

Zitierhinweis

Godsey, William D.: review of: Miroslav Šedivý, Metternich, the Great Powers and the Eastern Question, Pilsen: The University of West Bohemia, 2013, in: Český časopis historický, 2016, 1, p. 179-183, DOI: 10.15463/rec.608130787

český časopis historický

copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.



sobily či se tu zastavily (spíše ovšem vystupují jako objekty, nikoliv subjekty; a M. Ziegelbauer se snad objeví v následujících letech) a ovšem i o institucích. Dochází i na některé knihovny. Excerpce těchto zmínek, jejich interpretace a zařazení do širších souvislostí by nepochybně nebyla zcela zbytečná, zde ovšem pro to není místo.

A tak hledáme, doslova s dychtivostí, zda bude podána informace o dalším průběhu prací. Jejich pokračování by vřele uvítali nejen historici jak středověku, tak raného novověku, ale i filologové a literární historikové. Jde totiž o dílo nejen příkladné, ale také o dílo, které je svým obsahem a ovšem i rozsahem bez nadsázky zcela ojedinělé. Je tomu tak ovšem díky tomu, jak jedinečné dílo bratři Pezové vytvořili a jaké organizační zásluhy si vydobyli. Proto hledáme informaci o perspektivě. O tom v druhém svazku nenacházíme nic, v prvním pak je jenom odkaz na internetovou stránku http://www.univie.ac.at/monastische_aufklaerung. Kliknutím se otevírá stránka Spolku pro bádání o raně novověké monastické učenosti, která slibuje pokračování až do druhé půle 17. století, které tak překračuje hranici života obou bratří. A upozorňuje se i na různé podpůrné digitalizace, konkrétnější časové údaje však pochopitelně nepřicházejí. Máme se tedy právem my, nebo alespoň naši pokračovatelé, na co těšit.

Ivan Hlaváček

Miroslav ŠEDIVÝ

Metternich, the Great Powers and the Eastern Question

Pilsen, The University of West Bohemia 2013, 1033 pp., ISBN 978-80-261-0223-6.

By the late eighteenth century, the menacing international constellation that would determine Habsburg foreign policy throughout Metternich's time in office (1809–1848) had taken shape. To the east, Russia's rise to great-power status had extended its influence into areas of Europe such as the Holy Roman Empire and the Balkans that were vital to Habsburg interests. The Second Partition of Poland-Lithuania (1793) gave the Habsburg monarchy a common border with the Russian empire. Only shortly before, the Bourbon alliance that had been a cornerstone of Habsburg security since 1756 came unravelled under the impact of the French revolution of 1789. The ancient rivalry with France revived under new auspices. Before the end of the 1790s, French troops penetrated deep into Habsburg territory, a scenario repeated twice during the first ten years of the new century. Both times saw the capture of Vienna. Through client states and direct annexations, Napoleon furthermore extended his power into central, east-central, and south-eastern Europe in ways that threatened to strangle the Habsburg monarchy. Yet even at the most difficult junctures in the fight against France, there was always a party in the councils of government in Vienna that regarded Russia as the greater peril. Situated in the middle of the continent with few easily defensible borders, such as the "natural frontiers" claimed by post-revolutionary France or the vast land mass that protected Russia, the Habsburg monarchy occupied the most treacherous geopolitical position among the great powers, with the possible exception of Prussia. Fears of isolation between east and west remained in Vienna even after the conclusion of a general peace in 1815 and the rise of the congress system.



The Habsburg monarchy shared its longest common border with the Ottoman Empire, an entity that by the early 1820s appeared on the verge of disintegration. For centuries, the Sublime Porte had posed a mortal threat to Vienna. By the nineteenth century, its possible dissolution had ironically become the problem. In the diplomatic and political parlance of the day, the associated crises became known as the “Eastern Question” – which is one focus of Miroslav Šedivý’s deeply impressive book covering the question’s early phase down to the 1840s. Later instalments of the question included the rise of a series of semi-independent and sovereign nation-states (Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, and Rumania) in formerly Ottoman areas of the Balkans in the 1870s and the outcome of the First Balkan War (1912/1913). From the perspective of the Habsburgs, the prospect of Ottoman collapse as it presented itself in the first half of the nineteenth century presented two inter-related dangers. First, the expansion of Russia over the Danube into the Balkan breach would directly compromise the monarchy’s security. Second, the conflicting interests of the great powers respecting Ottoman breakdown raised the spectre of war and revolutionary violence. In 1840, it briefly appeared that the “Eastern question” would provoke a war between France and the other powers for the first time since the ouster of Napoleon.

Throughout this early phase of the “Eastern Question”, the state chancellor, Prince Clemens Metternich, managed Habsburg foreign policy, and he is Šedivý’s other focus. Hence the book is not just a major contribution to the international history of the period in respect of Austria’s active, if comparatively under-explored role in the Levant, but also to the scholarly re-evaluation of Metternich underway in recent years. The fact that the spotlight is on the man as well as his policies takes this work beyond conventional diplomatic history. Despite its length, the text remains engaged and readable throughout. As a decided opponent of the French revolution and its achievements, Metternich polarized in his own lifetime and his memory has continued to polarize since his death more than a century and a half ago. In an attempt to avoid the politicization that has sometimes led to historical simplification and misrepresentation concerning the chancellor, the author exhaustively consulted the relevant Austrian archival sources as well as those of other major and lesser powers. His researches took him to London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, and more than a half-dozen other places. Even the marginal glosses in the books of Metternich’s still-extant library at his former château at Königswart (Kynžvart) in western Bohemia (now the Czech Republic) have been exploited. Yet the analysis of the Habsburg diplomatic correspondence as preserved today in Vienna forms the study’s backbone given the authoritative character of that source for the chancellor’s views and policy. As the author repeatedly demonstrates, the previous scholarship has at times “relied too much” (p. 886) on diplomatic sources that were either ill-informed about or unfavorable to Metternich, and often both.

Between 1821 and 1841, Ottoman decay took two major forms that drew in the great powers. First, the Greek insurrection against the Porte set off a crisis that lasted with varying intensity from 1821 until the final establishment of an independent Greek kingdom some ten years later. The fact that Russo-Ottoman disagreements of longer standing, which culminated in war in 1828, were closely intertwined with the Greek question lent the crisis, from Metternich’s perspective, its explosive force. Second, the ambitions of Mohammed



Ali, the powerful governor of Ottoman Egypt, called the unity of the sultan's domains into question from an altogether different quarter. The pasha's armies twice occupied Syria and both times the road to Constantinople lay open. Was a new Arab empire in the offing? On the second occasion, in the early 1840s, the Tuileries supported Mohammed Ali's pretensions in a way that put France at direct variance to the other great powers. The result was a general war scare known as the "Rhine crisis." By then, Paris had replaced St. Petersburg as the Habsburg monarchy's greatest geopolitical worry, one furthermore enhanced by ideological considerations. Šedivý shows conclusively that Metternich pursued a consistent line throughout the Eastern crises of the decades after 1821: in concert with the other great powers he aimed to preserve the sultan's sovereignty and the territorial integrity of his empire. Though often accused of diplomatic deceit and circumvolution, the chancellor never wavered in the essentials of this policy, of which he made no secret and which he regarded as being in basic Habsburg interests. With mixed success, he endeavored to enlist the other great powers and unflaggingly encouraged the Porte to act in ways that he thought conducive to that purpose. The author's findings accordingly allow him to consign one of the many contemporary rumors about Metternich that was later credited by historians – that he plotted an Ottoman partition – to the realm of "legend." Such a proposal "never originated in [the] Ballhausplatz under Metternich's leadership" (p. 311).

Unlike the tsar, who in the 1830s pursued a policy of Ottoman support provided that his neighbour remained at Russian mercy, Metternich thought that the sultan should possess the means and ability to maintain his independence to the extent possible without foreign help. Above all this required reforming the ramshackle structures of Ottoman power. Metternich's questionable reputation as a simple reactionary and his paranoia concerning supposed revolutionary conspiracies emanating from France have obscured his lively awareness that popular unrest derived from dissatisfaction with the status quo whose causes needed addressing by those in authority. In the 1820s, he thus encouraged the sultan to introduce change as a means of quelling the Greek insurrection and recovering the loyalty of his subjects. Against the background of current events, Šedivý's discussion of the chancellor's attitude toward Islam and the Ottoman reform program known as "Tanzimat" makes for both fascinating reading and a particularly original contribution to Metternich scholarship. It was already well known that Metternich did not share the anti-Jewish prejudice of many of his contemporaries; it is now clear that he did not harbor the anti-Islam sentiments propagated from both the progressive left and the Catholic right in the Europe of his day. Several of his closest collaborators expressed the conviction that no invariable incompatibility existed between Islam and progress. Ludwig Lebzeltern could thus write to Friedrich Gentz: "Europe has never owed to ancient Greece a quarter of the high civilisation and benefits which it [Europe] has obtained from the descendants of Mohammed, that great man, that admirable lawmaker... When anyone in Europe says that the Koran sets up insurmountable obstacles to civilisation with its precepts, it is stupidity" (p. 379). Metternich himself was certain that the preservation of the Moslem fundamentals of Ottoman rule was a prerequisite for successful regeneration. For this reason, he supported the Tanzimat program initiated by Mustafa Reshid Pasha in the late 1830s: "Keep the



promises you have made in the Edict of Gülhane. The principles which it has proclaimed are applicable to your needs, and by applying them the empire will thrive" (p. 949).

Tellingly, the chancellor did not betray the reformer Reshid when he turned to him with what would have been regarded in Constantinople as a treasonable plan for forcing the sultan to implement change. Also in regard to Metternich's alleged complicity in Reshid's fall from power, Šedivý relishes demolishing a historical myth that originated both in contemporary hearsay and later easy assumptions about the chancellor's political predilections. Not only was Metternich not guilty as charged, but he exerted "immense effort to save Reshid" (p. 937). A similarly persistent misapprehension has concerned the Convention of Münchengrätz (1833), the notorious meeting between emperor and tsar at which Metternich was supposed to have subordinated Austrian to Russian interests in the east in exchange for help against revolutionary plots in the west. Scholars have typically interpreted the agreement as indicative of the increasing division of Europe in the 1830s into ideological east-west blocs. In fact, "no deal was made in Münchengrätz" (p. 547) given that the two powers already agreed on the necessity of defending the Ottoman Empire's integrity – Metternich's line from the beginning of the Eastern question. Šedivý's findings furthermore suggest that the idea of a Europe divided into reactionary and liberal blocs is too one-dimensional. The chancellor was anxious above all to maintain the great powers' unity. During the 1830s this entailed repeated attempts on his part at mediation between the maritime powers and Russia. In sharp contrast to the tsar, Metternich established, after initial reservations, cordial relations with the French King Louis Philippe, who owed his power to the revolution of 1830. When attempting to find a solution that would keep Mohammed Ali from overthrowing the Ottoman Empire, Metternich averred in 1839 that in "an urgent matter of this nature, we see no separate Austria, no separate Russia, no separate France. On the contrary, we are, to our way of thinking, uniting the Great Powers into a coalition" (p. 757). It would not be Louis Philippe, but rather the tsar who within months would deal Metternich one of his bitterest diplomatic defeats in rejecting a planned conference in Vienna to resolve the crisis. The maritime powers had already accepted the Austrian chancellor's proposal.

This study enthusiastically rejects the interpretation associated with the distinguished historian Paul W. Schroeder that European international politics underwent a structural change after 1815 in which the powers curbed traditional rivalries in favor of a more collective approach to security. Their goal was to avoid another disaster after a generation of revolutionary and Napoleonic warfare. Šedivý sees such an interpretation as "for the most part entirely baseless" (p. 19) and indeed supplies plenty of good evidence for the traditional egotistical manoeuvrings of the powers, such as Russia's seizure of the mouth of the Danube by the Treaty of Adrianople (1829). Yet perhaps paradoxically, Metternich himself was arguably the greatest exponent among European statesmen of a system to preserve the peace in the decades after 1815. His "ever present goal" was "the restoration of the Alliance of European Powers" (p. 436) that had originally come into being in opposition to Napoleon in 1813 and later been extended to include Bourbon France. Specifically in the Eastern question, Metternich searched again and again for ways to bring the powers





together. In the interests of peace, he was willing to accept a framework of negotiations in which he did not take center stage. Metternich was certainly no pacifist, while peace was in the basic interests of the Habsburg monarchy as he understood them. But perhaps we should not be too cynical. Metternich was truly horrified by the consequences of war, as a number of scholars have pointed out, and he and his family were themselves victims of the French invasion of the Rhineland in the 1790s. Perhaps the importance that the chancellor accorded to collective security and “peace management” (p. 835) is one way in which he can still speak to us today. To make sense of that voice, there is hardly a better place to start than Šedivý's fine study.

William D. Godsey

Werner DROBESCH (Hrsg.)

Kärnten am Übergang von der Agrar- zur Industriegesellschaft.

Fallstudien zur Lage und Leistung der Landwirtschaft auf der Datengrundlage des Franziszeischen Katasters (1823–1844)

Klagenfurt am Wörthersee 2013, 224 s., četná vyobrazení, mapy a tabulky,
ISBN 978-3-85454-126-4.

V souvislosti s komplexním nazíráním na dějiny se objevují nová témata, která byla doposud opomíjena. Takovým velmi záslužným krokem je i bádání o Stablním katastru a jeho prehistorii. Monografie vzniklá pod vedením korutanského historika Wernera Drobese je první moderní komplexní publikací k zajímavé problematice Stablního katastru. Kniha je jedním z výsledků projektu „Der Franziszeische Kataster als Quelle zur Wirtschafts-, Sozial- und Umweltgeschichte in der Startphase der Industriellen Revolution“, který vedl Helmut Rumpel. Pilotní studie byly zaměřeny na Korutany a Bukovinu.

Na význam Stablního katastru pro historické bádání poukázal zřejmě jako první Johann Peisker (1897), i když se mýlil v úsudku o neúplném zachování indikačních skic. Přelomová byla ve sledovaných souvislostech výstava věnovaná „150. výročí Rakouského pozemkového katastru“ (1967). Z bývalých rakouských území se začali katastru, vzniklému za vlády císaře Františka, věnovat jako první v druhé polovině 20. století slovinští historici, především Peter Ribnikar. Podnět ke komplexnímu bádání o úplné evidenci veškeré půdy v Rakousku vzešel z rakouského Spolkového úřadu cejchovního a měřičského (Bundesamt für Eich- und Vermessungswesen), který v roce 2000 započal se systematizací a digitalizací historických map.

Recenzovaná publikace je kolektivní monografií k tématice Stablního katastru, agrárním dějinám a aspektům hospodářských a sociálních dějin první poloviny 19. století se zaměřením na Korutany. W. Drobese precizuje specifikum agrárního vývoje Korutan a Vnitřního Rakouska na základě dobových statistických údajů. Jeho srovnání především s Čechami, které představují hospodářský protipól Korutan, je inspirativní a vybízí k dalšímu zamyšlení nad příčinami hospodářského vývoje v Korutanech. Otázky, jež čtenáře napadají, např. jakou roli sehrála v pomalejším tempu rozvoje Korutan pravděpodobně

