

scheitern mussten. Die beiden Aufsätze von Hartmut Bergenthum sind für die Frage nach den Grenzen von Wissenstransfers und nach Asymmetrien in vermeintlich globalen Kommunikationsräumen höchst aufschlussreich. Sie erkunden, wie das westliche akademische Erbe kenianische Geschichtsschreibung und -wissenschaft prägte und weisen daraufhin, dass einige der kulturwissenschaftlichen Identitätskonzepte, die in den 1980ern im „Westen“ als innovativ gefeiert wurden, von kenianischen Historikern bereits Jahrzehnte früher formuliert worden waren. Aus dem Land gelangten sie allerdings nie.

Auf nachhaltigere Weise irritierend ist – und damit kommen wir auf das stärkste der eingangs erwähnten Pferde zurück – die uneinheitliche Verwendung der Kategorie „Raum“ in dem Sammelband. Mal impliziert der Begriff Bezüge zu physischen Räumen; mal zu sozialen Positionierungen und Praktiken, die mehr oder weniger deutlich auf Orte verweisen; zuweilen erscheint der Begriff von jeglicher physischer Dimension losgelöst. Dass nigerianische Videofilme, die historische Erzählungen neu interpretieren, ausgerechnet Räume darstellen sollen (Matthias Gruber), leuchtet nicht unmittelbar ein – zumal das Konzept von „Texten“ oder „Narrativen“ angesichts des epischen Charakters der Filme hier mindestens ebenso angebracht erscheint. Auch ob es Sinn macht, kolonial produzierte Kategorien wie Ethnien als „Erinnerungsräume“ zu beschreiben (Hartmut Bergenthum), ist Streitbar. Freilich soll es nicht darum gehen, der einen oder anderen Definition von Raum die Legitimität abzuspochen. Es sind gerade solche Abweichungen in analytischen Perspektiven, die die Aufsatzsammlung inter-

essant machen, zumal, wie die Rezension zeigt, Gemeinsamkeiten und Überschneidungen zwischen den einzelnen Beiträgen erkennbar sind. Zuweilen vermisst man aber ein expliziteres, die Lektüre leitendes Reflektieren dieser Zusammenhänge – ebenso ein Abwägen von Unterschieden. Die Einleitung liefert einen „Problemaufriß“, aber keinen roten Faden für den Leser.

Dies allerdings sind lediglich Mäkeleien an der Anlage einer ansonsten äußerst anregenden Aufsatzsammlung. Sie liefert nicht nur für Afrika-Historiker, sondern für all diejenigen, die sich für die Dynamiken von Erinnerung, Identitäts- und Raumkonstruktionen interessieren, bereichernde, anregend aufgearbeitete und bisweilen überraschende Fallbeispiele. Sie kann außerdem als gewinnbringender Beitrag in die Debatte um die Nützlichkeit von Perspektiven des ‚spatial‘ turn für die Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften integriert werden.

**Jacek Purchla / Wolf Tegethoff (Hrsg.):
Nation, Style, Modernism (= CIHA
Conference Papers, vol. 1), Interna-
tional Cultural Centre: Cracow 2006.
390 S.**

Rezensiert von
Elana Passman, Chapel Hill

Is a national style indicative of provincialism or of a state's vigor? Does embracing the international suggest a nation's modernity or its rejection of the authentic spirit of

its people, the voice of the modern nation? This book examines how the notion of a „national style” was elaborated beginning in the 19th century and how such conceptions were defended, reshaped, or abandoned in the face of the growing influence of international modernism. Conversely, it considers internationally-oriented avant-garde movements in the national context. Based on a 2003 conference organized by Munich’s *Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte* and Cracow’s *International Cultural Centre* with help from the *Comité international de l’art*, „Nation, Style, Modernism” maintains a truly international scope. This edition, arranged in roughly chronological fashion, includes 13 articles in English (along with an English-language preface), 7 articles in German, and one in French; the editors have also published a separate Polish-language edition. Contributions by and large address the art and architecture of continental Europe, especially Central Europe.

Even more so than most books derived from conference proceedings, it lacks a clear organizational framework. Faced with neither a standard introduction nor any sort of conclusion, much less thematic or geographical subsections, the reader is forced to connect the dots herself, just as if she had attended the conference. A two-page preface by the editors all-too-briefly opens the volume. A conceptual essay, „Art and National Identity” by Wolf Tegethoff more effectively orients the reader. Tegethoff sets out a broad framework for the book by considering how the art of the distant past was used to create a sense of national style during the 19th and early 20th centuries; this process went hand-in-hand with the construction of the nation-state itself.

If Tegethoff does not explicitly reference the other contributions, he successfully pinpoints the major themes of the whole, above all by calling attention to national style as a cultural construction.

In the main, the book explores the tensions between the 19th-century propensity to assert a specifically national style and the international thrust to 20th-century modernism. By addressing the confluence of the national, international, and modern, the volume calls attention to their intriguing inconsistencies, ambiguities, and overlaps. Articles thus tackle, for example, the national aspects of the so-called International Style as well as attempts to tweak the traditional vernacular aesthetic into a more modern, cosmopolitan look to elevate local folk art to a form of „high culture.” Not surprisingly, certain subjects are revisited by multiple authors, including international expositions, museums, debates over form versus function, the *Heimatschutzbewegung*, and the garden city movement.

Many contributions examine the ways in which „small” (and relatively young or re-emergent) nations tried to find a middle ground between a modern, international aesthetic and one that reflected a specifically national style. Key was, first, to differentiate its culture from that of neighboring powers: Flanders from France, Czechoslovakia from Germany, Poland from Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary, and so forth. Second, it was essential not to appear retrograde; each of these nations therefore sought to trumpet its forward-looking agenda via its art and architecture. Yet at the same time, some made sure to reference past moments of greatness. If, for example, a 1929 Polish expo-

sition included several avant-garde structures influenced by the constructivists and suprematists, it also showcased brand-new buildings in a neoclassic style, the fashion just before Poland was fatally carved up by its neighbors.

Charlotte Ashby, Dirk De Meyer, Agnieszka Chmielewska, and Éva Forgács take up these issues most directly. Ashby beautifully captures the themes of the book in her clear, precise „Fennomane Building: A Finnish National Style in Commercial Architecture.” When Finland was threatened by Swedish cultural and Russian political hegemony, Fennomane architects created a specifically Finnish architectural style, but deemed it even more vital to project a sense of Finland as modern. In similar fashion, De Meyer looks to how Czech architectural historians tried to move out from the shadows of their German colleagues, who had cast local architecture as German, to establish instead a new Czech architectural history that alternately emphasized baroque influences, folk elements, or a modern, European style. Chmielewska examines how the Warsaw Academy sought to transcend interwar Poland’s ethnic and regional divisions via a new, national style based on a combination of folk art and the „art of the gentry”; constructivists and colorists opposed the Academy’s efforts, which they believed would reinforce Poland’s image as „backward.” Forgács charts Hungarian artists’ attempt to bridge the divide between a rationalist art and „the inherent national emotionalism of Hungarian culture.” Artists’ choices to accentuate either the modern or the national took on very different meanings in the changing political contexts of 20th century Hungary. France, though a unified nation-

state for far longer than most of the other countries under investigation, nonetheless felt compelled to reinforce a strong sense of national identity out of fear of being eclipsed by other powers. By looking to the renewed interest in both the art of the „primitives” and Romanesque architecture at the turn of the last century, Alice Thomine-Berrada and François-René Martin together point to how the French alighted on a style they could claim as the foundation of their national tradition (as opposed to the contested national origins of the Gothic and Renaissance styles). Christian Freigang examines how in the interwar era, the idea of a „national modern” architecture rooted in French traditions was deployed to combat the threat of the international modern associated with Swiss architect Le Corbusier, who sought a complete break with the past. Kate Kangaslahti dissects three Parisian art exhibits associated with the 1937 World’s Fair. In the divided political climate of Popular Front France, these exhibits, she argues, defined France against its rivals in Italy, Germany, and the Soviet Union to assert a vision of a France united in its diversity, grand in its achievements, and international in its pretensions; it was an image „at once nationalist and universalist.”

Many articles, in contrast, ground international movements in a national setting. In an absorbing case study, Stefan Muthesius focuses on Jakob von Falke, a German artisan and exhibit organizer based in Vienna. In the multiethnic context of Austria-Hungary, von Falke championed a universal aesthetic. Elisabeth Crettaz-Stürzel argues that although the Heimattstil of pre-World War I Swiss architecture drew equally from cantonal and interna-

tional sources (whether Belgian, English, Finnish, French, or German), it could not overcome the domestic fault line between French and German-speaking Switzerland. Wallis Miller chronicles how, in the context of Weimar's Neues Bauen, Germans debated Karl Friedrich Schinkel's oeuvre – as art or architecture, as modern or traditional. Magdalena Bushart concentrates on Adolf Behne's evolving stance in the debate over form versus function. Behne's eventual critique of the coldness and inhospitality of the International Style – and his own turn toward a more nationally or locally-rooted architecture – anticipated future criticism of the International Style. In a rather esoteric piece, Rostislav Švácha demonstrates that Doric elements underlie Prague's modern cubist architecture.

The nature and reception of international artistic movements also plays an important role in the volume. Focusing on dada, expressionism, and above all constructivism, Timothy O. Benson asks whether, in an age defined by the nation-state, these movements were in fact international or simply multinational. Likewise turning to constructivism, Hubert van den Berg contends that a transnational network of periodicals, exhibits, and meetings helped fashion constructivism into a self-consciously inter- and supranational avant-garde movement. Maria Elena Versari considers how the futurist movement shaped its image both at home and abroad as at once eminently Italian and the „Motherland” of the international avant-garde. In an engaging case study of Antwerp, An Paenhuyzen examines hostility to the international avant-garde at the local level. Specifically, Paenhuyzen follows Flemish nationalist and francophobe Seuphor's

change-of-heart as he became an ardent proponent of the international avant-garde in Paris; the arts community in Antwerp, deeply rooted in Flemish nationalism, rejected both Seuphor and his message.

Some of the more stimulating articles are comparative in focus; in this way, they draw the sorts of clear connections between cases that a broader conclusion to the book ordinarily would have provided. Beate Störtkuhl's fine piece analyzes the ways in which national architectural styles variously emerged in the multiethnic borderland region around Posen/Poznań in both the context of the German Reich and the Polish Republic. Whereas a 1911 exposition served as an occasion for Germany to underscore its historic ties to Posen as well as to boost the image of its Eastern provinces within the Reich, a 1929 exposition showcased a new Poland, at once forward-looking yet steeped in classical and vernacular traditions. Arnold Bartetzky adeptly contrasts Stalinist-era architecture in East Germany with Poland. In both satellite states – as in the Eastern bloc more broadly – traditional national flourishes were to adorn a unifying socialist architecture in the early 1950s. East Germany turned to regional traditions, perhaps as a way of avoiding the taint of the national associated with Hitler; Poland instead invoked a national style as a way of shedding its traditional status as victim and stamping its new territories as Polish.

Bernd Nicolai and Verena Schindler shrewdly cut across the book's themes to remind us that issues of national style and the international modern were not exclusive to Europe. Nicolai reflects on the experience of exile for modernist architects, who faced the challenge of adapting their

styles to the taste of their new home. Although famed German architect Erich Mendelsohn reshaped his version of modernism in California, his new ideas found little resonance in the face of the popularity of the International Style of Mies and Gropius, fellow exiles from Hitler's Europe. Nicolai's emphasis is on Mendelsohn, but his article in fact considers Central European architects' exile experience more broadly to include their output in Japan, Turkey, Palestine, and Kenya. Schindler's article on the architecture of Tiananmen Square fits into the book surprisingly well in that it examines the establishment of a national style that drew on a vernacular as well as an „international” – that is to say, European – aesthetic. If the look drew from Classical models, the materials and engineering were modern, and much of the inspiration came from the example of Soviet monumentalism.

The exceedingly low price for a hardcover work of art history comes at the expense of production values. Some of the images are simply too small or too dark to parse; typographical errors occur in all three languages. Curiously, the footnotes march down the right-hand margin of the recto page in green ink; the shadows that separate the text from the footnotes – and bleed into both – are distracting. However, it seems churlish to complain about production values when they have so clearly led to discount pricing.

More regrettably, the English portion of the text repeatedly betrays the fact that much of the volume is not the work of native speakers. At times, this is merely grating, as with odd word choices and the wholesale fabrication of words („alternation,” „auto-reflecting,” „enswing”); on

occasion, however, the English text is so contorted as to render entire paragraphs impenetrable. Many articles follow rather circuitous paths to touch on numerous, complex themes: the construction of national identity, the place of regional or cosmopolitan/transnational identity, the role of the avant-garde, and cultural transfer. Yet patient readers will be rewarded with a number of illuminating case studies, the best of which pay close attention to the peculiarities of national and political contexts. The book's broadly inclusive international scope makes for intriguing contrasts and comparisons: rarely do we read of Finnish, Flemish, and Hungarian (much less Chinese) identity together. *Nation, Style, Modernism* serves as a valuable reminder of the degree to which networks and trends crossed borders; movements we tend to associate with one nation or region in fact emerged in unique iterations throughout Europe and beyond.

Richard Ned Lebow / Wulf Kansteiner / Claudio Fogu (Hrsg.): *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham: Durham: Duke University Press 2006, 366 S.

Rezensiert von
Klaus-Peter Friedrich, Marburg

Die Verfasser dieses Sammelbands haben sich vorgenommen, in das wuchernde Dickicht der Forschungen zu den nationalen Erinnerungskulturen in Europa Schnei-