

BOOK REVIEWS

Michael Alfred Peszke, *The Armed Forces of Poland in the West, 1939–46: Strategic Concepts, Planning, Limited Success but No Victory!* (Solihull: Helion, 2013). Illustrations, maps, biographical sketches, index. 238 pp. ISBN 978-1908916549.

Michael Alfred Peszke, *Polskie siły zbrojne na Zachodzie, 1939–1946: Koncepcje strategiczne i realia geopolityki* [*The Polish armed forces in the West, 1939–1946: Strategic concepts and geopolitical realities*], trans. Tomasz Fiedorek. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis, 2014. 396 pp. ISBN 978-83-7818-547-5.

Michael Alfred Peszke has written many distinguished volumes on Polish military history in World War II. These two titles are the most recent: one published in England, and the other, a translation of it, subsequently published in Poland. Both include forewords by George Sanford. The Polish-language edition's subtitle shows the admirable symmetry of a classicist edifice; the English-language edition's has the quality of a *cri de coeur*.

Peszke recounts the military strategy of the Polish Government-in-Exile: the creation of a robust clandestine force, the Home Army (*Armia Krajowa*), in the occupied Polish homeland; and advocacy for British prime minister Winston Churchill's own preference for liberating Europe via the Balkans' "soft underbelly."

In furtherance of their overall strategy, the Poles sought to develop a Polish-controlled "special duties" air unit to supply the Home Army with trained cadres, money, and sabotage matériel. Until late 1943, this aspiration was thwarted by the geographical distance from Britain to Poland, which exceeded the flying range of available aircraft. By the time American B-24 Liberators and sufficient numbers of used British Halifaxes, discarded by the Royal Air Force's Bomber Command, became available to the Poles, they faced British Foreign Office obstruction. The Foreign Office, due to objections by the Soviet Union, also stymied attempts to have a British military mission parachuted in for the Home Army.

Peszke traces the numerical growth of the Polish Armed Forces in the West, particularly of 2 Corps (2 Korpus in Polish)—PolCorps to the British—in Italy, even as Polish political fortunes were waning due to adverse depictions of the Poles in Western media and the victories of the Soviet forces, who were pursuing their own strategic goal of dominating Eastern and Central Europe. Churchill failed to sway U.S. president Franklin Roosevelt to support his Balkans plan, and the Warsaw

—S
—n

ksd

Uprising of August–October 1944 rang a death knell for Polish hopes for a free Poland. Any chances of it were definitively buried at Yalta.

Peszke quotes a British War Office memo (TNA WO 204/5470, cited in the English-language edition, p. 166n18) that perfectly reflects the British military's perplexity: "What happened at Yalta is a big injustice for Poland, but there must be some reason why men in whom we have had faith signed something which is apparently contrary to what they promised us in words and writ."

Peszke discusses the final attempts by the Poles in the West to concentrate all their army units in northwestern Europe by moving there the three divisions of their 2 Corps from Italy and their Fourth Infantry Division from Scotland. Such a concentration had been stipulated by the British in their August 1940 military agreement with the Polish Government-in-Exile. In very early 1945, the British shelved this plan, and in April 1945 they consigned it to oblivion. The initial hesitation seems to have been due to Churchill's contingency plan for Operation Unthinkable, a proposed military confrontation with the Soviet Union that was meant to impose the will of the United States and the British empire upon it on behalf of a "square deal for Poland" (TNA CAB 120/691, cited in the English-language edition, p. 169n26). The Polish forces would have played a major part in such an operation. However, the Americans and the British Labour Party refused to countenance such a military confrontation.

The photographs in these books illustrate the history of the Polish armed forces in the West. At the zenith of the Polish-British alliance, in early 1941, Churchill and the British royal family visited the Polish forces. Władysław Sikorski, the Polish prime minister and commander-in-chief, signed two major treaties: the Polish-British military agreement of August 1940, witnessed by Churchill and most of the British wartime coalition cabinet; and a year later, likewise in London, the Polish-Soviet agreement that temporarily restored diplomatic relations between those two countries and allowed the formation of Polish forces on Soviet soil. Other photographs show General Władysław Anders, the Polish 2 Corps commander, discussing Poland's future with Churchill and with the British deputy prime minister, Clement Attlee. Finally, with Poland's situation already beyond remedy, we see the imposing strength of Polish military forces in Allied-occupied Germany and Italy.

CHRISTOPHER KASPAREK
Independent Scholar and Author

Barbara Smolińska-Theiss, *Dzieciństwo jako status społeczny: Edukacyjne przywileje dzieci klasy średniej* [Childhood as a social status: Educational privileges of middle-class children] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej, 2014), 328 pp. ISBN 978-83-62828-89-0.

An intriguing book on childhood and class privileges has been published in Poland by the renowned social pedagogue and researcher of childhood and children rights Professor Barbara Smolińska-Theiss, inspired by her profound knowledge of

the biography and various works of Janusz Korczak.¹ “Intriguing” may not be strong enough to express the potential controversy of the groundbreaking “categories of children and childhood” that the author creates. Among the most moving examples is the category of “enhanced quality” children in relation to middle-class children, who through their parents’ financial and cultural investments become children of “higher quality.” When compared against working-class children, their resources and extracurricular activities maintain their “superior” status. Smolińska-Theiss discusses the strong drive for success among children of “successful” parents. The author attempts to find out who these “successful” parents are, and her findings allow for an analysis of the Polish middle-class profile. In contrast to initial preconceptions, these parents are not necessarily wealthy, but they are highly educated and financially comfortable, often occupying prestigious positions or owning private businesses. Most importantly, they belong to the so-called knowledge class, where the highest virtue is placed on knowledge. Their attitude derives from the old *intelligentsia* that bestows great value on the child, the family, and tertiary education. The author claims that children born into this category of parents are under immense pressure to perform, which is placed on them by their pedagogically reflexive and ambitious parents, who wish to secure their children’s position in society through a number of educational measures, serving to push their children’s ability to the limit and diversify their skills and talents. The author does not limit herself to Pierre Bourdieu’s² theory of social reproduction through educational systems or Ralph Darendorf’s³ theory of the life opportunities of the young but makes a distinct effort to take her readers on an in-depth journey across a multitude of European theories on childhood and social reproduction. Thanks to the author’s fluency in German and her expertise in Polish literature concerning childhood, the reader may gain an insight into concepts and theories previously unknown because of language barriers. Due to the nature of study concerning social determinants of educational success, this book may be placed within the field of social pedagogy; however, it is also embedded in a wider interdisciplinary context. It discusses the typical pedagogical issues of the functioning of families and their children in the educational perspective: everyday learning practices, after-school activities, and individual educational and career choices, set against research contributions on the social causes of success and failure at school.⁴ The book enriches sociological

1. See Barbara Smolińska-Theiss, *Korczakowskie narracje pedagogiczne* [Korczak’s educational narratives] (Kraków: Impuls, 2013).

2. Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *La Reproduction: Éléments pour une théorie du système d’enseignement* [Reproduction: Elements for theory of education systems] (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1970).

3. Ralf Dahrendorf, *Life Chances: Approaches to Social and Political Theory* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979).

4. See Helena Radlińska, *Społeczne przyczyny powodzeń i niepowodzeń szkolnych* [Social causes of success and failure at school] (Warsaw: Nasza Księgarnia, 1937).

inquiries into stratification systems⁵ through input on the emerging Polish middle class. It travels across social sciences discussing class ethos and tradition and looks at patterns of social reproduction, analyzing inheritance of social status and duplication of parental educational routes by children. It also discusses social policy, highlighting issues of equal access and life opportunities. The concept of Bourdieuan *habitus* is well explored, drawing a matrix of the social and individual values, norms, practices of education, and activities that allow individuals to identify the practices inculcated by a family's social position as their own individually developed and adopted framework of social and educational tasks.

One of the significant advantages of this outstanding book is the use of large-scale empirical data, both qualitative and quantitative in nature, gathered during 1995–2010 in Warsaw's upper secondary schools, known in Poland as licea. The tools of data collection were based on triangulation of techniques: interviews with both parents and their children (thirty families); interviews with maturity exam graduates, equivalent to A-level graduates in the United Kingdom (seventy-four); and approximately 850 questionnaires and a number of narrative interviews. The extent of the study should be considered longitudinal, and due to the close engagement with three separate and prestigious licea, it draws a picture of Polish middle-class children and their objective situations, motivations, declarative goals, and self-perceived positions.

The study is remarkable when set against the ongoing, gradual change in the stratification system of Polish society since the introduction of democracy (1989). It raises interesting questions about school mainstreaming, enclaves of exclusion, and mechanisms of ensuring intergenerational power transfer. It also emphasizes the pressure put on children who are aware that certain privileges come at a price and that there are high expectations placed on them by their family.

The book is written in Polish, but it also contains an introduction and closing remarks in English, providing key information on research scope, main theoretical contributions, and the purpose of the scientific inquiries into childhood in a Polish middle-class setting. The book consists of six main chapters: (1) "The Discovery of the Child and Childhood," which is a rich compilation of ideas and previous studies into childhood; (2) "The Child's Place at School," where the author discusses the school's place in children's life and opportunities; (3) "From Social Causes of School Failure to Inequality and Diversity in Education," which shows the social fallacy of equal access to education and moreover to educational success, proving social background to be the key ingredient of school performance; (4) "The Theoretical and Methodological Research Framework," which sets the scene for the empirical study and contextualizes it in social science theory; (5) "Always Doing Well," which talks about the reinforcing element of success, boiled down to a simple

5. See Talcott Parsons, *Social Structure and Personality* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964).

statement—a “good family” produces a “good child,” and a “good school” produces “good students”; and (6) “High Quality Children,” which discusses the high level of consumerism among middle-class families directed not at material goods but at the enhancement of the child’s potential. These attitudes are born not only out of families’ favorable economic situation but also and more importantly out of knowledge-oriented “doxa.”⁶

In the research cases, it is clear that these “privileged” children’s talents and skills are developed through the significant investments made by their parents, who have a child-oriented approach. Conversely to the outsider’s perception, this transactional model does not limit the child’s agency but encourages independence and a sense of self-worth, tightening the family bond. Middle-class parents can be viewed as proficient risk managers of their children’s lives and life opportunities in a changeable, Beck-like⁷ risk society. The middle classes are portrayed as the most flexible and adjustable to societal and structural changes,⁸ with the ability to maximize opportunities that those changes bring. Their flexibility stems from a wide range of interests, classed as hobbies, which equip them not only with participatory social capital⁹ but most of all with a potential to utilize these additional skills in times of economic necessity. This shows that the middle classes embrace a lifelong learning model and accept the likelihood of multiple career changes during their adult life. The high reflexivity of middle-class parents and their investment in their children, treated as precautions, reduce the risk of unemployment and the social exclusion of their children. Middle-class parents plan ahead and are future-oriented.¹⁰

The profile of the children that emerges from this research is of great value when one considers that they may be classed as a hard-to-reach group because of age and status barriers between the researcher and the researched. This profile is revealing of how *habitus* works in practice. When compared to their Western counterparts, the children have modest needs of contemporary consumption and direct their expenses toward more knowledge-centric goals—for example, language courses abroad and IT devices used for study or creativity, rather than leisure or fashion.

This book is a must-read for Polish social pedagogues, sociologists, and policy makers. It also may be interesting for teachers, social workers, and students of relevant disciplines. The book is the culmination of many years of work that

6. Pierre Bourdieu, *Pascalian Meditations* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000), 16.

7. See Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992).

8. See Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000).

9. See, e.g., Francis Fukuyama, “Social Capital, Civil Society, and Development,” *Third World Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (2001): 7–20; Robert D. Putnam “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital,” *Journal of Democracy* 6, no. 1 (1995): 64–78.

10. See Anna Odrowąż-Coates and Justyna Stańczak, “Strategie edukacyjne rodziców z klas średnich w Polsce i Arabii Saudyjskiej” (“Educational Strategies of Middle Class Parents in Poland and in Saudi Arabia”) *Pedagogika Społeczna (Social Pedagogy Quarterly)* 3, no. 49 (2013): 77–96.

demonstrates the author's methodological and scientific maturity, taking readers for an inspiring, exciting, multidimensional, and interdisciplinary journey across the theory and practice of social research. It would be of great benefit to social science if it were to be translated in full into the English language.

ANNA ODROWĄŻ-COATES

M. Grzegorzewska Academy of Special Education in Warsaw

Anna Landau-Czajka, *Polska to nie oni: Polska i Polacy w polskojęzycznej prasie żydowskiej II Rzeczypospolitej* [Poland is not them: Poland and Poles in the Jewish Polish-language press of the Second Republic] (Warsaw: Żydowski Instytut Historyczny, 2015), 375 pp., bibliography, index. ISBN 978-83-61850-51-9.

As the author of the book under review rightly observes in her introduction, despite the significant development in research on Jewish topics in Poland over the last few decades, there are still numerous topics in the field that have barely been touched upon. One of them is undoubtedly the history as well as the thematic content of the Jewish press published in Yiddish, Polish, and Hebrew. Another essential weakness of the research on Jewish topics to date in Polish scholarship, especially noticeable within the context of research on Polish-Jewish relations, is the decidedly one-sided use of the source material, to a large degree presenting the Polish perspective.

Anna Landau-Czajka's book, which focuses on the image of Poland and the Poles in the Polish-language Jewish press of the interwar period, makes an essential, albeit still limited—as it initially appears—contribution to overcoming the aforementioned lacunae. For her primary source she has chosen the periodicals in Polish—much smaller than the periodicals published in Yiddish in terms of number and size of the editions, as well as size of readership and the periodicals' role in shaping opinions. It is commonly assumed that this press, although it certainly expressed Jewish opinion and was an important source for determining the community's attitudes and views, was nonetheless representative of only a small group of assimilated Jews who were, to quote the author, “in truth living in Jewish milieus . . . but circulating in Polish cultural spheres, in many cases more familiar with them than with Jewish ones” (186).

Aware of this limitation, Landau-Czajka also notices all the problems of interpreting the press that arise from this, including the inclination toward a certain propaganda in the periodicals' message (in contradistinction to the Yiddish and Hebrew press, the Polish-language press was also read by non-Jewish Poles), as well as the difficulties in creating an image of Poland and Poles that was clear, coherent, and adequate to their real convictions. As the author herself suspects, this is—and this is a key issue for the book—what became determined to a large degree by the specific context of the examined press. The position of the creators and consumers of the Polish-language press on the boundaries of both worlds—the Polish and the

Jewish—made it difficult for Jewish self-identification. Consequently, attempts at constructing an unequivocal image of Poles was problematic because on the one hand they were too much “ours” to treat as if they fell in the category of “strangers”; on the other hand they were too distant to write about in schemas that approached auto-stereotypes. The ambivalent attitude toward Polishness led to the development of a highly incoherent, incomplete, and multilayered image of Poles. What is equally significant, this image was deformed by a peculiar political correctness, which resulted from an unwillingness to formulate direct evaluations and judgments, which in the case of a critical stance might lead to accusations of a lack of patriotism or to interference on the part of censors. As Landau-Czajka assumes, this problem concerned the Yiddish-language press to a smaller degree, since on account of its more hermetic nature, it could afford a more decided stance in this respect. Such an observation, to some extent diminishing the significance of the Polish-language press, after an attentive reading of the reviewed book and comparing its content with the results of my own research, seems to me problematic and not fully adequate to the reality in question (which I will attempt to justify in the concluding section of this review).

Despite the uniformity of the research material, the basic sources of the book are extremely broad, in terms of both the number of particular periodicals and their range of types. Approximately 115 periodicals, from dailies (*Nasz Przegląd*, *Chwila*) to weeklies, monthlies, and even one-off publications, were analyzed. They represent a broad geographical and political spectrum—from large to small urban centers and from assimilationist to Zionist, Bundist, and Orthodox. Journals geared toward special interest groups are also represented, such as adults, youth, women, intellectuals, and so on.

The book is organized thematically. In seven chapters the following subjects are presented in a logical and well-thought-out manner: a thorough overall description of the Polish-language Jewish press (geography, readership, political nature, ideological declarations explaining the choice of the Polish language); the attitude toward the reborn Polish state in the years 1918–20; the patriotism of Polish Jews (the vision of a “glorious” past, a common struggle for national liberation, the problem of double patriotism, the German threat in the second half of the 1930s); the image of Józef Pilsudski; the Jewish stereotype of Poland and Poles (among other matters, a detailed analysis of particular classes in Polish society, from the groups with which they identified to “foreign” and “unknown”); anti-Semitism (roots, traditions, and political factors of the Polish antipathy toward Jews); and the problems of assimilation (including, for example, a fascinating examination of the attitude toward mixed marriages).

Despite the political and worldview diversity of particular periodicals, the attentive reader will note numerous common points in the surveyed press. For instance, they responded in quite a similar, critical manner to the wars fought during the reemergence of the Polish state (which did not hinder the periodicals’ decision to unanimously voice a call to arms in Poland’s defense when it was threatened); a

—S
—n

ksd

vision of a harmonious Polish-Jewish coexistence in the old Commonwealth was propagated; the Jewish contribution toward the struggle for independence was stressed; the legend of Piłsudski was buttressed; and anti-Semitism was condemned, but so were programs voicing the need for Jews to abandon their own national self-identification.

Obviously, there were also deep divisions. One of the issues evoking the greatest emotional responses was the question of the scale of Jewish identification with Poland and Polish society, which, for example, decidedly distinguished the Zionists (on this issue they expressed a rather ambivalent attitude) from the assimilationists and veterans (Jewish veterans of the struggle for independence) with their slogans propagating love of homeland.

Despite the concerns of the author, the picture of the attitude of Polish-language Jews toward Poland and Poles that emerges from reading Landau-Czajka's book does not differ in its essence from the opinions expressed in the Yiddish and Hebrew press. Researching the trilingual Jewish press in the Lublin region and being familiar with its opinions on this question,¹ I was surprised to discover numerous similarities. All the elements indicated earlier as common for the narrative of the Polish-language periodicals were also present in the Yiddish press: in a highly similar manner, the transformation of the attitude toward the reborn Polish state (from initial enthusiasm to overt disappointment); in a nearly identical manner, the personality cult of Piłsudski; the manner in which national holidays were described; and finally, use of the same pro-state narration (the homeland should be loved not for what it does, but in spite of what it does). With a high degree of probability, one can suspect that most Jewish periodicals, regardless of the language in which they were published, held the same intentions. The popularization of patriotic and civic attitudes was intended to counter accusations from anti-Semitic circles that Jews lacked feelings of attachment to Poland. This was also attained in the same fashion among the journals: primarily through internal censorship—that is, silencing or easing radical, unfriendly, and overly critical voices.

These similarities are not surprising. Despite appearances to the contrary, the Polish- and Yiddish-language press were related by fairly powerful bonds. There existed a mutual and—it would seem—fairly broad flow of content: journalists and reporters from both presses had a thorough knowledge of “competitive” periodicals, and it was common enough to have translations from the Yiddish-language press published in the Polish-language counterparts. From this perspective it seems simplistic to treat the Polish-language press and its writers as alienated and separate from the remaining Jewish society, unaware of its actual views and attitudes.

1. See Adam Kopciowski, *Wos hert zich in der prowinc? Prasa żydowska na Lubelszczyźnie i jej największy dziennik „Lubliner Tugblat”* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2015).

I must add the caveat that the preceding comments are supported by fairly limited material (comparing the Polish-language press with a provincial Yiddish press published in only one region). Confirming or negating these assumptions will be possible only with the further development of comparative studies on the Jewish press as well as the exchange of views and opinions among scholars dealing with its diverse types. Landau-Czajka's book is undoubtedly an important and pioneering contribution to this type of study. Brilliantly carried out, written in a vivid manner, and introducing to the academic world new, interesting, and previously unknown facts and opinions, it provokes reflection on the national self-identification of Polish Jews as well as their attitude toward Poland and Poles.

ADAM KOPCIEWSKI

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University

Marek Kornat, Sławomir M. Nowinowski, and Rafał Stobiecki, eds., *Piotr Wandycz: Historyk, Emigrant, Intelktualista* [Piotr Wandycz: Historian, emigrant, intellectual] (Bydgoszcz: Oficyna wydawnicza Epigram, 2014), 244 pp. ISBN 978-83-61231-52-3.

Piotr Wandycz is a child of the Second Republic and has lived to see Poland again free. In the intervening years he has established himself as the premier historian of East Central Europe—especially regarding Poland—in North America. I have the honor of being one of his students.

This collection of nine essays dedicated to him also includes an extraordinary bibliography of his published works: many, many pages. I should like to make a few comments on each of the essays, which reflect the range of Wandycz's scholarship, before some summarizing comments.

Rafał Stobiecki is responsible for a fine introductory essay in which he exhibits the meticulous attention to detail we have come to expect from him. It discusses the concept of "East Central Europe" in the "thought" of Wandycz. Stobiecki begins with a commentary on the meaning of the words, beginning understandably with Hal-
eck, and proceeds with a historiographical survey of the implications of the term. The significance of deeming "East Central Europe" as the lands between Russia and Germany is obvious. Relying largely on Wandycz's *The Price of Freedom*, Stobiecki underlines Wandycz's argument that the average person in Poland or perhaps Hun-
gary and, say, Ireland has essentially the same *Weltanschauung*, as simple a version as it may be. The concepts that limn the nations of the area are Christianization from the West, a certain "provincialism" in things political, and a weakly developed "political culture," though he excepts the Czechs from this last attribute. Third, he notes the interrupted nature of political sovereignty characteristic of the area; this induces the compensatory reliance on other unifying factors—what Wandycz calls "another conception of the nation." Fourth, we note the undeniable consequences of large German and Jewish communities. Here Wandycz is careful to distinguish an unsavory nationalist era of the last decades from a more tolerant and welcoming

—s
—n

ksd

tradition of the pre-modernist era. Finally, the struggle for freedom—which is the essential theme of Wandycz's important aforementioned work—is emphasized. This effort has had profound and not always positive consequences despite its essential and inevitable existence.

Stobiecki concludes his stimulating analysis by placing Wandycz in a retrospective conversation with such scholars as Szúcs. This section is perhaps a bit shorter than would be desirable, but space is of course limited in a volume of essays. This is, in sum, a fine contribution and treats Wandycz with obvious appreciation.

Marek Kornat's essay on Wandycz's treatment of Polish interwar foreign policy engages a subject most closely associated with him. Wandycz's writings on this theme are both voluminous and fundamental for subsequent scholars. This essay is, in large part, a historiographical survey of Wandycz's copious writings. It is, understandably, by far the longest and most detailed essay in the collection. Perhaps surprisingly, it notes at some length Wandycz's discussions of Dmowski, but this is complemented with a longer series of remarks concerning Wandycz's irreplaceable ruminations about Piłsudskiite federalism. Kornat notes, *en passant*, the singular failure: the surrender of essential Polish desiderata by Władysław Grabski (the Spa Conference), which Wandycz, correctly, considers "the greatest defeat in the diplomacy of reborn Poland"—an opinion Kornat and, incidentally, this author share. There are a host of other issues Kornat—a fine scholar—raises in this outstanding essay.

A joint discussion by Tomasz Schramm and Sławomir M. Nowinowski is devoted to Franco-Polish-Czech relations in the 1918–36 era, a subject Wandycz devoted much time to and a story he also continued into the war era in some of his earlier writings. This has been a theme that Wandycz has returned to on numerous occasions, and the authors should be congratulated on unearthing scattered literature. The authors rightly commence by noting that Wandycz's original standing as a historian rested initially on his volume *France and Her Eastern Allies, 1919–1925*—truly a masterpiece of diplomatic history—and its delayed sequel *The Twilight of French Eastern Alliances, 1926–1936*. The authors congratulate Wandycz, deservedly, for his impartiality in sensitive topics—the interwar relationship between Poland and Beneš's Czechoslovakia, for example. The authors of this fine historiographic analysis conclude by referring to Wandycz's "greatness" as a historian—an extraordinary compliment.

Although Wandycz has never considered himself a nineteenth-century historian, he is the author of a fine study titled *The Lands of Partitioned Poland*, a basic work in the study of post-partition Poland up to the time of its rebirth. With a huge basis in historical literature—which is usefully discussed in the bibliography—this study remains unsurpassed, as Mirosław Filipowicz argues in his contribution to the book.

The senior Polish scholar Henryk Bułhak examines Wandycz's two monographic studies of Second Republic foreign ministers Aleksander Skrzyński and August Zaleski. These important contributions to Wandycz's specialty in diplomatic history are, unfortunately, not available in English. The Zaleski volume, notably,

is based in part on oral sources that Wandycz amassed and for that reason alone is unique. The Skrzyński study, which discusses the whole career of the diplomat, emphasizes his theoretical approach to foreign relations as well as his more practical activities. It is an aspect of this relatively small volume by Wandycz to which Bułhak devotes the bulk of his essay. Bułhak usefully summarizes Zaleski's career in his presentation. Here the Beck-Zaleski relationship is very important; perhaps it deserves a more extended commentary, but that is a very minor matter when considering these two highly focused studies of Polish foreign policy.

Jerzy Borzęcki's study of Wandycz's publications concerning Polish-American relations begins understandably with the gracefully written synthesis *The United States and Poland*, in which Wandycz covers many issues with a minor blemish as regards the extent of his emphasis on Polonia. Borzęcki synthesizes a great many problems when discussing Wandycz's analysis of the relationship but unfortunately does not mention any of the other literature on the subject and thus does not put Wandycz in a comparative context.

There follows a stimulating theoretical consideration by Sławomir Łukasiewicz, "Piotr Wandycz and Politics and Political Studies," which discusses primarily Wandycz's work on federalism—a theme obviously close to his heart. It utilizes a good many archival sources. The work notes that Wandycz's studies on more theoretical questions of federalism, so significant for Poland, were later overshadowed by Wandycz's later compelling interest in diplomatic history.

The volume concludes with what we may deem more "personal" studies: a look at Wandycz's relationship with Jerzy Giedroyc by Małgorzata Ewa Ptasńska, which is based on an impressive survey of unpublished sources—over seven hundred letters now housed at the archives of the Instytut Literacki in Paris. The author includes almost 150 notes in what is a relatively brief essay: a devoted effort indeed. Here we are shown Wandycz's signal contributions to *Zeszyty Historyczne* and *Kultura*, which cumulatively were so important to both the Polish émigré community and scholars in the homeland.

The final, touching essay is devoted to Wandycz's father, Damian. The author, Mariusz Wołoś, is preparing a major monograph on Wandycz senior, and here we are provided a précis. Despite the condensed nature of this contribution to the *Festschrift*, Wołoś offers a brief biographical introduction, including reference to the senior Wandycz's service in the Pierwsza Brygada. Wołoś describes the elder Wandycz's work as a petroleum engineer, including his principled refusal to join unpleasantly autocratic OZON in his later political activities. The author concludes with a sizable review of Damian Wandycz's important relationship with the Pilsudski Institute in New York and a far shorter-lived role as director of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. His activities in publishing vital documentary studies and monographic works constitute a major contribution to Polish historiography, which Wołoś elucidates.

Piotr Wandycz is the most important historian of East Central Europe in North America and perhaps the homeland as well. His works are numerous and

—S
—n

ksd

wide-ranging: detailed diplomatic studies, more analytical surveys, and speculative works on politics and derivative issues. This *Festschrift* and others like it are richly deserved and help celebrate the career of a model for all historians of Poland. He certainly is a model to me, a student and now devoted friend of a great figure.

M. B. B. BISKUPSKI
Central Connecticut State University

Marie Sontag, *Rising Hope Book I: Warsaw Rising Trilogy* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Sunbury Press, 2015), 220 pp. ISBN 97816220065563.

Polish and Polish American themes in English-language fiction for young readers are rare indeed. A few titles for children were published during the 1980s by Anne Pellowski, and in the early 2000s Karen Cushman came out with her novel *Rodzina* about a Polish preteen traveling west on an orphan train. Titles for adolescents have been just as rare. Two notable novels for young adults include Susan Campbell Bartoletti's *A Coalminer's Bride: The Diary of Anetka Kaminska* (2000), a historical narrative set in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania in the late 1800s, and Maja Wojciechowska's brilliant fictionalized memoir of World War II, *Till the Break of Day* (1972). With the publication of *Rising Hope*, Marie Sontag joins this small group of writers focused on young readers. Sontag, just like Wojciechowska, chooses World War II as the background of her novel, but unlike Wojciechowska, she does so without the advantage of personal experience. Sontag's interest in Polish history might have been generated by her family background. In the novel's dedication, she identifies her paternal grandfather's name as Reikowski.

Rising Hope is the first volume in Sontag's ambitious plan for a trilogy of historical novels for young adults, novels set in Poland during the most turbulent times of recent Polish history. Her initial volume covers the five years of German occupation beginning with September 1939 and ending with the Warsaw Uprising in 1944 and the methodical destruction of the city by the Germans after the fall of the uprising. Sontag plans the second volume to document the years of Soviet domination of Poland between 1944 and 1989, and the final volume will carry her characters to the present time. It is probably fair to say that Marie Sontag, who describes herself as an educator, attempts to accomplish several didactic goals in her fiction. Thus, *Rising Hope* informs her young readers about the tragic realities of life in Warsaw during the German occupation and extols the bravery of Polish resistance fighters, especially the very young, presenting their deep patriotism and their willingness to sacrifice their lives for the freedom of Poland. At the same time, Sontag finds effective techniques to introduce her readers to Polish music and literature and the more distant past. So every now and then, her young characters may casually discuss the accomplishments of Frederic Chopin, or they may study for their clandestine lessons devoted to Polish poets such as Slowacki or Krasinski or to great freedom fighters such as Kosciuszko and Kilinski. Sontag reinforces such miniature in-text

lectures with a glossary, which identifies all historical figures and provides brief biographies and images.

While constructing the novel's plot, Sontag effectively introduces fictional characters into historical sabotage actions carried out by some of the most famous Home Army fighters: Zoska, Rudy, Moro, and several others. Sontag focuses particularly on the role Polish scouts played in the struggle against the German occupation, both during the Warsaw Uprising and during the months leading to its outbreak. Her novel pays homage to the youngest fighters, who sacrificed their lives for Polish freedom. She movingly describes the death of seven-year-old Henio Dabrowski, who works as a newspaper boy distributing copies of an illegal Polish newspaper, *Informational Bulletin*. Tragically, Henio becomes an object of interest to a couple of German policemen patrolling the streets of Warsaw. One of them "pointed his gun at Henio's back. As if in slow motion, Tadzio [Henio's older brother and the novel's protagonist] saw the German pull the trigger. Blam! Only one shot. Henio's arms flew up. His fine light-brown hair lifted in the breeze as his face contorted in pain. Henio's legs went out under him. Women across the street screamed. The two policemen laughed, and then walked away" (138).

This tragic episode is one of a whole string of events that contribute to the growth of Tadzio Dabrowski. In this classic bildungsroman, Sontag allows her readers to follow Tadzio's education and maturation process. The war deprives him of all parental support. His father leaves on a mysterious mission, and his mother and a trusted housekeeper are both arrested by the Germans and, after months of interrogations in the infamous Pawiak prison, are sent to Ravensbruck, a concentration camp for women. At thirteen, when the novel begins, Tadzio finds support from the leaders of his scout troop but refuses to engage in the scout actions against the occupiers. The readers witness his growth into a young patriot and a Home Army soldier.

To help her readers become familiar with both fictional and historical characters, Sontag lists them all in the glossary. This is an excellent idea, since some of the difficult Polish names may become confusing to English-speaking readers. However, one decision that the author makes in this regard is questionable. Her useful glossary offers her readers, in addition to brief biographies, photographic images of all characters: both historical figures and the fictional characters. So a question arises regarding whose pictures are used to illustrate fictional characters. If these period photographs depict some nameless victims of German terror, fictionalizing their lives and making up their names is disturbing. It victimizes them yet again. In future printings of *Rising Hope*, the author should consider deleting the photographs used for fictional characters and also replacing the map of Ukraine printed twice at the beginning and the end of the book with a historical map of Poland that reflects its pre-1939 borders. A historical map of Poland would be very helpful the Sontag's young readers.

Writing historical novels is not easy. The difficulty lies not in securing information about historical events, which are usually well documented, but in getting the

—S
—n

ksd

seemingly insignificant details of everyday life right. Except for a couple of errors, such as having Polish peasants drive pickup trucks during the German occupation or not realizing that a couple of German Jewish boys who spoke only German and Yiddish would have linguistic difficulty in communicating with Polish children, Sontag is very successful in creating a picture of Warsaw during World War II. *Rising Hope* teaches its readers about living conditions in occupied Warsaw and presents the whole spectrum of societal attitudes toward the occupiers. The novel is populated not only by courageous freedom fighters but also by ruthless collaborators and informers who are willing to sell their compatriots to the enemy, knowing full well that they are sending others to their deaths just to gain financial advantages. The novel's list of minor characters includes also Poles willing to risk their lives to save Jews, Jews who serve as soldiers in the Polish Home Army battalions, sadistic German soldiers, and some good Germans whose help saves Polish lives. Marie Sontag's novel is an important addition to young adult literature in English.

GRAZYNA J. KOZACZKA
Cazenovia College

Charles Gati, ed., *Zbig: The Strategy and Statecraft of Zbigniew Brzezinski* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013), 280 pp. ISBN 9781421409764.

Zbigniew Brzezinski needs no introduction, but he needs an explanation. He is one of the foremost international strategists in the West, but few could give a comprehensive account of his ideas and policies that contributed so much to the successful resolution of the Cold War and the international position of the United States as the sole superpower. This book, consisting of sixteen chapters, an introduction, and an interview with Brzezinski, with a foreword by former president Jimmy Carter, is written by his colleagues at Johns Hopkins University. It attempts to accomplish that comprehensive account in a series of essays dealing with his academic research, his foreign policy advocacy, and his personal life as a teacher, colleague, and presidential adviser.

Zbigniew Brzezinski was born in Poland but left as a child in the late 1930s when his father, a Polish diplomat, was posted in Montreal. Thus, he was spared the personal experience of the horrors of Nazi and Soviet rule in Poland, but its aftermath made it impossible for his family to return. He graduated from McGill University and moved to the United States to obtain his PhD from Harvard. After teaching there for a few years in the early 1950s, he moved to Columbia University. Both these universities were pioneering centers of research on the Soviet Union and communism, the foremost issue facing the United States in the post-World War II period. Brzezinski took up the challenge by becoming a Sovietologist.

A great strategist has to be able to accomplish three things: recognize correctly the complex reality of the international system, formulate a strategy to deal with this reality, and implement this strategy successfully to secure a victorious outcome.

Zbigniew Brzezinski has a record of outstanding achievement in all three of these areas.

In his early academic work, he concentrated on understanding communism, where some argued that his Polish background and his father's diplomatic experience in the Soviet Union in the 1930s made him uniquely qualified. He inaugurated the term *totalitarianism* as an organizing concept of study of the Soviet Union, a distinctly modern phenomenon based on mass society with total political, economic, and ideological control. This distinguishes totalitarian systems from the usual authoritarian ones. After the death of Stalin, this concept evolved, and some elements of it were used for close empirical examination of Soviet developments and thus remained relevant to the study of communism.

In the 1960s, other scholars studied the Soviet Union as a modern industrial society and saw the need for technical rationality for the advancement of such a society. But this rationality was made difficult by its incompatibility with Soviet totalitarianism. It was expected that this requirement for advancement would threaten the Communist Party rule and ease repressive aspects of the system. Two schools of thought were established in response to this analysis. Some scholars predicted that the Soviet system would adapt to the technical requirements of modern industrial society, even at the sacrifice of political control, leading to a US-Soviet convergence.

Brzezinski expected industrial modernization to bring changes to Soviet society, but he thought that it would not reshape Soviet politics and the need for control. Already in 1966, he predicted that this modernization would bring degeneration and not transformation of the communist system. Brzezinski saw the stifling role of Soviet bureaucracy and the resultant stagnation, which would lead to a political response, based on a coalition of the secret police, the military, and the heavy industrial complex, very much like the current situation. He noted a gap between a stagnant, inflexible system and a restless, dynamic Soviet society. He identified the key group challenging the system: non-Russian nationalities.

This academic work and these sharp insights into the politics of international communism were a perfect background for devising a successful US foreign policy. Vladimir Bukowski, a famous Soviet dissident, identified two main causes of failure of US policy toward the Soviet Union: a significant lack of understanding of the nature of the Soviet system among Western decision makers and the generally defensive, peaceful Western policy toward the Soviet Bloc, aimed at preserving the status quo. With Brzezinski, both problems were solved. As a result of his outstanding academic work, he had a deep, nuanced understanding of the Soviet system. He also had a keen sensitivity to the suffering of people under the communist yoke and shared their desire to regain freedom. This deep moral impulse told him to seek a solution to their predicament. He devised a strategy of peaceful engagement to prevail in the Cold War and to penetrate the Soviet system from within to support resistance to communist rule, promote pluralism and dialogue, and provide truthful information in defiance of Marxist ideology. He was a strong anticommunist internationalist aiming at the transformation and demise of communism. Starting

—s
—n

ksd

with the Kennedy administration, he began his career as a foreign policy advisor in the State Department, blending it with his scholarly pursuits.

The height of his policy work was his appointment as the national security advisor under President Jimmy Carter in 1976. Despite his battles with enlightened amateurs of the Eastern Establishment over the conduct of foreign policy, he managed to achieve a strong record of implementation not only in countering the Soviet Union but also in normalization of relations with China, starting a defense buildup in response to Soviet aggression, negotiating Camp David Accords for the Middle East, and signing a Panama Canal Treaty. He was the first to introduce the concept of human rights as a foreign policy tool, which became an important element of US foreign policy. His calculated moves and strong stand intimidated the Soviets into abandoning plans to invade Poland in the face of the emergence of Solidarity in 1980 and 1981.

Despite the Democratic Party's loss of the presidency, the Reagan administration was fully committed to Brzezinski's strategy of countering the Soviets and sought his counsel in implementing it. Reagan's strong and unambiguous anticommunist stand allowed Brzezinski to fully engage in countering the Soviet aggressiveness, so much so that William Casey, the head of the CIA and a close friend of President Reagan, sought to make him the national security advisor in the second term of the Republican administration. The essay by Patrick Vaughn, ironically titled "Brzezinski, the Pope, and the 'Plot' to Liberate Poland," gives many details of his activities in the 1980s and his friendship with Pope John Paul II, who shared his concerns. Other chapters deal with his involvement in US policy toward China, the Middle East, and his opposition to the Iraq War.

The book also contains personal reminiscences of him as a teacher and colleague as well as an account of a conference in Moscow in November 1989 that consisted of exchanges between Brzezinski and high-level Soviet officials who traded insights with him about the nature of the Soviet crisis and ideas for reforms. His prescient book *Grand Failure*, published in January 1989, analyzed the nature of the crisis of international communism and his strategies for influencing its transformation.

Numerous authors refer to Brzezinski's Polish background and its effect on his views and strategic vision. Robert Pastor recalls the left-wing caricature of Brzezinski as a "classic, hardline cold warrior, who was shaped by a Polish heritage that fused his hatred of Russia with disregard for communism." This image was especially promoted by those who opposed the late 1970s change of Carter's policy from accommodation of the Soviet Union to efforts to counter aggressive Soviet moves in Afghanistan, Africa, and Cuba as well as Europe. Pastor's view is that this caricature does not contribute anything to understanding the man and his policies. He most values Brzezinski for devising the concept of human rights as an instrument of US foreign policy, to be used as a weapon against both communism and all dictatorships. Other authors regard his Polishness as an anchor and not bias in his thinking about how to deal with the Soviet Union. Adam Garfinkle regards it as a contributing factor to his greatness as a strategic thinker in that it allowed him

to understand multiple political and cultural viewpoints and provided him with a capacity to imagine tragedy that makes him deeply aware of responsibility and of serious consequences of his actions in the international arena. Several authors, most notably Francis Fukuyama, emphasize Brzezinski's moral opposition to the Soviet Union and its domination of Eastern Europe and his recognition of the threat that it posed to the democratic values and institutions of the West. This moral stance was derived from his Polish background with its love of freedom and sensitivity to oppression.

The essays constituting this book are of high quality and contribute much to the understanding of Brzezinski's ideas and advice on US foreign policy. Nevertheless, they contain some mistakes. One mistake appears where Patrick Vaughn calls General Jaruzelski "a Polish general in Soviet uniform" when he obviously wants to use the words of Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who called him a "Soviet general in Polish uniform."

A more serious mistake appears in the essay "Anticipating the Grand Failure," where Mark Kramer claims that a January 1988 Hugh Seton Watson Lecture, given by Brzezinski in London, which talked about an emerging *de facto* neutrality of Eastern Europe, was similar to a January 1989 Henry Kissinger proposal made to Soviet leaders to conclude a superpower accord regarding the future status of Eastern Europe. This is similar to what coauthor Justin Vaisse describes in his essay "Zbig, Henry, and the New US Foreign Policy Elite," which recalls an event where Henry Kissinger attacked Brzezinski for criticizing *détente* by claiming that it was similar to Brzezinski's recommended policy of "peaceful engagement in Europe's future." The author correctly recognizes that there was a vast difference between the two: peaceful engagement was aimed at subverting Moscow's hold on Eastern Europe, whereas *détente* was aimed at stabilizing the overall US-Soviet relationship.

Unfortunately, Mark Kramer does not recognize a similar context here. Newspaper accounts described the Kissinger plan as "seeking Soviet acquiescence in national self-rule by those countries without the threat of renewed Soviet military intervention," which implied autonomy in internal policies for the local communist elites in exchange for a Western promise not to destabilize the existing balance of power. Observers dubbed it the second Yalta.

In his Hugh Seton-Watson Lecture, Brzezinski described the situation in Eastern Europe as a revival of the authentic national cultures, growing regional unrest, and continued decay of communism and its gradual transformation into a pluralist system. He predicted that 1988 would be the year of a new Spring of Nations in Europe, parallel to the popular revolutions of 1848. Brzezinski saw communism in a systemic crisis, where conditions were emerging for dismantling the Soviet empire and for the neutralization of Germany and Eastern Europe. In this context, he called for enlightened policies of the West to support this process: encouraging and facilitating gradual change, sustaining political resistance and dialogue. In Brzezinski's view, this growing emancipation and insistence on respect for human rights would eventually lead to genuine independence. This is a far cry from Kissinger's

—S
—n

ksd

superpower agreement, which proposed to limit changes in Eastern Europe and not to support and expand them. It would have permanently legitimized Soviet domination of Eastern Europe in its own sphere of influence, even with a doubtful commitment not to invade, and at a time when Soviet presence there was crumbling for its own internal reasons.

This is a rich and much-deserved presentation of Brzezinski's accomplishments. The Cold War was won by understanding the nature of communism and devising an appropriate strategy of dealing with it. It was helped by grand historical trends of technology, economics, and globalization, but without a strategy, these factors all might have come for naught. Putting Brzezinski's achievements in a historical perspective solidifies his reputation as one of the world's leaders who helped win the Cold War. Although some of the points made in the book are debatable, this is hopefully just the beginning of analyses of his contributions to the history of the Cold War that are going forward with many new materials available and a new time perspective. Brzezinski's legacy of the grand strategic vision for the United States will become more prominent without old political conflicts, just on his own outstanding merits.

DR. LUCJA SWIATKOWSKI
Independent Scholar

Jacek Tebinka, *“Wielka Brytania dotrzyma lojalnie swojego słowa”*: *Winston S. Churchill a Polska* [“Great Britain will loyally make good on its word”: Winston S. Churchill and Poland] (Warsaw: Neriton, 2013), 430 pp. ISBN 978-83-7843-273-2.

Professor Jacek Tebinka's *“Wielka Brytania dotrzyma lojalnie swojego słowa”*: *Winston S. Churchill a Polska* [Great Britain will loyally make good on its word: Winston S. Churchill and Poland] takes up a historical theme that intertwines with the chief events of World War II. The author's findings reset basic segments of the war's history and that of the Cold War, matters of great controversy still. Yet if the past history of representation of non-Anglophone texts in the greater Anglosphere predicts the present, the new book's subjects of extraordinary interest will not find deserved public attention in leading journals of review or opinion. In those precincts, a sharply focused study of a subject related to such enduring historical controversies would gather many avid readers. But this new book is likely to find no such broad interest—for no such review will appear. To that vexatious issue I shall later return.

Professor Tebinka (Gdańsk University) has researched Churchill's prewar, wartime, and Cold War relations with Poland. The author already bears a substantial reputation for his past analyses of British-Polish diplomatic and military history during World War II. This volume is thus founded in archival study and comprehensive text searches done over many years. Its findings stretch beyond those promised by its circumspect title.

s__
n__

ksd

No single subject of histories of the war is more central than the role of Winston S. Churchill, an articulate, if often less than wise, foe of Neville Chamberlain, British prime minister from 1937 to 1940, whom Churchill succeeded. Churchill was a dedicated foe of German dictator Hitler and the Nazi Reich, yet also—and a history reader encountering this fact nowadays must be struck dumb—a fervent and articulate supporter of an alliance between the Western powers and Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin and his militant Bolshevik state. That is, Churchill, the unflagging enemy of one of the two perpetrators of the Nazi-Soviet “Non-Aggression Pact” of August 23, 1939, with its attached secret protocol, was, at the same time, a partisan of close political and military ties with the other perpetrator. Countless influential Britons held like views during the war and its run-up. Hence, when the war went badly for Britain (and allied France) in the spring of 1940, Chamberlain’s government fell to the votes of a domestic coalition that carried a pro-Stalin Churchill into office.

Poland was the first, largest, and most important victim of the dictators’ 1939 pact and one of the longest sufferers from the collective diplomacy of World War II, both Nazi-Soviet and Western-Soviet. Its important place in the history of pre-war and wartime political events, its place in the conflict’s military history, and its role as Hitler’s venue for the centers of his mass killings of the European Jews from many countries make Poland a critical point for study of the central issues of the European war—thus the importance of Tebinka’s study.

He offers a penetrating, if often depressing, account of British-Polish and British-Soviet wartime encounters. Posing historical questions at the nexus of wartime diplomacy and military history, Tebinka leads us through British-Polish relations as his point of focus on the history of the war and its run-up and into Soviet-British-Polish relations during the four years of the later German-Soviet war. That front, which opened in late June 1941, was from its outset annexed to the ongoing conflict between Germany (and its allies) and the West (and its allies). Thus the chief controversies of wartime and Cold War history intersect—one of them being how the West, after Germany’s defeat, should deal with dictator Joseph Stalin regarding the future geographical and governmental formats of the nations that he and dictator Hitler had collaboratively destroyed from 1939 to 1941, beginning with their criminal 1939 pact.

Scholar Tebinka knows that “the past is prologue”: depth of understanding clarifies what follows. He therefore guides us through later Prime Minister Churchill’s attitudes toward Poland from his earliest days, following its post-World War I rebirth as a European state, attitudes etched in Churchill’s own words. Churchill was an early admirer of Lord Curzon, about whom he wrote an appreciative biography, and hence, as might be expected, was a supporter of the Polish eastern boundary Curzon imagined out of his ethnic blindness. (I add that, whatever their political stripe, British politicians generally abided in deep darkness when it came to East Central European and Balkan politics and ethnicities. History readers will recall Prime Minister Chamberlain’s revealing words describing, *en passant*, Czechoslovakia in

1938: “a far away place of which we know little,” words manifestly conveying more than he intended.)

Even worse for the diplomats of Britain’s wartime ally Poland, given Churchill’s determining role in the conquered country’s later history, the sometime anti-Bolshevist warrior of post-World War I fame had become, no later than 1938, a dedicated proponent of one of the most improbable fantasies in history: the Western (British-French) pairing with the Soviet Union—which he imagined as an alliance collaborating to save the British and French *empires* from the Nazi menace. Just as improbably, he saw the alliance as a collective force to serve London’s age-old policy of holding its balance of power control on the Continent.

Hitler’s renascent Germany outright challenged the second of those British policies. The dictator claimed for Germany, Europe’s most industrialized and powerful state in the mid- to late 1930s, the right to hegemony over the northern and western flank of the Continent west of the Soviet border. The Nazi boss’s will to Continental power confronted head-on the traditional British will. Meanwhile, both Western and Nazi governments soon showed themselves unaware of Stalin’s revolutionist-Leninist expansionist goals (although Prime Minister Chamberlain, an exception, was always suspicious of Soviet intentions).

During the 1920s and early 1930s, Churchill had not yet come upon the evil he later would cast on Poland and the Polish people. Tebinka’s many quotations offer solid substance for that assertion. Perhaps the enduring relationship of learner and teacher that Churchill developed with the Soviet ambassador I. M. Maiskii, plus a commitment Churchill had meanwhile made to radical Zionism, both dating from the mid-1930s, upended his earlier sympathies. His long connection with influential historian Sir Lewis B. Namier—*à la fois* a British government diplomatic advisor, an early socialist and admirer of the Bolshevik revolution, and also an ardent Zionist (whose knighthood was likely owed to Churchill)—also must have played a role in his transformation. Namier was often as anti-Polish as he was anti-Nazi. Probably the increase of Nazi-era, anti-Jewish animus in Poland helped bring the mid-1930s twist in Churchill’s thinking, wreaking havoc with his prewar and wartime political *bon sens*.

Readers may recall Stalin’s Moscow propagandists of the late 1930s as perhaps the shrillest critics of Hitler and his lunatic anti-Jewish prating. His ravings provided Stalin a target as big as a barn door for the arousal of pro-Kremlin sympathies domestically and abroad. Stalin’s anti-German propagandistic ululations collected many sympathizers for Soviet causes, which foreign admirers viewed as anti-Hitler—for example, sending the Red Army westward in Europe to replace perceived Nazi influence. In truth, the troublemaking Soviet Union was so much feared and despised by its immediate western neighbors—the states, such as Poland, that stood between Germany and the USSR—that all were potential German allies, a fact largely unrecognized by British diplomatic leaders.

I continue to follow the facts and arguments central to Tebinka’s study. The new Polish republic had faced a revanchist Germany ever since the Versailles Treaty of

1919. Hitler's claims for the revision of the post-World War I treaties struck fear within governments that had profited territorially from Imperial Germany's 1918 defeat and collapse, including Poland. But once in office, in 1933, the Nazi leader grasped that his first need was to pacify militarily stronger neighbors. Poland, betwixt and between Stalin to the east and Hitler to the west, was one of these neighbors. Hitler's surprise 1930s quest for an unadvertised *détente* with Warsaw quieted his loud claims for large-scale Polish territorial cessions to undo Versailles. In the fall of 1938, following the expansion of his military power, he began to show his hand directly, introducing friendly gestures toward Warsaw as part of appeasement-style actions, part of his quest to regain the former Imperial German territory of Danzig/Gdańsk without war.

Hitler's unspoken larger aim at that time was far more dangerous to Poland: to bring it under the Nazi wing as an eastern defense abutment of the Third Reich, part of his supervening goal to gain German dominance on the northern flank of the Continent. (The Mediterranean flank of Europe, he had assigned to another dictator, Mussolini.) Stalin's antipathy toward Poland had continued since its armies had defeated Lenin's in 1920, saving Poland from Muscovite domination.

Hitler schemed to acquire Poland as a friend, thereby intending to undo France, Poland's traditional ally, as a major European force and to terminate Britain's Continental influence. By 1938, he desperately needed Poland as an ally or passive observer in his quest for German hegemony, in order to avoid the dangers of a two-front war.

Poland's efforts to profit from the friendly moves by its Nazi neighbor had made it, since 1934, appear to be something of an ally of the Reich. Polish foreign minister Beck was viewed by many foes of the Nazi appeasement program as its author. In fact, Hitler, needing to stabilize Germany's foreign position, had authored the programs of pacification, such as the non-aggression treaties he offered more than one of his neighboring potential foreign foes during the early 1930s. Poland, fated to attempt to survive between the Nazi hammer and the Soviet anvil, was one neighbor that accepted.

In September 1938, Britons' naive hopes for a Western-Soviet alliance to confront Hitler's aggressiveness directed against Czechoslovakia erupted in widespread public pro-Soviet outbursts. By that time, many ranking Britons had become far less than subtle in their anti-Polish antagonisms—I cite, for example, the 1938 description of Polish foreign minister Beck as a "gangster" by foreign secretary Halifax's vice, Alexander Cadogan. The fact that the Soviets, in the tense days before Munich, publicly announced a mobilization against Poland—and not against Nazi Germany—did not prove instructive to naive Western supporters of a Soviet alliance.

The Polish government was possessed by another antagonism the Western allies could not understand: hostility toward its southern neighbor, Czechoslovakia, antipathy fortified by what the Poles regarded as the Prague government's "stab in the back" seizure of borderland Cieszyn in 1920, at the time of Poland's desperate conflict with Lenin's Soviet Russia. Czechoslovakia's anti-Nazi, Slavophile government also permitted concentrations of active anti-Polish agents within its borders.

—S
—n

ksd

Moreover, the Prague government was incautious in its coquetry with the ostensibly anti-Nazi Kremlin. In “faraway” Britain, the Kremlin and Czechoslovakia were often viewed alike, as bastions serving anti-Nazi interests. But for Hitler, Czechoslovakia was a potential aircraft carrier, looking to serve Germany’s enemies. For Beck, the much-publicized “aircraft carrier” was an advertised ally of one of Poland’s deadly enemies.

Churchill, fervently anti-German by the end of the 1930s yet imbued with his absurdly benign vision of the Soviet boss, championed the Kremlin revolutionary as unthreatening. This dream of a Soviet alliance with the West, Churchill shared with others, most of them with socialist leanings—although Stalin recorded in speech after speech his fanatical opposition to all types of socialism (and imperialism), save his own. The Kremlin-originated *History of the Soviet Communist Party [b]*,¹ *Pravda*-published at the time of the warlike confrontations during the run-up to the Munich Conference, trumpeted Stalin’s venomous hostility to democratic socialists, such as the British Labourites. But reading often opaquely formulated Soviet policy documents was not a task that interested the admiring Westerners, either then or later.

With his acuity blunted by confidence in pro-Soviet advisors, Churchill advanced blind into the Kremlin web during the late 1930s, just as Hitler did, if later. But Churchill’s recklessness was more enduring. Tebinka details Churchill’s wartime use and abandonment of Poland and its British-commanded fighting forces, as massive Soviet armies fed into the western continent during the German retreat of 1944–45. Stalin’s unannounced purpose was *Sovetizatsiia* to the west. In May 1945 the concentration of Western armies brought the advancing Red Army to a halt at the Elbe, in central Germany. Yet to the east, the prewar states of the *Cordon sanitaire*, including Poland, and the southeastern European countries, both allied and enemy to Hitler, had fallen, some for the second time, under Red Army occupations and attendant NKVD tutelage, into the expanding Soviet empire.

Well after Churchill had left the government, following the German defeat, he undertook to point up the Stalin-induced disaster that had all but overwhelmed the Continent. His famous Iron Curtain speech of March 1946 and his words delivered before a number of statesmen in Paris during December 1947 showed that he, by then, recognized the Soviet boss as the equivalent of the Europe-destroying Hitler. But as Tebinka points out, Churchill, in his self-enhancing memoir-history of World War II,² retouched for posterity the history of his wartime actions and, in particular, his encounters with Stalin and his agents. The partisan Churchill knew the importance of history. In that recognition lay his zeal to recount events of the war in which he was so much involved, but not all of them. For example, his close relationship with Maskii went unreported, as did his continuing public praise for

1. Moscow, 1938.

2. Winston Churchill, *The Gathering Storm*, vol. 1 (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1948).

Stalin after Katyń. Now we know that while he was writing, he had access to archival sources officially denied to other historians both then and for some years to follow. That is, he early had documents at hand proving the aggressive aims of Soviet prewar and wartime behavior but chose not to report them in *The Gathering Storm*.

Churchill's history served as an early milestone in the history of World War II and the background to the Cold War and, not long after, as a millstone weighing on future historians of the war, as did the memory of pro-Soviet propaganda crafted by British and US wartime authorities. Histories from on high could not easily be put beyond memory. The twisted findings of the Soviet-influenced judges during the 1946 Nuremberg war crimes trials of Hitler's surviving Nazi elite only deepened the obfuscation. Soviet-appointed and collaborating Western judges and prosecutors had forbidden the defense's use of relevant captured German documents during the trials. (It was not that the Nazi hierarchs were innocent of the charges brought against them, but that the judgments were swathed in the miasma of Kremlin-controlled history, from which the facts of the Nazi-Soviet conspiracies were carefully eliminated.)

Tebinka is less direct on the influence of Churchill's historical mismanagement than I have been. He does not specifically connect Churchill's *pro domo* censorship and the subsequent decades of histories distorting central episodes of wartime and Cold War history, as I have. But readers will find his abundant citations from Churchill's recorded remarks and writings persuasive on the subject. Many Britons, as well as other Westerners, who are still proponents of Churchill as a prewar and wartime leader will find Tebinka's history packed with profit—if they can read it. That, unfortunately, few will be able to do.

• • •

Speaking two years back, Norman Davies, the well-known British historian and Polish partisan, made the disconcerting point that Polish history goes largely unread (except for those segments dealing with the atrocities committed by the Nazi and Soviet regimes on Polish territory).³ That assertion can be checked for North America through a search for post-Soviet era writings on World War II in the two leading journals of review.⁴ Anglophone review editors, journalists, and academic historians, largely innocent of the Polish language (and not it alone), fall victim to a linguistic dysfunctionality predicting a historical “out of sight, out of mind.”

In fact, most of the newly available post-Soviet records emerging since 1989 and the informative studies based on them have appeared in non-Anglophone

3. Norman Davies, “Polscy historycy są nieobecni w światowych dyskusjach,” *Gazeta wyborcza* (online ed.), November 11, 2013. My general observations regarding the disuse of Polish history and historians were triggered by reflection on his words.

4. Here I refer to the *New York Review of Books* and the *New York Times Book Review*, both of whose online indexes I consulted for reviews of books by historians in Poland on Poland's role in World War II.

informational spaces. Many are in Polish. For over twenty years, since liberation from Soviet dominance, stunning new factual discoveries requiring serious reconsiderations of World War II and its coming have proliferated in former East Bloc countries, as they also did for a brief period after *perestroika* in the new Russia. Like the Polish written records that have bearing on the major political and military questions of the twentieth century, those records of the other European states that escaped from Moscow's control have likewise frequently gone unmentioned in the same review journals—and beyond them, unfortunately, in the professional journals and scholarship of linguistically deprived academics.

Review editors select their own reviewers—and many of the editors and their reviewers are plainly unaware of the Polish thread in prewar and wartime history and of Poland's place in the history of the Cold War. Likely unbeknownst to them, to other historical innocents and scholars, and to many censorial minds of journalism and academe is the fact that a few European governments (not just those of the former Soviet Union and its satellite states) decades back—and one more recently—began to encourage a similar, if unpublicized, censorship of history dealing with these war and postwar years. Behind the contrived stonewalling by the governments involved lie two great corrupters of verisimilitudinous historical reportage: politics and money. Because some governments control the employment of numerous historians (central wartime players Russia, Germany, and Poland are all examples), the danger, academic and non-academic, seems obvious.

RICHARD RAACK

Emeritus, California State University, East Bay

Ewa Mazierska and Michael Goddard, eds., *Polish Cinema in a Transnational Context* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2014), 342 pp., filmography, index. ISBN 978-1-58046-4680.

A transnational perspective is commonly applied to film studies worldwide. However, it has rarely been used as a research tool in the case of Polish cinema. Instead, it seems that Polish scholars have been extremely fond of the category of national cinema. An excellent book edited by Ewa Mazierska and Michael Goddard promises a paradigm change in this respect since its authors are aware that in recent years there has been “a shift from studying film as purely textual phenomenon, to the inclusion of the study of film production and film audiences” (3–4).

In the introduction Mazierska and Goddard do not confine themselves to reviewing the basic concepts of transnationalism, as presented in the works by Matte Hjort, Will Higbee, and Song Hwee Lim, but try to show the applicability of this category to Polish historical studies, at the same time convincingly justifying the thesis that Polish cinema has long been transnational, through the presence of, among others, Polish directors and actors in Western film industry (Roman Polański, Andrzej Żuławski, Jerzy Skolimowski, Walerian Borowczyk).

Following the methodological assumptions adopted by many contemporary researchers who deal with the issue of transnationalism, Mazierska and Goddard have decided to focus on three dimensions: the reception, the production, and diasporic filmmakers. This corresponds to a division of the book into three parts: the first one reviews the distribution of Polish films in Western Europe and the United States; the second one focuses on Polish coproduction and the participation of Polish actors in foreign films; and finally, the third part presents Polish immigrants who work in film industry in various Western countries.

The text by Peter Hames, which opens the first part, presents a great deal of interesting information on the distribution and reception of Polish cinema in the United Kingdom since the 1950s. This issue is considered in the broader context of the production from Eastern European countries and political changes that occurred after 1989, when films from this part of the world practically disappeared from British screens. Hames's informative text is supplemented by Darragh O'Donoghue's article on the British reception of Andrzej Wajda's films—beginning from the artistic successes of the late 1950s, when Wajda's "War Trilogy" (*A Generation* [*Pokolenie*, 1954], *Kanal* [1956], and *Ashes and Diamonds* [*Popiół i diament*, 1958]) was shown in cinemas, through the short-lived interest of the audiences after the premiere of *Man of Marble* (*Człowiek z marmuru*, 1976) and *Man of Iron* (*Człowiek z żelaza*, 1981), until the almost total absence of Wajda's films in the last thirty years.

Helena Gosciło's article reminds us that the weak presence of Polish films in the American market may be due to local audiences' generally feeble interest in European productions. Despite the fact that between 1962 and 2015 as many as ten Polish feature films were nominated for an Oscar, it was only recently that the Academy Award was granted to Paweł Pawlikowski for the movie *Ida* (2014), and the only creator who gained relatively more success overseas was Krzysztof Kieślowski, whose "seductive visual and aural power are precisely what appealed to American film critics" (66). The unique position of this director has also been confirmed by numerous books and articles discussing his legacy. Reception of Polish cinema in European countries, especially among the festival audiences, is a completely different matter, as writes Dorota Ostrowska, giving numerous examples of artistic successes at Cannes and Venice. She also tries to answer three interrelated questions: "how the success of the Polish school shaped the festivals themselves"; "what role Cannes and Venice played in shaping the Polish school"; and what the "expectations of the festival audiences brought to the viewing of films from Eastern Europe" (78).

The second part of the book, titled "Polish International Coproductions and Presence in Foreign Films," opens with perhaps the best text in this volume, dedicated to the works of Marek Piestrak, the only Polish film director who has shown interest in science fiction cinema, fantasy, and horror and whom some critics have called the "Ed Wood of Eastern Europe." Eva Năripea analyzes three of his films made in the Polish-Estonian cooperation: *The Test of Pilot Pirx* (*Test pilota Pirxa*, 1978), *Curse of Snakes Valley* (*Klątwa Doliny Węży*, 1988), and *The Tear of the Prince of Darkness* (*Łzy księża ciemności*, 1992). In order to capture the specificity of the

—S
—n

ksd

cinema, the author refers to the concept of “paracinema,” used by Jeffrey Sconce to describe the strategies of reading a text that “valorize all forms of cinematic trash,” “by concentrating on film’s formal bizarreness and stylistic eccentricity” (116–17). Năripea convincingly refers to postcolonial theories, not only to analyze the Orientalist stereotypes but also to prove that “the eerie atmosphere of these films can be read as signaling the general frame of mind prevalent at the time in the colonial situation of the societies of the Soviet Union and its satellite states” (127).

The other texts included in the second part of the book mostly focus on Polish actors acting in foreign films. Ewa Mazierska briefly discusses the transnational careers of Lucyna Winnicka, Krystyna Janda, Katarzyna Figura, and Alicja Bachleda-Curuś. Alison Smith focuses on the several roles that Jerzy Radziwiłowicz played in the films of French directors. It is the text by Lars Kristensen that seems most interesting here, however, in which he concentrates on two Polish actors who play the roles of Russians—Jerzy Skolimowski and Jerzy Stuhr. The former has acted as a KGB officer in *White Nights* (1985, Taylor Hackford), as an agricultural professor in Julian Schnabel’s *Before the Night Falls* (2000), and as a former agent who defected from the Soviet Union in *Eastern Promises* (2007, David Cronenberg). The latter played a Jew from Lithuania who lives in Moscow in Roman Kachanov’s film *Ar’è* (2004). Kristensen emphasizes two competing interpretations of Skolimowski’s role. The first of them “projects an image of not only Russians but all Eastern Europeans or ex-communists as backward, homophobic, and racist. . . . In the second reading Skolimowski’s unflattering portrayal of Russians can be regarded as a kind of subtle revenge of a colonized Pole, who felt superior over his Eastern neighbor yet could not openly reveal his sense of superiority toward his Russian colonizer and neighbor” (202–3).

The third part of the book, with the significant title “Émigré and Subversive Directors,” consists of several texts that focus on the works of, among others, Borowczyk, Andrzej Żuławski, and Agnieszka Holland and Krzysztof Zanussi’s international coproductions. A Western reader may consider articles by Jonathan Owen and Michael Goddard as the most valuable. The author of the first text situates the work of Borowczyk in the context of the French Left Bank group and draws attention to Borowczyk’s affinity with Chris Marker, Agnès Varda, and Alain Resnais: “[Borowczyk] creates a liminal cinema that settles itself on the borders between forms and incites us to question the nominal separateness of such categories as documentary and fiction, the essay and the narrative film, live-action and animation” (217).

In his text Michael Goddard offers a multifaceted analysis of Andrzej Żuławski’s oeuvre, arguing that the expressive excess in his films “has a political dimension and has been perceived as a danger to the social and political values represented by and in old and new moral realisms” (255). Goddard takes into account the films made in Poland (which are analyzed in their historical context)—*The Third Part of the Night* (*Trzecia część nocy*, 1971), which he calls a “revision of the myth of Poland

under Nazi occupation” (239), and *On the Silver Globe* (*Na srebrnym globie*, 1976–77), “a critical alternative to the aesthetics of the Cinema of Moral Concern” (242)—as well as those made abroad, in which he seeks interesting examples of transnational productions, such as *Possession* (1980), directed by a Pole and shot in Berlin, with a French producer and a script by an American.

The book ends with a text focused on foreign films by Agnieszka Holland that serve as an example of transnational nomadism understood as “an acute awareness of the nonfixity of boundaries” (296). Elżbieta Ostrowska challenges Holland’s prevailing image among Polish critics and audiences as a continuer of cinema of the author, instead situating her work in the context of Hamid Naficy’s *accented cinema* and in a division between strong and weak transnational films suggested by Mette Hjort. The book edited by Ewa Mazierska and Michael Goddard is one of the most interesting publications on Polish cinema in recent years, and it opens a new methodological horizon for our research.

KRZYSZTOF LOSKA
Jagiellonian University

Anna D. Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann, ed., *Letters from Readers in the Polish American Press, 1902–1969: A Corner for Everybody*, trans. Theodore L. Zawistowski and Anna D. Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2014), 592 pp. ISBN 978-0739188729.

Despite a growing body of work on the history of Polish immigrants in the United States and the structure of and developments within the American Polonia, the image of Polish Americans and Americans of Polish descent has remained largely unchanged. Monographs on Polish parishes, neighborhoods, and ethnic organizations continue to occupy a prominent place among the publications on Polonia, and consequently, the portrait of a Polish American is that of a Roman Catholic from the working class who is highly preoccupied with the “situation in Poland” and perhaps belongs to a folkloric dance group. In recent decades, scholars have indeed begun to question the validity of such an image. In discussing Polish Americans’ mobility patterns, aspiration for education, and different models of assimilation and integration, scholars demonstrate the idea of Polish American identity to be a complex one; however, more in-depth studies are needed to fully reveal the complexities of Polish American trajectories.

The extraordinary collection edited by Anna Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann and translated by Theodor L. Zawistowski and Anna D. Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann is a perfect example of such a work. Through a selection of letters written by Polish immigrants between 1902 and 1969, the volume displays the remarkable diversity of the Polish population in the United States since the first big waves of immigration. It reminds us that there were not only non-Catholic Poles but also different faces of

__s
__n

ksd

Catholicism; it not only shows that preoccupation with the situation in Poland could mean different things, but it also accounts for myriad arguments used in debates on the sociopolitical shape of the “old country”; and it documents not only the formation of Polish American identity but also the various processes of that identity negotiation and contestation. Although the diversity of immigrants’ experiences, their political outlooks, and their life trajectories should not be surprising, that it still surprises is due to the aforementioned persistence of a monolithic model of a Polish American.

Letters from Readers in the Polish American Press, 1902–1969 contains nearly five hundred letters, published in a Polish-language weekly titled *Ameryka-Echo*. The most popular section of the weekly was the part called “A Corner for Everybody,” in which the readers exchanged views and ardently debated various pressing issues. As Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann notes in her introduction, the authors of the letters constituted a very diverse group in terms of gender, age, religion, education, economic status, political outlook, and place of residence (the newspaper found readership outside of the United States too), and perhaps even more importantly, many of the letters were “written by a hand unused to holding a pen.” This diversity is well reflected in the style and the content of the letters (the fact that the volume’s readers may enjoy this diversity owes a lot to the translators’ carefulness and attention to details) and even in the ways they are signed: whereas some authors limit themselves to mentioning their name and place of residence in the United States (or in Canada or Argentina), others find it important to mention their village of origin and a word about their past and present status. Along with “Joseph Stokłosa from Michigan” we thus find letters sent by “a free peasant from Grzybowo,” “a former soldier,” “a *góralka* from Krościenko,” and “a Rusyn.” Yet what connects them is the will to share their views, protest against what was perceived as injustice, and have a say on the matters crucial for Poles both in the United States and in the “old country.”

The book is divided into five thematic sections, each of which is preceded by an introduction from the editor. The introductions alone provide a perfect overview of the issues that lay at the heart of the debates among Polish Americans. Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann pinpoints central questions and tropes that connect different contributions, encouraging readers to question certain assumptions regarding the commonplace image of Polish Americans and to reflect on the topicality of the problems discussed by *Ameryka-Echo* readers. And so chapter 1, “Religion, Church and Spiritual Life,” provides a fascinating account of immigrants’ discussion of the role of religion, the differences between faith and institutionalized beliefs and practices, and the importance of the Catholic Church and its problems, including the abuses of power by priests and sexual harassment. Chapter 2, “Polonia Communities in the United States and Diaspora,” discusses issues as different as the organization of Polonia, developments of and within parishes and organizations, and various professional trajectories. It too points out an important yet often neglected aspect

in the history of Polish immigration—namely, geographical distribution of Polish communities and its consequences.

The authors of the letters gathered in the third chapter, titled “Polish American Identity,” engage in debates on assimilation, stereotypes and “Polish jokes,” the duties of a “good” Pole and/or a “good” Polish American, and preservation of Polish language and cultural patterns, including gender roles and family structure. They evince gradual (and hotly debated) “Americanization” of Polish immigrants, including, for instance, a fascination with sports, ideas of success, and individual rights. Somewhat similar debates can be found in the following chapter, “The American Nation,” which tackles the issues of American politics and sociocultural developments and their influence on—and perception among—Polish immigrants. In discussing the subjects of socialism and communism, labor unions, and international relations, *Ameryka-Echo* readers refer to their own experiences from Europe and present their own reading of current developments. And they do not hesitate to express their admiration, preoccupation, and astonishment, no matter whether they are discussing the Cold War or the appearance of the Beatles (*Bitelsy*). Chapter 5, “Homeland,” features discussions on the relation between the Polish American community and events in Poland. Worth mentioning here are especially readers’ exchanges on (re)emigration and on “minorities” in Poland, including the letters from *and* about Ukrainians, Rusyns, Lithuanians, and Jews. The latter point to the complexity of what we tend to see as not only “Polish American” but also “Polish” identity in that they question the boundedness of ethno-national identities and remind us about different ways of being “Polish.”

The importance of the volume goes beyond the scholarship on Polish Americans and immigrants’ trajectories. First of all, it is simply a great read that sometimes makes one laugh, sometimes gives a pause for thought, and sometimes encourages drawing comparisons and parallels with the present day. Second, I am convinced it will constitute a great resource for scholars and students interested in telling and writing “history from below.” Given the weakness of social history in Poland, I consider this book to be particularly important for Polish researchers, and I very much hope it will constitute for them not only a resource but also an inspiration for scholarly endeavors, similar to the one undertaken by Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann and Zawistowski. Having adopted the book for a class, I also find the volume to be a great teaching tool. Analysis of the letters led to fascinating discussions and provoked students to ask whether such a readers’ “corner” would be popular nowadays and what problems could be raised and deliberated within it. In a time of anonymous and often far from respectful exchanges on Internet forums, *Letters from Readers in the Polish American Press* inevitably evokes a nostalgia and a reflection on what can be done with words—by people “unused to holding a pen” and those *no longer* used to holding one.

AGNIESZKA PASIEKA
University of Vienna

—s
—n

ksd

Bogusław Tracz, *Hippiesi, Kudłacze, Chwasty: Hipisi w Polsce w latach 1967–1975* [Hippies, mopheads, weeds: Hippies in Poland between 1967 and 1975] (Katowice and Kraków: Libron, 2014), 564 pp. ISBN: 978-83-64275-58-6.

The countercultural hippie movement, which emerged in the United States in the 1960s and soon gained popularity across the world, particularly in the countries of the West, also reached Poland, at that time under the rule of the communist regime, though in its slightly softened form after the fall of the so-called Polish Stalinism. The book under review by Bogusław Tracz is a monograph that focuses on the origins, development, and twilight of the hippie movement in Poland in the years from 1967 to 1975. The aims of the author of this book were very ambitious as he embarked on an in-depth analysis of this phenomenon, undoubtedly very important for a better understanding of the Polish cultural and social history of the period, in the most possibly comprehensive way. In his work he explores the widest possible range of sources and places the phenomenon in two contexts: the international and Polish. In this first context, Tracz isolates and shows the characteristic features of the transformations that occurred in the Western culture of the 1950s and 1960s, referring to their major catalysts: antiwar and pacifist movements in the United States, particularly during the war in Vietnam, and also popular music that diffused the hippie ideals (especially psychedelic rock). In the Polish context of the period, preceding the hippie movement, the author sketches a picture of the dynamically changing youth culture in postwar Poland under communist rule, from the 1940s until the moment when the first hippies appeared in this country. This introductory, much-needed social and cultural background of the subject of Polish hippies is introduced by the author in the first two chapters. All the remaining chapters (3–9) of this seminal work are an in-depth analysis of the phenomenon of the hippie movement in Poland.

In order to accomplish his goal of approaching the subject from different angles, Tracz has collected a sizable number of written sources, though—as he puts it in the preface to his book—“the sources for this subject are not numerous” (21). This subjective opinion is contradicted by the imposing result of the author’s study, for which he researched as many as sixteen archives scattered across the country with very good results for the purpose of his book. Bogusław Tracz proved able to discover and retrieve a significant amount of archival material that is of key importance for the analysis of the subject, material formed mostly from all sorts of documents written by officers of the communist militia (MO) and political police (SB), who on behalf of the state were involved in fighting against hippie activists. These materials, being properly and carefully investigated by the author, with the application of the indispensable comparative method, are successfully used in the book to build a detailed image of the birth and development of the promoters of “flower power.” Tracz complements the precious archival records with numerous print sources, including memoirs and interviews with the

witnesses to the epoch,¹ as well as articles published in the press contemporary to the events described in the book.

Naturally, the author also takes into account the existent scholarly studies on hippies and, in a wider context, on different phenomena occurring in public life and culture in the 1960s and 1970s. A long bibliography of these works listed at the end of the monograph, led by the books fundamental to the study of hippies and countercultural movements by Polish authors, such as W. Burszta, K. Jankowski, T. Paleczny, and M. Pęczak,² is paramount to all those who want to further study the subject. Although the reference list of works on Polish hippies used in this book seems complete, the reader will feel unsatisfied by a shortage of the most important works in English whose authors analyze the hippie movement in the United States and in Western Europe.³ This is not, however, a significant drawback of the work because in any case Tracz manages to reach for at least some of the findings of Anglo-Saxon authors, even though he does so through the mediation of Polish-language works or, in exceptional cases, Polish translations.⁴

It is noticeable that the author has done thorough research, mainly in archives and libraries, which has allowed him to construct a solid point of departure for his study of the Polish hippies. In the first chapters of his work, Tracz manages to create a multifaceted portrait of the hippie in the country on the river Vistula. The author answers numerous questions regarding leaders of the subculture and their ideology, the typical image of a hippie (including hairstyles and outfits), the group's interests, and the subculture's attitude toward work as well as leisure pursuits. Particularly interesting are those passages in the book that describe hippie communes, formed

1. For example, interesting accounts are given by a witness to the era and a former hippie, Kamil Sipowicz, whom the author refers to and in places confronts with some other sources.

2. W. Burszta, "U źródeł buntu: Lata sześćdziesiąte w cyklu śmierci i zmartwychwstania," in *Oblicza buntu: Praktyki i teorie sprzeciwu w kulturze współczesnej*, ed. W. Kuligowski and A. Pomieciński (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2012); K. Jankowski, *Hipisi w poszukiwaniu ziemi obiecanej* (Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1972); T. Paleczny, *Bunt "nadnormalnych"* (Kraków: Universitas, 1998); M. Pęczak, *Subkultury w PRL: Opór, kreacja, imitacja* (Warsaw: Narodowe Centrum Kultury, 2013).

3. The number of studies in English devoted to the hippie culture and countercultural movements in the 1960s and 1970s is large. Among them one can include W. L. Partridge, *The Hippie Ghetto: The Natural History of a Subculture* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973); S. A. Kent, *From Slogans to Mantras: Social Protest and Religious Conversion in the Late Vietnam War Era* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2001); and A. Charters, *The Portable Sixties Reader* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), to name but a few.

4. For example, a very important study by Roger Kimball, *The Long March: How the Cultural Revolution of the 1950s Changed America*, was translated into Polish by M. Kowalczyk (Polish title: *Długi marsz: Jak rewolucja kulturalna z lat 60: Zmieniła Amerykę* [Elbląg: Sprawy Polityczne, 2008]).

by the subculture's members with huge effort both in cities and in the country to imitate the American communes, despite persecutions by the communist regime in Poland.

Tracz devotes a large section of his book to mutual relations between the hippies and politics. He does not find any confirmation in the source material, contrary to what is said by some other authors, that the hippie movement was an anticommunist pro-independence movement. Indeed, Polish hippies' disapproval of life in the political and social system existing in Poland brought them closer to the political opposition, yet the long-haired people did not form their communes in order to be able to change this system. The author shows that a lack of a more significant commitment to anticommunist activity on the part of the hippies was confirmed by officers of the political police, who in their reports emphasized that there was no real threat to the foundations of the political and social form of government.

A separate strain in the work by Bogusław Tracz is the issue of the hippies' attitude toward religious communities, the Catholic Church in particular. The author's analysis leads him to the conclusion that on the one hand, the Church made attempts to attract the hippies and facilitated their participation in meetings and discussions within, for example, a university chaplaincy (especially Rev. Adam Boniecki in Krakow). On the other hand, only a handful of members of the hippie community showed a real zeal to find fulfillment in religiosity.

Another matter of great importance discussed in the book is the attitude of the hippies toward sexual freedom. The author puts the matter in international context and confronts stereotypical thinking about the hippies as promoters of promiscuity and free love, using accounts given by representatives of the movement. It turns out that the Polish hippies, as regards their approach toward sexuality, did not differ from the mainstream transformations of social conventions, and any exceptions to the rule were incidental.

In one of the chapters, the author embarks on the issue of the role of drugs in the life of the hippies. With precision and attention to detail, typical of this work, Tracz carefully classifies the narcotics available in the Poland of the day and analyzes the social contexts in which they appeared in the lives of the representatives of this subculture. Interesting conclusions are made here as well. Taking drugs, the author determines, was not only the domain of the hippies but was simply part of a wider phenomenon, embraced by different groups and circles of young people. Nevertheless, it was the hippies who became the forerunners of Polish drug addiction, drawing their inspiration from the West.

A large part of this monograph, comprising three chapters, is devoted to the description of actions taken against the hippies by state institutions. It was this that finally led to the twilight of the movement in the mid-1970s. Bogusław Tracz explains that the communist rule in Poland constantly perceived the hippie movement as hostile to both the political system and the so-called social order. Thus, from the very beginning of the subculture's existence in Poland, a large amount of repression and harassment was directed at the hippies. The author of this work provides

s__
n__

ksd

numerous examples of how multidimensional the actions were: on the level of the ideology concept in the upper echelons of the Communist Party, through law enforcement bodies (MO, SB), and through propaganda in the mass media (mainly the press). In circulation were instructions designated for MO and SB officers that helped them identify and classify conduct of the hippies based on the catalogue of crimes listed in the criminal code. In practice, actions taken against the hippies were widespread. One preemptive measure, for example, was their conscription to the army. This milieu was also kept under constant surveillance through the recruitment of collaborators from among the hippies. The MO executed numerous preventive actions. Decisive attacks on the hippies, operations code-named “Mak” (poppy seed) and “Porządek” (order), were coordinated nationwide and carried out in stages. The author meticulously tabulates statistical data, showing the scope and degree of the efficiency of these actions.

There is no doubt that the monograph by Tracz is a very valuable book that not only organizes but also extends our present knowledge about the hippie movement in Poland. The author has been successful in answering a large number of questions concerning details of life in this subculture. He also has verified and corrected or disproved a great deal of information about the movement that was included in older studies on the subject. Among Tracz’s most significant findings is the conclusion that the Polish hippie movement was not rebelliousness against the political status quo but was a form of cultural defiance, though it hit the system perforce. It was an imported culture, able to develop during a period of some relaxation in the communist regime after 1956. Even though it was not a mass movement, it provoked an enormous reaction (disproportionate to its size) from law enforcement bodies and the communist political milieu—which is the subject of a detailed analysis in the book. This work by Bogusław Tracz documents the Polish hippie movement as thoroughly as possible, and the author shows a model respect for the period sources, which testifies to his great professionalism in historical writing. The monograph is bound to remain, at least for the next years to come, the most important work on the counterculture of hippies in Poland, and because it is written in clear language, it makes an exciting story for everybody interested in exploring the Polish social and cultural realities of the 1960s and 1970s.

ROBERT BUBCZYK

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University

Agata Bisko, *Polska dla średnio zaawansowanych: Współczesna polskość codzienna* [Poland for intermediates: Contemporary everyday Polishness] (Kraków: TAIWPN Universitas, 2014), 468 pp. ISBN 97883-242-2614-6.

“Custom” and “everyday life” are two terms that most accurately describe the miscellaneous content of Agata Bisko’s book. The wide range of topics that appear in this publication includes issues related to such intangible aspects of everyday

__s

__n

ksd

culture as gestures and other “techniques of the body,”¹ linguistic habits, culturally and socially formed emotions, and even the general “ambience” stereotypically described (and felt) by Poles and foreigners as a “typically Polish ambience.” Topics that would appear in any classical ethnographic monograph dedicated to a “full description of a given culture” are also discussed here. Thus, the author describes annually celebrated feasts and family customs, analyzes the general attitude that Poles have toward time and space, and also describes interiors and houses, foods and drinks, and clothes and cars. Bisko completes her book with an examination of “Polish religiosity” and “Polish patriotism.” She discusses here how these two spheres are lived and experienced by Poles in their customary behaviors and everyday habits as well as festive traditions and numerous commonly shared opinions and stereotypes.

Writing about the “everyday culture of Poles” is not a new thing in Polish scholarly tradition. For example, the two-volume monumental classic by Jan Stanisław Bystroń (1892–1964), *The History of Customs in Old Poland: 16th–18th Centuries*, is a milestone publication dedicated to studies on Polish cultural history.² Although these volumes focus on a historically remote period (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries) and on people who inhabited the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, other smaller works by Bystroń reveal his interests in the everyday lives of his contemporaries. A collection of his essays published long after the author’s death under the significant title *Subjects That I Was Advised Against* is still an inspiring example of works dedicated to everyday culture.³ Bystroń was intrigued by seemingly banal everyday phenomena and the “lower” dimension of culture, such as unofficial inscriptions on walls—prototypes of contemporary graffiti. He realized that everyday culture, customs, and “common sense” should be scrutinized in a scholarly manner because they can reveal internal cultural mechanisms, stereotypes shared by people and the emotions that accompany these stereotypes. Additionally, his studies on everyday culture and customs related these topics to studies on Polish national identity.

Bisko’s book—dedicated to today’s Polish society—discusses all of these aspects. It searches for those dimensions of national culture that make Polish people feel “at home” in their “own culture.” Especially valuable in her book is a counterpointed narration that juxtaposes voices of Poles with voices of foreigners. Foreigners recalled in her book are usually those who experienced a long exposure to “Polish everyday culture” because they lived in Poland for a substantial period of time, were often married to a Pole, and generally had an intense relationship with Polish people and their customs. Simultaneously, Polish voices are discussed and

1. Here I am referring to a classic anthropological notion coined by Marcel Mauss in the 1930s. See Marcel Mauss, “Techniques of the Body,” *Economy and Society* 2 (1973): 70–88.

2. Jan Stanisław Bystroń, *Dzieje obyczajów w dawnej Polsce wiek XVI–XVIII*, Vols. 1–2 (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1976), originally published in 1932.

3. Jan Stanisław Bystroń, *Tematy, które mi odradzano: Pisma etnograficzne rozproszone*, selected and edited by Ludwik Stomma (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1980).

depicted from an “insider’s” auto-stereotypical perspective. Experiences of Poles as “outsiders” traveling and living abroad are also mentioned in the book. Cultural clashes and intercultural meetings appear to be the best tools for defining what is the nature of “contemporary everyday Polishness.”

Bisko aptly indicates and vividly describes the most significant components of “Polish culture.” Especially valuable are her reflections on the Polish concept of hospitality and ideals of friendship or the myth of “Matka Polka” (Polish Mother) and its relation to stereotypical images of gender roles prevailing in Polish society.⁴ When explaining today’s cultural patterns, she relates them to Polish history and specific social and political circumstances in remote as well as closer pasts. For instance, when discussing attitudes of contemporary Poles toward their professional lives and careers, she recalls not only the period of feudal society but also the Polish People’s Republic and the mental formation of *homo sovieticus*.⁵ She mentions various sociological theories—for instance, Max Weber’s classic reflections on the role of Protestantism and its connections with “the spirit of capitalism” (contrasting the Protestant-capitalist cases with Polish Catholic-oriented society). She also draws on more recent sociological and psychological theories and research undertaken on civil society, social capital, and power relations in various types of societies.

Nevertheless, *Poland for Intermediates* is not so much a scholarly work as a popular book dedicated to a wider audience. Indeed, it can be read as a textbook “in Polishness for the intermediate level.” It interprets various elements of Polish everyday culture and illustrates its specificity. There are, however, some problematic aspects in Bisko’s writing. As mentioned, the scope of her interests is very wide and diverse. This appears to make the contents very comprehensive and detailed. Yet in many places the book leaves the reader with the feeling that the author is overgeneralizing and even stereotyping. Moreover, the book seems to be focused on the durability of customs and worldviews, but it does not reflect sufficiently on the changeable reality of culture and the equally changeable character of “tradition” (which happens to be not only “inherited” and “repeated” but also “invented” or “reinvented”⁶). The other aspect not discussed thoroughly enough is the growing diversity of contemporary Polish society. The author too easily employs a concept of

4. “Matka Polka” (Polish Mother) is a symbolic figure in the Polish language as well as imagination. It is rooted in nineteenth-century ideals of Polish women—patriotic mothers bringing up sons to be ready to fight and die for Polish national independence. The figure of Matka Polka was often described in religious terms, relating her to the image of the suffering Virgin Mary (Mater Dolorosa), as is the case in a famous poem by Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855) dedicated to the Polish Mother (*Do matki Polki*).

5. Agata Bisko recalls the term *homo sovieticus* proposed by Józef Tischner (1931–2000), a Catholic priest, influential philosopher, and theologian. See Józef Tischner, *Etyka solidarności oraz homo sovieticus* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak, 2005).

6. Cf. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

“Polishness” and “Polish culture” as something that is obvious, commonly accepted, and shared by people living in today’s Poland. It would be advisable to pinpoint more clearly that “Polishness” is a disputed, negotiated, and contested but also strongly ideological and politicized concept. Too often the author refers to a communal “we” (whether “we” means “all Polish people” for her and how this can be defined is unclear).

These linguistic and theoretically problematic issues remind us that writing about stereotypes, customs, everyday culture, and the intangible dimensions of social life is not an easy task. At the same time, Bisko is a sensitive observer and makes the reader think and question his or her own culture. Even if readers might not agree fully with some of her generalizing interpretations, her book does provide a thorough “intermediate level course on Polishness.” Furthermore, it encourages reflection on the richness of everyday life and confirms that studies on seemingly banal everyday phenomena can lead to fundamental questions about communal identity and can uncover the complexity of social relations.

ANNA NIEDŹWIEDŹ
Jagiellonian University, Kraków