

Jörg Ganzenmüller, *Russische Staatsgewalt und polnischer Adel. Elitenintegration und Staatsausbau im Westen des Zarenreiches (1772–1850)*, Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2013. 425 S. ISBN 978-3-412-20944-5

In Jörg Ganzenmüller's work *Russische Staatsgewalt und polnischer Adel. Elitenintegration und Staatsausbau im Westen des Zarenreiches (1772–1850)*, the author has made use of several research hypotheses and methodological approaches. Firstly, according to Ganzenmüller, in order to integrate the territories that made up the states left after the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Russian Empire's government had to pay particular attention to the nobility. The nobility was important to the government not just for the critical role of this social group in the land's social, economic and cultural life, but more for its political status within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (p. 24). On the other hand, Ganzenmüller also claims that following the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's partitions, until around the mid-1840s, the Imperial Russian government conducted an integrationist policy (*Integrationspolitik*) with regard to the nobility. Yet one of the more important questions raised in this study about the *nature* of the integrationist policy regarding the nobility warrants further discussion. In this case, the book's author suggests using the methodological approach proposed by Talcot Parsons and Max Weber, where social integration can be *normative* or *pragmatic* (*die normative oder die pragmatische Integration*), and to ascertain which model for the integration of the nobility the Imperial Russian government chose, and why (p. 26).

Ganzenmüller is of the view that the Imperial Russian government implemented an integrationist policy regarding the nobility from the First Partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until the early 1840s. In a geographical sense, Ganzenmüller basically analysed government policy regarding the nobility in the former lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL) (material on the Kingdom of Poland is introduced in cases where the author deemed it necessary to compare phenomena, events and situations). Therefore, he thought it important to explain separately how he understood the definition 'Polish nobility' (*polnischer Adel*) used in the book. In this case, the author makes the unequivocal conclusion that the 'Polish nobility' could also be nobles originating from the former GDL lands, as 'they adopted the Polish language, religion, Polish traditions, and basically became a part of Polish culture' (p. 15). It is important to note that for his research, Ganzenmüller used material not only from the archives of the Russian Federation, but data from Lithuanian, Belarusian

and Ukrainian archives as well. He also referred to scientific literature published in Polish and Russian, and partly Ukrainian and Belarusian. Ganzenmüller prioritised Polish historiography, very accurately noting that in recent years, Polish historians have refused 'to depict interrelations between the Imperial Russian government and the Polish nobility only as antagonistic and in a constant state of conflict' (pp. 19–21). Works by Lithuanian historians have practically not been introduced into academic circulation in Ganzenmüller's study (probably due to the language barrier). Yet research on the nobility's self-government from the first half of the 19th century that has appeared in Lithuanian historiography (e.g. studies by Tamara Bairašauskaitė)<sup>1</sup> could have given the author an additional prompt for further historiographical discussion.

Ganzenmüller's book consists of three sections, each tackling a different issue. In the first chapter 'Between cooperation of the elite and state-building: integration of the Polish nobility into tsarist autocratic order', he raises the question of why and how the Polish nobility was brought closer to the imperial nobility (p. 25). In the second chapter, 'From local cooperation to "state event"?', about the transformation from Polish self-government to meetings of Russian nobles, Ganzenmüller analyses how the integration of institutions of the nobility's local self-government into institutions of the Imperial Russian government actually took place. In the third chapter, meanwhile, 'State building and ruling practices in the Polish provinces: the establishment of tsarist ruling structures in the western governorates', he analyses relations between the central government and representatives of local noble government (p. 25).

Ganzenmüller claims that the uprising of 1830–1831 was the symbolic divide, when the Imperial Russian government's policy regarding the nobility changed: there was a transition from a pragmatic integrationist approach to

<sup>1</sup> E.g.: T. Bairašauskaitė, *Lietuvos bajorų savivalda XIX a. pirmoje pusėje* (Vilnius, 2003). Some of Bairašauskaitė's research on the nobility's self-government in the first half of the 19th century has also been published in Polish: 'Sejmiki Generalnego Gubernatorstwa Wileńskiego (1801–1861)', *Profesor Henryk Łowmiański. Życie i dzieło. Materiały z sesji naukowej poświęconej dziesiątej rocznicy śmierci Uczzonego (Poznań 7–8 X 1994 r.)*, pod. red. A. Kijasa, K. Pietkiewiczza (Poznań, 1995), pp. 183–190; 'Kilka uwag o litewskich marszałkach powiatowych i gubernialnych. Wiek XIX – do powstania styczniowego', *Przegląd Wschodni*, t. 4, zesz. 2(14) (1997), pp. 179–195; 'Kilka uwag o sejmikach guberni litewskich (do lat trzydziestych XIX wieku)', *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*, Rok 1997, t. 49, zesz. 1–2 (1998), pp. 265–271; 'Dzienniki szlachty litewskiej z XIX wieku w zbiorach wileńskich', *Białostoczczyzna*, no. 2(54) (1999), pp. 32–37; 'Sejmiki w guberniach litewskich w pierwszej połowie XIX wieku', *Czasy Nowożytnie*, t. XII (XIII) (2002), pp. 85–101; 'Diariusz sejmiku 1817 r. jako źródło do dziejów szlachty litewskiej', *Pogranicze polsko-litewsko-białoruskie. Źródła – stan badań. Materiały konferencji*, red. M. Kietliński (Białystok, 2003), pp. 76–83.

an integrationist normative policy. Unlike the reign of Catherine II, Nicholas I no longer saw the nobility as another effective means of conducting the more successful incorporation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's lands into the Russian Empire. Immediately after the First Partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, according to Ganzenmüller, the Imperial Russian government took a two-sided position in terms of the nobility. On one hand, it sought to maintain traditional cooperation with the local elite, leaving it space for an opportunity to conduct local self-government. On the other hand, already at this stage, the government tried as much as possible to bring the Polish nobility *closer* to the general Imperial nobility, formulating new criteria for belonging to a particular estate, and announcing the mandatory registration of the Polish nobility: it was necessary to prove one's noble origins (p. 142). In this way, according to Ganzenmüller, the government's integrationist pragmatic policy regarding the nobles already featured characteristics of a normative policy approach. It sought both to maintain cooperation with the local nobility, and at the same time to transform this social group. It was the government that accelerated the local nobility's declassing processes. The author is of the opinion that right up until the 1830–1831 uprising, the nobility upheld its dominant positions in the lands of the former GDL, and even gained access to new career opportunities across the whole Russian Empire.

In the second chapter, Ganzenmüller concludes that the congress of the Polish nobility before the 1830–1831 uprising was a chance for them to voice their opinions on social, economic, judicial, and sometimes even cultural matters, which affected the estate's existence as a social class. The deliberation of political concerns remained the prerogative of the ruler and the state. The institution of the nobility's leaders carried out a double role: it represented the estate's interests in communication with the government, and also performed some local administrative functions. It was through the nobility's leaders that the estate was more closely associated with Imperial ruling structures. But Ganzenmüller claims that even when the Imperial Russian government implemented an integrationist pragmatic policy regarding the nobility, there are still no grounds to suggest the complete independence of the nobility's self-government institutions. Although the authorities allowed nobles to keep their local ruling institutions, they did limit their potential to have an impact on society's development, or to initiate reforms benefiting the nobility (p. 256). Losing its political tradition in the former lands of the GDL, the Polish nobility also gradually lost its identity, cultural expression and influence on local society.

In the third chapter, Ganzenmüller draws more attention to the Imperial Russian government's establishment in the Northwest Region. He believes that the government needed an adequate staff of officials that could guarantee the more successful incorporation of the occupied lands into the composition of the Russian Empire. This is why the government

was forced to cooperate with the local nobility, represented by the noble leaders. The appointed governors and elected noble leaders often found common ground, while any conflicts that arose were of a more personal than a national or social nature (p. 367).

It is important to note that at the end of the book, Ganzenmüller not only repeats the main conclusions from his study, but also compares the policies regarding the nobility implemented by the Habsburg Empire and in Prussia. These ruling structures applied a policy model concerning the nobility different to the Russian Empire's officials: they progressed from an integrationist normative policy to an integrationist pragmatic policy (p. 382). Ganzenmüller presumes that the latter integrationist policy model regarding the nobility was more successful. Neither in the Habsburg Empire nor in Prussia was there such dissatisfaction in the government's policy among the nobility, which was expressed in the Russian Empire in the form of the 1830–1831 uprising.

*Olga Mastianica*