

über das Osmanische Reich verbreiteten Vorstellungen. Unter Einbeziehung der Weltausstellung in Wien 1873 und der Eröffnung des Orientexpresses 1883 schildert Samsinger die Popularisierung von „Orientreisen“ und die Verbindung von modernem Reisekomfort mit der Wahrnehmung eigener „Überlegenheit“ über die Bewohner des als rückständig und gefährlich, aber exotisch, malerisch und geheimnisvoll wahrgenommenen „Orients“.

Es fällt auf, dass der Herausgeber Rudolf Agstner selbst mit den ersten drei aufeinander folgenden Beiträgen ganze 156 Seiten in Anspruch nimmt, so dass abzüglich der beiden Beiträge des zweiten Herausgebers Samsinger für die übrigen fünf Beitragenden zusammen nur 92 Seiten verbleiben. Vielleicht durch den Charakter des Buches als Festschrift bedingt, wird außerdem in der Einleitung der behandelte Stoff etwas euphorisch als Beleg für die „alte Freundschaft zwischen Österreich und der Türkei“ gefeiert (S. 11-13), ohne auf die weniger „freundschaftlichen“ Zielsetzungen wirtschafts- und kulturpolitischer Durchdringung des Osmanischen Reichs durch fremde Mächte hinzuweisen. Auch hätte eine genaue Begründung der häufig wechselnden Begriffswahl zwischen „Türkei“ und „Osmanischem Reich“ beziehungsweise „Istanbul“ und „Konstantinopel“ sicher nicht geschadet. Die im Wortlaut abgedruckten Auszüge aus den Originalquellen, die sich teils über mehrere Seiten erstrecken, erscheinen manchmal etwas lang.

Diese Kritikpunkte ändern aber nichts an der Tatsache, dass sich der vorliegende Band, in dem sichtlich viel Mühe und Quellenarbeit stecken, ebenso interessant wie abwechslungsreich liest und den Wis-

sensstand um Einblicke in bislang weniger bekannte Aspekte österreichischer und österreichisch-ungarischer Präsenz im Osmanischen Reich bereichert. Auch die zahlreichen, teils farbigen Illustrationen fallen positiv auf.

Anmerkung

- 1 Vgl. z. B. Necla Geyikdağı, *Foreign Investment in the Ottoman Empire. International Trade and Relations 1854–1914*, London 2011; Yavuz Köse, *Westlicher Konsum am Bosphorus. Warenhäuser, Nestlé & Co. im späten Osmanischen Reich (1855–1923)*, München 2010; Johannes Berchtold, *Recht und Gerechtigkeit in der Konsulargerichtsbarkeit, Britische Exterritorialität im Osmanischen Reich 1825–1914*, München 2009; Suraiya Faruqi/Gilles Veinstein (Hrsg.), *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire*, Paris 2008; Malte Fuhrmann, *Der Traum von deutschen Orient. Zwei deutsche Kolonien im Osmanischen Reich 1851–1918*, Frankfurt a. M. 2006; Maurits van den Boogert, *The Capitulations and the Ottoman Legal System. Qadis, Consuls and “Beraths” in the 18th Century*, Leiden 2005.

Vejas Liulevicius: *The German Myth of the East: 1800 to the Present*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 292 S.

Rezensiert von
Annemarie Sammartino, Oberlin

Vejas Liulevicius is known to most scholars of German history for his 2000 *War Land on the Eastern Front*, a book that radically recentered German historical understanding of World War I, from the Fields of Flanders to the imperial landscape of occupied Ober Ost.¹ His new book, “*The German Myth of the East: 1800 to the Present*”, is

an ambitious attempt to work through the history and meaning of Germany's relationship with Eastern Europe over a much greater stretch of time.² Although the title states that the book begins in 1800, in fact the text stretches over more than a millennium of history. While it is possible to quibble with some of Liulevicius's findings, as would be the case in any study of this scope, it is an important effort to grapple with a wide-ranging body of literature on this topic that remains under-theorized despite some significant studies in recent years, including work by Philip Ther, Gregor Thum, Wolfgang Wippermann, Kristin Kopp and others.³

This book is more of a grand synthesis of work on the German relationship to the East than a monograph reliant upon new research, although there is some of that too. This combined with Liulevicius's translations of German terms and explications of even basic events and concepts in German history make this book ideal for non-specialists.

Liulevicius begins with the Germanic migrations and the Roman Empire and takes his study through to the present day challenges of EU enlargement. He argues that throughout the period starting in 1800, but with important antecedents even earlier, there has been a persistent, if multi-faceted, "myth of the East" that has shaped German theory and practice, what he defines as a "durable reflex of looking at the East as both a site of the future and its promise and at the same time a location of peril, associated with the past" (p. 1). Both ideas about the promise and peril of Eastern Europe would come to underwrite German imperial projects in the region, from the "Polenpolitik" of the Kaiserreich

to the genocidal fervor and utopian imaginings of the Nazis. Liulevicius adds several caveats to this bold claim about the stability of this myth, stressing that the German relationship to the East has never been monolithic and evolved over the course of centuries. Nevertheless, this is an account that is invested in the continuity of Germany's relationship to the East. Liulevicius is, furthermore, implicitly arguing that Germany's relationship to an imagined "East" was more important than its particular relationship with any nation – Russians, Poles, etc. His elision of these national groups can run the risk of generalizing, but has its own rewards, as it becomes clear that different "Easts" provided a succession of Others to evolving notions of the German self. Indeed, the variety of quotes from important figures in German history provides an important reminder of the pervasiveness of German prejudice towards Eastern Europe and the people who lived there in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Although the book states that this myth coalesced during and after the Napoleonic wars and was "articulated fully around the middle of the nineteenth century" (p. 69), his evidence suggests that 1900 was a more important turning point for two reasons. The first is that it was in 1900 that prejudices towards Slavs (especially Russians and Poles) became spatialized. In other words, the turn of the century brought with it a myth of the East, not just a myth of Easterners. While there was evidence of the East as a space of conquest or threat prior to 1900, the popularity of geography in this period made the space of the East more important than the people who inhabited it, a crucial shift. Secondly, while

there is some discussion of the possibilities of Eastern Europe prior to 1900, the idea of Eastern Europe as a space to enact a radically different future – either of revolution or conquest – takes a quantitative leap in this period, especially during and after World War I. It was after 1900, that the myth of the East as a space of possibility achieved equal standing with the myth of the East as a space of backwardness or threat. The Great War rightly takes center stage in Liulevicius's account of this shift, but the importance of the Russian Revolution, as it created an image of an East of radical futurity not eternal backwardness, should not be forgotten.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of this book is its use of the twists and turns of Germany's myth of the East to offer an alternative, but convincing, chronology of twentieth century German history. Rather than the familiar political caesuras of 1918, 1933 or 1945, Liulevicius sees the period from 1914–1933 as one unit, 1933–1943 as another, and 1943–1955 as a third. This reperiodization is thought provoking. For example, it makes sense to see 1943–1955 as a broad unit in which Germans faced the reality of defeat at the hands of an Eastern foe, and Liulevicius's account of 1955 as a year of transition, because of the founding of the neutral state of Austria, the establishment of the Warsaw Pact and NATO alliances, and the return home of the remaining POWs in the Soviet Union, is convincing. After 1955, Liulevicius charts the diminishment of the myth of the East, to the point that he sees that “there is reason to suppose that the German myth of the East has now largely ended” replaced by a “more sober and demythologized relationship” (p. 239). Given the violence

that has been done under the spell of this myth, one can only hope that this conclusion proves true.

Notes

- 1 Vejas Liulevicius, *War Land on the Eastern Front: Culture, National Identity and German Occupation in World War I*, Cambridge 2000.
- 2 Liulevicius does take on Austrian notions of the East alongside German ones, even after the founding of the German nation-state. However, his discussion of Austria is more of an afterthought.
- 3 Philipp Ther, *Beyond the Nation. The Relational Basis of a Comparative History of Germany and Europe*, in: *Central European History* 31 (2003) 1, pp. 45-73; Gregor Thum (Hrsg.), *Traumland Osten. Deutsche Bilder vom östlichen Europa im 20. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen 2006; Wolfgang Wippermann, *Die Deutschen und der Osten. Feindbild und Traumland*, Darmstadt 2007; Kristin Kopp, *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space*, Ann Arbor 2012.

John D. Garrigus: Before Haiti. Race and Citizenship in French Saint-Domingue, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 396 S.

Reviewed by
Benjamin J. Landsee, Toronto

John Garrigus addresses how race, class and color intersect with the experience and idea of citizenship in colonial Saint Domingue and revolutionary Haiti. He does this by exploring how free people of color in the southern peninsula developed a political position that denounced racism, yet endorsed slavery. Garrigus argues that society in the southern peninsula grew in isolation from the rest of the colony and largely outside of French influence. This