Johannes Remy. *Brothers or Enemies: The Ukrainian National Movement and Russia, from the 1840s to the 1870s*. U of Toronto P, 2016. x, 334 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $66.00, cloth.

The book *Brothers or Enemies: The Ukrainian National Movement and Russia, from the 1840s to the 1870s*, by Johannes Remy, confirms the author's reputation as a leading authority on the Ukrainian-Russian-Polish encounter of the middle decades of the nineteenth century. He continues to explore the topics that he began studying in his previous publications, particularly in the work *Higher Education and National Identity: Polish Student Activism in Russia 1832-1863*. But whereas his first monograph was devoted to Polish student activism and Polish responses to Russian imperial policies in Right-Bank Ukraine, this more recent work deals with the Ukrainian national movement and the Russian government—a story set on a larger territory and having a slightly different timeline.

The book *Brothers or Enemies* is somewhat descriptive in style, and it is not overly steeped either in methodology or fashionable theory. It does, however, provide us with an abundance of sources and facts—this owing to the scrupulous research conducted by the author in several major libraries and archives in Russia and Ukraine. Most sources (both published and archival) have already been explored by historians. But Remy puts together a variety of facts—a mixture of what has been known, little known, and unknown—and he reconstructs, with impressive precision, the minutiae of Russian censorial practices and the diverse actions of Ukrainian activists and intellectuals. The author's stated goal is to examine the "relations between the Ukrainian nationally minded intelligentsia and Russia" (5) during several crucial decades of the Ukrainian-Russian encounter, that is, from the 1840s through the 1870s. What makes Remy's argument compelling is that he works on two levels: he focuses on the Ukrainian national activists' perception of Russia and Russians while at the same time analyzing the Russian government's responses, often reactive, to the actions of those activists. The result is a most comprehensive picture of the Ukrainian-Russian encounter in the cultural and political fields during the reign of Russia's notoriously conservative emperor Nicholas I and that of his "liberal" son, Alexander II, who oversaw the implementation of two of the most infamous "anti-Ukrainian" measures ever enacted in late-imperial Russia—the Valuev Directive of 1863 and the Ems Ukaz of 1876.

Among Remy's most important findings are the following. Even the most "academic" and cultural activities of Ukrainian intellectuals in the 1840s and the 1850s, including the publication of folklore and original literary works (particularly those of Panteleimon Kulish and Taras Shevchenko), had an implicit political meaning (this thesis was first suggested by Roman Szporluk

Volume VI, No. 1 (2019) DOI: https://doi.org/10.21226/ewjus487

[Szporluk 91]). Remy argues that both the Ukrainian activists themselves and the Russian authorities were aware of the political and modern character of the Ukrainian national movement of the time. For instance, according to the author, Kulish's early works of non-fiction, such as *Povest' ob" ukrainskom" narode* (*The Story of the Ukrainian People*) and *Ukraina* (*Ukraine* [both written in the 1840s]), "show his political, rather than cultural, antipathy to Russia," which also pointed to the "importance of pre-existing ethnic identity for modern nation building" (26, 34). In a heated socio-political atmosphere that was exacerbated by the revolutionary events of 1848 in Europe, even Ukrainian folk proverbs could become politically detrimental.[1] Accordingly, in 1853, the Russian censorial committee found that some of the proverbs published by Ukrainian scholars promoted animosity between Ukrainians and Russians. Tsar Nicholas himself ordered his minister of education to issue an official reprimand to a scholar concerned. Overall, the Russian authorities, particularly the secret police (the notorious Third Section), correctly understood the "modern character" of the Romantic nationalist ideas that were espoused by the members of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood and did not see in them only an old-fashioned patriotism (59). In this, Remy disagrees with Russian historian Alexei Miller, who has written that the Russian government failed to appreciate the modern character of the Ukrainian national movement and considered it, instead, merely nostalgic in nature (Miller 55). It seems, however, that both of these views miss the point: the always paranoid Russian authorities somewhat exaggerated the modern nationalist element in the ideology of the Ukrainian Romantics, who were not quite yet modern "nationalists" (Bilenky 196-97, 304). It is also possible that the government simply did not understand modern nationalism as such and viewed it as a lesser danger than social revolution.

Remy, however, manages to reveal something important about how imperial Russia functioned—namely, the crucial role of local authorities (governors general) in the formulation of official policies toward minorities. The author describes two instances: first, when Kyiv governor general Illarion Vasil'chikov informally supported the local Hromada in the late 1850s and early 1860s in an effort to curb Polish influence in Right-Bank Ukraine; and second, when Governor General Aleksandr Dondukov-Korsakov, in the 1870s, protected Ukrainian national activists because he believed, among other things, that "Ukrainian activities could be controlled better when they were public" (180). Only when the imperial centre grew

[1] Remy gives a few examples of such proverbs. Among them one finds the following: "'Make friends with a Russian (moskal'), but keep a stone in your bosom'"; and "'Who's there? The devil. Good, as long as it's not a Russian'" (55).

stronger in the second half of the 1870s, writes Remy, did the policy toward Ukrainians become more centralized and, at that point, "more difficult to challenge" (231-32). Yet we know from the subsequent history that the situation shifted once again in the late 1890s, when a new governor general, Mikhail Dragomirov (himself a descendant of Ukrainian Cossack aristocracy), more than anyone before him supported Ukrainian national activists. The role of powerful local governors also points to the premodern colonial nature of the Russian Empire (Starr 14-16).

Remy revisits the story behind the adoption of the notorious Valuev Directive in 1863. The author points to the fact that while the directive was designed as a temporary measure and was not even sanctioned by the cabinet of ministers or the State Council, it remained binding for censors until 1876, when the even more brutal Ems Ukaz severely limited public expression of Ukrainian identity. Remy manages to underscore the contingent and arbitrary character of Russian political decision-making: through such decision-making, a temporary restrictive measure of limited effect designed by a maverick official often became a lasting repressive policy. The author also argues that although the minister of the interior Petr Valuev alluded to the Polish-Ukrainian conspiracy against the government, he simply used the Polish factor as a pretext in order to crack down on Ukrainians, and he even fabricated evidence against some Ukrainophiles.

Much of Remy's work has been informed by polemics with Miller's earlier book on a similar topic *The Ukrainian Question: The Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century*. But while Miller's account is more conceptual (which leads to certain deficiencies in his interpretations of Russian-Ukrainian relations), Remy's account is driven more by sources and facts and is devoid of sweeping generalizations. And, to put it simply, while Miller emphasizes the weakness of the Russian government in its dealings with Ukrainophiles, Remy shows the strength of Ukrainian activists. Remy does not plainly refute Miller's "modernization" paradigm; rather, he entirely avoids the discussion of why the project of Russification ended in failure. However, Remy seems to agree with Miller's conclusion that the Russian government had very limited means at its disposal to prevent "the expansion of the Ukrainian national movement" (230).

We will not find in Remy's book *Brothers or Enemies* a Miller-style debate on the fate of the Ukrainian and the "all-Russian" national projects because the book ends a bit abruptly, with the year 1876—the year that the notorious Ems Ukaz was enacted by imperial authorities. The author only just touches on the efficiency of that decree. Also, he does not deal with overall Russian policies toward Ukraine. He lists, however, the statistics of Ukrainian publications after 1876 (see 222), which clearly show that the Ems Ukaz (although not rescinded until 1906) did little to prevent Ukrainian activists

from publishing Ukrainian-language books, both fiction and non-fiction (the latter category was banned under the decree). He also comes to the important conclusion that as a result of harsh measures of the 1870s that were aimed at curbing Ukrainian cultural activities, the Ukrainian movement became increasingly alienated from Russia and Russians (223-24). A previously strong pro-Russian current in the Ukrainian movement was particularly affected (even if its existence has been a bit exaggerated by the author); after 1876, it was on decline. Mykhailo Drahomanov, a leading Ukrainian intellectual, who, according to Remy, had once supported the "inclusive, all-Russian national identity" (223), became disillusioned with Russia, and he opted, instead, for Ukraine's European connection in his numerous and highly influential émigré writings. In relation to this, another of Remy's statements is particularly potent: in refuting Faith Hillis's fairly controversial idea about the persistence of a united "Little Russian lobby" up until at least the 1890s (Hillis 89-105), he notes that the idea of Ukraine's independence had already emerged by 1850 (5, 11), which, thus, effectively separated "Ukrainians" from "Little Russians."

Remy's book *Brothers or Enemies* should become indispensable for all historians of nineteenth-century Ukraine. It should also be of great use to historians specializing in Ukrainian-Russian relations.

Serhiy Bilenky
Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies

Works Cited

Bilenky, Serhiy. *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe: Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian Political Imaginations*. Stanford UP, 2012. Stanford Studies on Central and Eastern Europe.

Hillis, Faith. *Children of Rus': Right-Bank Ukraine and the Invention of a Russian Nation*. Cornell UP, 2013.

Miller, Alexei. *The Ukrainian Question: The Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century*. Translated from Russian by Olga Poato, Central European UP, 2003.

Remy, Johannes. *Higher Education and National Identity: Polish Student Activism in Russia 1832-1863*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2000. Bibliotheca Historica 57.

Starr, S. Frederick. "Tsarist Government: The Imperial Dimension." *Soviet Nationality Policies and Practices*, edited by Jeremy R. Azrael, Praeger, 1978, pp. 3-31.

Szporluk, Roman. "Ukraine: From an Imperial Periphery to a Sovereign State." *Daedalus*, vol. 126, no. 3, Summer 1997, pp. 85-119.