

Zitierhinweis

Frary, Lucien J.: Rezension über: Michail Vital'evič Škarovskij, Konstantinopol'skij patriarchat i Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' v pervoj polovine XX veka, Moskva: "Indrik", 2014, in: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas / jgo.e-reviews, jgo.e-reviews 2018, 1, S. 30-31, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/4592c271f8fb48a48b7311fdd7571526>



Franz Steiner Verlag

IM AUFTRAG DES
Leibniz-Instituts für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung

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.

arbeiterstab das gesamte polnische Kulturleben mitprägte. Das letzte Hauptkapitel *Jazz im transnationalen Kommunikationsraum* macht die Diskrepanz zwischen den Jazzszenen beider Staaten noch einmal deutlich, war es doch besonders das polnische Jazz-Jambore-Festival in Warschau, bei dem regelmäßig westeuropäische und amerikanische Jazzbands zu sehen waren und welches den Musikern die Möglichkeit zum Austausch und zur Vernetzung eröffnete. Hervorzuheben ist hier das Kapitel zur *Europäischen Jazzföderation*, deren Entstehung und Existenz als blockübergreifende Kulturorganisation der Autor erstmals untersucht hat. Etwas ernüchtert bleibt man leider nach der Lektüre des Fazits, in dem lediglich die Ergebnisse sehr knapp zusammengefasst werden, ohne die im Text angelegten spannenden Befunde zum Vergleich zwischen Polen und der DDR und ohne die möglichen Rückschlüsse vom Umgang mit dem Jazz auf den Charakter der Beziehungen zwischen Regime und Bevölkerung systematisch aufzuarbeiten und in den Forschungsstand einzuordnen.

Fraglich bleibt, ob sich die verzögerte Entwicklung des Jazz in der DDR im Vergleich zu Polen tatsächlich nur mit der Angst der Funktionäre vor unabhängig organisierten Gruppen von vermeintlich potentiellen Dissidenten erklären lässt. Die deutsch-polnischen Unterschiede erklären sich möglicherweise auch aus spezifisch deutschen Vorstellungen von kulturellen Hierarchien und Amerika-Bildern, die bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts zurückreichen und mit denen sich Autoren wie Kaspar Maase schon in-

novativ auseinandergesetzt haben. Schmidt-Rost hat dankenswerter Weise keine weitere Heldengeschichte der Jazzler im Ostblock geschrieben – er diagnostiziert, dass die Jazzler in den siebziger Jahren Teil des privilegierten Establishments waren. Dennoch vermisst man beim Lesen über viele Seiten diese kritische Distanz, wenn er häufig mit Begriffen wie „die Herrschenden“ und das „Regime“ operiert. Die Konstellationen bei den staatlichen Akteuren waren komplexer, wirtschaftliche Interessen kollidierten mit ideologischen Vorgaben und die Musiker sahen sich nicht nur politischem Druck, sondern auch der Skepsis des Publikums ihrer Elterngeneration ausgesetzt. Dieses Problem stellte sich dem Jazz übrigens ebenso in den westeuropäischen Staaten, zum Vergleich mit denen das Buch durchaus anregt. Man kann die kulturellen Praktiken von Vorträgen der staatssozialistischen Jazzler, die der Autor reflektiert darstellt, nun als pragmatisches Abgreifen möglicher Ressourcen eines zu verachtenden Kulturapparates abtun oder aber noch einmal nach ideologischen Schnittflächen zwischen Jazzpredigern und dem sozialistischen Kulturkanon fragen. Nicht nur erhielt der Jazz, einmal als Kunstmusik deklariert, durch die kulturelle Hierarchie der Musik im Sozialismus einen höheren Stellenwert als der Beat, sondern auch die kulturellen Praktiken von Bildung und Aufklärung des Publikums weisen Schnittstellen zum sozialistischen Jugendideal der Nachstalinzeit auf.

Michel Abeßer, Freiburg i.Br.

MICHAÏL V. ŠKAROVSKIJ: Konstantinopol'skij patriarchat i Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' v pervoj polovine XX veka. Moskva: Indrik, 2014. 230 S. ISBN: 978-5-91674-303-6.

The latest volume by Michail Škarovskij, a well-known church historian, surveys relations between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople during the first half of the twentieth century. Straightforward and clearly organized, the book's main strength is its research base consisting of Russian, Serbian, Bulgarian, German, United States, and Turkish archival sources. The chronological narrative is divided into two major parts: 1) Relations of the Patriarchate of Constantinople with the Russian Church in the First Half of the Twentieth Century, and 2) Russian and Bulgarian Communities and Monasteries in the Canonical Territory of the Church of Constantinople. The book covers a tumultuous period when the

existence of the Eastern Orthodox Church was in peril. The general impression is of significant worsening of relations between Constantinople and Moscow, due mainly to the splintering of the church after the Russian Revolution of 1917.

The First and Second World Wars changed the world dramatically. In the ideological conflict that ensued, religion played a complex role, as typified by the Russian Orthodox Church, the prevailing religious confession of Eastern Europe. Škarovskij charts the immense complications that the continuum of the Great War, the Russian Revolution, and the Greek-Turkish War created for the Eastern Orthodox leadership. New entities such as the Living Church, the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, and the Orthodox Churches of Poland, Finland, and Estonia broke from the Moscow Patriarchate. In Constantinople, Patriarch Meletius IV (1921–23) responded by extending the jurisdiction of the Mother Church to émigré communities. Under Patriarch

Basil III (1925–29), Constantinople established closer links with the Balkan churches. According to Škarovskij, the Phanar sympathized more with the diaspora than with the Russian Orthodox Church, which suffered intense persecution. During the relatively long reign of Patriarch Photius II (1929–35) relations between Greece and Turkey improved, but Moscow's attempts at reconciliation with the Russian Orthodox Exarchate in Western Europe foundered.

The Second World War brought the Russian Orthodox Church into a new position: a change of attitude occurred after Stalin sanctioned the appointment of Metropolitan Sergei as the Russian Patriarch in 1943. From that point, the Russian church became involved in the political expansion of communism to neighboring countries. Meanwhile, Hitler's Third Reich aimed to manipulate the Orthodox populations of the regions under its control. Škarovskij's account of German occupation policy illuminates the fascinating story of religious survival during wartime. Also absorbing is the discussion of Stalin's revived plan for Panslavic solidarity in the Balkans. Remarkably, by the end of the war, relations between Constantinople and Moscow had improved.

In the post-war period, the Russian Patriarchate began to challenge the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome and Constantinople. With the support of the Soviet regime, the Moscow Patriarchate – touted as the Third Rome – sent delegations abroad. The pan-Orthodox Slavic conference held in Belgrade in 1946 and the celebration of the five-hundredth anniversary of the autocephalous Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow in 1948 reflected Stalin's flexibility in disseminating the Marxist message. Patriarch Alexei undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and attempted to bring the region under Russian influence.

A senior delegation led by Russian Metropolitan Nikolai to London, Paris, and the United States in 1945 sought to extend control over the diaspora. Soviet leadership also employed religion in its foreign policy when dealing with regions within its vicinity. For example, the Polish Orthodox Church was compelled to recant its autocephaly, and the Latvian and Estonian Churches were forcibly incorporated under Russian jurisdiction. Thus, the expansion of the Moscow Patriarchate mirrored the extension of the political ideology of communism.

Škarovskij's reporting of the relationship of the Ecumenical Patriarchate with the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and the Bulgarian community within its territory demonstrates the generally amicable relations between Sofia and the Mother Church in the period under review.

In the last subsections of the book, Škarovskij describes the construction of various Russian Orthodox churches, hospitals, and monastic establishments within the Ottoman Empire, on Mount Athos, and within modern Turkey. The heritage of the Russian church in the heartland of the Orthodox commonwealth is emphasized.

Although the book lacks a general thesis and contains little analysis, the author is to be commended for a lucid survey of an important period of recent Eastern Orthodox Church history. Major personalities and complex events crowd the narrative, which includes descriptions of the smaller Orthodox churches in Eastern Europe, diaspora communities, as well as Mount Athos. Most importantly, the study provides serious researchers with a useful guide to unpublished sources.

Lucien Frary, Lawrenceville, NJ

ZEEV LEVIN: Collectivization and Social Engineering. Soviet Administration and the Jews of Uzbekistan, 1917–1939. Leiden: Brill, 2015. XVII, 254 S., 28 Abb., 1 Kte. = Eurasian Studies Library, 5. ISBN: 978-90-04-29470-7.

The opening of the previously unavailable Soviet archives at the outset of the 1990s provoked a rush by Western and post-Soviet scholars to rediscover the Soviet modernity. After the first wave of scoops went down, the second wave on the eve of the new millennium brought better documented and more mature case studies on various regions, including Central Asia, that underwent communist party building, nationalities policies and socialist campaigns. By

the 2010s, this wave went back, as some authors withdrew from digging the archives and others re-orientated themselves to later periods. The third wave came with the scholars' anticipation of the 100-years' anniversary of the February and October Revolutions of 1917. The newly published works by authors engaged in long-term archival research appear as studies more advanced than before. The monograph by Zeev Levin on the history of Central Asian Jews during the first two Soviet decades is one of them.

Cross-referencing along various archives in Moscow and in Central Asian Republics with a small touch of oral testimony is the core value of Levin's research. Moreover, the author demonstrates an ex-