

Format de citation

Žvanko, Ljubov Mykolaïvna: Rezension über: Svetlana Michajlovna Fal'kovič (ed.), *Mež dvuch vosstanij. Korolevstvo Pol'skoe i Rossija v 30-50-e gody XIX v.*, Moskva: "Indrik", 2016, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas / jgo.e-reviews*, jgo.e-reviews 2019, 1, S. 31-34, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/002edbbb74014ce988e69911ea34f2eb>



Franz Steiner Verlag

IM AUFTRAG DES
Leibniz-Instituts für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung

copyright

Cet article peut être téléchargé et/ou imprimé à des fins privées.
Toute autre reproduction ou représentation, intégrale ou substantielle de son contenu, doit faire l'objet d'une autorisation (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Mež dvuch vosstanij. Korolevstvo Pol'skoe i Rossija v 30-50-e gody XIX v.

[Zwischen zwei Aufständen. Das Königreich Polen und Russland in den 30er bis 50er Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts]

Otv. red. Svetlana M. Fal'kovič. Moskva: Indrik, 2016. 775 S. ISBN: 978-5-91674-369-2.

Historically, relations between Poland and Russia have always been uneasy. Since the events of spring/summer 2014 in Ukraine, however, they have been virtually frozen. Each new publication devoted to studying historical experience in these very difficult times, therefore, makes an important contribution to establishing future cooperation between the two states.

The book being reviewed here is “the first work in Russian historiography covering a comprehensive set of problems that had a significant impact on the relations between Russia and the Kingdom of Poland which coexisted within the Russian Empire in the thirties till fifties of the 19th century” (URL: <https://inslav.ru/publication/mezh-dvuh-vosstanij-korolevstvo-polskoe-i-rossiya-v-30-50-e-gody-xix-v> [last accessed on: 21.10.2019]). The collective monograph was prepared by senior staff at the Institute of Slavic Studies, which is a part of the Historical and Philological Sciences Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS). It is important to note that the book is a thematic continuation of the study *Pol'sha i Rossiia v pervoi treti XIX veka. Iz istorii avtonomnogo Korolevstva Pol'skogo* (Poland and Russia in the first third of the 19th century. From the history of the autonomous Kingdom of Poland) (Moscow 2010), published as a part of the research project *Pol'sha i Rossiia v XIX veke* (Poland and Russia in the 19th century).

The editor-in-chief of the publication, Svetlana M. Fal'kovich (a leading researcher at the Institute of Slavic Studies), and Boris V. Nosov (a deputy chairman of the Russian half of the Commission of Historians of Russia and Poland and the head of the department at the Institute of Slavic Studies) outline the research aims in the preface of the book. They encompass the issues of centralization, constitutionalism, autonomy, the relationship of the national political centres with the suburbs and peripheral regions, the delineation of the functions and powers of central and local authorities, and their interaction with different social strata and groups, which is expressed in the formation of social movements and their ideological and political positions (p. 9). The maxim that staying “under one imperial roof” has led to close social and cultural ties between the two peoples is stressed throughout all the chapters. However, in this regard, it is important to note that the fundamental aspect that influenced the entire history of Polish-Russian relations from the end of the 18th until the beginning of the 19th century is the participation of the Russian Empire in the partitions of the Polish state. In the context of Polish statehood, this period is unambiguously characterized as *zabór rosyjski*

(“Russian annexation”). It is, therefore, impossible to talk about mutual and equal relations in different spheres of public life, since the loss of independence a priori deprived such relationships of equality. The authors of the publication omit this, concealing the openly predatory policy of the Russian Empire on Polish lands. It should be pointed out, that Jerzy Zdrada’s book *Historia Polski 1795–1914* (History of Poland. 1795–1914), which first appeared in print in 2005 and then again in 2015 (with both editions issued in Warsaw) unfortunately remains outside the historiographical field of view of the Russian authors, despite the fact that Jerzy Zdrada is one of the leading historians of that period.

Several other points about the book are also worth highlighting. Firstly, despite repeatedly stressing the common history of the peoples of Poland and Russia, the texts refer to a sort of opposition between the Poles and Russians, which was even reflected in the “common slogan of the liberation movement for both countries ‘For your and our freedom!’” (p. 10). Secondly, the texts answer the key question of how the second Polish uprising (the January uprising of 1863) became possible without mentioning the Poles’ struggle for their ethnic liberation and the restoration of their statehood. Thirdly, the book’s conclusions contain the rather debatable maxim that “the masses of the Russian and Polish people [in the singular!] were not yet ready to conclude a fraternal union [sic!]: too many negative stereotypes and prejudices coming from historical memory separated them” (p. 740). Today, with the considerable baggage of historical knowledge we now bear, it seems a little strange to use propaganda clichés from the times of the USSR. It is difficult to imagine that this is just the result of old Soviet thinking due to force of habit. The use of the rhetoric from a past epoch may in fact reflect the ideological convictions and self-image of Russia’s current ruling elite in relation to other orthodox Slavic peoples in Eastern Europe.

The publication has a clear structure that is in keeping with its objectives. Following the preface, which introduces the subject of the book, there are eight chapters in chronological order. The text of the “Ogranicheskii statut Tsarstva Pol’skogo” (the “Manifesto of February 14, 1832. On the New Order of Administration and Education of the Kingdom of Poland”), adopted by Nicholas I after the suppression of the November Uprising of 1830/31, is presented in the appendices (pp. 741–751). The book also has an index of names.

The first chapter, “Podavlenie vosstaniia 1830–1831 gg. i ustanovlenie rezhima chrezvychainogo upravleniia” (“The suppression of the uprising of 1830–1831 and the establishment of the emergency management regime”) by Boris V. Nosov examines the causes of the uprising and the impact of the European revolutionary crisis on the situation in Poland. The main reason for the uprising, according to the author, was the unresolved peasant issue, which made the protest movement in the occupied Polish lands similar to the protest movements in the Russian provinces. “In the insurgent Kingdom of Poland they [peasant reforms – L. Zh.] acquired special significance, since

both the character of the uprising and its prospects, in particular, the replenishment of the Polish Army and other rebel forces, depended on the position of the peasantry” (p. 56). The author also draws on rich factual material to portray the uprising, the assault of Warsaw and the suppression of the rebellion. “In spring and summer of 1831, the Berlin and Vienna courts helped the tsarist government in suppressing the uprising in Poland, particularly on the grounds of their general participation in the division of the country [...]” (p. 65) According to a Russian historian at the turn of the 19th century, one of the results of the defeat of the uprising was the emergence of Polish emigration – a new evil for Russia, since the Poles “carried a scream” against Russia to Paris, London, Belgium and America showing themselves as victims of tyranny at every opportunity (p. 82).

The second chapter, “Politika carskogo pravitel’sstva v Korolevstve Pol’skom vremeni namestnichestva I. F. Paskevicha” (“The tsarist government policy in the Kingdom of Poland at the time of the governorship of I. F. Paskevich”), also by Boris V. Nosov, is devoted to the tsarist government repression of the rebels, the main methods used to implement the “appeasement” policy, e. g. the trial of the uprising participants, etc. Particular emphasis is placed on the analysis of Nicholas I’s Manifesto on the formation of the Kingdom of Poland (February 14, 1832) as a subject of the Russian state without any significant changes to its legal status. Important aspects of Nicholas’ policy towards the Kingdom of Poland after the suppression of the uprising were the dissolution of the Polish army as an attribute of sovereignty, the replacement of “nationality” with “citizenship” (p. 106 f.), the elimination of a separate Catholic church and the recognition of the Mogilev metropolitan’s primacy among Catholic bishops.

The third chapter by LIUDMILA P. MARNEI is devoted to the economic development of the Kingdom of Poland and the Russian Empire in the 1830s, ‘40s and ‘50s. It depicts leading industries, transport, and the specific nature of agricultural development at the time. The chapter concludes that the Kingdom of Poland “still remained one of the most industrialized parts of the empire” (p. 247). The fourth chapter, “Patrioticheskoe obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v Korolevstve Pol’skom v 1830-ch – nachale 1860-ch gg.” (“The patriotic social movement in the Kingdom of Poland from the 1830s to the early 1860s”) by GALINA V. MAKAROVA focuses on the attempts of the Poles to resume the activities of the conspiratorial patriotic movement, the role of the “Spring of Nations of 1848” and the influence of the Crimean War on the social movement in the Kingdom of Poland, etc. The conclusion that “the authorities’ attempts to establish positive contacts with the Polish nobility [...] [and] representatives of the emerging bourgeoisie, despite of their interest in economic relations with the whole empire, did not produce the expected results”, also deserves the reader’s attention. According to the author this was a consequence of the fact that the awareness of the loss of national independence was passed on from generation to generation in Poland and remained the dominant narrative in social consciousness (p. 373).

The fifth chapter, “Pol’skii vopros v mezhdunarodnoi politike 1830-ch – nachala 1860-ch gg.” (“The Polish question in international politics from the 1830s to the early 1860s”) by OL’GA S. KASHTANOVA considers the positions of the leading countries in relation to the rebels as well as the impact of the activities of Polish emigrant diplomacy on shaping European public opinion in favour of Poland and its attempts to include the Polish question in the international diplomatic game (p. 449).

A significant part of the book is devoted to the “Pol’skaia ‘Velikaia emigratsiia’ 1831 – nachala 1860-ch gg.” (“The Polish ‘Great Emigration’ from 1831 to the beginning of the 1860s”). This comprises the sixth chapter, written by Svetlana M. Fal’kovich. “The mass exodus of Polish patriots from their homeland” was the logical result of the defeat of the November uprising. The author examines the dynamics of this phenomenon, highlights the main centres of emigration and provides an overview of its activities.

The development of education and culture in the Kingdom of Poland from the 1830s until the early 1860s is depicted in the seventh chapter by Ol’ga S. Kashtanova. It is slightly surprising that the writer does not begin by indicating the real reasons for the closure of Polish higher and secondary educational institutions. Not a word is mentioned about the Russian Empire’s russification policy. The author appears not to find the transformation of Polish Catholic churches into Orthodox churches in any way unusual (p. 642).

The last chapter, “Nakanune Ianvar’skogo vosstaniia (1856–1862 gg.)” (“On the eve of the January uprising [1856–1862]”) by Boris V. Nosov, is dedicated to the events in the run-up to a new uprising against the Russian Empire. However, the chapter seems unfinished, though this could also reveal the author’s intention of writing a new book starting from this point.

Thus, when it comes to the generalizing characteristics of the book reviewed here, the well-known Polish proverb appears fitting: “Punkt widzenia zależy od punktu siedzenia”, which means: “The point of view depends on the location.” In other words, the principles of the foreign policy pursued by the modern Russian state have had an impact on the interpretation of the history of Russia’s relations with Poland. At the same time, it is necessary to recognize the fact that the Russian historians contributing to this volume, collected rich factual material and offered the reader a broad reconstruction of the events of the “common history of Russia and Poland in the 19th century”. In so doing, they sought to portray the relationship processes in a holistic manner, to sketch the interconnections, and to depict a complete image of the era.

LJUBOV’ N. ŽVANKO
Char’kiv