

really nothing new or newly insightful here. This ground has been covered before, in Jakub Karpinski's *Countdown* (1982), among other more recent works.

The bulk of Bernhard's book is devoted to "describing and delineating" the growing collaboration after 1976 of workers and intellectuals in the struggle to liberate the public space necessary for the rebirth of civil society. The strength of these chapters lies in the clear and concise way that Bernhard traces the process, and especially in his conclusion. In it, Bernhard credits the intellectuals of KOR with showing the workers how to lead the country "out of the psychology of captivity" that had prevailed since 1956, and to transcend the "cycle of intense and sporadic protests punctuating periods of apathetic withdrawal" (p. 208) that had characterized the years between 1970 and 1976. Ultimately, of course, workers and intellectuals together did succeed in forcing the regime to concede the legal recognition of *Solidarność* in 1980, which, Bernhard argues, represents the triumph of civil society over the state. The survival of *Solidarność* underground after the imposition of martial law in December of 1981, and its spectacular rise to actual political power in 1989, are confirmation of this triumph.

This book is extensively researched in both primary sources and secondary literature, and handily written. Bernhard has succeeded admirably in distilling the essential achievement of the Polish opposition between 1976 and 1980. In addition, Bernhard provides some introduction to and critique of existing analysis. Although in a few places Bernhard's "own theoretical analysis" verges on belaboring the obvious (and I am not completely convinced of the self-proclaimed "newness" of his interpretations), overall this is a highly useful and readable book.

ANITA SHELTON
Eastern Illinois University

MYROSLAV SHKANDRIJ. *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta. 1992. Pp. xii, 265.

The topics around which the cultural discussion of the 1920s in Ukraine revolved remain critical in its post-totalitarian society: the adaptation of modernity by a static and apathetic population and the relationship of Ukraine to Europe as well as to Russia. This debate, which began as discussions of various literary approaches, became pivotal in the definition of Ukrainian identity and in the manner in which the republic came to be subordinate politically and culturally to the Muscovite center of the Soviet Union. Myroslav Shkandrij places the debate in its political context without watering down the cultural issues and reducing them to a Russian-Ukrainian confrontation. The weave of politics with the richly nuanced cultural crosscurrents allows the reader to follow both the

intellectual debate and its political uses. The heart of the debate was the relationship of art to the people and to the promotion of revolutionary sensibilities. To reach the people, literature in Ukraine had to be in Ukrainian. Ukrainians opted for a Western definition of culture and of revolution. The Ukrainian avant garde opted for Europe and rejected the need for a Russian intermediary in building a progressive society. The debate itself was not about nationalism or the rights of the Ukrainians, although it came to be identified and presented as such both by its supporters and by their opponents.

The scholar accustomed to an imperial or even a simple Russian framework in the analysis and presentation of the cultural developments of the former Soviet Union will find Shkandrij's approach useful and refreshing. He is interested in the cultural and political situation in Ukraine in the formative years of the Soviet Union. The critical discussions in Ukraine that fashioned its cultural landscape were shaped by a multiplicity of forces, including those of Moscow. The major issue facing the Ukrainian intelligentsia was how to reconcile their own cultural sensibilities, which were very much within the context of the European avant garde, with the perception of the political leaders, both in Kiev and in Moscow, of what popular predilections of the Ukrainian masses were. Initially, the Ukrainian communists agreed with Moscow that a single proletarian culture would emerge from the unified proletariat. But the growth of the popularity of national sentiment in Ukraine convinced even the most die-hard communists of the need either to ride the popular wave or lose the masses and their support of the revolution. At the same time popular sentiment remained philistine, and Ukrainian fiction and theater were expected to have the requisite romantic and even mawkish vaudeville character. The party found the emergence of the Ukrainian avant garde and its claim to speak for the future doubly disturbing: it challenged both the revolutionary hegemony of the centralized party and Russian cultural superiority. Above all, it gave ample proof that Ukraine was fully capable of existing on its own with no help or intervention from the north.

Shkandrij masterfully presents the interactions between the cultural elite, the party, the influence of both the classics and the European modernists, and the local Ukrainian party functionaries that came to personify national communism, the first incarnation of communism with a human face. He does this by presenting the full picture, warts and all, of the cultural development of modern Ukraine. This is an indispensable book for the study of the intellectual and literary history of the former Soviet Union as well as modernization.

The debates of the 1920s have resumed in the 1990s, but the original so far appears to have been

more perceptive than the contemporary reverberations.

MARTHA BOHACHEVSKY-CHOMIAK
McLean, Virginia

NEAR EAST

ENGIN DENIZ AKARLI. *The Long Peace: Ottoman Lebanon, 1861-1920*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1993. Pp. xviii, 288. \$40.00.

The parochial problems of our global village's smaller polities have not infrequently loomed larger when internationalized by the interposition of neighboring regional powers and the world's great powers. This is true particularly when these problems have been of the sort that engender civil strife and complicate the operation of meliorative social, economic, and political reconstruction. If only for this reason, then, the modern history of Lebanon, a Middle Eastern polity that has experienced such a combination of tensions in our own time, merits Engin Deniz Akarli's painstakingly researched contribution to our understanding of Lebanon's earlier nineteenth-century experience with these problems when it still was only a part, although a rather distinctive one, of the Ottoman empire.

The diffusion of the complex, and sometimes antithetical, changes associated with "modernity" contributed at first to painful polarizations in Lebanon's intrasectarian and intersectarian relationships. They culminated in the civil war of 1860, and led after this to the peaceful recastings of these same relationships into more tolerant and cohesive political configurations. Concurrently, however, similarly multifarious European and Ottoman developments played themselves out in the Lebanese arena. Thus, from the late 1830s into the 1840s and 1850s, European powers, particularly France and Britain, challenged each other's interests and Ottoman authority in Lebanon and involved themselves with their respective sectarian allies in the fueling of tensions there. In the early 1860s, however, the European powers and the Ottomans, reacting to the civil war and working within the emerging international order of the day (the Concert of Europe), helped craft, for what they hoped would be the resolution of the Lebanese problem, an interesting institutional framework that combined a significant degree of representative government for the Lebanese polity while reserving the appointment of its Ottoman governor to themselves. The subject of Akarli's study is the progress of a semi-autonomous Lebanon whose physical and political parameters they had drawn and whose development they sought to oversee.

An appreciation of the process of change in a polity subject to so complex a set of determinants invites the question of their respective hermeneutical weightings, a historiographical issue of interest to students looking to see how socioeconomic and political con-

siderations link up with regional and international affairs. Put in this way, the question for Lebanon becomes one of weighing the relative importance to the process of change of those discrete events that, combining endogenous, regional, and international activities, may be said to introduce some scene-setting modifications to the character of the polity, such as occurred with the internationally sponsored Lebanese settlement of the early 1860s, against those longer-term and broadly based socioeconomic and political influences that are portrayed as carrying the polity's development in their wake.

Drawing on the relatively numerous files on Lebanese affairs of the latter part of the nineteenth century in the Ottoman archives, a hitherto largely unexplored source, Akarli highlights the extent to which regional, rather than international, influences combined with indigenous ones to shape the Lebanese polity in this period. The Ottoman administration, he argues, shepherded Lebanon with statesman-like skillfulness through a relatively long period of progressive stability. Anxious to retain their hegemony over a region that was of ever-increasing interest to France and Britain, the Ottomans oversaw the political life of Lebanon in a manner that strengthened the Lebanese polity and its experience with democracy. In order to keep foreign intervention at bay, for example, the Ottomans curtailed the influence of some of the governors who by going too far in antagonizing public opinion might create a situation that would invite intervention. With such careful analyses, Akarli has given greater substance and weight to very important aspects of the modern history of Lebanon.

JOHN P. SPAGNOLO
Simon Fraser University

JOSEPH KOSTINER. *The Making of Saudi Arabia, 1916-1936: From Chieftaincy to Monarchical State*. (Studies in Middle Eastern History.) New York: Oxford University Press. 1993. Pp. xii, 260. \$39.95.

In 1902, 'Abd al-'Aziz Al-Sa'ud, commonly known as Ibn Sa'ud, captured his ancestral capital of Riyadh and refounded Saudi rule in Najd. Joseph Kostiner argues in this meticulous study that initially 'Abd al-'Aziz became a traditional Arab chieftain. He led an alliance of nomads and settled inhabitants who shared responsibilities and duties, but who lacked either a sense of nationalism or clear territorial limits. By 1936, however, this chieftaincy had evolved into a state displaying the essential characteristics of centralized government, social cohesion, and territorial limits.

In contrast to theories that attribute this state formation to the charismatic 'Abd al-'Aziz, or to aspects of the religious reform movement known in the West as Wahhabism, Kostiner emphasizes the crucial role played by changes in the external "environment." When the Ottoman empire entered World