

From here, things are, again, hit and miss: Maciej Górny's piece on German and Polish ethno-psychology is hard to unpack, but Maria Wojtczak's article on German female authors and their shifting positions vis-à-vis the German-Polish relationship from 1890 to 1939 is an accomplished study. Matthias Barelkowski introduces us to his initial findings regarding German Jews and the "progressive women's movement" in the Prussian East. It is an intervention like Grazyna Liczbinska's article on late nineteenth-century Lutheran German men marrying Catholic Polish women that has all the hallmarks of classic studies of colonial encounters, however, and more such work would have been useful and directly to the point of the volume. Masculinity is haphazardly introduced in the latter part of the collection, such as in the article by Pascale Mannert that forwards a theory of ambivalent masculinity in eastern Galicia, using one single subject's writings. Jolanta Mickute's study of idealized Jewish women in the east provides an interesting twist on the colonizing mind. Mickute makes the case for these women as excellent colonizers, but for a distant, Zionist project. Jews are central again in Christhardt Henschel's analysis of the Polish interwar attempts to integrate minorities into the military. The final section involves three studies of the Nazi occupation. Jan H. Issinger's piece on the training of German *Ordnungspolizei* as colonial officers is an area ripe for further analysis, and I will look out for his future work on this subject. Wiebke Lisner describes the strange situation of midwifery in the Warthegau, and Krystyna Radziszweska analyzes the perversely modernizing effect of life in concentration camps for illiterate women.

The volume closes with the always wise words of Winson Chu. After walking us through the relevant literature and pointing out that Poland was late to the post-colonial studies game, Chu explains that today, on the one hand, the liberal left in Poland self-colonizes by constantly holding themselves up to the west as the only model to strive for, while on the other hand, conservatives invoke postcoloniality in their nationalist arguments. Chu ends with his usual refrain that employing the "colonial" lense as a framework for analysis can be too narrow, and that, especially when we include literate natives, à la Frysztacka's intervention in this volume, the story becomes much more complicated.

The book is recommended for specialists due to several important essays.

ROBERT NELSON
University of Windsor

Brothers or Enemies: The Ukrainian National Movement and Russia from the 1840s to the 1870s. By Johannes Remy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016. ix, 329 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. \$65.00, hard bound. doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.29

Brothers or Enemies is a welcome addition to the small but growing body of new scholarship on nineteenth century Russian borderlands, and, specifically, on Ukraine. In recent years, a very interesting discussion has emerged concerning identity formation, state policy, and the long-term viability of an "All-Russian" nation-building project in Ukraine (Faith Hillis, *Children of Rus'*, 2013; Alexei Miller, *The Ukrainian Question: Russian Nationalism in the 19th c.*, 2003). There is general agreement among historians that the project ultimately did not succeed, but the explanations for the failure and its timing vary widely. With his book on the Ukrainian national movement—which in the second half of the nineteenth century came to be regarded as a threat and a dangerous rival to the idea of an "All-Russian" nation—Johannes Remy offers an altogether different perspective.

Brothers or Enemies examines the Ukrainian movement in the crucial decades between the founding of the clandestine Cyrillo-Methodian Society in the 1840s and the promulgation of the Ems decree (the prohibition on publishing in Ukrainian) in 1876. The book consists of seven chapters, organized mainly around an analysis of the most important Ukrainian political, literary, and historical texts produced and/or published at the time, as well as the government's response to them. On this basis, Remy argues that "the roots of Ukrainian independence were planted" in the 1840s, half a century earlier than some historians claim.

The book is not, however, strictly speaking, an intellectual, political, or social history, though it certainly contains elements of each. Rather, the author has a very specific objective: to investigate how Ukrainian activists perceived Russians and the Russian state. Remy shows that in the 1840s, the sense of difference was "already" very strong. In the most extreme version of the stereotype, Russians were seen as "undemocratic, prone to dominating other nations, collectivist rather than individualist, immoral in their violent behavior, egoistic, lacking respect for others' property, and incapable of deep religiosity or high ideals in general" (224). These anti-Russian attitudes softened somewhat in the 1870s, most notably in the writings of the Mykhailo Drahomanov. As a progressive, he believed in the necessity of sweeping, empire-wide political change and found common cause with those Russian intellectuals and activists who were willing to work towards a democratic Russia. Ukraine's future was, to his way of thinking, contingent on the political transformation of the Russian Empire. For Drahomanov, in this respect, it was possible to be both Ukrainian and Russian, at least in a civic sense. With the Ems Ukaz and the new wave of repressions against Ukrainian activists, including Drahomanov, however, this optimism, as Remy notes, began to fade.

Did the assertion of essential differences between Ukrainians and Russians constitute a profound rupture? There is ample evidence to suggest that this kind of "othering" had a much longer and fuller history—on all sides. In fact, much of the nineteenth century Russian discourse on Ukraine centered on the *meaning* of the differences between Russians and "Little Russians," not their very existence. Yet, in another way, Remy is exactly right. In the 1840s, as his book highlights, this sense of Ukrainian identity found a modern political expression in the programmatic works of the Cyrillo-Methodian Society. What made the Ukrainian national movement modern—and potent in its own right—was not the assertion of difference per se but rather the democratic aspirations of the Ukrainian activists, their feelings of solidarity with (the concept of) a Ukrainian people, and their devotion to the idea of a decentralized political life (what Remy refers to as "nationalism"). Indeed, as Remy's study confirms, political separation became a recurring theme among Ukrainian activists from the mid-1840s on. And this, implicitly, did pose a grave challenge to the construction of an "all-Russian" nation.

For specialists, perhaps the most interesting part of *Brothers or Enemies* is the author's account of the evolving government response to the Ukrainian movement. Among other things, the author shows, on the basis of extensive and careful archival research, the extraordinary lengths to which the Minister of Internal Affairs and the head of the Third Section were willing to go to by 1863 to incriminate and suppress the legal activities of the movement. The Polish revolution, Remy argues, provided an opportunity to fabricate evidence, spread disinformation and circumvent regular procedures in order to introduce the first prohibitions against publishing in the Ukrainian language. "The temporary character of the circular on Ukrainian publications," he writes, "followed from the dubious manner in which it emerged, not from Valuev's supposed opinion that the restrictions were desirable only for a short time" (166).

Brothers or Enemies provides an important corrective to the recent tendency of historians to minimize the significance of the Ukrainian national movement in the Russian Empire, to view it as a mere reflection of state policy, and/or to treat it as a subsidiary of the movement that later developed in Habsburg Galicia (western Ukraine).

OLGA ANDRIEWSKY
Trent University

Vatican II Behind the Iron Curtain. Ed. Piotr H. Kosicki. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2016. viii, 225 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Glossary. \$65.00 hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.30

Although this book consists of five separate articles and an introductory overview, it has a coherence and cohesion that one rarely finds in edited collections. Every chapter covers similar themes and addresses related questions, resulting in a broad yet thorough presentation of a topic that has received surprisingly little attention from historians: the role of Catholics from the Soviet Bloc during the Second Vatican Council, and the impact of that momentous event in the communist world. The volume includes coverage of Hungary (Árpád von Klimó), Yugoslavia (Ivo Banac), Czechoslovakia (James Ramon Felak), Poland (Piotr H. Kosicki), and global diplomatic affairs (Gerald P. Fogarty). The editor's introduction provides a useful overview, along with an excellent summary of the existing scholarship. This is a pathbreaking project, and one that historians specializing in Catholic history and east European history will find extremely valuable. I cannot begin to even summarize the wealth of fascinating information here, so instead I will pull back and mention a couple themes that run throughout the entire book.

One of these threads is the role of Church-State relations in framing how Vatican II was received in eastern Europe. The authors approach the term "oppression" with varying levels of critical nuance, though all of them have to deal with this topic, because it cast a shadow on every aspect of the Council's history in the region. They all agree that the old image of a "Church of Silence" is unfounded: Catholic religious life was never stamped out, and both clerical and lay voices continued to be heard. Nonetheless, communist antagonism and oppression appear in every story told in this book. One challenge in writing about communist religious oppression is evident in these essays: precisely which aspects of state policy should be interpreted under this rubric? From the perspective of the Catholics under study, the violations ranged from imprisonment to the removal of religion classes from state schools. In other words, they experienced the challenges of modernity in the context of communist authoritarianism, thus blurring the lines between the two. This led to miscommunication (some willful, some unintended) at the Second Vatican Council. A west European bishop might advocate "freedom of conscience," and be met with resistance from conservatives who continued to adhere to the obligatory antimodernism of Pius X, if not the Ultramontanism of Pius IX. East European clerics, meanwhile, heard the same words and applauded, assuming that "liberty" would restore their right to teach the catechism in state schools, and free people from unwanted exposure to secular (and state-sponsored) decadence and atheism. These essays illustrate how the Council's rhetoric could cut different ways in different contexts, and they exemplify the methodological challenges that come with describing such moments.