

teraktionen und „Außenbeziehungen“ ein großes Gewicht beimessen, ohne darüber jedoch die internen Transformationen und Dynamiken aus dem Blick zu verlieren. Gewiss hat die räumliche Unterteilung der Kapitel ihren Preis, der in den Bänden zum 20. Jahrhundert – in dem sich viele Prozesse in regionaler Beschränkung kaum mehr erklären lassen – besonders deutlich wird. Aber auf der anderen Seite macht sie auch eine der Stärken der gesamten Reihe aus: Regionale Spezifik, häufig eines der ersten Opfer planetarischer Synthesen, bleibt hier wichtig und konstitutiv. Die Einteilung in größere Räume und Regionen leuchtet meist ein; nicht zuletzt waren Austauschbeziehungen und Netzwerke lange Zeit, und häufig auch noch in der Gegenwart, regional strukturiert. Und die Texte sind von Historikern der Regionen verfasst, nicht aus einer globalgeschichtlichen Vogelperspektive. Sie eignen sich daher gut als Einführung und Überblickswerk und werden auch im Unterricht sehr nützliche Dienste leisten.

Anmerkung:

- 1 P. Feldbauer/A. Schottenhammer (Hrsg.): Die Welt 1000–1250, Wien 2011; T. Ertl/ M. Limberger (Hrsg.): Die Welt 1250–1500, Wien 2009; P. Feldbauer/J. P. Lehnert (Hrsg.): Die Welt im 16. Jahrhundert, Wien 2008; B. Hausberger (Hrsg.): Die Welt im 17. Jahrhundert, Wien 2008; P. Feldbauer/J. P. Lehnert (Hrsg.): Die Welt im 18. Jahrhundert, Wien 2011; M. Mann (Hrsg.): Die Welt im 19. Jahrhundert, Wien 2009; H.-W. Tobler/W. Bernecker (Hrsg.): Die Welt im 20. Jahrhundert bis 1945, Wien 2010; M. Stromberger/H. Konrad (Hrsg.), Die Welt im 20. Jahrhundert nach 1945, Wien 2010.

Dominic Sachsenmaier: Global Perspectives on Global History. Theories and Approaches in a Connected World, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2011, 331 S.

Reviewed by
Robert Cole, New York

Dominic Sachsenmaier's book is a rare example of historiographical writing that invites us not only to consider the sorts of histories we write but also to think critically about the conditions under which we write them. The book offers a subtly analyzed and meticulously annotated intellectual genealogy of the recent global enthusiasm for the writing of "global history". Sachsenmaier notes that the "border-crossing perspectives" of global history have taken hold around the world at precisely the same moment that "new forms of institutionalization and interdisciplinary cooperation have started supporting historical research cutting across national and other boundaries" (pp. 2-3), and he identifies this concatenation as marking a pivotal turning point in both the content and the context of historical scholarship worldwide. Yet, despite the apparent globalization of "global history", this convergence of language may obscure the persistence both of wide methodological rifts among national historiographies and of structural inequalities that privilege certain sources of global histories over others. Drawing from his deep familiarity with historical scholarship in the United States, Germany, and

the People's Republic of China, Sachsenmaier develops a series of case studies that demonstrate the very different conceptual and political valences that "global history" has taken on in these three very different contexts.

In his study of the U.S. historiography, Sachsenmaier argues that concepts of global history emerged out of a thoroughgoing critique of Eurocentrism, which was itself made possible both by changes within the American academy and by broader cultural and political movements. In the decades following the Second World War, as students of more diverse backgrounds entered American colleges and graduate programs, they began to write histories that reflected their own diverse experiences. This new generation of historians, many of whom were actively involved in the Civil Rights, anti-colonial, and anti-war movements of the postwar decades, looked for ways to displace Europe and "the West" from their habitually central positions. Indeed, two of the most influential approaches to global history to emerge after the 1960s – specifically, dependency theory and postcolonial theory – derived much of their legitimacy from a claim to have originated outside the Western academy. Although many different approaches to writing global history have taken root in American history departments since then, Sachsenmaier sees this de-centering impulse as informing the concept's use in America. He writes, "In the main, the 'globe' emerging from global and transnational historical scholarship in the United States is not a fixed entity waiting to be filled with new master narratives but primarily an open question addressed by a myriad of individual research activities" (p. 105). While this is unquestionably

a positive development, it is troubling to note, as Sachsenmaier does, that this methodological broadening has not necessarily been matched in the global circulation of scholarly work, where American scholarship continues to hold privileged status worldwide while historiographies outside the US remain largely marginalized.

The mobilization of concepts of the "global" in German historiography has been driven by very different social forces. The question of central concern to several generations of post-war German historians was the interpretation of the Nazi era. For these scholars, the German nation-state has remained of central importance, and global concepts have been relevant only to the extent that they have enabled new interpretations of German history. In Germany, Sachsenmaier writes, "many new transnational perspectives aim less to deconstruct the nation-state as a modern invention than to establish a more accurate historical understanding of the forces, processes, and contexts that shaped or characterized the German past" (p. 151). Sachsenmaier identifies two trends that have begun to challenge this: first, as European political integration has tentatively advanced, so too have attempts (encouraged in no small part by the cultural offices of the European Union) to fashion a distinct European historical identity out of its constituent national histories. Second, Germany's growing immigrant population has the potential to unleash pluralizing forces similar to those that changed the American academy in the postwar decades, evidenced most recently by growing interest within Germany in studies of diasporic and transnational communities.

Sachsenmaier's reading of the Chinese global historiography offers an important counterpoint to these first two case studies. Whereas nation-centered histories dominated American and German historical scholarship until relatively recently, the luxury that accommodated "professional negligence of global entanglements and influences from the outside world" has, in China, been "[impossible] for generations" (p. 172). Since at least the mid-nineteenth century (and, arguably, much earlier even than this), the study of world history, and of its relationship to Chinese history, has been an intellectual and political imperative for many Chinese historians. Yet the precise contours of the "world" that was of interest to Chinese historians have varied greatly over the past century. In the early twentieth century, there was a proliferation of diverse notions of globality, many of which sought to understand the relationship between China and modernity as represented by Europe, North America, and Japan, but running alongside these were powerful critiques of imperialism and feelings of solidarity with the colonized world. With the ascendancy of Marxist historiography from the late 1920s, the history of the West, coupled with the revolutionary experience of the Soviet Union, were the starting points for debates about the nature of Chinese society and its stage of development. Historians of the Soviet Union continued to dominate Chinese world history departments after the founding of the People's Republic in 1949, although the souring of Sino-Soviet relations in the 1950s-60s saw their displacement by historians of Africa, South Asia, and Latin America as China attempted to position itself at the center of a Third World revo-

lutionary movement. It has only been in the decades following the death of Mao Zedong and the reforms of the 1980s that a full-throated form of nationalism has reasserted itself in the Chinese historiography. Even within these recent efforts to elucidate the distinctiveness of China's national history, however, the significance of concepts of global history has not fallen away entirely. While previous generations of PRC historians may have construed the world as a space of revolutionary potential, contemporary historians have gravitated towards post-revolutionary notions of "modernization" and "globalization" as descriptors of the global historical processes in which China is embedded. As Sachsenmaier points out, reconciling "nationalism" and "globalization" has not posed an insoluble contradiction for PRC historians; on the contrary, "many influential Chinese scholars see globalization and nation-building as complementary processes, and in a following step have come to advocate nationally specific outlooks of world history" (p. 236).

For Sachsenmaier, the unifying principle behind these disparate forms of global history is their critical reassessment of the spaces that frame our histories. Yet this assumption that concepts of the "global" are necessarily spatial excludes the possibility that global histories could be written that take concepts of time and temporality as their points of departure. One might consider Ernst Bloch's notion of "simultaneous non-simultaneity" – which describes the overlapping coexistence of multiple social temporalities – as the seminal example of this line of thought, as it gives rise to a concept of the "global" not as homogenous ("flattened") space but as heterogeneous

temporal unevenness. Similar attempts to rethink global temporality and its relationship to historical space characterize the work of theorists and historians including David Harvey, Henri Lefebvre, Reinhart Koselleck, and Wang Hui. Indeed, the basic critical thrusts of dependency theory and postcolonial theory, which Sachsenmaier presents as forerunners of today's global history trend, might be said to originate just as much in critiques of global temporality as in spatiality. A deeper engagement with this changing historiographical imbrication of global space and time would make Sachsenmaier's analysis even more revealing of the sorts of intellectual and political concerns that animate various forms of global history.

This study's greatest value lies in its powerful reminder that there is no a priori "global" that can serve as a transparent category of analysis; such categories are necessarily constructed and come freighted with assumptions and histories of their own. This reminder could not be timelier, as many of the world's academic institutions and faculties continue to grapple with the question of what the emergent "global university" should look like. Certain concepts of the global could serve to fundamentally reconfigure the academy, to bring marginalized voices into transnational discussion, and to inspire new forms of collaborative scholarship. It is, unfortunately, just as easy to imagine configurations of the global university that serve only to entrench extant forms of institutional and linguistic privilege and to reproduce a vanishingly small transnational scholarly elite. Given this danger, it is not enough for the academy to aspire to be "global"; it must know what sort of world it intends to envision

and who is to be included in its envisioning.

Ulf Engel / Matthias Middell / Stefan Troebst (Hrsg.): Erinnerungskulturen in transnationaler Perspektive (= Transnationalisierung und Regionalisierung vom 18. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart, Bd. 5), Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag 2012, 253 S.

Rezensiert von
Dietmar Rothermund, Heidelberg

Dieser interessante Sammelband ist aus einer Sommerschule der Universität Leipzig hervorgegangen und umfasst 14 Aufsätze, davon die Hälfte in englischer Sprache. Erinnerungskultur ist ein neues Leitthema der Geschichtswissenschaft geworden. Meist ist die Erinnerungskultur national verankert (und beschränkt), sie aus transnationaler Perspektive zu betrachten, ist daher ein zu begrüßender neuer Ansatz. Freilich haben auch die Mehrzahl der Beiträge zu diesem Band nationale Erinnerungskulturen zum Gegenstand. Die transnationale Perspektive kann dann nur bedeuten, dass Fallbeispiele geliefert werden, die einem Vergleich dienen können. Es können hier nicht alle Beiträge besprochen werden. Es sollen nur einige Aufsätze erwähnt werden, die besonders interessante Fragestellungen enthalten. Der erste Teil des Bandes trägt die Überschrift „Die Erinnerung an den Nationalsozialismus in transnationalen Bezügen“.