

# Reviews

Acta Poloniae Historica  
96, 2007  
PL ISSN 0001 – 6829

*Historia Polski w liczbach*, t. I: *Państwo, Społeczeństwo* (*Poland's History in Figures* vol. I: *The State, Society*), Warszawa 2003, Główny Urząd Statystyczny, 576 pp., bibl., tables, diagrams, maps; *Historia Polski w liczbach*, t. II: *Gospodarka* (*Poland's History in Figures*, vol. II: *Economy*), Warszawa 2006, Główny Urząd Statystyczny, 696 pp., bibl. tables, diagrams, maps.

The Central Statistical Office has published *Historia Polski w liczbach*, a work comprising two volumes. In 1900–1999 ten thematic issues were brought out (*Population, Territory, Agriculture and Forestry, Mining and Industry, Building Trade, National Income, Education, Science, Culture, Transport and Communication, Trade, Finances, The Population's Living Conditions, The State and the Armed Forces*) in preparation for a huge work which was to be a statistical synthesis of Poland's history. In 1994 *Economic History of Poland in Numbers* was brought out for foreign readers who do not know the Polish language. *Historia Polski w liczbach* has been worked out by a team of authors (Andrzej Wyczański, Cezary Kukło, Juliusz Łukasiewicz, Andrzej Jezierski, Cecylia Leszczyńska, with the editorial collaboration of Wanda Bohdanowicz and Grażyna Szydłowska) under the direction of Andrzej Wyczański and the late Andrzej Jezierski. The work comprises over 1,000 tables, 37 diagrams, 20 maps, several drawings and brief introductions to each part and each chronological period, which provide a kind of commentary on the statistical materials. Volume I of *Historia Polski w liczbach* concerns the state and society (the political system, population, social structure, living conditions, education and culture) while Volume II deals with the economy (currency, prices, agriculture, industry and building trade, transport and communication, internal and external trade, finances, national income). The same chronological division into three periods of Poland's history — up to 1795, 1795–1918 and 1918–2000 — has been applied in both volumes. As regards territory, each part presents the state in the frontiers it had in each period (in the 19th century when the Polish state did not exist its pre-1772 area and Upper Silesia have been taken into consideration; the part dealing with World War II refers to the pre-1939 Polish Republic).

The statistical data have been drawn mainly from studies dealing with social and economic history, not from direct sources, which means that they are indirect, reconstructed data (as Andrzej Wyczański calls them), gathered, elaborated and presented as a result of research on various spheres of Poland's history, mainly economic history. Their value depends on the methods used in these studies, on the competence and reliability of the historians who conducted them, and, of course, also on the sources they had at their disposal. For let us remember that contrary to some West European countries, for instance Italy, where valuable statistical sources were produced as early as the Middle Ages, such sources practically did not exist in Poland before 1795. This was due to the state of the Polish economy at that time, an economy which only to a small degree could be called a market economy, to the weakly developed and uncompetitive state and local administration, and the low level of culture and education of the population which did not have enough knowledge to present social phenomena in statistical categories.

In 1795 the Polish state ceased to exist, the Polish territories having been divided among Russia, Prussia and Austria. For over a hundred years, when in Poland and Europe great changes were taking place in economy, social structures

and political system (demographic explosion, industrialisation, emancipation of peasants, development of modern means of transport and social communication, spread of education, development of professional administration, development of parliamentarianism) — changes referred to by Juliusz Łukasiewicz (vol. II, p. 179) — the statistical documentation reflecting these changes in Polish territories was produced by the occupying powers, each of which had a different political system, different lines of economic development, different systems of law and administration, and a different currency. It is frequently difficult to compare these pieces of information, let alone reduce them to a common denominator.

In the short period after 1918 when Poland existed as an independent state (1918–1939) she was faced with the difficult tasks of re-uniting the Polish territories, unifying the system of law and administration, and levelling up the differences in culture and mentality that had arisen in the previous period. These tasks were not yet completed when World War II broke out. New disturbances occurred during the war (1939–1945): the German occupation and the incorporation of a part of Polish territories into the Reich, the incorporation of another part of Poland into the Soviet Union, which meant that the statistical information produced at that time differed in kind and value. After 1945 the construction of a non-market economy of the socialist type led to the production of a completely different statistical documentation which served another type of economy and was used for political propaganda. Cecylia Leszczyńska points out that “since in the Polish People’s Republic the trade turnover was calculated on the basis of completely different prices and rates of exchange than in the pre-war or 1991–2000 periods, it is purposeless to compare these figures” (vol. II, p. 361). Prices, which are an important economic indicator, meant something completely different in the socialist economy from what they mean in a market economy. The transformation carried out in 1989 meant a return to a market economy but its effects were not seen at once. The Polish statistics of that period has been governed by specific laws, which was due partly to the changes in Poland’s economy and political system and partly to the lingering tradition of using statistics for political propaganda.

In view of these specific difficulties which Poland has faced in gaining and working out statistical source information, of great importance are the Polish historians’ studies on social and economic history for they provide those reconstructed, elaborated statistical data. It is on these studies that *Historia Polski w liczbach* is based. In the preface to the second volume Andrzej Wyczański briefly characterises these studies, emphasising the merits of both old historians who, like Franciszek Bujak and Jan Rutkowski, laid the foundations of Polish economic and social history during the inter-war period (among other things they initiated the publication of “Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych” which is still the most important Polish periodical in this field) and of historians active after World War II who, like Natalia Gańsorowska, Witold Kula, Marian Małowist and Jerzy Topolski (I would add Stanisław Arnold) have developed these studies and brought up many disciples. International contacts have played a stimulating role especially since 1956, in particular contacts with French historians (École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris), but also with Italian historians (Fondazione Giorgio Cini in Venice, Istituto Internazionale di Storia Economica Francesco Datini in Prato — participation in the *settimane di studi*, organised there every year, required the use of statistics), with historians from Great Britain (Michael Postan from Cambridge), USA (the controversial *New Economic History*), and Germany (Institut für Vergleichende Städtegeschichte in Münster). An important role has also been played by Polish historians’ active participation in International Congresses of Economic History and various international commissions (e.g. the Commission for Urban History) and in the work of, for instance, Journées Internationales du Verre. Based as it is on all these studies, *Historia Polski w liczbach* is, in a way, a summing up and a synthesis of their results. But it also shows some gaps in our knowledge. We

still do not know enough about the ethnic and religious structure of the population of the pre-partition Commonwealth, even though these were questions of primary importance for a state with such a diverse ethnic and religious structure. There are only two tables referring to this question in Volume I (51 and 52). We still do not know precisely the percentage of Orthodox believers in the pre-partition Commonwealth, to say nothing of less numerous religions and denominations. The dominant view is that Roman Catholics constituted the majority of the population before the partitions, though this assertion has not been irrefutably proved by research. It is, however, difficult to establish precise figures because of constant fluctuations in this respect and also because religious fanaticism frequently distorted the picture.

Even though *Historia Polski w liczbach* supplies only statistical information, it provides, in a way, a global picture of Poland's history. The authors have not confined themselves to quantitative data referring to demography and economy, but have also presented the most important information concerning the political system (the functioning of parliaments, lists of presidents and governments, maps showing the territorial development of the state and its administrative divisions), and culture (the number of literate persons, of schools, and students studying at Polish and foreign universities, publication of books and periodicals, the number of theatres, music institutions, viewers and listeners). This is a work which will undoubtedly be very useful for everyone interested in Poland's history.

Andrzej Wyrobisz

Karol Modzelewski, *Barbarzyńska Europa (Barbarian Europe)*, Warszawa 2004, Wydawnictwo Iskry, 519 pp.

While writing about barbarian Europe the author has in mind the lands which on the threshold of the new era were lying north of the Roman limes. He goes on the assumption that these territories were united by a common civilization. They did not belong to the area of classical or — in the later period — Christian culture, and this fact determined their separate character. Karol Modzelewski introduces geographical boundaries to the material he subjects to analysis. He mainly makes use of the sources concerning the German and West-Slavic peoples, although the Ruthenian texts are not without consequence to his exposition. He contradicts the tradition of research established for many centuries, which holds that the German and Slav worlds were completely separate. On the contrary — he says — this was the same world, and following this view he analyses the Frankish, Burgundian, Lombardic, Polish and Polabian texts jointly.

Karol Modzelewski does not impose on himself any strict chronological boundaries and embraces with his view thirteen hundred years, from Caesar up till the 13th century, when barbarian Europe still continued to exist. Beginning with the early Middle Ages its area was gradually shrinking, as the influence of the Graeco-Roman culture with Christianity as its vehicle reached one country after another. The author quite consciously interprets as if at one breath, without any chronological differentiation, the sources coming from this enormous expanse of time. This attitude, in part, springs from his conviction that over those many centuries the barbarian world did not change in its essential structures; in part, however, this is a methodological device dictated by necessity. There are so few extant texts that it is impossible to subject every minor division of time to a separate analysis.

The difficulties presented by the source basis spring also from the fact that the authors such as Tacitus, Thietmar or Helmold did not belong to the barbarian world themselves. Thus one must reckon with the danger that their relations about the ancient Germans or early-medieval Slavs are not exact, for they are partly based on lack of understanding. Modzelewski perceives the above-mentioned problem, and he points out mistakes in the writings of those and other ancient and medieval authors; on the other hand, however, he contests

the opinion sometimes voiced in the literature that these relations are thoroughly incredible, since they consist of the literary threads behind which there is no real world.

Of much significance in the book under review is the interpretation of *leges barbarorum*. These were the codifications of German laws prepared towards the end of Antiquity or in the early Middle Ages. Their analysis is difficult because they arose in the classical and ecclesiastical cultural environment, and were written down by Christians, sometimes for the use of the tribes that had already lived in the area of the Roman Empire. The author tries to authenticate the view that the above-mentioned sources to some extent reflect the "barbarian" stage in the history of a given tribe. He emphasizes the traditional character of some codifications, e.g. Rothari's codex, written in Italy in the middle of the 7th century. Certainly, this legislation did not aim to establish a new law but to write down the one that had obtained so far. In the case of *Pactus Legis Salicae* Modzelewski invokes the fact that it was codified by Frankish sages who lived on the right bank of the Rhine, that is in the area of *Barbaricum*. However, the author nowhere seems to say clearly when this codification took place; still, the context shows that he has in mind the times of Clovis. Recently a hypothesis has been posed that the first 43 paragraphs of Salic Law arose in the 4th century for the use of the Franks serving in the Roman army<sup>1</sup>; the reader would certainly like to learn what is Modzelewski's opinion of this thesis and whether he thinks its acceptance could influence the interpretation of the sources.

Karol Modzelewski devotes a lot of attention to the discussion that in the recent years arose around the transformations caused in the Mediterranean world by the great migrations of people. He rejects the conception proposed by some researchers that many Roman institutions, such as the system of taxation, survived the invasions unharmed. He is not convinced, either, by the asseverations of those scholars who contend that the invaders became integrated with the local communities without any conflict. He is even inclined to believe that the said historians are rather directed by the demands of current ideology than by the analysis of sources. He also supports the once generally accepted thesis, attacked in recent literature, about the personal character of early-medieval law. This, rather traditional, but probably correct vision of the period between Antiquity and the Middle Ages allows the author to defend the credibility of *leges barbarorum* as a source for the history of barbarian Europe. In fact, if the Germans had been really completely absorbed by the local population, the texts under discussion would reflect solely the life of a Roman province.

This does not remove all the doubts and the reader may sometimes ask himself whether the book deals with barbarian Europe or rather with the kingdoms that arose on the basis of the Roman Empire. The reviewer fully realises that the factor responsible for this is the optics of the sources. A question arises, however, how this problem can be overcome. The author does not take into consideration the archaeological material, which is certainly difficult to use in the interpretation of social phenomena. However, he does not refer to the Northern literary sources, either. It is true that most of the latter were written by Christians and barbarian Europe appears in them merely as a vague memory. But is it anything more than a memory in Rothari's codex?

The author also takes part in another great discussion that left its imprint on medieval, especially German studies of the several last decades. It developed around the theory of the so-called *Königsfreie*. It says that the German society in ancient and early-medieval times had an aristocratic structure; it was divided into the potentates and the great masses of population subject to them. There

<sup>1</sup> E. Magnou-Nortier, *Remarques sur la genèse du Pactus Legis Salicae et sur le privilège d'immunité*, in: *Clovis. Histoire et mémoire*, ed. M. Rouche, vol. 1: *Le baptême de Clovis, l'événement*, Paris 1997, pp. 495-538, esp. 499-502 (*ibidem* the author's remarks and the cited literature).

were practically no freemen, unless we use this term to denote the settlers living in royal domains. Modzelewski rejects this view of the barbarian world, following in this respect the recent tendencies in European historiography.

He does not propose, however, a return to the theory dominant in the 19th century, which viewed the tribes of the times of Tacitus or Jordanes as if they consisted of free and equal individuals. In the first place, he draws attention to the fact that there were social differences within those tribes. The political position of the wealthy and of noble birth was privileged. Besides, the individuals were under the collective control, not only of the family, but also of the tribal meeting. Acts, to be passed, had to be voted unanimously, therefore the participants who opposed the opinion of the majority exposed themselves to repressions, even of a physical character. So one can hardly speak of a democratic political system in those societies, but it was not an authoritarian system, either. It was the people's assembly that made the decisions on important matters, and even its most influential participant, a king, could only argue, but not command.

Modzelewski considers the societies under his analysis to be best characterized by the term "barbarian collectivism". He illustrates the meaning of this term with several examples. An individual was endowed with any rights only if he belonged to a tribe. Both an outcast and a slave were deprived of them. One could find defence against the aggression of a member of the same tribe in one's family, on whose help one could also count when brought before justice. An individual was defended against pauperization by the law of proximity, as well as by the neighbourhood community which did not allow intruders to seize one's meadows and forests. However, there was also another side to this coin. Suffice it to say that a man suffered the threat of bloody revenge, or was obliged to pay a fine when his kinsman committed a crime; and that he had to take a vow clearing his kinsman of guilt when the latter was brought to justice.

The author emphasizes the importance of religion. In barbarian societies it was ubiquitous. Meetings were held in the places of worship and were accompanied by prayers, offerings and prophecies. During warfare the priests supervised the discipline, since war was a religious matter. The kindred community always appeared in the face of *sacrum* as a whole. Modzelewski even thinks that there was no distinction between *sacrum* and *profanum* in the barbarian system of ideas. The latter thesis certainly requires some examination, since the author himself says at one place that the palisade surrounding the meeting place divided the sacred area from the external world. In another place he says that the people's assembly was held at a sacred time, that is in new and full moon (other periods were evidently deprived of sacral value).

Still, one would expect a more insightful interpretation of the religious function of large all-tribal assemblies. It was not confined — as the author contends — to asking the supernatural powers for their opinion about the decisions taken, or calling for the assistance of the gods in the execution of acts. The main task — perhaps the most important — of the large all-tribal assemblies were the acts of worship which were to revitalize the world, and restore primeval vital powers to the people. Such ceremonies were held in the Semnons' forest, in Saxon Marklo or Swedish Uppsala. Karol Modzelewski consciously does not take up the problem of ethnogenesis. This is a painful gap, also because he might provide an answer to the question whether and to what extent the cult was the (original?) bond linking the large tribe.

A more insightful analysis of the ceremonies that took place in sanctuaries of an extra-regional character might throw some new light on social stratification. It is a well-known truth that in the main centres of worship all the tribesmen were obliged to take part in the principal ceremonies, and some peoples fulfilled this duty by sending representative delegations. So it was at Marklo on the Weser, where the representatives of all the three "estates" of the Saxon tribe were present: aristocracy, freemen and *lits*. This means that from the sacral point of view the presence of the semi-freemen was equally important as that of other social

categories. The information who the tribal representation consisted of is given in *Vita Liburni Antiqua*. Karol Modzelewski repudiates the credibility of this source as far as the participation of the *lits* is concerned. I do not share his scepticism. It is true that the opinion of the semi-freemen did not count in the least in matters under debate at the meeting, but *lits* were sent to Marklo because of the religious role they were to fulfil there. In the face of the supernatural powers the tribe had to appear as a whole, and the semi-freemen were part of this whole.

The most innovatory are those parts of the work where the author discusses the ideological basis of royal power. He reconstructs it, referring to three ideas: of the great kinsman, the great neighbour and the great warrior. The conviction prevailing in those tribes was that the king was a kinsman of every tribesman. On this ground a German ruler became a protector of a woman who was not subject to the *mund* of any other man, he was also obliged to take revenge or *wergeld* when a freeman who did not belong to any family was killed. Karol Modzelewski also expresses the view that *kuntinga*-z, one of two old-German terms denoting a king, has no dynastic reference, as it has been generally accepted, but denotes a person who is a kinsman of all the tribesmen. The idea of the great neighbour contains a concept that a monarch is at home in any neighbourhood community.

In accordance with the position expressed in the book the concepts contained in those ideas endowed the king with the essential instruments of power. As a great kinsman he seized the escheats, that is property left by those who died and had no heir. As a great neighbour he had at his disposal the land belonging to the neighbourhood communities, where he could freely, without the consent of the people living in the vicinity, dig up forests and give the land reclaimed for cultivation to his men. The author formulates a far-reaching thesis: the idea of the ruler as a great neighbour is the genesis of the institution of *regalia*. Finally, as the great warrior, the ruler had a right to call up an army and to appropriate a large part of the plunder. The whole exposition is crowned by the following conclusion: the attributes of the great kinsman, the great neighbour and the great warrior became systemic premisses which had led to a change in the political position of the king; he turned from the leader of the people into their ruler.

The problem requires some commentary. Let us first pose a question whether those three categories should not be supplemented by a fourth: the great farmer. Ammianus Marcellinus (XXVIII, 5, 14) says that the Burgundians depose their king when they suffer defeat at war and when they have bad crops. Modzelewski cites this passage, but comments on it in a different context, although the cited fragment provides an illustration to the role of the ruler as a great warrior. But Ammianus' passage contains also an argument that suggests a positive answer to our question. It turns out that the monarch is ultimately responsible for providing the tribe with food.

The other comment is of a more general character. The above-mentioned attributes do not suffice to explain the systemic breakthrough, simply because — if we understand them correctly — they characterized a barbarian monarch regardless of the era when he reigned. In fact the transformation of the leader-king into the ruler-king took place at a certain moment, and this moment was not the same in every tribe. It is a certain deficiency of the book that it does not systematically follow the factors that had led to the downfall of the barbarian world. The reader, for example, does not learn anything about the detachment of armed warriors that followed the ruler. We have to acknowledge that Karol Modzelewski emphasizes the role played in those transformations by classical culture and Christianity. His expositions contain many true and inspiring remarks. And yet they do not always seem adequate or convincing.

The author says e.g. that the baptism of the new peoples was not a result of but the beginning of the systemic transformation. So it was certainly in Saxony, a country where the new religion was imposed by force from outside. However, in the majority of cases the adoption of Christianity was a sovereign decision taken

by the king-ruler of a pagan tribe. Suffice it to mention Mieszko I. He was a powerful monarch even before 966 and it cannot be doubted that Poland passed the threshold of becoming a state even before bishop Jordan visited Poznań and Gniezno. Thus, in this case, the beginning of the systemic transformation took place without the influence of classical culture and Christianity. It cannot be doubted, however, that in this and many other cases the new religion left its deep imprint on the social structure of previously barbarian peoples. The work under discussion provides many instructive examples to this effect.

The world of historical science has received a new important book which will certainly constitute a reference point for any scholar dealing with tribal societies in late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages. Rich factual material, an inspiring attempt at a systemic approach, many convincing source analyses, a splendid, clear style — all this must arouse our respect.

Roman Michałowski  
(Translated by Agnieszka Kreczmar)

Maciej Michalski, *Kobiety i świętość w żywotach trzynastowiecznych księżnych polskich (Women and Sainthood in the Lives of Polish 13th Century Duchesses)*, Poznań 2004, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 355 pp.

Maciej Michalski's book belongs to the current of hagiographic research which examines sainthood in connection with social questions. This current, a leading representative of which is André Vauchez, regards the lives of the saints as a source which shows the religious climate of each epoch to perfection and also makes it possible to analyse extra-religious phenomena. What is characteristic of Michalski's book is that it analyses sainthood in connection with gender category.

The gender studies current cannot claim a long tradition; nevertheless, since the 1980s it has attracted a growing interest and borne fruit in a huge number of publications introducing the category of gender into historical reflection. An undoubted value of this current is that it has drawn the attention of contemporary historiography to the question of women. The essence of the gender method consists not so much in its appreciation of women's role in history as in its treatment of the category of gender as a cultural phenomenon. The category of gender — which is a cultural category, in contradistinction to sex, which is a biological category — has been singled out in research because the way in which manhood and womanhood are perceived has been changing throughout the ages and has thus become a subject of historical research, on a par with other cultural phenomena.

The book consists of three parts. In the first, *The Sources and Their Heroines*, the author examines the methodological aspects of hagiography as an historical source. He points out that the lives of the saints should be regarded as literary texts and that all their three planes, the didactic plane, the historical facts and the plane of hagiographic *topoi*, should be taken into consideration. Michalski also presents the questions which the gender current has noticed in hagiographic research, such as, for instance, the relationship of the female heroine of a story and the male author. An examination of this question will draw a researcher into a whole series of detailed studies. The question arises whether it is possible to distinguish the way in which women treated their sainthood from the way in which it was presented by male interpreters. Did the ways in which sainthood was manifested in the Middle Ages depend on gender? Was sainthood divided into male and female sainthood in the hagiographic texts of that epoch?

In the first part the author examines the sources which have attracted his interest and presents their heroines: St. Hedwig of Silesia, St. Kinga, St. Salomea and Anne, wife of Henry the Pious. He compares the knowledge we now have at our disposal with the not always reliable stories contained in the saints' lives. All

these female saints were linked by close ties with Franciscan spirituality and, naturally, with Poland and the Piast dynasty. But the author strongly emphasises that these ties go further back: he writes that sainthood seems to have been "inherited" in the Central European courts. This transfer of ideas between the Andechs, the Arpads, the Piasts and partly also the Přemyslids is closely linked with the person of St. Elizabeth of Hungary whose cult was propagated by all Polish saintly duchesses and with whom they were sometimes closely related. In these Central European court circles an important role was, of course, played by the Franciscans; the minor brothers not only enjoyed a high position in all courts in this part of Europe but were also consistent propagators of the cult of St. Elizabeth as well as of Polish duchesses.

The second part of the book, *Women and Sainthood up to the 13th Century*, discusses, on the one hand, the genesis, forms and functions of the cult of saints from the beginning of Christianity and, on the other, women's role and position in the Church, especially during the period of reforms from the 11th to the 13th century. The author pays special attention to female saints and, referring to the opinion that their number symbolises women's position in the Church, or even in society, he shows that just as the years 650–750 have been called "a golden age of female saints" by Jane T. Schultenburg<sup>1</sup>, so, after a clear decline in the 11th century, the period from the beginning of the 13th century to the end of the 15th can be called "a second golden age". Let us point out that although in the Middle Ages men always predominated over women as regards the total number of saints, Vauchez has shown on the basis of canonisation processes that among lay people the number of women equalled or often surpassed that of men<sup>2</sup>. Michalski writes about the reform of the Church in the 11th–13th centuries, emphasising women's role in the new religious movements: the Beguines' communities and the mendicant orders. It is a pity that he concentrates on the order of St. Claire and pays insufficient attention to women's presence in penitentiary and tertiary brotherhoods or to the programme of a religious engagement of lay people, proposed by the mendicants. After all, this form of religiousness is closely connected with Polish saintly duchesses whose links, as lay persons, with the Franciscans are emphasised in the book.

In the third part of the book, entitled "*Vita perfecta*" of Polish Duchesses, the author analyses the texts of the saints' lives. He puts forward the theory, which he successfully defends, that the lives we are interested in were written according to a pattern which divided the female saints' lives into certain basic stages, separated from each other by turning points. He starts by presenting the childhood and youth of the duchesses, regarding their marriage as the first turning point. Michalski analyses the relations between the female saints and their husbands, paying special attention to their sexual relations. Sexual abstinence, resorted to either periodically during the husband life, and after his death, or throughout entire woman's life, is a question referred to in all their stories. It is worth pointing out that two of the four marriages discussed were spiritual unions (those of Kinga and Boleslaus and Salomea and Koloman). According to Dyan Elliot, we know of only eleven cases of marital, life-long chastity vows in Europe in the years 1100–1500<sup>3</sup>, so these were exceptional cases. Michalski analyses this phenomenon taking into account the theological debates which were then being held on marriage — which only quite recently had been raised by the Church to the rank of a sacrament — and especially on the significance of the

<sup>1</sup> J. T. Schultenburg, *Female sanctity: Public and Private Roles, ca. 500–1100*, in: *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. by M. Erler and M. Kowaleski, Athens–London 1988, pp. 103–104. See also: J. T. Schultenburg, *Forgetful of Their Sex, Female Sanctity and Society ca. 500–1100*, Chicago and London 2001, pp. 64–65.

<sup>2</sup> A. Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, translated by J. Birrell, Cambridge 1997, pp. 267–269 (the French original appeared in 1988).

<sup>3</sup> D. Elliot, *Spiritual Marriage. Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock*, Princeton 1993, appendix 5.

consummation of the marital union. These saintly examples of spiritual unions reflected the Church's view that marriage was a union of souls, which did not have to be strengthened by corporal contacts, while according to secular opinions the principal aim of marriage was creation of offspring. The four saints' lives also try to promote the idea of the spouses' equality and of a fair treatment of women in marriage, while the general view was that man should determine his wife's life. In relations with their husbands the duchesses are always presented as the active part; sometimes they even dared to be disobedient, in particular when their virginity was at stake. What is more, our heroines knew how to influence their husbands, especially in religious matters.

Another moment which the author regards as a turning point in the lives of the saintly duchesses was the death of their husband, for a husband's death radically changed a woman's situation in the Middle Ages. The only exception was St. Hedwig whose status had changed earlier when she took abode in the Trzebnica convent; her husband's death only completed this change. The author analyses the acts of asceticism undertaken by these saints, paying special attention to the specifically female forms of religiousness, such as mortification by an ostentatious resignation from adornments and luxurious garments. In writing about fast, Michalski stresses its links with the cult of the Eucharist, which was thriving at that time. He points out that asceticism in food consumption was the domain of women. According to researchers, this was due to the fact that the preparation of food was also regarded as a specifically female occupation. In Michalski's view the whole of late medieval ascetic practice referring to the physical sufferings of Christ was connected with women's religiousness.

A saint's death was the third turning point. Their death was the beginning of a new life, the beginning of a cult, and it was also proof of the sainthood for it was always accompanied by signs testifying to the uniqueness of the dying woman. The author argues that the successive stages in the saintly duchesses' lives could serve as an example for virgins, wives and widows of how to fulfil a woman's most important roles in medieval society. Michalski regards sainthood as a kind of women's ally for it allowed them to achieve independence. The status of a saint put a woman above social and cultural divisions, breaking the rules which determined the place of each gender in society.

There are three reasons why *Women and Sainthood* is a most welcome book. First, it is a very good monograph based on hagiographic sources which the author treats, first and foremost, as a reflection of the epoch's culture. Secondly, it is an excellent example of the use of gender methodology, which is very popular in the West but is not yet fully fledged in Polish medieval studies, a methodology which can be very fertile, as is proved by Michalski's book. The introduction of the category of gender into research makes it possible to pose new questions and present new propositions of replies. The main aim of the method is to broaden the perspectives of research, but not to depreciate the results historians have achieved so far; after all no methodology can replace a researcher's knowledge and solid work, undoubtedly manifested by the author of *Women and Sainthood*. The third reason why the book is welcome is that it is the first monograph on the lives of 13th century Polish duchesses which perceives their similarities and attributes their genesis to the same cultural background.

Grzegorz Pac

Wojciech Iwańczak, *Do granic wyobraźni. Norymberga jako centrum wiedzy geograficznej i kartograficznej w XV i XVI w. (To the Limits of Imagination. Nuremberg as Centre of Geographical and Cartographical Knowledge in the 15th and 16th Centuries)*, Warszawa 2005, Wyd. DiG, 336 pp., ill., bibliography, index of personal and geographical names.

There is already abundant literature concerning the great geographical discoveries of the end of the 15th century that made a decisive impact on the further economic and political development of Europe and the world. Fewer analyses have been devoted to the intellectual and psychological reasons and effects of those discoveries and the extent of their influence on social and cultural life. It is to these issues that Wojciech Iwańczak has devoted his book which takes up the important subject of the role of Nuremberg as the centre of geographical and cartographical knowledge in the 15th and 16th centuries. In fifteen chapters the author presents this city — one of the most important urban centres of Germany on the threshold of the early modern era. It was the home not only of agile, enterprising merchants but also, and mainly printers and editors who were rightly named the “eye and ear of Germany”. It played a special role in the humanist dissemination of the tradition of Antiquity and the development of readership, scholarship and science.

The author analyses competently and in detail the so-called “Nuremberg school” — the milieu of scientists specializing in geography, cartography, astronomy and mathematics, who substantially contributed to the knowledge of that era. This was the place of work of the famous mathematician, geographer and astronomer Johannes Regiomontanus, the author of *Tabulae regionum*, containing the geographical co-ordinates of 62 countries and cities of Europe and the distances between them measured in hours of travel from Nuremberg, as well as *Ephemerides*, showing the positions of the Sun, Moon and planets on particular days in the years 1475–1506. *Ephemerides* was not only an extremely important theoretical achievement, but also a significant practical aid to sailors that helped them to orientate themselves when at sea and make great voyages that discovered the new lands.

One of Regiomontanus's pupils, as Iwańczak notes, was Bernhard Walther who laid great services in the field of verification of astronomic tables and the resultant reform of the calendar taken up by the Apostolic See in the 16th century. Apart from those two scientists the “Nuremberg school” was the home of outstanding cartographers such as Sebald Schreyer, Hartmann Schedel, Johannes Warner and especially the legendary Martin Behaim — “the spiritual discoverer of America” and creator of the earliest surviving globe of 1492 — traveller, discoverer, cartographer and author of the map of the world. Iwańczak lists and analyses very carefully their life stories and results of scientific work, discussing critically their sources and inspirations as well as theoretical achievements and practical results. A separate chapter has been devoted to the interesting figure of Hieronymus Münzer — physician and traveller, co-author of Hartmann Schedel's *Chronicle of the World* and author of the first printed map presenting Central-Eastern Europe (the so-called Map of Germany). The above-mentioned names do not exhaust the circle of scholars—humanists, translators of ancient works, astronomers and cartographers, creators of the maps of the Earth and the Heavens, as well as globes, whose diverse works have been presented exhaustively in Iwańczak's book.

Nuremberg, as Iwańczak shows convincingly, was an important centre of knowledge about the “New World” — the new discovered lands and archipelagoes; information about it spread from here to other cities and countries of Europe. It was here that the first edition of Nicholas Copernicus's epoch-making work *De revolutionibus* appeared in 1543. But Nuremberg was not only the leader in the publication of innovatory works and in spreading information about geograp-

hical and scientific discoveries. It was the birth-place of many works of practical significance — hand-books, travellers' maps, compendia of practical instructions for everyday work and existence of explorers, sailors, travellers and merchants. This city, as Iwańczak shows, played an enormous role in shaping the new picture of the world on the threshold of the early-modern era, and the new social mentality embracing all of Europe. As Iwańczak rightly contends, its inhabitants were extremely active and the city was open to everybody, hence it was visited by crowds of newcomers. It did not pose barriers that would hinder the influx of people, its climate favoured the circulation of ideas and the transfer of novelties from all the world. The author ends his work with the important question about the reasons why Nuremberg lost its central, leading role to the Netherlands in the second half of the 16th and especially in the 17th century.

The book has been prepared very carefully, on the basis of printed sources and secondary literature; its bibliography numbers over 600 items in various languages. It is an important step forward, enriching our knowledge of the intellectual and scientific development of Europe in the era of geographical discoveries. It should only be regretted that it has not been provided with an English summary, which albeit briefly, could bring its content closer to the readers who do not know Polish. The subject taken up in it deserves to be presented in an international arena, especially since the book has been prepared in a careful and solid way.

Maria Bogucka

Grzegorz Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka 1942–1960. Działalność Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i Ukraińskiej Armii Powstańczej (Ukrainian Partisan Warfare 1942–1960. The Activity of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists [OUN] and the Ukrainian Insurrection Army [UPA])*, Warszawa 2006, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN, Oficyna Wydawnicza Rytm, 720 pp., ill.

Although more than half a century has elapsed since those days, we are still far from the reconstruction or a multilateral analysis of the tragic events that took place in the broad Polish-Ukrainian borderland during the Second World War and right after it was over. One of the major reasons for this state of affairs is our scanty knowledge about many aspects of the Ukrainian armed underground. Polish historians, mainly focussing on the reconstruction of Polish martyrology and defence against aggression have seldom taken up separate research into the history of the Ukrainian movement. What makes matters worse, the Poles cannot ask for information the Ukrainians, since the latter rather engage in their civil wars, than in a discussion of the fortunes, character and historical significance of the OUN and the UPA. Grzegorz Motyka's book largely helps to fill this blank or rather bloody gap.

The author, who has devoted several years to research into the history of the Ukrainian armed movement, can be admired for being able to distance himself from the Polish-Ukrainian, and equally heated, Polish-Polish politico-historical quarrels. His public pronouncements have always been very cautious, and factual. This opened to him the doors to many collections of documents inaccessible to other researchers. These were, in the first place, the materials of various levels of the Soviet Secret Service as well as military documents. At the same time he did not neglect to make a systematic study of the memoirs and historical works written by Polish émigrés. One can risk a statement that he is one of the few researchers with such a deep and detailed knowledge concerning the history of the Ukrainian armed underground during the Second World War.

In a short review it is impossible to summarize a bulky volume, tightly packed with facts and details, written in a succinct, inornate style. The wealth of information it contains, though placing high demands on the reader, is quite

justified. The author cites many documents to which probably no Polish historian will have access for a long time. Besides, the detailed information on the participants in these events, meticulous descriptions and analyses of some facts (such as the circumstances of the first murder of Poles committed at Parool in February 1943), reconstructions of the internal situation within those organizations at concrete moments, etc. are of crucial importance for the justification of the author's fundamental theses. Consequently, Motyka's stand, even if it may arouse some doubts, is solidly entrenched in a concrete historical material.

What should be acknowledged as Grzegorz Motyka's most important conclusion, is his repudiation of the theory, so popular with the Ukrainian historians, of the "double-front" strategy of the *UPA*, which was supposed to conduct simultaneous fighting against the USSR and Nazi Germany under the cover of a fight for Ukrainian independence. The author says that from the Ukrainian point of view the Germans were potential allies in the fight against the main enemies of independent Ukraine — Russians and Poles. In the first years of the war some Ukrainian politicians even cherished illusions that the Germans would be ready directly to support Ukrainian aspirations to independence. At the same time, however, the Germans were cruel invaders who ruthlessly exploited the occupied territories and in order to enforce obedience, applied mass-scale bloody repressions. Since 1943 the Ukrainian attitudes had been additionally complicated by the expected imminent defeat of Germany at war, which meant that the Ukrainians had to seek support for the idea of their independence from the Western allies. This greatly impeded their co-operation with the Germans on the anti-Soviet front. The author perceives a similar ambivalence on the German side. The Ukrainians were seen as serious menace to peace in the rear of the front, but at the same time as potential allies in watching other inhabitants of the occupied territory (Poles, Jews) and in the fight against the Soviet Union. As a result since 1939 up till the summer of 1944 that territory saw both acts of far-reaching German-Ukrainian co-operation, bloody repressions aimed at the Ukrainian intelligentsia and countryside, since 1943 more and more frequent armed conflicts between the Germans and the *UPA*, as well as examples of military and intelligence co-operation between the *UPA* and various German institutions and detachments aimed against the Russians, and sometimes Poles. It was precisely on the strength of an agreement contracted between the representatives of the *Abwehr* and the *UPA* Command-in-Chief that a group of the leaders of the *OUN* with Stepan Bandera at the head were released from concentration camps in September 1944, and the German airplanes several times dropped relief for the anti-Soviet partisan groups.

For the Polish reader of special significance are those findings of Motyka which concern the origin and character of the Ukrainian attacks on the Polish population. The author calls into question the thesis that the whole of the *OUN-B* and the *UPA* had aimed from the very beginning at the physical liquidation of the Polish element. He recalls the findings of the autumn of 1942, when at the second conference of the *OUN-B* a decision was taken that "as far as the Poles were concerned, «they should all be expelled, but allowed to take everything they want, since England and America will defend them. Those unwilling to leave — should be liquidated». There was a design to definitely liquidate (...) the so-called active Poles, that is those involved in conspiracy, enjoying a high social authority, who were the natural leaders of the local communities. Special proscription lists were to be prepared by regional and district military commanders" (p. 306). He goes on to say: "the leadership of the *OUN-B* in Volhynia on their own initiative decided to drive to extremes the instruction of the definite «expulsion» of all the Poles, and to liquidate all the Polish population, without «playing at» sending leaflets with the order of evacuation... If this hypothesis is true, the respective decision was made between February and the beginning of June, 1943, most probably by a group of three men: Dmytro Klyachkivsky («Klym Savoov») — the leader of the *OUN-B* in Volhynia; Vasyl Ivachiv («Som») — the military adviser of the *OUN-B*;

and Ivan Lytvynchuk («Dubovy»), heading the detachments of the *OUN-B* and the *UPA* in North-Eastern Volhynia" (pp. 307-308). In the autumn of 1943 the leadership of the *OUN* and the *UPA* not only approved of the actions in Volhynia, but also decided to extend "the Volhynia tactics" into the area of Eastern Galicia. The spiral of crimes lasting until 1947, unleashed by those decisions, took the toll of scores of thousands if not over a hundred thousand human lives, and caused unspeakable suffering to hundreds of thousands others. The author makes an unwavering statement that the body responsible for this tragedy was the leadership of the *OUN-B* and the *UPA*, "who aimed at a complete removal of the Poles from all the lands considered to be Ukrainian, without hesitating to commit mass murder on the defenceless population" (p. 413).

The materials compiled by Motyka allow us to conclude that the most important aspect of the *UPA*'s history, which had been at the same time long pushed into the background, was its fight against the Soviet Union. It started as early as 1943 with regular war between the Ukrainian detachments and the Soviet partisan groups directed by Moscow. However, it reached its full height after the Red Army had seized the former lands of the Second Republic of Poland between January and October 1944. When the Soviet troops were marching in, the *UPA* had about 25-30 thousand fighters in partisan detachments, a developed organizational background and broad social support. The repressions directed against the people accused of collaboration and nationalism, as well as against the Orthodox Church, the mass conscription into the Red Army and ruthless economic exploitation of Volhynia and Galicia made many people escape "to the forest" and enriched the partisan detachments with new people. The main purposes of the underground army were: to prevent the consolidation of the Communist power; to protect the local population against exploitation and repressions; and to prepare the outbreak of a national uprising. The Ukrainian underground authorities endeavoured to avoid direct clashes with well-armed and trained military detachments, and rather lay ambushes for smaller ones. One of the victims of such a surprise attack in 1944 was Gen. Vatutin, commander of the First Ukrainian Front. Initially the *UPA* leaders assumed a possibility of an internal collapse of the USSR at the final stage of war or an outbreak of conflict between the USSR and the Western Allies, which would increase their military chances and open the way for gaining political support in the international arena. However, the *UPA* tactics changed with the end of the war and the stabilization of the international situation. They reduced their armed detachments, and concentrated on developing their conspiratorial structures all over the Ukraine and on educational work among their youth. They focussed their attacks on the functionaries of the local powers, party activists and teachers. In the years 1944-1945 in the Drogobych district alone, 16 teachers were killed, and further 21 kidnapped. Between January 1949 and April 1950 in the Stanislav region 20 chairmen of village councils, 19 kolkhoz directors and 30 militia plenipotentiaries were killed. Any local inhabitant who "turned traitor to the cause" by refusing to co-operate with the *UPA*, or collaborated with the authorities, met with bloody revenge.

The Ukrainian armed underground did not stop fighting even in the period of the progressing stabilization in the international arena. The supporters of the *UPA* were deeply convinced that its existence and activity were tantamount to the nation's survival. Its defeat, on the other hand, would be the beginning of the nation's final annihilation.

The authorities used a wide range of measures in their fight against the *UPA*. In the regions of its operation they located additional military units and created an *NKVD* apparatus specialized in collecting information and watching the movements of partisan detachments. Direct anti-partisan warfare was waged by the Red Army and four Divisions of the *NKVD* Internal Troops. The latter willingly organized their own partisan groups disguised as the *OUN-UPA*, which penetrated the area under this cover. There was a moment when such groups numbered over

1,000. Apart from operations aimed directly against the partisans, some mass pacification actions were also carried out. They involved public executions of partisans and their collaborators, massive arrests, and destruction of the property of the families and villages that supported the *UPA*. In the years 1944–1953 scores of thousands people were deported: both selected families and the whole localities, in order to stop the assistance of the civil population to the “forest people”. In the winter of 1945/46 due to the “Great Blockade” organized with the help of 25 thousand soldiers, the main structures of the *OUN-UPA* underground army were destroyed. The underground authorities decided to carry out a gradual demobilization of the remaining detachments and to transform the movement into a political structure which was, however, to retain the possibility of diversionary actions. The forest was to be mainly the place of hiding against arrest. A powerful blow aimed at the *UPA* was the death of its legendary Commander-in-Chief, Roman Shukhevych, alias “Taras Chuprynka”. In March 1950 he committed suicide in *UPA* conspiratorial lodgings near Lviv. A long period of the extinction of this organization in the Ukraine started, extending over several years. As late as 1951 the authorities were still searching for about 1,500 partisans. However, as Motyka says, “the history of the *OUN-B* and the *UPA* more and more changed into a dry register of deaths or captures of individual members of the underground”. In 1954 Vasyl Kuka — Shukhevych’s successor — was arrested. This signified the end of organized conspiracy in the Ukraine. The last armed group of the *OUN*, operating in the borderland between the Stanislaw and Tarnopol districts, was liquidated in a round-up in April 1960. “In the course of fighting against the *UPA* the Soviets killed 153 thousand, arrested 134 thousand and deported over 203 thousand inhabitants of the western regions of the Ukraine”. (649)

Motyka’s book adds new quality not only to the Polish historiography of the Second World War.

Its message is far from unequivocal. It is a factual, but austere reminder of the junction of events which had led to the crimes of genocide committed by the Ukrainian underground, but at the same time a testimony to the enormous sacrifice laid at the altar of the independence of their country by hundreds of thousands of frequently nameless defenders of the Ukraine against the Soviet regime.

Włodzimierz Mędrzecki

*Gefährdungen der Freiheit. Extremistische Ideologien im Vergleich.*  
Ed. Uwe Backes and Eckhard Jesse, Göttingen 2006 Verlag  
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 592 pp., Schriften des Hannah-  
Arendt Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung.

Nazism, Italian Fascism and Stalinism are frequently reduced to the same totalitarian denomination. Discussions over totalitarianism are the subject of hundreds of important publications. And the standpoints presented in them are still far from being unanimous. While recalling this fact I keep pondering on the much greater, almost enormous capacity of the notion of extremism, which seems to be able to encompass both old and ever new ideologies and movements. The volume under discussion is devoted to the kinds of extremism that can be observed at present. It focuses on the comparative studies of extremist ideologies. It appeared in the sixth year of the 21st century. This century seems to carry still greater threat to the survival of humankind and the globe than the bygone short *Age of Extremes*, as it was called by Eric Hobsbawm in his now classic book. The well-known German scholars Uwe Backes and Eckhard Jesse who edited this volume start their introduction to it by referring to Hobsbawm.

Apart from a few contributions, the volume is the outcome of a conference that took place in Dresden in 2004, and is composed of papers and essays written by German scholars, most of whom are attached to the Hannah-Arendt Institut.

One can hardly overestimate the significance of this volume, which is a kind of an encyclopaedic lexicon based on a solid list of primary and secondary sources. Any summary or criticism of it must be fragmentary because of the number of issues the volume takes up, because of its internal contradictions, and because of the tens of models it proposes for the constantly fluctuating and changing political relations in Europe and the world. For the same reason, in this short text I find it impossible to make any broader comments on at least several tens of definitions of extremism presented by the German scholars.

Although four out of these seventeen essays are devoted to Islam as an example of totalitarian religion and terrorist threat, and some fragments concern Latin America, the volume mainly deals with extremism in contemporary Europe — that is its ideologies, programmes and the attitudes of individual politicians and thinkers. Stress is deliberately laid on the comparison (or even equation) of the extremist Left and Right. This is emphasized in Eckhard Jesse's final essay *Grenzen des Demokratieschutzes in der offenen Gesellschaft — das Gebot des Äquidistanz gegenüber politischen Extremismen*.

What the book accepts as a measure of extremism is the attitude to the constitutional democratic state. This criterion, however, is not precise, since the formally democratic ideologies and programmes of many movements frequently conceal anti-democratic, authoritarian or totalitarian practices. History knows very democratic constitutions that were only a screen for a totalitarian system (Stalin's USSR). The use of notions such as Centre, Left and Right according to their historical definitions created in bygone centuries seems still more risky.

Uwe Backes has devoted his introductory essay to the history of the concept of extremism; he begins with Aristotle, and deals with the French Revolution, republicanism, monarchism, the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, totalitarianism (Fascism, Nazism, Communism) and even the religious fundamentalism of our times. Backes poses a question: is the combination of anticonstitutionalism and antidemocratism a necessary condition that allows us to speak of extremism? Can the label of extremism be applied if only one of those two factors is fulfilled? Backes goes on to analyse theoretically three "model" forms of extremism that can be opposed to the notion of democracy (as a synonym of democracy he mentions "democratic constitutionalism"). In his approach these three forms of extremism are: "democratic anticonstitutionalism" (communist and anarchic doctrines), "constitutional antidemocratism" (e.g. RSA) and finally "anticonstitutional antidemocratism" (the world outlook of Hitler and his team). The distinction between those three components helps, in his opinion, to distinguish between "milder" and "sharper" forms of extremism. This concerns not only ideologies, but also political movements. This is not the end of his exposition: he divides the notion of anticonstitutionalism into such parts as anti-parliamentarianism, antiliberalism, and antipluralism. In the case of antidemocratism Backes distinguishes anti-egalitarianism and the attitude to the concept of a nation's sovereignty. He delves deeper into the essential antinomy between constitutional state and — autocracy. He sees as signals of extremism the tendency to concentrate coercion, to monopolize the only true ideal, and to proclaim the faith in the omni-defining laws of history. A movement can be recognized as extremist if it negates just one of the essential principles of the constitutional-democratic state.

The authors of the papers contained in the volume embark upon long, very academic and contradictory discussions concerning the definition of the term "extremism". They give food for intellectual reflection, provide reviews of literature, but at the same time have the vice of engaging in theoretical discussions for their own sake.

Jürgen Lang draws attention to the diversity of the definitions of the rightist and leftist kinds of extremism. Cas Mudde shows the difference between anti-liberally orientated extremism and radicalism, which consists in the recognition of the principle of the nation's sovereignty by the latter.

Florian Hartlieb deals with populism in Western Europe. He reaches the conclusion that populism marks the parties and movements that, aspire to speak for the nation as a whole, but oppose the Establishment and the traditional parties. They contest very specific matters in order to mobilize the masses. The populist movements don the gowns of the defenders of morality, strive for the polarization of views and maximum access to the media. The populist parties are generally headed by charismatic political leaders convinced that are absolutely right. Hartlieb emphasizes that populism and extremism are not synonymous. Populism need not show antidemocratic or anticonstitutional tendencies. Populists treat "the nation" as a politically mature entity, underrated by the politicians of traditional parties. They present to this nation simple solutions of complicated problems. They often propagate (apparent) reforms. Both leftist and rightist populists in Western Europe are distinguished by sharp, "venomous" anti-Americanism. Both the former and the latter spread imaginary theories about international plots that they are fighting against. The rightist populists accept the necessity of strong national identification, and oppose the European Union. Leftist populists, on the other hand, appear as the herolds of the Peace Movement, and in their political struggle use the hackneyed dichotomy of: Fascists vs. anti-Fascists. Hartlieb draws attention to the fact that regardless of how powerful the populist groupings are, they frequently bring to light the fears and problems of the masses, not sufficiently noticed by the traditional parties. A question arises: where is the boundary line between the populist groupings and the modern parties that make use of mass-media?

Patrick Moreau and Eva Steinborn say that antiglobalist movements partly fill the empty space left after the downfall of communism. Globalism, to some extent, draws on the collapsed Utopias of the Left. However, antiglobalism is not *eo ipso* tantamount to extremism, only some antiglobalist movements take extremist forms.

Running through many essays like a red thread is the problem of the common features of extremist Right and Left, the correlation between the extremist views of society and the power of various kinds of extremism. Kai Arzheimer reaches the conclusion that the rightist extremism and the leftist one are generally at opposite poles and have few points in common. Arzheimer's statistical tables and expositions are based on a questionnaire that embraced 23, 044 people in 19 countries in 1999. This kind of research can hardly be the basis for creating model pictures of individual kinds of extremism. The size of his sample (about a thousand people in each country), the criteria of its selection, and the changing character of the attitudes and problems that appear in various countries have made his conclusions outdated in the seven years that have elapsed since the poll. It is hard to see where he got the idea that leftist extremists gained the upper hand in Poland in 1999 (p. 276).

Many researchers, including Arzheimer, draw attention to the essential differences between extremists in the "new democracies" of the ex-Soviet bloc, where the attitude to the "Communist past" is the basic criterion of the political outlook, and extremist postures in Western Europe, where they are defined by the attitude towards economic problems, "traditional values" or immigration.

Three papers are devoted to Central or Eastern Europe (Tom Thiemé, Miroslav Mareš, and Andreas Umland). Their typological generalizations, in my opinion, do not quite correspond with the realities of our region. Cas Mudde speaks of three types of extreme rightist parties: 1 — the traditional nationalist type reminiscent of the parties of "pre-Communist" times; 2 — the Communist-nationalist type; and 3 — the newly-arisen populist parties. The authors say that the future prospects of the latter are the most promising. This division is not clear. It is called into question in the same volume by Tom Thiemé (p. 348).

The authors draw attention to the fact that some groupings derived from the previous ruling parties (Russian and Czech Communists) openly take over the nationalist watchwords of the Right, while the rightist parties frequently borrow

anticapitalist programmes from the previous leftist or ruling parties. The German researchers find it difficult to classify the Communist Party of the Czech Republic and Moravia (KSČM) and the Polish Self-Defence Party (*Samoobrona*), finding that they are a mixture of leftist and rightist tendencies. The authors sometimes use the term "moderate extremism", realizing that an open and radical antidemocratic policy in present-day Central-Eastern Europe can find no acclaim. In the case of Poland, Thieme says that despite her ethnic homogeneity, the nationalist phraseology finds there an alarming support of the electorate, while in the multi-ethnic Slovakia or Rumania the Hungarian minority is fully accepted (p. 349). Miroslav Mareš of Brno points out that the idea of Pan-Slavism is used by various Czech groupings, including extremist ones, as an instrument of manipulation. Pan-Slavism appears to be an instrument of defence against the influence of the West and globalization. Mareš realizes, however, that this was not a factor of primary importance in the past and it is even less important nowadays. However, he does not seem to know that in contemporary Poland, for example, Pan-Slavist ideology has no influence whatsoever (p. 361).

Andreas Umland sees many ideological tendencies of present-day Russia as "palingenetic ultranationalism". He draws attention to the definite rightist bias of Russian extremism. He rightly perceives conscious (open or concealed) imitation of Nazism in many Russian rightist types of extremism. He says that just as 20th century Russia was a reference point for the students of the extreme Left, so 21st century Russia may be the object of research for the students of the multi-faceted extremist Right.

The register of extremisms of the present world could be extended *ad infinitum*. The volume under review could be supplemented by another: about the transformations and aspects of contemporary racism and its position in extremist movements. Here we may include the revival of anti-Semitism in Europe, which draws on the old traditions and the new antagonisms between the Arabic world and the state of Israel and the Jews. Of great significance is the problem, so far almost untouched, of anti-Communism as a vehicle used by the extreme Right in Central and Eastern Europe. In Poland and in Hungary, the Right, not without success, has loaded *en bloc* into this vehicle the whole of the post-war half-century, and even more: the socialist and leftist movements preceding 1938. Frequently, the presentation of "the communist enemy" does not differ from the old Nazi propaganda. Anti-Communism, for understandable reasons, is often combined with an anti-Russian attitude.

The authors focus on the phenomena of new types of extremism that took shape in the last decade or decades. While reading their expositions we certainly note the weakness of the Polish anti-war, anti-globalist or ecological movements. What finds better reflection in the Polish reality is rather the general world-wide re-awakening of anarchism. But generally, the above-mentioned movements may only occasionally be defined as extremist. What can always be defined as extremism is rightist or leftist terrorism. Its threat should focus the maximum attention of the whole of mankind. Small groups of terrorists using mass-destruction weapons can wipe out whole countries from the globe with lightning speed. This cannot be compared with the "old-fashioned terrorism", with the assassins of the Tsars, kings or politicians of bygone centuries. The technological revolution opened up horrifying possibilities for small political groups.

The catalogue of extremist threats presented in the book inclines us to some selection questions about the most crucial problems. What threats to world peace are the most important? To what extent does Islamic terrorism threaten a global catastrophe? Considering that *jihād* is, as the authors say, a "derivative of modernity", it must be asked to what extent the whole world is threatened by individuals, organizations or states that act in the name of religion, racial hatred, ultranationalism or chauvinism? Where can the policy of the religious-nationalist states lead us? How can this threat be prevented? The authors of this volume say that there can be no tolerance for those who abolish the foundations of democracy,

and at the same time emphasize that extremism has to be fought with the aid of fully democratic methods, and that complete tolerance should be preserved in this fight. One wonders, how do these fine principles relate to the reality of our world?

*Jerzy W. Borejsza*