

Zitierhinweis

Janjetović, Zoran: Rezension über: Katrin Boeckh / Sabine Rutar (eds.), *The Balkan Wars from Contemporary Perception to Historic Memory*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, in: *Südost-Forschungen*, 76 (2017), S. 385-391, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/dce714a8169049e69d917c0273f07a7a>



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.

Die Beiträge des vorliegenden Sammelbandes zeigen die Imperien aus einer neuen Perspektive auf, nämlich von den einzelnen Akteuren heraus. Somit bieten die dargestellten imperialen Biographien einen wertvollen Blick in die Lebenswelten, Karrieremuster, Handlungs- und Mobilitätsmöglichkeiten sowie in die Selbstpositionierungen innerhalb des Imperiums von einzelnen Elitenmitgliedern. Durch die interessante Erzählweise und die Darstellungen der spannenden Lebensläufe ist es durchaus zu vermuten, dass das Buch sowohl vom Fach-, als auch vom breiteren Publikum wahrgenommen werden wird.

München

Marija Đokić

The Balkan Wars from Contemporary Perception to Historic Memory. Hgg. Katrin BOECKH / Sabine RUTAR. Basingstoke, London: Palgrave Macmillan 2017. 350 S., 2 Abb., ISBN 978-3-319-44642-4, £ 66,99

The centenary of the Balkan Wars understandably caused much smaller ripples in the European public than the 100th anniversary of the First World War. This is also the case for the public of the Balkan states, although the editors claim that their impact had been even greater than that of the Great War. This claim was repeated three times in the introduction to the volume (2, 6, and 9), therefore this author cannot refrain from remarking that the claim needs to be qualified and its validity reduced only to some countries, as it would be plausible to claim this for some (e.g. Macedonia), but very hard for others (e.g. Serbia). It would be more to the point to say that for some countries they created a whole historic national narrative regarding the Balkan Wars and the First World War. This is especially the case for Serbia and Bulgaria, since in the first they are still regarded as part of the “wars for liberation and unification”, whereas in the latter First Balkan War was the war of liberation, the Second war that reduced the results of the First. Moreover, the First World War was the conflict in which Bulgaria tried to undo the results of the Second Balkan War. Indeed, it could be claimed that in the case of Bulgaria, even more than any other “revisionist” power, World War II was an attempt at revising the results of the World War I, and in that way of the Second Balkan War as well. The Balkan Wars soon came to be perceived by the contemporaries as causes for the First World War (as is mentioned several times in this volume), and by the generations at the end of 20th century, as ushering in new brutal ways of waging war (aimed particularly at civilian populations with the view of removing ethnic and/or confessional undesirables from certain territories). Both phenomena are dealt with in the book that is actually devoted primarily to perceptions (contemporary and retrospective) and representations, and much less to the wars themselves.

The content is sketched by the editors in the 1st chapter “The Balkan Wars from Perception to Remembrance” (1-9). The very choice of the term “chapter” suggests rather a

monograph, than a collection of articles. And indeed, the volume is well structured and divided into three thematic parts, comprising four to five texts each, while the introductory chapter stands alone. The authors range from venerable veterans of historiography on South-East Europe, to young scholars and Ph.D. candidates. The editors should be commended for knowing their crew, since all papers (chapters) are on a more or less equal level. This proves the editors knew their work as well.

Part I, "War in the Balkans. Towards the End of Empire", is somewhat more factual than the others: it too deals with perceptions, stereotypes, images, "othering" etc., but it also refers more to the realities of the Balkan Wars and period preceding and following them. This part opens with the chapter by the experienced FIKRET ADANIR "Ethnonationalism, Irredentism and Empire" (13-55), which deals with ideological concepts and propaganda slogans (in plain words) used in the process of ousting Ottoman power from the Balkans since the early 19th century. In dealing with them the author does not limit his examination to local actors, but examines rather the views that various circles in the West (Philhellenes, Evangelicals) held regarding the Ottoman Empire. To be sure, the nationalism of Balkan peoples and their uprisings and wars against the Turks are also unavoidable ingredients. Adanir depicts the process of gradual ouster of the Ottomans from the Balkans since 1876, as well as the Ottoman government's attempts to stop or reverse it. He is especially interested in the parallel process of gradual "nationalisation" of the Ottoman elites: faced with growing nationalism of the peoples within the Empire and its impending dismemberment, they too tended to grow increasingly nationalistic, especially in the case of the Young Turks. The Balkan Wars and concomitant forcible population transfers eventually helped transform Turkish elites from imperial to ethnonational. At all times, even if he does not agree with every statement and claim, the reader feels the touch of the old master of Balkan studies. The text is supplemented by an 11-page long bibliography.

The next chapter "Violence, Forced Migration, and Population Policies During and After the Balkan Wars (1912-1914)" by EDVIN PEZO (57-80), examines violence and migrations caused against the backdrop of perceptions and images of undesirable "others". For their part, these perceptions and images are construed by the author as part of population policy. While in retrospect they could be interpreted as having played that role, it would mean overstressing the facts if one would ascribe changes in the ethnic make-up only to animosity of the elites and peoples of the Balkan states toward the Ottoman Empire and Balkan Muslims. The very military operations, insurgency and measures to clamp down, unplanned (although often tolerated) excesses of irregulars and sometimes of regular soldiers, vengefulness on part of local Christian inhabitants, fear and religious convictions of the local Muslims and other factors certainly contributed to large population shifts that occurred during and right after the Balkan Wars. The author justly sees violence as a common denominator behind all these occurrences. Yet, he also underlines the role of violence in reshaping society beyond pure ethnic and demographic changes and deplores that the "soft violence" after the wars was not better explored. In order to make the wartime violence understandable, Pezo deals briefly with anti-Ottoman plans and perceptions (not

devoid of doses of Orientalism of the Balkan variety) of the Balkan national elites. After a brief attempt at establishing the number of migrants, the author deals with migrations and population policies as a consequence of the Balkan Wars. This section is focused mainly on the Turkish-Greek problem, whereas other population transfers (as they came to be euphemistically called) were left out. Even though other population movements were not so accurately recorded, it is a pity they were omitted from this part of the chapter. The fact that the Turkish-Greek “exchange of populations” continued (under somewhat different circumstances) and was “legalised” after the First World War was not mentioned either, although it would further highlight the importance of population transfers during the Balkan Wars. Like Adanir, Pezo also observes the rise in Ottoman Muslim nationalism during the last years of the Empire’s existence – aimed primarily against the Greeks and Bulgarians, but also against Albanian Muslim refugees in Anatolia. By resorting to ethnic nationalism, Turkey joined other Balkan states in attempting to homogenise her population.

The 3rd chapter in the first part, “Gjergj Fishta, the ‘Albanian Homer’, and Edith Durham, the ‘Albanian Mountain Queen’. Observers of Albania’s Road to Statehood” by DAUT DAUTI (81-104) deals with two personages important above all for the Albanians in the period of the Balkan Wars. The first was an Albanian Franciscan friar and patriotic poet, and the latter an English journalist and humanitarian worker. Both of them depicted the struggle of the Albanians for their statehood and supported it with their pens. Dauti shows how the perceptions of their activities changed over time and in keeping with political changes in Albania and Kosovo. It is interesting to note that Fishta was not a persona non grata for the Yugoslav communist regime after 1945, as he was in Albania, where he was “rediscovered” only after the fall of communism. In his work Dauti quotes Albanian history textbooks several times so as to show their perception of certain events and phenomena. He does it without bias, but it would have been interesting if he had compared them with foreign historiographies and schoolbooks, especially of the neighbouring peoples.

KATRIN BOECKH’s article “The Rebirth of Pan-Slavism in the Russian Empire 1912-1913” (105-137) is a typical research work with a novel conclusion. The author argues that the Balkan Wars, especially the first one, resuscitated Russian Pan-Slavism that eventually served the purpose of preparing the Russian public for the First World War. The article initially gives a brief overview of Russian Pan-Slavism in the 19th century, and then turns to the activities of the Pan-Slavists during the Balkan Wars. The main source the author used for following social events and propaganda activities of the Pan-Slavists, is the coverage they received in the journal “Novoie vremia”. Public reactions, as well as reactions of the regime to such agitation were also dealt with. The final part of the chapter is devoted to Nikolaus von Hartwig, the Russian ambassador to Belgrade 1909-1914, who in spite of his German origin was one of the most prominent practicing Pan-Slavists. His importance was increased due to the fact that he was posted in one of the key capitals for Russian Balkan policy. As ambassador he was able to twist the orders of his minister in accordance with his own convictions and ultimately influence the Serbian government. Quoting the reference in Czar Nicholas’ WW I manifesto that linked Pan-Slavism with Russia’s inter-

ests, Boeckh sees in Pan-Slavism “the last political idea to be disseminated before the collapse of the empire” (135). With considerable plausibility she pin-points the date of birth of the last wave of Pan-Slavism at the time of the Balkan Wars.

The outbreak of the Balkan Wars caused considerable hubbub in European capitals and in the European press. For that reason the 2nd part of the volume is entitled “European Eyes on the Balkans. Reassuring the Self”. It opens with NICOLAS PITROS’ “Marianne Staring at the Balkans on Fire. French Views and Perceptions of the 1912-13 Conflicts” (141-160). The author minutely listed and classified the major French papers of the time (together with their print run) and described the attitude of certain organs toward the conflict(s). He established that they were very much dependent on the ideological point of view of the social groups they represented. However, Pitsos also aptly distinguishes varying opinions within the one and the same ideological camp. Similar to this is FLORIAN KEISINGER’s article “The Irish Question and the Balkan Crisis” (161-178) that examines the attitude of the Irish press. Unlike the French one, it was divided along sectarian lines with the Roman Catholics (separatists) supporting the cause of the Balkan allies and the Protestants (unionists) sympathising mostly with Turkey. The interests of the Roman Catholics was far from academic: in the struggle of small Balkan peoples they saw an example they should emulate in their own struggle for independence. For these reasons, the Second Balkan War attracted much less attention.

In his contribution “Political Narratives in Croatia in the Face of War in the Balkans” (179-196), STJEPAN MATKOVIĆ examines the impact of the Balkan Wars on adherents of various political streams in Croatia. Like historians dealing with the topic before, he noted the surge in pro-Yugoslav feelings in Croatia, especially among the youth. Also affected were many members of the Party of Rights. However, in politically divided Croatian society the sympathies for Balkan allies were not universal.

In chapter 9 (“Deviationist Perceptions of the Balkan Wars. Leon Trotsky and Otto Neurath”, 197-215), GÜNTHER SANDNER depicts the Balkan correspondence activities of these two prominent nonconformist intellectuals. Like all foreign correspondents, both of them were not able to come very close to the frontline, but gathered information in Balkan capitals. The author shows how they processed them in accordance with their ideological views, criticising their own governments in the process.

The title of the 3rd part of the volume “Memories of Victory and Defeat. Constructing the Nation”, is not well chosen since the articles deliver less than the title promises. They deal with the commemoration of the Balkan Wars in historiography, schoolbooks and society. One of them deals solely with Bulgaria, another with Serbia, the third one with both, the fourth with Macedonia, whereas other Balkan states unfortunately remained unmentioned.

In their article “Bulgarian Historiography on the Balkan Wars 1912-13” (219-239), SVETOZAR EL DAROV and BISER PETROV offered a minute study of the subject. They adduced a huge bibliography that they divided into four ideological periods: 1912-1944, 1944-late 1970s, the 1980s and afterward. The first was the most fruitful, albeit one-sided in the choice of topics and due to its Bulgarocentrism, while the second was marked by Marx-

ist dogmatism. During most of this period (except 1952-1963), the Balkan Wars were not a desirable topic for the political elite. During the third period, socialism was mixed with nationalism, and was subsequently followed by the post-socialist phase of transition that still lasts to this very day, but produced no major headway in the study of the Balkan Wars (with the exception of publication of some contemporaries' memoirs). When it comes to the wealth of information, this chapter is certainly the best in the whole volume.

STEFAN ROHDEWALD's chapter "Religious Wars? Southern Slavs' Orthodox Memory of the Balkan and World Wars" (249-270), is quite another pair of shoes. As suggested by its title, it goes beyond the Balkan Wars themselves – in both directions. It starts with common Serbian and Bulgarian saints and shows how saints were "nationalised", and how the nation was "sacralised" during the 19th century. It seems that the author puts too much emphasis on the militarisation and veneration of saints, forgetting the military parables that are as old as Christianity itself. This does not make his analysis of "nationalisation" of formerly common Slavic saints (Cyril and Methodius) or sacralisation of lieux de mémoire (like in Kosovo) less convincing. He carries his analysis of the (mis)use of the veneration of saints for the policy of remembrance and for practical politics into the inter-war period and the Second World War. Unlike half-baked Balkan-experts, Rohdewald is very much aware that the Serbs and the Bulgarians were nothing special in their (ab)use of the sacred for nationalist goals. Briefly but sufficiently, he shows how such a practice is imbedded in the European nationalist tradition.

DUBRAVKA STOJANOVIĆ's chapter "The Balkan Wars in Serbian History Textbooks (1920-2013)" (275-289) examines how the Balkan Wars were depicted in Serbian schoolbooks. Her article focuses especially on several key topics connected with the Balkan Wars. She shows that during the 1920s the pupils were presented with a romantic picture of the causes of the wars, which became more realistic during the next decade. After the Second World War, the causes were depicted as both liberating and imperialist. Another point she discusses is the Serbian invasion of Northern Albania that was explained vaguely during the inter-war period, and more realistically after WW II, only to be nationalistically garbled after 2000. However, Stojanović attests that the schoolbooks currently in use are objective on this subject. When writing about the Second Balkan War Serbian textbooks of the inter-war period always depicted the Bulgarians as the bad guys. The books from the socialist period deplore the event as a fratricidal conflict. After the fall of Slobodan Milošević, the tenor became more nationalistic, only to become more unbiased during the last couple of years. The author analyses the ideologies behind such presentations of the past, dictated by political needs of a given regime at a given moment. Her conclusions sound very plausible, but what makes them seem less so is the bibliography of only 15 textbooks at the end of the article. For so far reaching conclusions, one would expect a much longer list. If the works were meant to stand as *pars pro toto*, it was never mentioned.

The penultimate chapter of the volume is PETAR TODOROV's article "From Bucharest 1913 to Bucharest 2008. The Image of the Balkan Wars in Macedonian Historiography and Public Discourse" (291-317). The author claims that the Balkan Wars are regarded

by mainstream Macedonian historiography as the most tragic event in Macedonian history. The Macedonian people are seen as the wars' main victim, their neighbours and great powers being their persecutors. Although the wars have been constantly used politically, they have not been thoroughly researched. In the opinion of the author one of the reasons is the diversified role the Macedonian people had played during the conflict. This makes it impossible to give a unified interpretation needed for nation building – that has always been the chief goal of mainstream Macedonian historiography. Todorov shows how the main tropes connected with the Balkan Wars have been dealt with in not very numerous works on the subject over time. The latest trend is that the views have become even more nationalistic than during the socialist period, and that they include the Albanians in the narrative. The last part of the article connects the perception of the Balkan Wars among the Macedonian public with current internal and especially external political problems facing the young republic at present.

The book closes with EUGENE MICHAIL's chapter entitled "The Balkan Wars in Western Historiography, 1912-2012". The basic flaw of the paper is that it includes the British, American and German historiographies, leaving out historiographies of important countries such as France or the Balkan countries' neighbour, Italy. However, in the given framework the article offers good insight into the presence of the Balkan Wars in so defined scholarship. The author's conclusion is that there are next to no works devoted specifically to the Balkan Wars after the Second World War. At the same time, he observed a kind of unification (or de-nationalisation) of views on the conflicts after 1945. Like some authors already discussed, Michail suggests both orientalism and interest or ideologically-motivated views during the wars themselves. He also sees the Balkan states in the context of the then prevailing nation-state paradigm. He criticises the significant lack of knowledge of the Balkans in the West, and the tendency to use the report of Carnegie's Endowment as the sole source. For the period after the Second World War, the author notes that the Balkan Wars were usually dealt with in works with broader topics, only to be reinstated as a subject in its own right during the Yugoslav wars of dissolution – and then usually only as an explanatory background for contemporary events. He opposes the prevailing view that sees violence as something typical only for the Balkans (whereas it is allegedly only an occasional aberration in the rest of Europe), putting most of the blame for this oversimplification on the Carnegie report.

The book "The Balkan Wars from Contemporary Perception to Historic Memory" will not enhance greatly our knowledge of these wars, but will certainly contribute much to knowledge of the wars' perceptions – in the past and at present – in South-East Europe and in the West. Despite minor shortcomings of some articles, all of them are on extremely high level of scholarship and objectivity. Finally, a word is in place about the cover. Whereas the subject matter is clearly stated in the title of the volume, the super-abstract painting on the cover (one of those that require a users' manual to be understood) suggests rather a volume of modern poetry or idealistic philosophy. Should the book live into a second edition, this should be changed for the sake of its visibility on the shelves. Its contents mer-

it a more attractive cover – i.e. more attractive for average historians and general readers likely to be interested in the topic. Apart from that, the publisher deserves high praise for using the good old footnotes instead of the irritating and unpractical endnotes, so beloved by most Anglo-Saxon publishing houses.

Zagreb

Zoran Janjetović

Wolfram DORNIK, Des Kaisers Falke. Wirken und Nach-Wirken von Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf. Mit einer Nachbetrachtung von Verena Moritz und Hannes Leidinger. Innsbruck, Wien, Bozen: Studienverlag, 2. korr. Aufl., 2013 (Veröffentlichungen des Ludwig Boltzmann-Instituts für Kriegsfolgen-Forschung, 25). 279 S., ISBN 978-3-7065-5004-8, € 24,90

Unter den Generalstabschefs und Oberbefehlshabern der Großmachtarmeen des 1. Weltkriegs nimmt Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf eine Sonderstellung ein: Mit einjähriger Unterbrechung 1911/12 leitete er den Generalstab Österreich-Ungarns von November 1906 bis Ende Februar 1917. Er prägte in hohem Maß die Kriegsvorbereitungen, beeinflusste nach Kräften die Sicherheitspolitik der Habsburgermonarchie in den Vorkriegsjahren und führte mehr als dreieinhalb Jahre das Armeoberkommando (AOK), dessen offizieller Oberbefehlshaber Erzherzog Friedrich seinem Generalstabschef weitestgehend freie Hand ließ. Niemand wurde dementsprechend stärker mit Österreich-Ungarns Siegen und Niederlagen identifiziert. Nach dem Krieg bemühte sich Conrad, Kritik an seiner Führung in Frieden und Krieg zu entkräften und seine Verdienste herauszustreichen. Er selbst war publizistisch aktiv, profitierte bei seinen Bestrebungen aber auch davon, dass ehemalige Mitarbeiter in Publikationen ein positives Bild der Fähigkeiten und Leistungen ihres früheren Vorgesetzten zeichneten. Kritik wurde nur in Ausnahmefällen in die Öffentlichkeit getragen, denn das Prestige der „alten Armee“ schien es erforderlich zu machen, Conrads Ansehen nicht zu schmälern. Noch lange nach seinem Tod 1925 stellten das ehrende Angedenken an die Streitkräfte der Habsburgermonarchie und die Würdigung ihres langjährigen Generalstabschefs geschichtspolitisch zwei Seiten einer Medaille dar. Hagiographisch anmutende Biographien, aber auch die Benennung von Straßen und Plätzen hielten diese Sichtweise wach. In ihrer knappen, gut nachvollziehbaren „Nachbetrachtung“ gehen Verena Moritz und Hannes Leidinger dem lange Zeit in Forschung und Öffentlichkeit gepflegten Bild von Conrad nach (201-221). Eine kritische Herangehensweise, die Conrads Führungsfehler im Krieg und seine Rolle als Kriegstreiber in der Vorkriegszeit in den Vordergrund rückte, setzte sich allerdings zunehmend durch und dominiert seit mindestens drei Jahrzehnten die Forschungsliteratur.