Ukrainian movement leaders across the three decades under study reached “beyond the limits of the possible”,³ the postulates they voiced in public, ready to be satisfied with their fulfilment, mostly boiled down to respecting

² The pamphlet *Ukraina Irredenta* penned by Yulian Bačynsky, member of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party set up in 1890 in Galicia, was published in Lviv in 1895; the manifesto *Samostiina Ukraina* by Mykola Mixnovsky, member of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party established in 1900 in Xarkiv, was issued in Lviv in the same year.

³ In his 1900 article *Poza mežamy možhlyvoho* (*Beyond the Limits of the Possible*) Ivan Franko did not expressly postulate independence for Ukraine (as is often said) but made indirect references through contrafactual considerations on what would have happened with the country in case the Hadyač Union with Poland of 1658 had not failed and Russia had not defeated Ivan Mazepa's army at Poltava in 1709. The title used by Franko gained a symbolic meaning in the twentieth-century Ukrainian independence discourse.

their cultural and school-related rights in the autocratic environment of the Russian Empire. Fearing the accusation of political crime, they declared loyalty toward the authorities and avoided confrontation. In the course of the 1861–4 Russian-Polish conflict, a definite majority came out in favour of the Empire rather than the insurgents – doing so, in some cases, owing to tactical considerations. There is no indication that the Little-Rus' Revolutionary Committee actually existed there, though the authorities' internal correspondence and, afterwards, Soviet historiographers have referred to it. Before the Ukase of Ems, only the studies of Serhiy Podolynsky (notably, *The Steam Engine*, 1875) had expressly represented the revolutionary convictions within the Ukrainian movement. Although, the author concludes, even its moderate activists usually sympathised with the common people rather than the elite, there were very few such who were ready to directly oppose the social order and demand the country's independence from tsarism.

Based on how the situation developed between 1876 and 1904, when exponents of Ukrainian identity were completely deprived of the possibility to legally express their views and beliefs, we know that the breakthrough based on a revolutionary challenge of the tsarist rule in Ukraine occurred only in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The 1890s saw the emergence of milieus which developed their activity during the Revolution of 1905–6. Before then, Ukrainians joined the *Narodniks* movement, which extended, however, all over Russia. Taking this into account, it can be concluded that, in the period under examination, the censors and investigators, and the officials and judges following them, exhibited inquisitiveness in reading the writings of the Ukrainian leaders, along with the skill to foresee the perilous aspects of their views for the state in case the latter would not oppose their dissemination in a timely fashion.

Yet, Remy would not commend these officials' vigilance and care about the state and social order, not to mention the politics that was pursued on the basis on their recommendations. In his opinion, the monarchy finally, in 1876, opted for a wrong path with respect to Ukraine. The censors and the administrators aptly recognised in the Ukrainian authors' works a strong sense of distinctiveness expressed in the negative stereotypes of 'Great-Ruthenians' who were ascribed alien civilisational values; however, they decided that such an attitude was characteristic of a narrow circle of intellectuals. The Ems Ukase completely banned any publications in the Ukrainian language, save for fiction pieces and 'historical memoirs' approved by the censorship for use of elitist circles. Thereby, it denied the existence of a 'second Russian nationality' – the Ukrainian one, beside Russian – believing that the identity-based community of a 'South-Russian' and 'Great-Russian' peoples should be preserved.⁴

⁴ The conviction that there existed two historically and mentally different 'Russian nationalities' (*resp.* ethnicities): a South Russian and a Great Russian one

As Remy suggests, only a strategy where the authorities would allow for development of the Ukrainian (South Russian) identity – whether by means of creating a two-nation state or, as a more extensive concept, a federative country – could have turned out to be fruitful for Russia. Let us add that for the strategy to be delivered, the Russian state should have been liberalised, if not democratised. Remy argues that the Empire’s leaders ignored the fact that the Ukrainian identity could not get extinguished as it was formed on the foundation of the history, language, and customs of the Ukrainian people that were clearly distinct from those in the other parts of the Russian state. This having been the case, Valuev and, subsequently, Tsar Alexander II himself posed a mission impossible for the state to tackle. With the forces the Empire had at its disposal, it could merely tame the development of a separate identity, rather than having it eliminated.

It may be doubted whether the authorities of Russia could have recognised the situation as it stood in as early as 1876. By that moment, no strong ethnic or national movements had developed in Europe yet, which would have been based on any other stratum than landowners and/or the mythologised ‘own’ historical tradition reaching as far backwards as the Middle Ages: ‘own’ meant that no other national movement aspired for it (as in the case of Poland or Hungary). Where either of these two factors was absent, the emergence of a national movement owed a lot to the country’s people’s express religious and linguistic opposition toward the state’s centre – as in Greece, Serbia or Bulgaria, against the Ottoman Empire. As for the Ukrainians, of all these factors, the religious denomination could primarily have an effect (and only so with respect to the Poles), along with the language (to a much lesser extent than in the aforementioned cases). The Ukrainian movement rivalled with its Russian counterpart for, mostly, the same historical tradition – in its dynastic and Cossack-heritage dimension. A potential for a mass independence-oriented movement was hard to recognise among the Ukrainian people well until the 1890s, all the more so that after the wave of reforms and tremors (which Remy demonstrates by analysing the late works of Kuliš, or Drahomanov’s early ones) from the period of Alexander II’s early rule, the movement’s leaders did not even mention an independence option for their country. Instead, they resolutely reoriented toward a coexistence with Russia – whether as part of a conservative defence of the Slavic/Eastern Christian culture or a reformatory trend referring to the original democratic inclinations of the Slavic people.

was expressed by Mykola Kostomarov in his treatise *Dvi ruski narodnosti* published in *Osnova*, the magazine he edited, issue no. 3 of 1861. This concept was alternative to the policy pursued by the authorities which until the early years of the 20th century endeavoured to put into effect the idea of a ‚Russian nation’ embracing three branches – namely, Great-Russian, Little-Russian and White-Russian – with the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians occupying subordinate or ancillary positions.

This being the case, it is not the question why the authorities imposed the Ems Ukase but rather, why they did not desist from this regulation until the critical moment came in 1905, by which time the national movements in Europe, including within the Empire's limits (to mention Baltic or Caucasian people), had surged to a very different level, seems to be the more interesting one. Yet, to answer it, the period later than dealt with in the book would have to be analysed.

Nevertheless, it has to be emphasised that the author's findings with respect to the limits of political imagination of the first and second generation of Ukrainian leaders broaden our knowledge on the chronology of the development of the Ukrainian national idea. These findings did not incite Remy to any resolute polemics with the researchers who either have overlooked the early Ukrainian manifestations of independence thought, or perhaps did not attach appropriate importance to them; nor does the Finnish author propose a new theoretical perspective that would explain the reasons behind the successful outcomes of the Ukrainian movement and the other peer movements in the Empire's western lands. Remy is concerned with refraining from squeezing the individuals' views into schematic patterns or generalisations; instead, the actors are allowed to speak with their own voice. Still, the probably most important interpretation that was proposed before his study by Aleksei Miller has not been undermined.

Remy rightly considers the history of the development of the Russian ethnic or national ideology in right-bank Ukraine as described by Faith Hillis to have been based on an erroneous assumption that there was no Ukrainian movement present within the Empire until the moment the Ukase of Ems was passed. In her opinion, before 1876, the intelligentsia circles in Ukraine, together with the Hromada of Kiev, represented the Little-Russian identity understood as a part of the Russian identity.⁵ What Remy's findings primarily do is contribute to undermining such simplified concepts, which otherwise were rare in the earlier studies of Western scholars examining the nineteenth-century Ukrainian movement.⁶ (Let us note that today's Ukrainian journalism rejects such concepts, usually based on the unmeritorious charge that they apparently favour an anti-Ukrainian discourse of Russian mass media and authorities.) For a change, Remy approaches Serhiy Bilenky's work with a greater esteem: Bilenky analysed the shaping of the geographical imagination and the associating of the 'idioms' of nationality (historical tradition, folk

⁵ Faith Hillis, *Children of Rus': Right-Bank Ukraine in the Invention of the Russian Nation* (Ithaca and London, 2014).

⁶ Those who do not share these theses include, i.a.: David Saunders, *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture, 1750–1850* (Edmonton, 1985); Myroslav Shkandrij, *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times* (Montreal, 2001).

culture, language, ethnic identity, and mentality) with the notions of Ukraine, Poland, and Russia in the lands on the Dnieper between the early 1830s and 1847. In this case, Remy accurately finds that Bilenky has written a fulfilling study in the history of ideas, whereas the book under review deals with political events and ideas in their mutual influences.

Remy's continence in regard of entering the theoretical framework is worth of breaking up; his analysis of the Ukrainian movement of the 1840s–70s is worth comparing with the concepts of Aleksei Miller, the Russian scholar specialising in the tsarist policies with respect to the national movements in the Empire, who fulfils his potential in constructing grand models and in historical comparisons. By highlighting the differences between them, the importance of the Finnish historian's work can be emphasised. Remy polemicised with several of the theses Miller put forth in a study of 2000,⁷ assessing the tsarist policy toward the Ukrainians as a more repressive one, but did so only when he had 'hard' source evidence to support his view. For instance, he considered illegitimate Miller's view that the Russian authorities generally delivered the Ems Ukase without commitment, with the result that the Ukrainian movement has only partly lost the possibility of shaping the public opinion. In the introduction to his book, though, Remy considers Miller a 'giant' (as far as his research area is concerned), on whose shoulders such continuators as he himself stand. Remy fairly modestly outlines his role as a researcher who, in studying the relationship between the imperial administration and the Ukrainian activists, has devoted more attention to the former party.

However, the difference between these historians appears crucial if we take into account Miller's general conviction that the ultimate source of failure of the tsarist policy pursued in the Ukrainian lands between 1847 and 1914 was the weakness of the state machinery, rather than the strength of a Ukrainian national identity. The Russian historian was of the opinion that the state's leadership team could have carried out a 'Russian nation' project embracing the Empire's Orthodox people and extending also to the 'Little Russian' 'branch'. For this to have happened, the authorities should have begun a modernisation project earlier than after the 1905–6 Revolution and managed it with no less consistency, with use of no lesser resources across the provinces, than France and Great Britain did. This argument was based on the assumption that the nineteenth-century Ukrainian national movement had a potential tantamount to that of the Provençal, Breton, Scottish or Welsh movements. As per this concept, Ukraine was categorised together with those peripheral regions of France and Britain, the Ukrainian historical

⁷ Алексей Миллер, "Украинский вопрос" в политике властей и русском общественном мнении (вторая половина XIX в.) (Санкт-Петербург, 2000); English edn.: *The Ukrainian Question: The Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century* (Budapest and New York, 2003).

tradition having been neglected (among other aspects). Miller moreover underappreciates the impacts on the Ukrainian nation-forming process from Polish independence movement and the Ukrainian movement in the Austrian Galicia.⁸ Remy's idea to move the origins of the Ukrainian independence idea forty years backwards puts the potential of the Ukrainian movement in the Dnieper region in a different light. In this respect, Remy's study proposes an important alternative to Miller's findings.

Nevertheless, on the other hand, Remy most probably overestimates the potential of some of the building blocks (language, historical tradition, denomination, customs, stereotypes) to which Ukrainian ethnic or national ideologues might have referred. The reader may get hold of an impression that in his opinion the Ukrainian movement was 'doomed to success' regardless of the methods employed to destroy it. The author accurately draws his and our attention to the importance of the Ukrainian historical tradition (the culture-forming role of Kiev as the central hub of the early mediaeval state; South Rus' princes in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries; the Cossacks; the Left-Bank Hetmanate; the ethos of struggle against the Tatars and the Turks). Yet, I do not find quite convincing the author's implicit assumption that the people in the Ukrainian lands constituted a separate linguistic unit within the Empire in the nineteenth century, which suggests that clearly definable linguistic borders existed between Ukraine and its neighbouring units already at that stage. To my mind, Miller's suggestion that if the alphabetisation of the people of Ukraine had been commenced a few decades before 1914 within the literary Russian language context, rather than only in the 1920s and 1930s within the Ukrainian one, such a move could have had an essential impact on the shaping of their identity, can still be expected to be substantively criticised with Remy's book published.

The difference occurring between these two authors lies in their divergent theoretical assumptions with respect to the process of emergence of nations. Miller's option for the modernisation paradigm incited him to recognise a given community as a nation only at the stage when manifestations of the sense of identity-based individuation began appearing on a mass scale – which would have been impossible without the industrial revolution, the emergence of countrywide markets, and the establishment of a common education system.⁹ Miller's constructivist 'creed' manifests itself, in turn, in the conviction that the formation of the nations was primarily dependent on the building blocks configured by elites, to which end they mostly had free rein – especially if they could employ a modern state apparatus to support the delivery of their projects. Remy, for his part, avoids the espousal of either option in the dispute between the followers of the modernisation paradigm

⁸ *Ibidem.*

⁹ *Ibidem.*, 9–19.

and the perennialistic paradigm, on the one hand, and constructivism and primordialism, on the other. He makes brief references to two debaters whose observations, although not based on representing the same set of views, may apply, in his opinion, to the Ukrainian case – namely, the ethnosymbolist Anthony D. Smith¹⁰ and Miroslav Hroch¹¹ (the latter's views being closer to those of modernists, with a focus on the East Central European nations). Both of them, as Remy observes, highlighted the importance of early modern and, in general, pre-modern sources of nationalism. Making references to these two scholars, Remy stands afar from Miller but close to the ethnosymbolists.

Remy appears as an exponent of a historiography that represents a 'from below' approach as it is oriented toward explaining the course of historical processes based on studies of the practices developed as part of the functioning of institutions and identifiable in the long term. This is not to say that the standpoint of his analysis of the Ukrainian movement in the three decades between 1847 and 1876 has taken into consideration all the impact factors and viewpoints. Similarly to Miller, Remy weakly marked the reciprocal influences between the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the Dnieper land and their Galician peers. He shuns from outlining a broader picture of Russia's international situation in the time of the Crimean War, the January Uprising, the unification of Germany, and the crisis in the Balkan realms of the Ottoman Empire that broke out in 1875. Lastly, he makes no reference to the attempts at periodisation of the Ukrainian nation-formation process as proposed, with use of Hroch's pattern of phases, by John-Paul Himka, Andreas Kappeler, Paul Robert Magocsi, Roman Szporluk, and others. The reader would have otherwise noticed the independence idea emerging in the Dnieper area in as early as the late 1850s/early 1860s, against the contemporaneous developmental stage of the Ukrainian nation-forming process. In Kappeler's approach, for instance, the process was entering its B phase but was thereafter 'turned back' resulting from the tsarist repressions; following yet another, failed, attempt in the early 1870s, it 'got off the ground' only in the late years of the century.¹² Such a simple reference to the earlier discussions would have reinforced one of the key arguments in Remy's book, which, somewhat simplified, can be summarised thus: compared to Austria, the Ukrainian movement in Russia has 'lost' a few dozen years owing to the political repressions administered by the autocracy.

¹⁰ Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford, 1986).

¹¹ Miroslav Hroch, *In the National Interest: Demands and Goals of European National Movements of the Nineteenth Century: A Comparative Perspective* (Prague, 2000).

¹² Andreas Kappeler, 'Національний рух Українців у Росії та Галичині: Спроба порівняння', in Я. Д. Ісаєвич *et al.* (eds.), *Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність* (Київ, 1992), і, 104–9.

To sum up, I believe that Johannes Remy's study ought to be of interest not only to historians of Ukraine and/or Russia but to all scholars specialising in nation-forming processes. It explicitly reconfirms the accuracy of the remark made by Roman Szporluk (in his polemic with Ernest Gellner) that in researching into these processes it is important not only to discern the nationalist thinkers' striving for an ideological hegemony but also to analyse which specific elements of the historical tradition they actually referred to (in other words, whether they published their visions and whether they met with any social resonance – and, moreover, what it was that they actually wrote).¹³ Eventually, those historians who are not completely positive about the concept of 'invented traditions' will find in this book a fear-soothing message that there have occurred certain limits to 'effective' manipulation of the past in the identity policies pursued by states.

trans. *Tristan Korecki*

Tomasz Stryjek

Adéla Gjuričová, Andreas Schulz, Luboš Velek, and Andreas Wirsching (eds.), *Lebenswelten von Abgeordneten in Europa 1860–1990*, Droste Verlag, Düsseldorf, 2014, 340 pp.; series: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, clxv, Parlamente in Europa, 3

Research on political parties, parliamentarianism and social elites has been among the principal spheres in historiography and political science for several decades. Recently, this research has extended to views on the everyday lives of members of parliament and other law-making bodies.

This trend is reflected in the reviewed publication, which is a part of the Düsseldorf series on the history of parliamentarianism and political parties. According to the editors, the aim of the book is to contribute to deepening the scholarly dialogue between researchers on political parties and experts on parliamentarianism. The publication reflects the results of a scientific conference of the same name, which was organized jointly by the staff of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and Charles University in Prague in October 2011. The research framework of the conferences on transformations of European parliaments, oriented primarily towards Western European parliamentarianism, was thus territorially extended to Central and East Central Europe.

¹³ Roman Szporluk, 'Thoughts about change: Ernest Gellner and the history of nationalism', in John A. Hall (ed.), *The State of the Nation. Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism* (Cambridge, 1998), 23–39.

The essays presented in the reviewed volume bring together the viewpoints of political scientists and sociologists, historiographic researchers focused on the development of political culture, and scholars on the theory of communication. In total, twenty-two authors contributed to this book, mostly from Germany and the Czech Republic, but also from the Netherlands, Hungary, France, Austria and Great Britain. The essays which make up the book are written in German or English, except for the initial essay by Adéla Gjuríčová and Andreas Schulz, which summarizes the general opinions appearing in the papers and is provided in both languages, i.e. German and English. The main issue interconnecting almost all of the papers is the professionalization process of the parliamentary mandate. The advanced stage of professionalization is frequently accompanied by a perception of parliamentary activity as a full-time job, which can result in a loss of contact with the ordinary, everyday life of constituents.

Together with the first essay, the other seventeen papers are divided into three sections: i) The path to the profession. Political socialization of the deputies; ii) Parallel worlds: Private life and everyday parliamentary life; and iii) Self-staging and perception by others. Members of the parliament and the public media. Essays included in the first section are dedicated to two main spheres – the gradual professionalization of the parliamentary mandate, and the specific conditions of executing the mandate in both chambers of the Cisleithanian imperial council. Heinrich Best, one of the authors, applies Max Weber's traditional division of the deputies – into members living *for* politics, and members living *from* politics – as a functional criterion for typologies in the assessment of members of the French, German and British parliaments. He arrives at the general view that around the year 1918 the traditional elites left politics, and were replaced by the mass arrival of professional politicians who lived on an expense allowance system and salaries. According to his findings, the average stay in the parliament lasted for two-and-a-half terms in the twentieth century. András Cieger examines the professionalization process of parliamentary mandates in the Austrian Council, paying special attention to the conditions for acquiring and execution of the mandate, which were largely based on experience in the regional administration. He arrives at the conclusion that the Austrian deputies became professionalized at the end of the nineteenth century. Paul Seaward's essay concerns the financing of political activities in Britain, and he focuses on the long-lasting and gruelling effort to implement the concept of parliamentary mandates as a fully professional activity, entitled to remuneration. His essay covers the period from 1869 until 1997, with overlaps extending to 2009. All of these three essays provide parallel analyses of political culture, especially focusing on what was acceptable to the deputies and what was beyond acceptance. In this vein Franz Adlgasser, basing his observations on his extensive biographical studies, which resulted in a two-volume biographical dictionary of the Austrian deputies between 1848

and 1918, reflects on the feasibility of being active in the central parliament while simultaneously being engaged in a civil occupation. He pays particular attention to the attorney and judgeship careers of certain deputies. In the Austrian milieu, he dates the departure of the traditional aristocratic elites from the Imperial Council to the year 1907, i.e. to the circumstances marked by the introduction of universal suffrage. In turn, Tomáš W. Pavlíček analyses the procedures connected with appointment of the Czech civil deputies to the House of Lords of the Viennese Imperial Council. He focuses attention to the profession and age of the selected deputies and attempts to determine the reasons for their appointment to the upper house of the Parliament. He mostly proceeds from a group of already-appointed deputies, but in some cases maps the entire process of the selection and distinguishes between appointed and the non-appointed persons.

The second part of the publication is dedicated to the everyday lives of the deputies. Relying on his extensive research based on the correspondence of Bohemian deputies in Vienna, Luboš Velek's essay presents an overview of parliamentary housing, catering and the daily routine of the deputies from the 1860 until the First World War. He also comments on the deputies' facilities, the sanitary conditions of their housing, their contacts with their homes and the financial demands placed on them in their exercise of parliamentary mandates. He reaches the conclusion that the parallel exercise of another profession was difficult if not impossible for the Czech deputies, hence their acceptance of the imperial parliamentary mandate was conditioned upon them having a very good financial situation. In contrast, Volker Stalman analyzes the German parliament between 1871 and 1933 with respect to transformations in the typology of politicians. His observations concern the financing of parliamentary activities, methods of evading the initial ban on remuneration, the deputies' working conditions, the frequency of a double parliamentary mandate (i.e. imperial and provincial, the latter of which could be remunerated), and the creation of an awareness of a 'professional estate'. Ines Soldwisch's essay deals with the special features of the European Parliament between 1979 and 2004. This institution, being of a completely new type, was characterized by technological facilities built from scratch and the creation of a collective consciousness on the part of deputies coming from various countries of Europe. The author draws the reader's attention to the difficulties arising from having operations and sessions of the European Parliament in various locations (the so-called 'motion parliament'), which also complicated the deputies' daily lives. Adéla Gjuričová examines the impact, from the sociological perspective, of the Czechoslovak deputies' housing in the Prague-Opatov parliamentary building on a housing estate in the suburb of Prague, where the non-Prague deputies of the last federal Parliament of Czechoslovakia and the Czech National Council had their homes between 1990 and 1992. Andrea Hopp's work is concerned with an

opposite phenomenon – the effect of the parliamentarian's political activity on their family members. She presents a portrait of women from the family of the Prussian Prime Minister and German Reichs Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, who was accompanied in his statesmanship activities mainly by his wife Johanna, daughter Marie, and daughter-in-law Marguerite. Jana Malínská and Josef Tomeš use extant archival documents to recount the fate of a parliamentary restaurant of the Czechoslovak National Assembly in the interwar period.

The third section contains essays dedicated to the 'shared life' of the deputies, the public and the media. Jean Garrigues's essay concerns the role of the French parliament during the so-called Panama scandal in 1892–3, which initiated a change in relations between the parliament and the press. The author analyses the response of the individual actors in the affair – the deputies, ministers and journalists, followed by the organization of a parliamentary commission of inquiry. Levente Püski addresses a similar theme, but with reference to interwar Hungary. He describes the media strategy of the opposition press *Pesti Napló* during the negotiations concerning a corruption scandal at the Ministry of Agriculture in the Hungarian parliament in 1924, emphasising the role of the opposition and the retaliation of the government, which used the entire scandal to impose further restrictions on parliamentary freedoms. Anne Bos and Charlotte Brand analyse the reasons for the resignations of politicians from their posts as ministers and deputies because of scandals in the Dutch political milieu. They conclude that new political movements, which do not have the opportunity to examine their candidates' long-term histories in parliaments, are more prone to be involved in scandals.

The contribution of Benedikt Wintgens concerns deputies in the Bonn parliament after 1949, their relations with the media, and the creation of the new parliamentary infrastructure, which was affected by the specific small town conditions, i.e. the proximity of the deputies and the journalist reporters. During the early period of its existence, the West German Parliament was characterized by the accessibility of the parliamentary sessions to the public via radio and TV coverage. In contrast, Bettina Tüffers examines the East German Chamber of Deputies in 1989–90, the plenary sessions of which were televised live. However, the exaggerated expectations of the TV viewers, arising from their total inexperience with the conduct of the democratic representative bodies, were disappointed in the end. It became apparent that the televised coverage of just one segment of the parliamentary work – the plenary sessions – was distorted, because many real decision-making processes remained hidden from the viewers, who instead witnessed the usual dragging out of the parliamentary session. Tomáš Zahradníček tackles a similar story using as his main hero Rudolf Hrušínský, an amateur politician, popular actor, and symbol of democracy. His fragmentary appearances in the parliament could not shatter his general popularity, but in the parliamentary environment he

was drawn deeper and deeper into isolation because his conduct differed from that of other deputies, who yearned for the highest possible media attention.

It is immediately apparent that the topics of the essays in this book are rather distant from each other. This distance arises naturally from the disparate territorial, chronological, and factual environments in which the conference organisers, and subsequently the editors of and contributors to the publication, approached the theme of deputies' lives. At the same time, comparison of the varying circumstances in which the deputies worked in the West, Central, and East Central Europe helps to identify the transformations of parliamentarianism. The reviewed publication can thus serve as a valuable collection of reference material for further study on the history of parliamentarianism and political culture.

trans. Miroslav Košek

Pavel Cibulka

proofreading James Hartzell

Rudolf Kučera, *Rationed Life. Science, Everyday Life, and Working-Class Politics in the Bohemian Lands, 1914–1918*, Berghahn Books, New York and Oxford, 2015, 206 pp., illus.

Rudolf Kučera's research focuses on the social and cultural history of Central Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He also works on questions relating to the methodology and history of historiography, with his research interests clearly reflected in his publications.¹ The work reviewed here deals with a theme that seems to present a natural progression from his earlier investigations, since it is positioned at the intersection of the history of social classes and identity issues, the history of ideas, and the history of the First World War.

¹ Rudolf Kučera, *Staat, Adel und Elitenwandel. Die Adelsverleihungen in Schlesien und Böhmen 1806–1871 im Vergleich* (Göttingen, 2012); *idem*, 'Facing Marxist Orthodoxy: Western Marxism, The Making, and the Communist Historiographies of Czechoslovakia and Poland, 1948–1990', *International Review of Social History*, lxi, 1 (2016), 35–50; *idem*, 'Marginalizing Josefina. Work, Gender and Protest in Bohemia 1820–1844', *Journal of Social History*, xlvi, 2 (2012), 430–48; *idem*, 'Losing Manliness: Bohemian Workers and the Experience of the Home Front', in Joachim Bürgschwentner, Mathias Egger, and Gunda Barth-Scalmani (eds.), *Other Fronts, Other Wars? First World War Studies on the Eve of the Centennial* (Boston, 2014), 331–48; *idem*, 'Philanthropy and Public Donation Striving for the State Recognition. The Bohemian Ennoblements 1806–1871', in Milan Hlavačka (ed.), *Collective and Individual Patronage and the Culture of Public Donation in Civil Society in the 19th and 20th Centuries in Central Europe* (Praha, 2010), 194–209.

The eponymous central concept *Rationed Life* should be understood as an embodied, scientifically-justified vision of a completely rationalized, regulated and organized world, where particular elements of human practice are precisely measured out and located in time and space. This concept thus offers a concise description of the experience of Czech workers during the First World War. The phenomenon of rationed life is analysed within the framework of the three elements indicated in the subtitle – science, everyday life, and working-class politics. While at first glance the thematic and temporal scope (the working class in the Bohemian lands, 1914–18) might indeed appear somewhat limited, the wealth of findings and interpretations significantly exceeds this apparently restrictive framework. *Rationed Life* also provides a study of the role of science in shaping a modern society and of attempts to salvage a particular vision of the world in the face of the catastrophe of war. Kučera's work also offers insight into everyday life in this period, particularly those moments where it was entangled with discourses of power and public debate. The central research focus, namely the working class, is understood by the author in terms of continuity and change, thus as a certain dynamic, fluid and incomplete project. Wartime serves here as a lens which sharpens the focus on both the traits of communities of Czech workers already established in the nineteenth century and also on the formation of a new situation connected to the collapse of the old social and political order. Consequently, the author's central research questions concern "the war's influence on the transformation of an organized working class – its culture and the way active workers understood themselves and their surroundings during the rapid wartime changes" (p. 6). This transformation, connected both to the creation of a new identity and also the formulation of particular demands that defined the working class both internally and externally, is termed 'working-class politics' by the author.

The book is divided into four chapters on particular spheres of social life and the related 'politics' connected to them. Chapter 1 is titled 'Rationed Society: The Politics of Food', Chapter 2 'Rationed Fatigue: The Politics of Work', Chapter 3 'Rationed Manliness: The Politics of Gender', and Chapter 4, the final one – 'Rationed Anger: The Politics of Protest'. It is worth noting that in the final two chapters the notion of being 'rationed' serves as a metaphor, while in relation to the chapters on food and work the concept should be understood literally. The apparently distant themes were not, however, chosen by chance, since the aspects addressed in particular chapters supplement each other wonderfully at some points while overlapping at others, a feature enabling the reader to better understand the complex questions that Kučera explores.

Likewise, the internal structure of the particular chapters is clear and consistent. Each one begins with an anecdote that reflects the chapter's central theme. Thus the rationing of food is depicted through highly personal

testimony relating to police inspections of Prague families' homes, while the notion of the worker-machine is illustrated through a description of a film recorded at a Czech steel mill. The story of the film *A World without Men* introduces the subject of women's emancipation, while Kučera first presents his thesis relating to workers' rebellion against the liberal-bourgeois order through a symbolic scene depicting the theft of a single ladies shoe from a shop in Plzeň/Pilsen during protests in August 1917. The author possesses undeniably gifted, literary style that engages readers, although anecdotal depictions of history might raise some feats that reality has been embellished and simplified. However, the author does not rely solely on stories but, having captivated his readers' imaginations through such images, produces concrete analysis of the themes addressed.

The vivid depiction of the central idea of each chapter is followed in each case by a methodical expansion of the subject through the addition of historiographical and source-based detail. This is how the context of science and the rationalization based upon it is introduced as the central force intervening in people's wartime lives. What is crucial is that Kučera considers scientific and social attitudes to be completely identical with the worldview of the middle class to which most scientists belonged. Workers' encounter with an all-encompassing regulation was something that possessed not only economic but also ideological dimensions. Hence efforts, for example, to efface from social consciousness the previously common-sense assumption that those engaged in heavy labour require meat were an attempt not only to prove that proteins, sugars and fats derived from other foods were equally nutritious, but such efforts also had a 'civilizational' dimension. These arguments enabled the imposition of higher classes' narratives on workers: it was labourers who could thus be held responsible for wartime shortages and crises because they rejected modern dietary opinion and instead continued their bad, pre-war habits in the realm of nutrition. It is also worth noting that a similar tone was adopted both in official ministerial publications of the period as well as in the activities of propagators of nutritional science in other parts of the Monarchy.² The reduction of physical labourers to machines and tools in turn engendered the dictates of efficiency while also enabling the removal of the worker 'élites' from supervision and management processes, meaning that they could be replaced by military figures or experts from the field of rationalization.

² See Cracow, Archiwum Państwowe (*State Archives*), P-978, 'O żywieniu się ludności w czasach wojennych' (On the nourishment of the population in wartime), ed. by the Imperial and Royal Ministry of Internal Affairs, Jan. 2015, pp. 2025-9; see the same as 'Volksernährung in Kriegszeiten', <<http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00608655>> [Accessed: 21 Aug. 2014]; Leonard Bier, *Jak żywić się w czasie wojennym? Wykład wygłoszony staraniem Prezydium Miasta Krakowa w Sali "Sokoła" w dniu 6 czerwca 1915* (Kraków, 1915).

Kučera sees in the rationalization (and rationing) of food and labour a means towards the transformation of perceptions of gender and relations between the sexes. Reconsideration of the value of preparing meals, deciding what and when to eat, selecting suitable products and educating future generations brought about recognition of the work of housewives as something akin to a public duty that was certainly crucial to the interests of state and society. Meanwhile, the economic necessity of employing women in posts left vacant by men called up to the army also had a variety of consequences. Those males who, for various reasons, were not conscripted had to face being branded inadequate men. On top of that, they could now also encounter women in uniform who held a certain authority over them. A female ticket inspector or a female trade inspector could, after all, impose legal punishment on a man by issuing a warning or a fine. Furthermore, female industrial labourers adapted to their new surroundings by changing their appearance, dress or behaviour, thus creating something of a 'new gender'. The theme that is least convincingly based in the scientific discourse of the time is the question of rationed anger. Here, however, the author draws on the concept of 'moral economy' as developed in E.P. Thompson's classic work.³

A further common element of all chapters, in addition to the anecdotes and outlining the central ideas, are the attempts at presenting the realization of the ideals of rationing in practice. The author links this theme with the depiction of specific activities of the state and of public discourse, including the official language used in it. The state's activities did not take place in a vacuum but had an impact on the experiences of individuals and social groups, thus producing particular responses. Consequently, analysis of the tensions between the aims of the authorities and the interests of the working class enables the author to end each chapter with a conclusion pertaining to the influence of the central theme on the perception and self-identification of the working class. So, according to Kučera, wartime realities relating to nourishment contributed to the disintegration of the working class. In the period analysed in *Rationed Life*, various groups' of workers access to food differed significantly, largely as a result of divergent policies that were in place at particular workplaces, where meals of varying size and quality, as well as food supplements, were offered, with the state also having an influence through the organization of field kitchens. Furthermore, in the context of labour and its organization, the war brought not only destruction of the existing order but also came to outline new horizons for the working class. Kučera argues that wartime rationalization of labour diametrically transformed the aims of workers' movements, as well as those of their chief opponents. While before the war the largest possible participation of workers' representatives was

³ Edward P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York, 1966).

sought in managing companies, with significant improvements in working conditions and safety being the main objective, wartime experience resulted in a significant radicalization of workers who became increasingly open in expressing overtly communist aspirations. At the same time, it was no longer the state that was addressed by such demands but the owners of industrial enterprises. Equally, wartime gender politics influenced the violent transformations affecting the working class' social agency. While in the early phase of this conflict the symbolic devaluation of physical labour behind the frontline together with the influx of female workers into workplaces contributed to the collapse of the pre-war, androcentric nature of the working class, this experience prepared the class for the new post-war reality where women were to be equal members of trade unions and socialist parties. And, beyond that, mass protests previously associated by researchers with what are known as hunger strikers had, according to Kučera, not only economic significance since they bore great influence on the formation of workers' demands. Firstly, taking protests outside the workplace, with workers thus encountering and joining forces with other disenfranchised social groups, led to the masses' emancipation. Secondly, unrest on the streets shattered the previously impervious border that constituted the foundation of the liberal world order – namely property laws. The theft of food deliveries, shoplifting and burglaries of homes belonging to the higher social classes strengthened the working class's belief in the necessity and indeed possibility of bringing about social justice through violence.

Somewhat problematic is the task of identifying the sources on which Kučera bases his study. The introduction is lacking even a broad outline framing the source base employed, while reading the bibliography and footnotes fails to provide any indication as to which archives the author explored or the reasons behind his selection. A clearer description is given of the historiography used in the book. Kučera has employed both the huge corpus of literature produced under socialism on the working classes in the Czech lands, as well as more recent social historical studies.⁴ Indeed, the critical combination of wartime sources with Marxist-Leninist historiography is no easy task. Kučera adopts this approach because taken together the material offers a fairly radical depiction of the subject matter of the book. On the one hand, there are the narratives of the Austrian authorities and the contemporary middle classes that were explicitly opposed to the working class. On the other hand, we are faced with the clearly propagandistic and ideologically-engaged literature of the communist period. The fragments of documents, newspapers and memoirs selected by the author seem to be unusually suggestive, thus

⁴ See in particular: Ivan Šedivý, *Češi, české země a velká válka 1914–1918* (Praha, 2001) and Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total war and everyday life in World War I* (Cambridge, 2004).

adding colour to the text while also posing readers difficulties in establishing the true extent of the issues presented in *Rationed Life*. I do not recommend instead citing concrete statistics with numbers and percentages but would suggest an approach to sources and their analysis that would enable readers to gain an impression as to whether a given phenomenon was marginal or had affected the majority of the working class or society. A good illustration of this problem is evident in the suggestive description of the loosening of morality among women working in industry. In presenting his argument, the author claims that this process was unprecedented and as proof for his claim he cites a fragment from the diary of a craftsman who had experienced disappointment at the hands of women, whom he calls 'beasts' and 'bitches' (p. 116).

Perhaps a further questionable aspect of the book is the findings on the social degradation of workers and growing social inequality during the wartime crisis (pp. 29–30). It would be relevant to draw upon quantitative research when drawing conclusions about the economic impact of the war, although such data would actually indicate that it was the middle class who were the biggest losers in this respect.⁵ Furthermore, the relative decline in middle-class incomes was significantly larger than among workers. To speak of the pauperization of workers and the loss of social status would be more relevant to the case of farmers rather than civil servants and those holding some amount of capital. Likewise, aggregated data on the subject of income and inequalities offer proof for theses that are the very opposite of the author's claims. Economic crises, particularly in the realm of consumption, lead to egalitarianization rather than strengthen inequality.⁶ It can thus be argued that in these sections, Kučera has relied too heavily on sources created by workers themselves and by the socialist press – sources which, of course, presented the conditions of manual industrial labourers in the worst possible light.

trans. Paul Vickers

Bartosz Ogórek

⁵ See Jon Lawrence, 'Material pressures on the middle classes', in Jay Winter and Jean-Louis Robert (eds.), *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin, 1914–1919* (Cambridge, 1999), 229–54.

⁶ Thomas Piketty, 'Income inequality in France, 1901–1998', *Journal of Political Economy*, cxi, 5 (2003), 1004–42; Thomas Piketty and Emmanuel Saez, 'The evolution of top incomes: a historical and international perspective', *National Bureau of Economic Research. Working Papers*, 11955 (2006); Anthony Atkinson and Salvatore Morelli, 'Economic crises and Inequality', *UNDP-HDRO Occasional Papers*, 6 (2011); Anthony Atkinson, Thomas Piketty, and Emmanuel Saez, 'Top incomes in the long run of history', *Journal of Economic Literature*, xlix, 1 (2011), 3–71.

Nina Jebsen, *Als die Menschen gefragt wurden. Eine Propaganda-analyse zu Volksabstimmungen in Europa nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*, Waxmann, Münster, New York, 2015, 368 pp., summary in Danish, ill.; series: Internationale Hochschulschriften, 610

This book by a Danish scholar is based on her doctoral thesis submitted in 2013 at the Southern Danish University of Sønderborg, and is about plebiscites designed to decide about integration of Schleswig, a part of East Prussia, Carinthia, Burgenland, and Upper Silesia into the respective countries. Well recognised by historians, the topic is approached by Nina Jebsen in an untypical way. Instead of offering yet another description of the diplomatic background behind the establishing of a post-war order, the study focuses on the visual propaganda that accompanied the plebiscites. In regard of the posters, postcards, *notgelds* (replacement currency issued by some local governments), and leaflets, the discourse analysis method is applied; it is based on description of the motifs and visual techniques used in the visual propaganda, set in the historical context.

The study is structured in a simple and logical fashion (though the reader may initially be somewhat discouraged by the numbering of subchapters, down to a fourth degree). Chapter 1 discusses the methodological assumptions and types of sources under analysis. The subsequent chapter concisely presents the circumstances in which the plebiscites were conducted, and discusses their outcome. In its final section, the key notions of 'nation' and 'identity' are defined. Anthony D. Smith appears to have guided the author to the theory of nationalism; his *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism* is definitely the most frequently cited work.¹ Following Smith, Jebsen dissociates herself from the concepts proposed by Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm and Ernest Gellner, whereby national or ethnic identity is regarded a relatively late product of social elites. In her analysis of the propagandist measures, Jebsen makes use of the instruments applied in historical research into stereotypes. The voluminous Chapter 3 (occupying two-thirds of the book) analyses a hundred and several dozen posters and other visual communications made on the occasion of the plebiscites. This material is arranged primarily by dominant motif, such as national and regional symbols (national colours, emblems or crests, personifications), maps, features of natural and cultural landscape, mythical and historical figures, representations of social classes and groups (e.g. peasants) and other cultural signs, including soldier, death, woman, or child. The book concludes with a review of the major categories extending to larger groups of symbols, these including – in Jebsen's concept – territory

¹ Anthony D. Smith, *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach* (New York, 2009).

and ethnic background, shared sites of memory (*lieux de mémoire*), national heroes, saints and patrons, national and regional stereotypes, language and loyalty to the homeland, the latter being of special importance in this approach.

The introducing chapters, dealing with the facts and the study's methodology, are sketchy and satisfactorily introduce the core section. The author is well-versed in the studies in nationalism, and has properly acquired the basic knowledge on the plebiscites. The reader would probably welcome an opportunity to learn more about the internal policies of the countries concerned, but negligence of this particular historical aspect does not seem a fundamental error. Items missing in the list of references is a more controversial issue. The author honestly admits she does not have a command of all the languages of the sources she refers to; it is for this particular reason, indeed, that she confines herself to visual items, which are rarely described with words (p. 16). The Danish-German relations is Jebsen's primary competence; for the rest, she mainly relies on German or English-language studies. And this would not be a real problem, had she made more use of the studies by Polish, Hungarian or Yugoslavian historians also available in these languages. Since it is not what she does, a few important books on related topics have escaped her attention: otherwise, they could have broadened her knowledge of the facts and influenced her work. Polish Germanist Hubert Orłowski, author of a monumental history of the German stereotype,² is among those neglected; so is Milan Ristović, Serbian expert in West European (mainly, German and Austro-Hungarian) graphic representations of the Balkan peoples in the nineteenth and twentieth century;³ or, Tomasz Szarota, Polish author of the monograph *Der deutsche Michel*, exploring the German national self-stereotype⁴. Ethnic stereotypes as a research topic obviously enjoyed popularity in East Central Europe particularly in the 1990s, so high that it is hardly possible to exhaust the related literature. With respect to these three authors, the point is not to stuff the bibliography with more items, not to mention observe regional parities, but it is about the research being key to the Jebsen study. The civilisation gulf between Germany and Poland – being Orłowski's research focus for a number of years – appears in the plebiscite propaganda under analysis no less often than the stereotype of pugnacious and savage Serbs, of which Ristović writes. With Szarota's book at hand, in turn, Jebsen would

² Hubert Orłowski, *Polnische Wirtschaft. Zum deutschen Polendiskurs der Neuzeit* (Studien der Forschungsstelle Ostmitteleuropa an der Universität Dortmund, 21, Wiesbaden, 1996).

³ Milan Ristović, *Schwarzer Peter und die Räuber vom Balkan. Themen über den Balkan und Serbien in deutschen satirischen Zeitschriften 1903–1918* (Studies on South East Europe, 17, Wien, 2015).

⁴ Tomasz Szarota, *Der deutsche Michel. Die Geschichte eines nationalen Symbols und Autostereotyps* (Klio in Polen, 3, Osnabrück, 1998).

have more penetratingly analysed the propagandist self-images of Germans, which contradicted all the evil and pernicious characteristics of the eastern and southern neighbours.

The core part of the book mainly describes the types and examples of visual representations in question. The author follows a pattern consisting of several items. Each subchapter opens with announcement, sometimes repeated, of what motif would be subject to analysis this time. Then follow dictionary definitions of the terms the author subsequently uses (explaining, for example – which is quite unnecessary – what a symbol, flag, or emblem is). With these introductory remarks done, the images are analysed, by plebiscite territory. Wherever necessary, certain contexts and allusions are explained, including in the notes. Whenever a motif related to a given country (for instance, personification of death) appears in none of the sources the author is aware of, the other plebiscites are subsequently discussed and the absence of reference taken note of. As decided in the opening section, the proposed interpretations of posters, postcards and other sources are mostly limited to a description of what is visible on them. Apart from this simple stocktaking exercise, explanations of heraldic motifs or concerning the places and sites of significance to national historical narratives (such as the Dybbøl Mølle – a mill that was destroyed a number of times during the battles against the Prussians and the Germans, the symbol of Danish will to persist and survive). The discussion of each motif is concluded with a concise summary of the observations made. This pattern reappears a few dozen times across the book, which inevitably leads to repetitions, particularly in the concluding sections of the subchapters. The author usually finds at such points that the motif having been analysed was designed to symbolically reconfirm the strength and civilisational resilience of a nation, as opposed to its (demonised or humiliated) rival. It is at these points that the prevailing inspiration with historiography of nationalism seems to be passing by the purport of the sources which most often built upon regional, rather than national or ethnic, identities. And it is only in the conclusive part that Jebesen comes to the conclusion (which is pretty apparent to the reader in several preceding sections) that the plebiscite-related propaganda did not at all set regionality against ethno-nationalism but rather, the former – offering a collection of motifs that could be instrumental in the nationalist(ic) mobilisation of the local communities – complemented the latter. The regional motifs, Jebesen points out, proved attractive because of their imminent emotional powerfulness. The attachment to little homelands and their defence against the enemies appears to have been the predominant motif in all the cases under analysis.

An advantage of the method of analysis of visual sources assumed by Jebesen is that it enables to highlight the analogies and differences between the regions. In certain cases, which regrettably are merely ascertained in the book, direct transfer of visual motifs was the case; some of the posters were

probably plagiarised. The minor differences occurring between the original and its copy, which appeared in the course of such transfers, tell us a lot about the cultural and civilisational character of the regions concerned. An excellent example is offered by a Danish poster featuring a child holding an extemporised toy in one hand and the Danish flag in the other (p. 184). The featured slogan, in German, was targeted at the mothers and suggested between the lines that voting for Denmark is their only chance to be extricated, together with their families, from the post-war poverty. The Polish version of the poster, which was propagated in Upper Silesia, seems identical at first glance – except for the Danish flag replaced by a pennant with the White Eagle and the slogan persuading to vote for Poland (p. 189). Yet, one finds the message peculiar, owing to a characteristic detail: a holy medallion with the acronym 'IHS' featured on the neck of the 'Polish' child distracts the viewer's attention from the social or living quality problems – otherwise represented in the original Danish concept – toward religious differences. Indeed, the economic argument appeared in the Polish-German propaganda war more often on the German than Polish side. Instead of promising the mothers prosperity or welfare, the Polish poster strove to incline them to testify to their attachment to the Polish Catholic tradition.

On the other hand, the study under review illustrates the disadvantages of an overly consistent application of a method in analysis of visual discourse. The historical context accompanying the descriptions of the pictures seems to have been marginalised. The posters, postcards and other sources analysed in the study were not some abstract beings but were one of the many channels through which the propaganda was disseminated. Some of them refer to certain other pronouncements or facts about which the reader, in most cases, has no chance to learn. One example of such unsatisfactory contextualisation is the discussion of a *notgeld* that was (probably) issued by the Poles during the struggle for Upper Silesia, envisaging the activist, journalist and politician Wojciech Korfanty, a group of insurgents and a few, clearly symbolic, figures – though the author would not tell us in specific what they namely symbolise or epitomise (p. 266). Similarly hidden from the reader is the context in which the works were created. Obviously, in case of political propaganda that was, at times, prepared hastily and proved artistically lowbrow, it is not always worthwhile or possible to identify the artist or the circumstances of the work's appearance. All the same, a trip (or two) to the zone of micro-history would have done the book a favour. It would perhaps have allowed to avoid some misinterpretations (to be discussed in a moment). One more drawback of the assumed method, particularly irritating while reading this book, is that the narrative is too strictly subjected to the motifs featured in the posters. The point is, while selecting the available material, the author is every time 'driven' by a single selected motif. Where the images are ambiguous or represent several symbols at a time, a selection has to be made – yet, the

criteria behind it are not clear enough to the reader. As a result, the allegories of the countries and regions can be found in a subchapter on effigies of women (which is formally fine, with female figures being the case) as well as in the one dealing with economic arguments. Separate subchapters discuss women and children, but the picture showing a mother shielding her children from an armed Prussian (in a *Pickelhaube* helmet) is mentioned in none of them: instead, it is covered in a fragment discussing the portraits of servicemen. Another example: in the plebiscites under analysis, the Germans made references to a peculiarly understood historical justice, admonishing the voters against giving the fruit of German several centuries' work away to aliens. The standard slogan "Do not let strangers harvest the crop grown out of the grain sown by the German hand!" was preferably illustrated with a figure of sower, which is dealt with in a separate subchapter. Sometimes, however, there is no sower portrayed – as in the Upper Silesian postcard (p. 201) where the artist satisfied himself with a view of sown fields, complemented with a variant of the above-quoted slogan. In line with the proposed pattern, such representations, although bearing a different message, belong to the subchapter 'Landscape', set there next to the symbolic depictions of Upper Silesian industry and images of specific locations. Such mechanical distribution of the analysed material makes it difficult to grasp the accompanying message. It seems, for instance, that the actual significance of fear of conscription among the voters (which for Great War veterans meant being conscribed once anew) escapes the author's attention. Leaflets and posters warning against coerced recruitment in case the plebiscite voting fails used diverse motifs, featuring soldiers, tearful mothers, workers or farmers detached from work, and even personified death; hence, the author scatters them here and there, following the logic of the image. This is actually legitimate and consistent – and yet she loses sight of the living people who created the propaganda as well as its consumers.

Some errors in the interpretation of the images come as an indirect consequence of the author's assumptions. With more focus on the history behind these works, such errors would probably not have occurred. The book contains a reproduction of a poster showing a drowning boat 'Austria' with three despaired and emaciated castaways on-board (p. 247). Jebesen interprets it as a Hungarian plebiscite poster designed to persuade the inhabitants of Burgenland to vote for Hungary, using economic arguments – hence the image of poverty-stricken post-war Republic of Austria. In reality, the poster, dated 1919 (the date is visible on the reproduction) – two years before the plebiscite – was made by a Hungarian leftist artist, Mihály Biró. During the plebiscite Biró resided in Vienna (which probably would have hindered his alleged contribution to anti-Austrian propaganda campaign); moreover, he could not be further away from a willingness to support Regent Horthy's extreme rightist regime that ran Hungary at the time. Contrary to Jebesen's absurdist

interpretation, his work was meant to arouse compassion rather than aversion, and was not meant to be received by the people of Sopron. Another instance of inaccurate understanding is possibly the evaluation of a *notgeld* from Schleswig (p. 112). The idea that a banknote could have been a product of pro-Danish (thus, anti-German) propaganda on the front side, simultaneously being pro-German (anti-Danish) on the back side, excellently exemplifies the fatal consequence of one-sided analysis of sources, which cannot be properly understood without the context.

Apart from the serious deficits, stemming (directly or indirectly) from the author's method, the book is not free from simple errors, especially in the spelling of Polish or Slovene names proper. Some translations of the texts featured on Hungarian or Slovenian posters do not really follow the original. Mistakes as to the facts or fallacies are met less frequently, and seem to have appeared because of hastiness or clumsiness, rather than actual ignorance. One such mistake is that the German Reich handed the Klaipeda District back to Poland (p. 44). The argument that the comers from the depths of Germany heavily influenced the outcome of the Upper Silesian plebiscite diverges from the state of the art. As we know today, this argument was based on multiply manipulated data, mainly to boost the spirits of the Poles.⁵

One more objection I should like to express relates to how the material has been selected. Contrary to the assumptions behind the study, some of the reproduced posters were not produced in the context of the plebiscites but formed part of more extensive propaganda campaigns. This is mainly true for the Hungarian revisionist posters that evoked the country's territory and symbols from before the Treaty of Trianon. Most of them are rather loosely related to the study's actual subject-matter, which makes them different from the Polish, German, Danish, or Yugoslav posters analysed in parallel.

Apart from the critical remarks, the material collected and systematised in the study under review makes one reflect on the iconography of European nationalisms. It is striking how often they use the same motifs, sometimes outright copying the ideas of the others. While the book by Nina Jebesen triggers criticism, mainly due to scarce contextualisation of the analysed images and a variety of errors, it nonetheless does convincingly demonstrate the similarities between the visual narratives.

trans. Tristan Korecki

Maciej Górny

⁵ Benjamin Conrad, 'Die Fälschung einer Niederlage. Zur Rolle der Heimkehrer in der Oberschlesien-Abstimmung 1921', *Inter Finitimos*, ix, 2011, 103–118.

Anna Landau-Czajka, *Polska to nie oni. Polska i Polacy w polskojęzycznej prasie żydowskiej II Rzeczypospolitej* [Poland – That's not Them. Poland and Poles in the Polish-Jewish Press in the Interwar Period], Żydowski Instytut Historyczny im. Emanuela Ringelbluma, Warszawa, 2015, 375 pp.

The main aim of Anna Landau-Czajka's work, *Polska to nie oni. Polska i Polacy w polskojęzycznej prasie żydowskiej II Rzeczypospolitej*, is to present an overall and complete-as-possible image of Poland and Poles in the Polish-Jewish press in the interwar period. According to the author's claims, it is estimated that – depending on the criteria used – in those days there were between 160 and 365 press titles which could be classified as the Polish-Jewish press. The scholar – a sociologist and a historian – personally reviewed approx. 115 titles. Among them were dailies, weeklies, monthlies, trade periodicals, and journals dedicated to various groups of readers and consumers, including both widely known titles as well as those with a small local readership. In addition, the author included some memoirs in her research.

Her book consists of seven parts. Chapter 1 depicts the phenomenon of the Polish-Jewish press in the interwar period. What emerges is a cultural borderland, with all its implications. The author highlights not only the multilingual society of Polish Jews, which included Jews functioning in a variety of cultural systems, but also the fact of Polish readers of the publications. Due to the language medium chosen (Polish), this press was read as well as reprinted by non-Jews. Thus the question arises to what extent we might imagine, for instance, a category of a Jewish communication community, or how such a recognition affected discourses in the Polish-Jewish press. In addition, the author herself is a Polish reader. Although she examined a wide spectrum of readers as well as a plethora of press titles, it nevertheless seems impossible to depict such a concept in its all complexity and variety in a single chapter.

The next chapters deal with patriotism issues. Chapter 2 focuses on the attitudes of Jews towards the idea of an independent Poland, particularly during the Great War and the Polish-Soviet War. Moreover, the author identifies two mutually-exclusive legends spread about Jews in this regard, both deeply rooted in the Polish collective imagination. One asserts the Jews' predilection for communism, even to point of being willing to spy; while the other portrays Jews as persons looking forward to Poland regaining independence. Taking into account the relevance of these legends, the scholar discusses the reactions towards anti-Jewish pogroms in the Polish-Jewish press. As the author suggests, Jewish commentators usually tried to convince readers that while the culprits were Polish, Polish society had no responsibility for the violence.

While Chapter 2 considers the days on the eve of Polish independence, Chapter 3 focuses on the interwar period. In it the author shows various forms of Jewish manifestations of Polish patriotism, including ones in the public sphere and concerning celebrations of national holidays. Another general tendency in the Polish-Jewish press is also highlighted. Anna Landau-Czajka claims it was rare for Jews to consider Poland to be an exclusive option in terms of permanent residence and to rule out other potential places of destination and settlement.

Whilst the main idea of the reviewed study is to present a general picture, Chapter 4 stands out in its presentation of a particular issue – the phenomenon of Józef Piłsudski, as a politician and a legend – both during his life as well as in the *post-mortem* continuity of his cult. What should be appreciated is that the author not only offers examples of relatively widely-known components of his golden legend, but also shows some contradictions. The best example of this would be sorrows and deep resentments towards Piłsudski's unfulfilled promises expressed on pages of the Polish-Jewish press following the statesman's death.

Chapter 5 deals with the perception of Poles as a crucial issue for Jewish self-identity. Anna Landau-Czajka examines the phenomenon of cultural strangeness, which was one-sided, indeed. While Jews reading the Polish-Jewish press were acculturated, and consequently, immersed – more or less deeply – in the Polish culture, the Jewish culture remained unknown for most Poles. Having said that, the author offers some examples to show that this overly simplistic view was more complex in reality. One such example is the coexistence of Poles and Jews considered to be the intelligentsia in small towns.

In the penultimate chapter Anna Landau-Czajka examines the issue of Polish anti-Semitism. While overall her perspective is rather wide and general, she does however offer some exceptions, showing the aforementioned phenomenon in the light of particular waves of anti-Jewish collective violence, for example in a series of conflicts which erupted between Polish and Jewish students in the 1930s. The last chapter shows the cultural battle of both Jewish and Polish circles against assimilation. As the author shows, not only did the opponents of assimilation condemn integrationists, but they also harshly rejected the idea of a dual identity, particularly the *Polish-Jewish* concept.

The source data used by the author – a plethora of press titles (at least) overviewed by her – is impressive indeed. The work, although written to deliver an overall perspective, also manages to offer items of information about local contexts, including for instance the conditions of press distribution. However, taking into account the author's basic premises as well as the scale of the whole project, a reader might experience a feeling of insufficiency and wind up with an impression of having a vague view. During my reading of the work I experienced a constant and recurring feeling that some chosen threads of the book offered a great potential for further elaboration, even at the expense

of omitting others. While remaining within her framework of a catalogue of the research questions, at the same time Anna Landau-Czajka could have proposed some more interpretative categories. Besides, one could question the extent to which it is reasonable to follow the applied method of press research – reading, for instance, issues of the chosen month of each year – at the expense of focusing on particular events. It seems to me that it would have been beneficial to offer more examples contextualising and interpreting the events, giving insights into the more dynamic and complex questions.

proofreading James Hartzell

Marzena Szugiero

Najmniej jestem tam gdzie jestem ... Listy Zofii z Vorzimmerów Breustedt z Warszawy i getta warszawskiego do córki Marysi w Szwajcarii (1939–1942) [‘There’s the least of mine where I am ...’ Zofia Breustedt, née Vorzimmer’s letters from Warsaw and the Warsaw Ghetto to her daughter Marysia in Switzerland, 1939–42], ed., with an introduction and comments by Elżbieta Orman, German-language texts trans. by Elżbieta Wrońska, Fundacja Centrum Dokumentacji Czynu Niepodległościowego, Księgarnia Akademicka, and Instytut Historii PAN, Kraków and Warszawa, 2016, 320 pp.

A volume of letters written in the Warsaw Ghetto is, inherently, a disheartening piece of reading; yet, when reading this particular book, one cannot resist the charm of its author’s personality. Before we meet her ‘in person’ through her letters, we make an initial acquaintance with Zofia in the sketch ‘In the eye of micro-history’ penned by Elżbieta Orman, the volume’s editor. This vivid and erudite essay, excellently written – showing deep respect, fondness and understanding for the characters’ choices and attitudes, whilst keeping the necessary scholarly distance – could function as a separate booklet. Both parts of the volume are mutually complementary, showing different perspectives. These perspectives open towards unusual people, for the author’s family background was unusual indeed.

The Altenberg bookstore was much of an institution in the pre-1914 Lwów; it was actually one of the major publishing institutions in Polish (Austrian-ruled) Galicia, with enormous merits in editing and publishing classical works of Polish literature. Róża Altenberg, the enterprise owner’s daughter, married her father’s associate Jakub Vorzimmer, an independence activist and admirer of Józef Piłsudski. Their marriage broke up a few years later. Róża’s two sons, Henryk and Tadeusz, brought up in a patriotic spirit, joined the Polish Legions in the First World War and took part in a series

of battles that continued until the 1920 Polish-Soviet War. One of them became later on an eminent Polish historian; his brother was killed in the Katyn massacre. They assumed the surname Wereszycki in 1924 (after the Wereszyca [*Vereshitsa*] River by which they fought in 1920).

Their sister Zofia, the central character of the book, was a painter. Elżbieta Orman carefully reconstructs her short-lived artistic career, and shows us reproductions of the few surviving paintings, along with those of which only photographs remain. Zofia Vorzimmer got married to a German painter Hans Breustedt. They lived in poverty – in fact, an artistic poverty with scarce food available but not without trips to Italy to practice open-air painting sessions, making friends with Paul Klee, Walter Gropius, and others. Their situation became complicated with Hitler's assumption of power in 1933. Although Hans is not of Jewish descent, he is married to a Jewish woman and does not intend to divorce her. This leads to his exclusion from the chamber of professional painting artists, which implies a ban on selling his works, thus preventing a moneymaking opportunity. Their poverty grows increasingly gnawing; the artists make some ornaments for living, but get less and less commissions. They cannot afford to emigrate to America, so they decide to go to Poland. This is not an easy step to make: the Second Republic was not quite enthusiastic about receiving the Polish Jews who wanted to flee from the German Reich. Yet, they finally succeed: Henryk Wereszycki, a reserve lieutenant and a former Legions soldier, employed with the 'Józef Piłsudski' Institute of Recent History, had some personal relationships contracted during the wartime years. He used the opportunity to (reportedly) access the Prime Minister himself, Felicjan Sławoj Składkowski, helped to this end by his Institute superior, Lieutenant-Colonel Waclaw Lipiński (later on, a merited organiser of the September 1939 Warsaw defence against the Nazis and anticommunist conspiratorial activist after 1945, who was killed by the communists at the Wronki prison). The Breustedts finally arrived in Warsaw in June 1939.

The couple were delighted. They met with their families and friends and collected money to eventually buy a ticket to America. But they were not successful enough to leave before 1 September. Being a German, Hans was arrested immediately after the war broke out, and Henryk Wereszycki again had to rescue him using his acquaintances. Shortly after that, the Wereszycki brothers were mobilised and set off to join their assigned military units; Zofia and Hans remained in Warsaw. They survived the nightmare of the city's siege; once the Germans entered the city, they decided that Hans should go back to Weimar and thereafter had his wife join him there. It seemed to them that a handful of formalities will do the job – still not fully aware what kind of a world has emerged around. Once everything was settled, a ghetto was set up in Warsaw – and all the permits immediately lost their validity. Zofia found herself enclosed in the ghetto whilst Hans was conscribed with

the Wehrmacht and sent to the Eastern Front. Zofia's brothers were taken captives – Henryk by the Germans and Tadeusz by the Soviets. Tadeusz's family were hiding within Warsaw and then in a village near Cracow; Zofia's mother stayed in Lwów whereas her father remained in Warsaw.

There was, however, one more aspect to the story – quite an important one, without which the book would have not been written. The Breustedts had a daughter, Marysia, who was born in 1922. In 1938, the last moment it was possible, they had her sent to Switzerland, to their friends' place. Marysia was the addressee of Zofia's letters now published.

Marysia received letters from her mother and from her father. She informed her grandaunt in the United States of what was taking place in Poland using words that sound like a cruel irony today: "Mum is in Warsaw, doing well. Babbo [thus Hans was nicknamed by Zofia and Marysia] is in the Eastern Front" (p. 103). She would send her mother parcels to the ghetto; Henryk Wereszycki sent her his officer's pay received as a POW, Hans also tried to help by sending parcels. As a result, being a ghetto resident, Zofia could enjoy pretty good material standard of living. This is why she invited her mother to live with her in the ghetto since January 1942, who had lived in poverty at the 'Aryan' side before. As Róża Altenberg tells her granddaughter, "I am awfully happy being ... together with your Mum, for a week now" (p. 261). What she did seems incomprehensible today; but the truth is that one can live and make decisions as the future is hidden from them.

Elżbieta Orman emphasises the emotional balance and personal optimism of the letters' author. In spite of a bearable material situation, she had no illusions about her situation. She wrote her daughter how horrible it is "in the depths of Asia" (pp. 221, 225), and Marysia had to decipher the message for herself. But she also wrote, "I believe I feel too good" (p. 233). She clearly wanted to keep her daughter undisturbed. But there was more to it: she could enjoy petty things, reminisce her happy moments from the past or figure out those to possibly come, or get mentally transferred to works of art or alien countries. The quote from a letter made part of the book's title – "There's the least of mine where I am" – expresses this attitude. As Orman tells us, it was when in the ghetto that Zofia began considering herself a fully mature person.

Contrasting with this personal optimism is the increasing horror of the situation, the intensifying nightmare, like a bad dream with no awakening; not in this world, at least. "The coil is tightening, at night I hear it, // tighter and tighter, trembling and roaring", the words of Krzysztof Kamil Baczyński's poem¹ kept resounding in my ears as I read through those letters. For this story ended as it was bound to end: Mrs. Altenberg and her daughter were killed during the Ghetto's liquidation in August 1942, most probably

¹ The opening lines of the poem *Z głową na karabinie* (written in December 1943).

deported to the extermination camp in Treblinka; the exact date of their death is unknown.

But the war finally ended as well. The one who received the letters survived; so did her father and so did Henryk Wereszycki, the only member of the family who stayed in Poland. His long letter to his niece written in the summer of 1945 (pp. 285–8) is dry and to-the-point: "... as you probably know, none of our relatives has stayed alive". He did not feel he was a member of the winning nation. "The most important thing that keeps me alive is the duty: you need to work. This is the only option for one to be able to struggle for national identity. We have been defeated too."

In one of the most moving fragments of the book, Wereszycki, finally released and back home, writes a sorrowful and cordial letter to his brother-in-law: "My beloved Hans, ... I am now left completely alone in this altered world ..." (p. 288). This is how individual human friendships triumph over collective hatreds, Micro-history over Macro-history. I think I can understand Wereszycki's books somewhat better now. His most important studies, recently reissued and available at bookstores, are about the nineteenth century – to primarily recall *Pod berłem Habsburgów* [Under the Habsburg sceptre] (1975), an excellent synthesis of Central European nationality questions, and the trilogy *Sojusz trzech cesarzy* [The three emperors' alliance] (1965–77), describing the formation of a system of alliances which eventually led to the First World War. When I first read them, as a grammar school and then university student – long, long years ago – I knew nothing of their author's biography. I was delighted by their reflexivity: meditation on the evanescence of the world, incongruence between intentions and effects, and nullity of the intents of even the wisest of diplomats – a rather rare thing in scholarly literature. Never expressed in words, such threads were glaringly omnipresent. Today, I think that the man's tragic wartime experiences must have influenced his perspective on the past.

It is difficult to come at a conclusion. The family Altenberg/Vorzimmer/Wereszycki did not consider themselves Jews. Their background was Polish patriotic intelligentsia of Galicia, strongly involved in the independence movement. Before September 1939 they could suppose that, in spite of the anti-Semitic attitudes so strongly manifested in interwar Poland, their descent would gradually become of no significance whatsoever, remaining but a genealogical curiosity. The war and the occupation changed everything. Most of the family perished. How they responded to the tragedy, what they thought and how they behaved is shown in the book. But the book raises a wider afterthought. That Polishness, in terms of a multicultural whole, has incurred a damage because of the annihilation of Polish Jewry, is remarked by a number of authors. The damage borne by the Polish intelligentsia by losing a generation of assimilated patriotically-inclined intelligentsia of Jewish origin, which contributed to Polishness a hard-to-define singularity, has probably

not been considered as thoroughly. While intelligentsia found themselves excruciatingly gelded after the war, some of its groups had been affected more than the others – the one in question most of all. What would Polish intelligentsia be like today, with people such as the characters of the book under discussion still being part of it, we can only figure out.

trans. *Tristan Korecki*

Maciej Janowski

John J. Kulczycki, *Belonging to the Nation. Inclusion and Exclusion in the Polish-German Borderlands 1939–1951*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2016, 402 pp.

Who is a Pole? Which are the concrete characteristics that distinguish Poles from Germans and others? Perhaps language, religion, or simply ‘self-identification’ can serve to make this distinguish. But, as John Kulczycki shows in this important book, none of those criteria were found adequate by the post-war Polish authorities. In the years after the war, the population of Poland was in massive flux: from the eastern *Kresy* to the newly gained post-German lands in the west, from the countryside back into cities, from villages into newly constructed industrial towns. One important aspect of this flux was deciding what to do with individuals of ‘doubtful’ nationality, those who had signed up as *Volksdeutsche* during the war, others who spoke dialects not quite Polish or not quite German. In stark contrast to the contemporary situation in Czechoslovakia, the Polish authorities were quite willing to grant citizenship to thousands of ex-*Volksdeutsche*, autochthons, and others as long as they pledge loyalty to the Polish state and nation. In practice, however, this process was far from simple. Kulczycki’s thorough research reveals for the first time (in particular for an English-speaking audience) the complicated details of an important and little-known episode in postwar Polish history.

In order to understand what happens after 1945, one must be familiar with the complicated and tragic events of 1939 to 1945. Kulczycki provides an admirable overview of German policies toward Poles, *Volksdeutsche*, and other ethnic groups in occupied Poland. He makes clear that different regions of Poland were under quite different regimes in this respect. For example, in Silesia individuals of German background were strongly pressured into signing up as *Volksdeutsche* while elsewhere declaration of one’s German-ness (however attenuated) was more voluntary. These policies would have a direct impact on post-war rules and attitudes toward the ex-*Volksdeutsche*. The Germans created four categories of *Volksdeutsche* by the DVL Ordinance of 4 March 1941. Those assigned to group I had shown their active support for German nationality and politics; group II had merely “demonstrably proven their Germanness” (p. 33) without active participation in German political

or social groups. As for categories III and IV, these included individuals of 'German descent' but not citizenship; many speakers of Slavic languages deemed 'racially German' fell into these groups. The higher the group, the better the privileges, job opportunities, and rations. On the other hand, some Polish citizenships were involuntarily included in one of these categories and drafted into the Wehrmacht.

Kulczycki makes clear that the seeming simplicity of these categories was in fact much more muddled in practice. In different parts of occupied Poland, officials took more or less seriously the need to prove one's 'Germanness' in the form of German grandparents, the use of the language at home, or even 'racial criteria'. Further complicating matters, at times officials were so overwhelmed by central directives that they thrust individuals into categories without any knowledge or acquiescence. Conversely, these overworked bureaucrats simply rejected any doubtful applications to be included on the DVL. And groups like the Mazurs were more or less automatically included as 'potential Germans', even when these doggedly continued to use their own language despite German directives.

Such was the confusing background of Polish officials' tasks in the post-war period. In attempting to sort 'Germans' from 'Poles' in these years, official policy followed two more-or-less contradictory aims. On the one hand, truly disloyal 'Germans' who could not be integrated into the Polish nation should be expelled. On the other, given the severe depopulation of Poland during the war, leniency should be shown to individuals who showed any possibility of a change in attitude or desire to integrate with other Poles. And, of course, the attempt to categorize citizens was complicated by a variety of factors: women waiting for their husbands to return from military or labor service, fears that any notice by the authorities would lead to deportation to Siberia, uncertainty about one's own wishes: stay 'at home' in Poland or leave for Germany to make a new life.

Kulczycki's book is arranged chronologically and focuses mainly on the half-dozen years from the 'liberation' of Poland by the Red Army to the end of mass resettlement/deportation in 1951. As he shows, a number of factors determined policy toward 'doubtful' Poles in this period. A primary issue was the shifting of Poland's borders approximately 150 miles westward. The 'recovered lands' (to use the ideologically charged phrase employed by the communists) in the west were to be more or less cleansed of Germans, then re-peopled by Poles. To be sure, thousands of Germans had fled already before the arrival of the Red Army, but many 'doubtful' individuals remained. The situation was further complicated by the arrival of tens of thousands of 'repatriates' from the former eastern territories of the Polish republic which had been incorporated into the USSR in 1944–5. Thus material, political, ethnic, ideological, and practical issues collided in the formulation and execution of population policy here.

While the Polish Republic (soon to be 'People's Republic') had little interest in retaining Germans as citizens, the murkiness of ethnic-cultural identity was such that central policy (essentially, to keep as many people as possible, given the huge depopulation of the country 1939–45) often clashes with local perceptions and interests. To take just one example: in February 1945 it was decreed that *Volksdeutsche* of categories II, III, or IV who did not voluntarily sign up to the DVL and who showed some Polish national characteristics were specifically given the right of 'rehabilitation' and citizenship (p. 111). Many local officials – Kulczycki provides a number of specific cases and objections to such blanket rulings – protested that local conditions had to be taken into account, such as the Polish mothers whose three sons were (without their permission) placed on the DVL (presumably in order to be drafted into the Wehrmacht). On the other hand, local officials often knew of specific anti-Polish behaviors during the war years, or took the opportunity to blackmail applicants, or simply refused to forward doubtful cases without generous bribes from applicants.

The agreement at the first post-war conference at Potsdam (August 1945) that only recognized a provisional Polish-German border on the west spurred the government to push harder to populate the western territories, aiming to create a *fait accompli* of a solidly Polish population in this area. But, again, the complicating factor was just how to determine 'Polishness'. Kulczycki cites example after example of central authorities bemoaning the fact that 'Polish' (or at least potentially Polish) individuals and families were often deported along with the Germans. In order to prevent this, in 1946 a central directive was issued to verify nationality of these doubtful individuals in a way that recognized the potential Polishness of autochthons, even when these had had German citizenship before 1945. Kulczycki quotes Władysław Gomułka from March 1946 as declaring, "Even those who over the years succumbed to Germanization should be restored to Poland." (p. 170) The autochthons also provided the Polish government with living proofs of the essential Polishness of the 'restored' territories. On the other hand, by this point most autochthons, whether or not they considered themselves truly 'German', in any case desired to leave Poland. Political insecurity, looting, and mistreatment both by local officials and newly arrived Poles from the east combined to convince many autochthons that leaving their homeland for Germany was the best option. Even when, as often happened from mid-1946 onward, individuals were rehabilitated and cleared of crimes against Polishness, their property was rarely restored to them.

With the tightening of communist control in Poland and the ending of mass expulsions in 1947, policies entered a new phase. Ironically, state policies aiming to woo 'doubtful' Poles were increasingly met by petitions to leave Poland on the part of those individuals. The state stepped up Polonization courses and educational efforts to integrate autochthons, Mazurs, and

ex-Volksdeutsche who were deemed appropriate for integration. But by now the repressive policies of the (still proto-)PRL were becoming more and more clear, relatives who had ended up in Germany were being located, and material conditions continued to be grim. In such a situation, despite the fact that the government extended a blanket rehabilitation in 1950 to all remaining category III and IV *Volksdeutsche* (over 1.7 million of them), many of these continued to suffer discrimination as 'not quite Polish'.

Perhaps the most surprising aspect of John Kulczycki's excellent book is the consistent effort of the Polish government throughout this period to retain as many 'potential Poles' as possible – as long as they had not shown themselves as enthusiastic Nazis or had committed other crimes. This contrasts sharply with the contemporary attitudes of the Czechoslovak state toward its Germans who, even when protesting their affinity to the Czech nation, were simply shipped out. To be sure, the situation in Poland was more complex, with many local peasants truly not seeing themselves as either German or Polish but 'locals'. Still, the prevalence of 'national indifference' and even pre-national attitudes toward identity that Kulczycki so richly documents provide a corrective to facile tendencies toward nationality policies in this region. This is a book that in its approach, depth of research, and richness of examples, should be read by anyone seriously interested in post-war Polish history.

Theodore R. Weeks

Tom Junes, *Student Politics in Communist Poland: Generations of Consent and Dissent*, Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, 2015, 328 pp.

Unlike women, who until recently were almost non-existent in the standard historical narratives about the opposition to the communist regimes in East-Central Europe, students have from the very beginning gained a rightful place among those who contested these regimes. Since the extensive live coverage of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 by Radio Free Europe, every historical account of this first major upheaval in the Soviet bloc has underlined the crucial role played by the students, who demonstrated their solidarity with Poland by marching on 23 October to the Budapest statue of the 1848 military commander, General Józef Bem. Moreover, the student heroes who lost their young lives under communism became – through the symbol of their supreme sacrifice – genuine catalysts of forbidden memory. Jan Palach, the Czech student who set himself on fire after the so-called 'normalization' destroyed all the hopes for change which the Prague Spring had nurtured, has remained a powerful symbol of the revolt against an oppressive system. In Poland, the controversial death of Stanisław Pyjas, the Cracow student who

was very active in the Workers' Defence Committee, has become a symbol for the lawlessness and brutality which characterized the anti-opposition actions of the communist secret police (Pol.: *Służba Bezpieczeństwa*). However, in the standard historical narrative of Poland under communism, student-led movements are most prominent with respect to the protests of March 1968, which made them not only the protagonists in one of the major revolts in the country, but also part of a transnational wave of anti-system European demonstrations on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

At the outset, one may rightly ask what new light this book sheds on the generations of dissent and consent in communist Poland? Above all, the book renews the spirit of in-depth inquiry, which is increasingly disappearing in historical writings due to the enormous pressure to publish for the sake of making an academic career. Tom Junes' volume is one of those rare publications which arises out of passionate research on a particular topic, as well as from hard work based on the extensive use of multiple primary sources and solid methodological underpinnings. A left-oriented student activist himself, the author embarks with visible empathy on a study of student politics in the recent past of a country which is not his own, yet at the same time is not totally alien, for he is of Polish descent. Junes seems to have spared no effort to analyse an impressive number of primary sources in the Polish language, including unedited archival materials from 15 repositories besides the already published volumes of documents. He also consulted almost 30 different periodicals, among which many are from the student press and publications. In addition, he interviewed no less than 50 persons, including three conversations with the legendary and highly influential Karol Modzelewski.

The methodological backbone of the book is, as suggested in the very title, the rather controversial and vague idea of generations. But Junes is able to make good use of this concept by redefining it to fit the purpose of his inquiry into student politics. In fact, one of the first things that strike the reader is the number of generations which succeeded each other in the almost forty-five years of communism in Poland. They number no less than eight, which makes this book unique compared to all others, which use the more traditional idea of generation and refer to three different age groups with different perspectives on communism: one with recollected experiences of the pre-communist period; another born and raised under communism; and the other being the one that reached maturity around the time of the collapse of communism.

Junes' concept of generation is more restrictive and precise, thus making it a useful methodological tool. For him, to speak of a generation makes sense only as long as it is strictly related to the common socialization between same-age cohorts during university years, i.e. during undergraduate studies (five years in communist Poland). Taking into account that the student body is continuously changing due to the normal process of graduation, it can

be assumed that approximately every five years there is a totally new social group in universities, which might be considered as a new generation. The author emphasizes that, on the one hand, each of these generations of Polish students were marked by the same experiences, which definitely shaped the way they related to politics. But on the other hand, he clearly illustrates that different groups in the same generation could react differently to these formative experiences, so in each age cohort there were at least two contrasting 'generational units'. Thus, the spirit of dissent was transmitted from one generation to another, in spite of the fact that some same-age cohorts were more consenting than others, as the very succession of major upheavals in the historical evolution of communist post-war Poland suggests.

While the first generation identified by Tom Junes, which he calls the 'lost generation', was homogenous in its past-oriented recollections and inter-war conceptions, the second generation, that of the 'great leap forward', definitely marked a major break with the pre-communist interwar period. As the author illustrates, this break resulted to a great extent from the need of the communist regime to create its own elite by doubling the number of students and explicitly offering the young people of peasant or worker backgrounds opportunities that were not available to them before communism. A former activist in the Union of Polish Youth (Pol.: *Związek Młodzieży Polskiej*, ZMP) recalls the following about the experiences of this generation: "My beliefs grew out of my experience. ... I was, of course, aware that if you are a member of the ZMP, you had certain privileges, for example to be able to get a higher education. But I also knew that the ZMP was an opportunity for the rural youth ... to get out of the overpopulated countryside, to learn a profession." (p. 30). This quote implicitly suggests the ambivalence of this generation, which fully engaged in building the socialist Poland, but for different purposes. Leaving aside the counter-culture which had already emerged at that time among those groups which found the Stalinist compulsory rituals to be boring and empty, according to Junes the students who allowed themselves to be absorbed by the official propaganda formed two distinct 'generational units'. On the one hand were those who truly believed in the wonderful ideals of a just and egalitarian society, and on the other those who opportunistically used the new ethos to build a better life for themselves. Junes underlines that it was the group of the true believers that inspired the revolt of the next generation, which seized the opportunities offered by de-Stalinization to become instrumental in the Polish October of 1956.

Of course this dynamic is not unpredictable or surprising, but the author's work has the merit of documenting it thoroughly and, more interesting, illustrating it by adding a multitude of personal experiences, recalled today by individuals who were once involved in student politics. While Poles who have read Karol Modzelewski's much-praised memoirs might find it rather banal to refer to an interview with him as if it were something revealing,

those who, due to the language barrier, did not have this privilege are at least given a glimpse into the worldview of this generation through Junes's efforts. "The only language we knew was that of the communist newspapers, communist radio ... and the youth organization. It was all one and the same", points out Modzelewski before explaining the reaction of his generation to Xruščev's Secret Speech of 1956, which was quickly translated into Polish and circulated underground. To him and his colleagues, who were all "raised according to Marxist principles", the explanation of Stalinist terror as the result of concentrating the entire power in the hands of a single man was "unlikely". On the contrary, Modzelewski continues, "if such things were going on, then it was not one person but the system. It was necessary to make an analysis of society and it was clear that it was the system. And if the system was to blame, that meant the system was bad. And if the system was bad, then it needed to be abolished. And if the system needed to be abolished – and it was them who taught us this – then it needed to be done in a revolutionary way." And revolutions, according to Marxist-Leninist views, were to be carried out by workers, but with the instrumental help of "the intelligentsia, which imbues the working class with a revolutionary consciousness." Thus ends Modzelewski's argument about the theoretical foundations of 1956 (p. 47). In Junes' words, the generation of youth socialized under Stalinism became "the nemesis of the Stalinist project" (p. 58), for it was Stalinism that taught them how a real revolutionary dedicated to a project of societal change must have thought and acted.

Followed by the generally conformist generation of the 'small stabilisation', as the author defines it, the generation of 1956 nonetheless inspired a veritable myth among the following age cohort, which comprised a 'generational unit' of dissenters who, in their turn, would catalyse the emergence of the next nearly-mythical student generation, that of 1968. With respect to this generation, Junes' research really breaks new ground, as he announces in fact from the very beginning of his work. The conventional knowledge about the events of 1968 is that students revolted against the regime, while workers refrained from joining a protest that was not theirs, while in turn during the next – working class – revolt of 1970, the students failed to manifest any solidarity with the workers. Not only are students of communism familiar with this interpretation of Polish post-war history, but so too is any film connoisseur, because it was above all the world-wide known cinematic narrative *Man of Iron* by the famous Polish director Andrzej Wajda that disseminated this version of the story.

The author, however, demonstrates that the largest group of people arrested in 1968 were not students, who represented only one fifth of the prosecuted individuals, but workers. It was the official propaganda, underscoring the alleged division between students and workers that created, in combination with the myths surrounding the foundation of the Solidarity

(Pol.: *Solidarność*) movement, the above-mentioned narrative about the Polish 1968 (p. 113). The author also puts the Polish protests of 1968 in the larger context of European revolts of that year, and underlines not only the transnational influence of the Prague Spring upon Polish students, but also the crucial differences, which are illustrated by a comparison between the French and the Polish movements. Both were indeed part of a European transnational phenomenon, which allows students from many countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain who matured politically due to the experience of this revolt to use the term ‘class of 1968’. Yet, the protests of 1968 in Western countries had a considerable impact on their respective societies, while those in the communist countries, including Poland, only “exposed the true nature of the regime”. By doing so, they changed the beliefs of a whole generation, which had to suddenly confront not only the state violence, but also the adverse official propaganda.

Yet many from the generation of 1968 would later play important roles in the history of Poland. Above all, as the secret police archives illustrate, the same age cohort went onto the streets in 1970 in support of the rebellious workers. Later its members, who were no longer students, played a crucial role in the opposition movements which emerged beginning in the second half of the 1970s. However, with regard to student political activism the author argues that the next generation was characterized by ‘socialist complacency’, by a lack of action due to self-contentment, which he contrasts with the ‘acquiescence’, i.e. the reluctant acceptance without protest which was typical for the generation of the ‘small stabilisation’ (p. 143). Nevertheless, the generation of ‘socialist complacency’ included significant ‘islands of dissent’ which were located in various cities, most notably in Cracow and Gdańsk, and evolved to a great extent under the influence of the Catholic Church. These defiant groups ensured the transfer of political activism to the next generation, that of 1981. Obviously, this subsequent generation was marked by the fundamental experience of witnessing the emergence of *Solidarność*, which inspired them to establish the first post-war national student movement which was built up from below, the Independent Students’ Association (Pol.: *Niezależne Zrzeszenie Studentów*, NZS). Although the period of Martial Law put an end to this independent mass student movement, its spirit survived and was fully embraced by the later and last generation, that of 1989.

This last generation, which experienced the *Solidarność* movement during childhood, no longer entertained any illusions about the communist regime. Not only had the students’ beliefs changed, but the times had also changed, and the involvement in clandestine activities was no longer very dangerous – arrest no longer meant imprisonment, but only a mild form of harassment as compared to previous periods. Thus, the ‘children of *Solidarność*’ represented a politically very active generation, which revived the banned NZS in the underground. As one of its members recalls: “We, as children, remembered

1980. ... Both my parents later became members of *Solidarność* and talked about politics at home all the time. ... The legal and normal life was terribly grey and very boring. Communism was not only a criminal system that killed millions of people, including some in my family, but in my personal experience it was above all just terribly grey and boring. ... The only thing in that situation that gave me a certain drive was this kind of activity. ... Something was happening” (p. 233).

As Junes underlines, the paradox of this last generation to have come of age under communism is that it did not directly contribute to the collapse of communism. Although students were extremely active in the riots of 1988, including commemorations of the revolt of 1968 in various cities, they were deliberately excluded from the Roundtable Talks by the communist authorities, who were afraid of their radicalism and preferred to negotiate with the leaders of *Solidarność*, whom they already knew from 1980–1. The negotiations did not lead to the legalization of the NZS, which made the students feel indeed betrayed. While they did nonetheless contribute to the collapse of communism by voting massively in the first free elections of June 1989, “for many a member of this generation the events of 1989 would hold an ambiguous legacy” (p. 249). And with them, Junes argues that student activism in its classical form practically vanished. As new opportunities arose with the advent of post-communism, students engaged in building personal careers rather than fighting for common societal goals.

The topic of this book has its advantages, but also its drawbacks. The focus on students’ political activism, both official and unofficial, pushes the author towards discovering their involvement in issues of common interest. However, as other reviewers have already noted, this leaves out much of the students’ everyday life, touching only briefly on the issues related to way they spent free time and the immense influence of western youth sub-cultures upon Polish young people. The author is obviously aware that such issues are important and touches upon them, but this inevitably remains marginal to his analysis, which gives priority to students’ political socialization. Another interesting issue which is unfortunately given only scant attention in this work refers to the post-communist politicians’ CVs from the time when they were ‘student activists’. The author discovers, quite predictably, that Aleksander Kwaśniewski was active in the Socialist Union of Polish Students (Pol.: *Socjalistyczny Związek Studentów Polskich*, SZSP), while Donald Tusk and Bronisław Komorowski were active in the dissident student milieus of Gdańsk and Warsaw, respectively. It would have been interesting, however, to find out more about the pre-1989 backgrounds of the current Polish politicians, among whom one may expect to find quite a number of individuals who became interested in politics under communism as student activists, on both sides of the barricade. This is, perhaps, the subject for another book. Until then, I highly recommend this one to all those interested in Polish or

(Eastern) European recent history, in spite of the fact that, unlike the Czechs, Slovaks and Hungarians, the unfortunate students from my native country of Romania, who died in prison for the crime of having become inspired by their Polish (and Hungarian) colleagues in 1956, have no place in this otherwise wonderful research.

Cristina Petrescu