

Die spezifische Situation Zentraleuropas zeichnet C. in den beiden darauffolgenden Kapiteln am Beispiel verschiedener urbaner Zentren „um 1900“ nach. Seinem Forschungsschwerpunkt folgend, widmet er den „Wiener Kulturen“ ein ganzes Kapitel. Er zeigt, dass das Wien der Jahrhundertwende keine „deutsche“ Stadt war, sondern ein urbaner „Zwischenraum“, der durch das konflikthafte Zusammenspiel kultureller Vielfalt und nationaler Homogenisierung geprägt wurde. Dies traf auch auf die vielen kleineren und größeren Städte der Habsburgermonarchie zu, die Gegenstand des fünften Kapitels sind. Neben Budapest, Prag (Praha), Pressburg (Pozsony, Bratislava), Czernowitz (Tscherniwzi, Cernăuți) und Triest (Trieste, Trst) geht C. auch auf die kleine, heute in der Slowakei gelegene Stadt Leutschau (Levoča, Lőcse) ein, die zugleich seine Geburtsstadt ist. Unter Verweis auf seine eigenen Erfahrungen in einer mehrsprachigen (ungarisch-deutsch-slowakischen) Familie betont er, dass Vielsprachigkeit allen nationalen Homogenisierungsversuchen zum Trotz in Zentraleuropa eine „bis weit ins 20. Jahrhundert gelebte Wirklichkeit“ gewesen sei (S. 303).

Im letzten Kapitel hebt C. noch einmal die Notwendigkeit postkolonialer Perspektiven auf die gesamte Geschichtsregion hervor, mittels derer eine „Provinzialisierung“ (S. 348) des Zentrums erfolgen soll, wie er in Anlehnung an Joseph Roth, einen der feinsinnigsten Beobachter Zentraleuropas in den ersten Jahrzehnten des 20. Jh., formuliert. Er meint damit die Auflösung hegemonialer Erzählungen durch ihre Heterogenisierung. Dass dies in den letzten zwei Jahrzehnten längst zum wissenschaftlichen Standard geworden ist, zeigt nicht zuletzt der von ihm mitherausgegebene Band *Habsburg postcolonial*¹. Gleichwohl lässt sich gerade hier ein Kritikpunkt anbringen: C. richtet seinen Blick vornehmlich auf die Zentren, auf die großen Städte und die künstlerische und intellektuelle Elite, auf die Musils, Kafkas und Bártoks. Zwar gelingt es ihm, diese großen Erzählungen auszudifferenzieren – das Verhältnis von kultureller Vielfalt und nationaler Homogenisierung an den inneren und äußeren Rändern der zentraleuropäischen Region bleibt jedoch weitgehend im Verborgenen. Ungeachtet dieser Kritik hat C. – wie vielleicht sonst nur noch Karl Schlögel – einen entscheidenden Einfluss auf die neuere deutschsprachige Forschung zur urbanen Geschichte und Kultur in Zentral- und Osteuropa ausgeübt, die das alte sozialhistorische Paradigma „Konflikt versus Symbiose“ zugunsten einer multiperspektivischen Betrachtungsweise aufgegeben hat.

Praha

Ines Koeltzsch

¹ JOHANNES FEICHTINGER, MORITZ CSÁKY u.a. (Hrsg.): *Habsburg postcolonial. Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*, Innsbruck u.a. 2003.

Tomas Balkelis: The Making of Modern Lithuania. (BASEES/Routledge Series on Russian and East European Studies, vol. 56.) Routledge. London – New York 2009. 176 S. ISBN 0-415-45470-0. (€ 124,99.)

During the last fifty years a vast number of studies has been produced which discuss different aspects of nationalisms in Europe and in the world. Some smaller nations, such as the Poles, Czechs, or Hungarians, have received a fairly large amount of scholarly attention, while others still await updated and more comprehensive presentations for a wider international readership. In this respect the *BASEES/Routledge Series on Russian and East European Studies* contributes to filling this academic lacuna and introduces Tomas Balkelis' study on the genesis and evolution of the Lithuanian national intelligentsia from its appearance during the second half of the 19th century and until the establishment of the Lithuanian state in 1918.

B. primarily investigates the topic from socio-cultural and socio-political perspectives. In seven chapters the author's main arguments are developed by focusing on: the general historical context of the Lithuanian-inhabited imperial provinces during the second half of

the 19th century (Ch. 1); the preconditions under the influence of which the first Lithuanian national intelligentsia appeared, analysing its organization, activities, relations with the wider imperial society and so on (Ch. 2); the national intelligentsia's attempts to establish itself in the local non-Lithuanian-dominated cities, especially in that centre of the North Western provinces, the city of Vilnius (Ch. 3); the impact of the Revolution of 1905 on the intelligentsia and their first more systematic attempts to make connections with the Lithuanian-speaking masses (Ch. 4); the role that gender relations played among the nationalists, exemplified by the search for "national brides" and discussions on the design of "pure" Lithuanian families (Ch. 5); the analysis of cultural activities during the period of 1906-1914 (Ch. 6); and, finally, an investigation into the displaced Lithuanian intelligentsia in Russia and its role in conceptualising and propagating Lithuanian independence during the First World War (Ch. 7).

The complexity of the topic is rather well presented in the introductory chapter of the book. One has to agree that there are still few studies in English which examine this particular question in a more comprehensive way. Earlier works (by Senn, Sabaliūnas, Misiūnas, Vardys), and more recent studies (by Donskis, Eidintas, Staliūnas, Weeks and others) discuss only particular individuals or specific aspects of the theme¹. After brief review of literature and sources, B. raises a number of important research questions, mainly focusing on the "aspects that highlight a modern, constitutive and socially constructed character of Lithuanian nationalism [...] reappraisal of the self-praising rhetoric of early patriots by suggesting that issues such as the elite's displacement, social isolation, educational experiences, gender views, and their narrowly based and factional political activities, were critical factors that shaped their identity and the whole nation building process" (p. xvii). Thus, from this perspective, any analysis of the Lithuanian national intelligentsia as a specific social group should correspond to the evolution of Lithuanian state and society as a whole – supporting the titular thesis of the "making of Lithuania".

B. departs from the assumption that the Lithuanian intelligentsia constituted a clearly distinct group within local social strata, contrary to some scholars, who argue that due to its abstract meaning, the term "intelligentsia" should not be related to any particular social class in *stricto sensu*, but more to an unattached or "free-floating" intellectual community ("Freischwebende Intelligenz", as Karl Mannheim calls it). Moreover, the author further reduces the scope of his focus by concentrating only on secular national political intelligentsia as, perhaps, the most clear-cut representatives of the analysed social group, as well as those who were generally more visible in the political and social arenas.

Even though choosing such an approach is justifiable, however, it can be argued, that the exclusion of the Lithuanian Catholic clergy from the investigation has introduced rather noticeable distortions into the overall picture of the Lithuanian national intelligentsia before 1918. As the author many times indicates, the nationally oriented Catholic clergy had significant influence on the Lithuanian-speaking masses, as manifest not only in the management of a number of private Lithuanian schools (between 1906 and 1914), but also in the publishing of periodicals and the use of the authority of the Church for political or other reasons.

¹ See, for example: ALFRED E. SENN: Jonas Basanavičius, the Patriarch of the Lithuanian National Renaissance, Newtonville 1980; LEONAS SABALIŪNAS: Lithuanian Social Democracy in Perspective, 1893-1914, Durham 1990; THEODORE R. WEEKS: Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia. Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier, 1863-1914, DeKalb 1996; ALFONSAS EIDINTAS: President of Lithuania. Prisoner of the Gulag. A Biography of Aleksandras Stulginskis, Vilnius 2001; DARIUS STALIŪNAS: Making Russians. Meaning and Practice of Russification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863, Amsterdam 2007.

More confusion is caused by the descriptions used to separate secular intelligentsia from clergy: the former are called the “patriots”, while the latter – simply the “Lithuanian clergy” (p. 102). B. rightly points out the disagreements between the two factions, yet ascribing patriotism only to the secular intelligentsia is rather misleading – patriotism, just like nationalism, was spreading among the Lithuanian clergy too. As it is well known, many priests such as Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas, Antanas Dambraskas-Jakštas, Jonas Mačiulis-Maironis to name a few, were also part of the same national intelligentsia. Moreover, a very important detail is missing from B.’s study: the definition of the term “patriotism,” a term which is extensively used throughout the text. As a result the reader is often left wondering about the difference between “patriotism” and “nationalism”.

Finally a brief remark needs to be made regarding one of the concluding theses, which states that “political radicalism was their [national intelligentsia’s –VP] response to the social isolation in which the empire had pushed them due to its inability to provide them with adequate opportunities for social advancement” (p. 122). Such an interpretation is quite common in the discourses of many national(istic) historiographies, where the empires are predominantly seen as the oppressors and the national minorities as victims. Arguably, such a perspective is quite erroneous. The Russian Empire (especially after 1905) did provide a number of opportunities for the social advancement of individuals as long as they were willing to comply with the state’s norms and order. Even with all kinds of restrictions, representatives of different national minorities could, and did, receive higher education, employment, were able to climb up the imperial bureaucratic ladder and so on. It would be quite misleading to think that the imperial authorities were obliged to support all kinds of nationalists, radicals, revolutionaries and their demands for the revision of state’s political system and even its territorial organization. From this perspective, the position of the Lithuanian intelligentsia was not so different in comparison with other ethnic and national minorities. Opportunities for social advancement were available, but whether nationalists could, or wanted to, take that path – is another question. Similar questions can be raised about those Lithuanians who actually decided to integrate and become imperial citizens – can they be considered as part of the larger Lithuanian intelligentsia? Moreover, one could further expand the definition of the “Lithuanian intelligentsia” and discuss not only Lithuanians in the Russian empire, but also emigrants to the USA, the UK and other countries. Unfortunately, these groups are not discussed in the book.

Needless to say, notwithstanding these few remarks and suggestions, B.’s book is a welcome and important contribution to the fields of social history and nationalism studies in Eastern Europe and the Baltic States. The author provides an international readership with an abundance of information about the Lithuanian case, as well as raising a number of stimulating research questions. Hopefully this investigation will be continued and subsequently integrated further into the wider European historical context.

Marburg

Vytautas Petronis

Johannes Frackowiak: Wanderer im nationalen Niemandsland. Polnische Ethnizität in Mitteldeutschland von 1880 bis zur Gegenwart. (Studien zur Historischen Migrationsforschung, Bd. 24.) Schöningh. Paderborn u.a. 2011. 238 S., Ill., Kt. ISBN 978-3-506-77108-7. (€ 29,90.)

In den letzten Jahren sind zumindest in unserem östlichen Nachbarland die Diskussionen über die Existenz einer polnischen Minderheit in Deutschland in politischen Kreisen wiederaufgelebt. Dem folgten allerdings keine neuen wissenschaftlichen Studien zur Existenz polnischstämmiger Gruppen außerhalb der bekannten Großregionen wie Rheinland und Westfalen oder Oberschlesien seit dem späten 19. Jh.

Der selbst aus dem Milieu polnischer Migranten der ersten Stunde stammende Johannes Frackowiak hat in der vorliegenden Studie die Geschichte der Industrieregion um Bitterfeld seit den 1880er Jahren einer genauen Analyse unterzogen. Als Folge des beginnen-