

have (correctly, in my opinion) been included in this book. Here the debates over the definition, limits and characteristics of these internal conflicts are directly determined by their nature, the degree of fracture, mobilisation and exclusion they generated and their indices of violence against combatants and non-combatants.

However, memories and narratives of a war are not only determined by how conflicts develop, but by how they end and how the end is managed. In fact, the post-war period is equally or even more important than the conflict itself for shaping the memory of a war. This observation informs the emphasis given in this work to reconstructions of the national community and how subsequent accounts of the war are ‘administrated’. Civil wars constitute a privileged place for the production of memory, as is abundantly evident in the great and enduring narrative stereotypes that originate from the conflicts themselves (class wars, struggles for independence, the Crusades, the *Liberazione*). Contemporary warfare is a powerful mnemonic generator, and its physical, symbolic and narrative reconstruction, far from being a problematic, seems to serve as a mechanism for potential or real exclusion.

This book, edited by Kissane, is primarily concerned with reconstructions of the notions of national community, rather than with physical or material rebuilding. It hits the mark significantly and relevantly by including nationalism as factor that affects inclusion and exclusion in reconstructions following the radical fractures of internal wars. However, it also contains questionable aspects, and not all chapters reflect the same degree of analytical depth or knowledge of sources. I find the inclusion of the Basque Country as a case of internal war that begins in 1968 with the first terrorist act by ETA, both surprising and unacceptable. Here also, stories are in play – given that words define realities – and the only literature that has spoken of an ‘internal war’ in the Basque Country is that which seeks to self-justify terrorism.

JAVIER RODRIGO
Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, Spain

Tarik Syril Amar, *The Paradox of Ukrainian Lviv: A Borderland City between Stalinists, Nazis, and Nationalists*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press 2015, 368pp. £24.56 (hbk).

Lviv continues to fascinate and puzzle. Over decades, this borderland city has been a fertile ground for studies on national mobilization and ideological clashes in East-Central Europe. Another aspect that attracts scholarly attention is remarkable diversity discernible in history, urban landscape, cultural identities and demographic composition of Lviv. Throughout city’s long history, diversity emerged as an asset and a problem, as a taken-for-granted

aspect of daily life and a target for various political regimes attempting to grind and integrate the local melange.

Tarik Cyril Amar examines precisely this theme with a keen eye, erudition and intellectual rigor. His focus on personal agency is particularly noteworthy. Based on an impressive array of archival sources and other material, Amar suggests a compelling account of persistence and malleability of local identities in the grip of Soviet communism, Nazism and nationalism. The impact of the three most transformative and violent ideologies of the 20th century on Lviv is consistently presented through activities, testimonies and individual choices of their main implementers, both those coming from afar and those recruited locally.

The book offers a concise introduction into Lviv/Lwów/Lemberg's multi-ethnic history before 1939 and sheds light on how conflicts between Poles, Jews and Ukrainians that predated the war were instigated during the German occupation in 1941–1944 and instrumentalized for implementation of the “Final Solution”. Amar also pays much attention to policies and practices of Sovietisation in 1939–1941 and after the Soviet comeback in 1944. He makes a strong point that the post-hoc view of Sovietisation as an external oppressive factor to which the local population withheld, does not fully correspond to reality. He presents evidence that the local identities were deeply transformed not only by the state violence, but also by active and passive acceptance of Soviet modernization. One of the main arguments of the book is that in Lviv and Western Ukraine the Soviet modernity hijacked and transformed Ukrainianess. Thus, a part of the “paradox of Ukrainian Lviv” declared in the title of the book emerges from inseparability of Ukrainisation and Sovietisation.

The presented material does prompts a critical revision of the customarily standpoint that the Soviet ideological project was Russianised through and through. However, Amar's statement that under the Soviet regime “Lviv was made overwhelmingly Ukrainian” (p.4) does not look convincing for the present reviewer. Surely, “eastern Ukrainianess” helped to translate the Soviet modernity and made it less foreign in the eyes of the western Ukrainian population. However, despite demographic dominance of Ukrainians, Lviv remained far from overwhelmingly Ukrainian in terms of culture and identity. Ukrainian orientation was rather allowed to exist in curtailed sanitized variants as an antidote to the demonised “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism”. Neither use of Ukrainian language was taken for granted in official contexts.

Notably, the Soviet variant of Ukrainianess did not manage to completely replace local memories, nostalgias, dialects, folklore, traditions, subcultures and practices of socialization - in short, local “ethnic stuff” - that continued to exist below the radar of Soviet fostering imperatives. Local ethnicity in this context deserves a second glance not only as a locus of adaptation or merging into ethnic nationalism, but also as a persisting resource of difference and discontent. Efforts of the past and present radical nationalists in Lviv to instrumentalise ethnic difference often cannot be called other than illiberal, intolerant and narrow-minded. However, as Amar's account of the Polish, Ukrainian and Jewish experiences under both Soviet and Nazi occupation demonstrates, many

times redefinitions of Lviv's local specificity in non-national terms turned to be equally discriminatory and illiberal. The promise of Nazis to link racially purified Lemberg to a "European cultural community"; arguments of western Ukrainian opinion-makers about superiority of Galicianness in opposition to "spoiled" identity of eastern and central Ukrainians; the Soviet zeal to elevate local Ukrainians from their "backwardness" and local Jews from their Jewishness – all were generated by exclusive political imaginaries.

Another intriguing topic discussed in the book is locality and the category of "local". Probably the biggest paradox of Lviv is that neither racial and ethnic violence and expulsions, nor politically motivated repressions made local genealogies irrelevant. With Jews killed and Poles expelled, the city was prepared for the project of Soviet Ukrainisation. Nevertheless, different historical genealogies connecting the locals with Central-European political cultures, historical memories and multi-ethnic traditions continued to remind about themselves in quite unexpected contexts. The story about efforts to rehabilitate the Communist Party of Western Ukraine (KPZU) with its roots in a "diverging", non-Bolshevik tradition illustrates this point very aptly.

To conclude, this is a seminal study essential for everyone who wants to get a deeper insight into issues of ethnicity, nationality and nationalism in Eastern Europe. While examining historical consequences of state-sponsored political, racial, and social ideologies shaping Europe in the 20th century, Amar's book also leads us to deeper understanding of the role of Lviv in the contemporary political mobilization in Ukraine.

ELEONORA NARVSELIUS

Centre for European Studies, SOL, Lund University, Sweden

Alexsandar Pavković and Christopher Kelen, *Anthems and the Making of Nation States: Identity and Nationalism in the Balkans*. I.B.Tauris, 2016, 264pp. £69.00 (hbk).

There is precious little academic literature on national anthems and how they have or have not helped create nation states. That probably has a lot to do with the fact these minute-long songs are hard to take seriously, especially in a country, like the United Kingdom, where the anthem is only begrudgingly sung.

That is something Pavković, associate professor in politics at Macquarie University, Sydney, and Kelen, professor of English at the University of Macau, seem to be trying to rectify with this textual analysis of the anthems of the former-Yugoslavia (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia).