

On Parallel Tracks at Different Speeds: Historiographies of Imperial Russia and the Globalized World around 1900

Martin Aust

ABSTRACTS

Mit Blick auf die Geschichte Russlands im 19. Jahrhundert argumentiert dieser Artikel, dass weltregionale und globale Ansätze in der Geschichtsschreibung voneinander profitieren. Die Globalgeschichte benötigt quellengesättigte Untersuchungen von Räumen, in denen sich regionale und globale Aspekte verflechten. In den zurückliegenden drei Jahrzehnten haben Historiker Russlands im 19. Jahrhundert und Globalhistoriker sich von vergleichbaren Imperativen leiten lassen: Russlandhistoriker dekonstruierten eine russozentrische Sichtweise der Vergangenheit Russlands, die die Vielfalt des Vielvölkerreiches verschleierte, während Globalhistoriker eine eurozentrische Lesart der Weltgeschichte überwinden. Der Artikel stellt zwei Fallstudien über die Fürstin Olga Aleksandrovna Shcherbatova und Fedor Fedorovich Martens in den Mittelpunkt, die Licht auf Russlands Teilhabe an der Entdeckung und Internationalisierung der Welt im späten 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert werfen.

Elaborating on the history of nineteenth-century Russia, this article argues that world-regional histories and the global history approach benefit from each other. Global history has to be informed by source-based inquiries in spaces where the regional and the global meet. In the past three decades historians of nineteenth-century Russia and global historians have been affected by related imperatives: historians of Russia deconstructed a russocentric view of Russia's past which veiled the diversity of a multiethnic empire while global historians reached out to deconstruct a eurocentric reading of world history. The article highlights case studies of Princess Olga Aleksandrovna Shcherbatova and Fedor Fedorovich Martens which shed light onto Russians' involvement in exploring and internationalizing the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

This contribution reflects my perspective on global history as a historian of Russia. Over the years my research interests have changed and diversified with global perspectives emerging as one amongst other approaches toward my studies of Russia's past. In my PhD thesis I undertook an inquiry into Russian social history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, investigating how Russian noblemen and noblewomen settled arguments about land.¹ My second book explores transnational Polish-Ukrainian-Russian-Soviet memories of seventeenth-century wars from 1934 to 2006.² Over the past decade imperial and global dimensions of Russia's past have been at the heart of my publications.³ Thus, the methodologies of my work depend upon which aspect of Russia's past is to be researched: culture, society, politics, entanglements. This makes global history one of many approaches available to the study of the past. Being interested in Russian relations with Europe, other empires and the world, some methodologies have moved into my focus: comparative history, transnational history, world history, and global history. In my work contributions to the study of contested memories in the twentieth century, reflections on Russia and Europe and studies of transfers into the Russian Empire are informed by the paradigms of transnational history and *histoire croisée*.⁴ Comparative history has provided insights into autobiographical practices in the Romanov, Ottoman, and Habsburg empires.⁵ However, global and world history prove their relevance beyond comparative, transnational and entangled historical approaches. That holds especially true for the study of nineteenth-century Russia. In Jürgen Osterhammel's reading of the nineteenth century, Russian history is fully integrated into his analysis of the transformation of the world.⁶ Osterhammel includes many Russian examples in his account of the nineteenth century to highlight connectivity and to develop varying comparisons e.g. of frontiers and industrialization among lots of other issues. From a German Russianist's perspective two issues are remarkable here: Firstly and very basically, historiographies in Germany and the USA display different notions of the term global history. In Ger-

1 M. Aust, *Adlige Landstreitigkeiten. Eine Studie zum Wandel der Nachbarschaftsverhältnisse 1676–1796*, Wiesbaden 2003.

2 M. Aust, *Polen und Russland im Streit um die Ukraine. Konkurrierende Erinnerungen an die Kriege des 17. Jahrhunderts in den Jahren 1934–2006*, Wiesbaden 2009.

3 M. Aust, A. Miller, and R. Vulpius (eds.), *Imperium inter pares: Rol' transferov v istorii Rossiiskoi Imperii (1700–1917)*, Moscow 2010; M. Aust (ed.), *Globalisierung imperial und sozialistisch. Russland und die Sowjetunion in der Globalgeschichte 1851–1991*, Frankfurt a.M. 2013; M. Aust and J. Obertreis (eds.), *Osteuropäische Geschichte und Globalgeschichte*, Stuttgart 2014; M. Aust, *Russia and Europe 1547–1917*, <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/europe-and-the-world/knowledge-transfer/martin-aust-russia-and-europe-1547-1917> (accessed 27 March 2019); M. Aust, *Die Russische Revolution. Vom Zarenreich zum Sowjetimperium*, München 2017; M. Aust, *Die Schatten des Imperiums. Russland seit 1991*, München 2019.

4 Aust, *Polen und Russland im Streit um die Ukraine*; M. Aust, K. Ruchniewicz, and S. Troebst (eds.), *Verflochtene Erinnerungen. Polen und seine Nachbarn im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Köln 2009; Aust, *Russia and Europe*; M. Aust, *Imperium inter pares*.

5 M. Aust and F. B. Schenk (eds.), *Imperial Subjects. Autobiographische Praxis in den Vielvölkerreichen der Habsburger, Romanovs und Osmanen im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, Köln 2015.

6 J. Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World. A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton, NJ 2014. See my review of Osterhammel's *Transformation* from the point of view of a Russianist: M. Aust, *New Perspectives on Russian History in World History*, in: *Kritika. Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 17 (2016) 1, pp. 139–150.

man historiography there is a certain distinction between comparative world history and global history as an endeavour to explore synchronicities and entanglements on a global scale. In one of his articles on how to conceive world history Osterhammel differentiates it from global history which he defines as “interactions in systems encompassing the whole planet”.⁷ Sebastian Conrad follows Osterhammel’s lead in stressing synchronicity and connectivity as hallmarks of global history which help differentiate global history from world history.⁸ In the USA this distinction can also be made. The 1995 article *World History in a Global Age* by Charles Bright and Michael Geyer points to differences between global and world history in the sense that once there was a time when the world had not yet been globalized.⁹ However, the English translation of Osterhammel’s German book shows that in the English language the terms global history and world history can be used synonymously, thus blurring the lines between the two of them: Osterhammel’s *Verwandlung der Welt* became a global history in the English translation of the title.¹⁰ Beyond Osterhammel’s seminal book on the transformation of the world in the nineteenth century there still remains a lot to explore by historians of Russia. This holds especially true for Russia’s contribution to globalizing the world in the nineteenth century and to drawing a balance sheet of how nineteenth-century globalization in some cases limited and in others enlarged opportunities and agencies in Russia.

1. Global History, Area Studies, and Regional Histories

Two imperative principles of global history – to provincialize Europe and to decenter our approaches to the study of the past¹¹ – do not sweep area histories or at least the study of the history of regions from the table: global history as any history has to be studied from a specific vantage point and has to be based on specific sources. The required vantage point can be a region, and source-reading requires language skills. Both can be turned into a strong argument in favour of studying a region’s history within the confines of global history.¹² Further, studying spaces and people needs to consider mental maps and self-descriptions. Studies of mental maps have indeed challenged area studies, most notably in the case of Eastern Europe in the broad German sense of the term Osteuropa including Russia and the Balkans.¹³ However, this does not ban regions from historiog-

7 J. Osterhammel, “Weltgeschichte”: Ein Propädeutikum, in: *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 56 (2005) 9, pp. 452–479, at p. 460.

8 S. Conrad, *Globalgeschichte. Eine Einführung*, Munich 2013, pp. 9–13.

9 M. Geyer and C. Bright, *World History in a Global Age*, in: *American Historical Review* 100 (1995) 4, pp. 1034–1060.

10 Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Munich 2009; Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World*.

11 D. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton, NJ 2008; S. Conrad, *Die Weltbilder der Historiker: Wege aus dem Eurozentrismus*, in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 65 (2015) 40–41, pp. 16–22.

12 B. Schäbler (ed.), *Area Studies und die Welt. Weltregionen und neue Globalgeschichte*, Wien 2007; S. Beckert and D. Sachsenmaier (eds.), *Global History Globally. Research and Practice around the World*, London 2018.

13 K. Kaser (ed.), *Wieser Enzyklopädie des europäischen Ostens*, Vol. 11: *Europa und die Grenzen im Kopf*, Kla-

raphy's basic terms. Spaces have to be studied. As long as actors themselves use a certain vocabulary to relate themselves to spaces, including their mental maps in historiographical analysis is justifiable. The blossoming field of autobiographical practices in empires support the significance of empires and regions as imagined spaces, and as spaces of reference in public discourse.¹⁴ At the same time, this argument shall not be misread as a defense in favour of classic area studies. Historiographic terms signifying regions should be read as analytical ideal types and umbrella terms to produce a synthesis of broad and vast knowledge. These terms should not be understood as containers delimiting a certain area from other regions of the world or global processes. But global history needs to be related to places and spaces in a source-based way. This opens the door for historians of regions to commit themselves to the global history project. Without language skills and source-based local studies exploring connectivity between the local and the global the global history project will be doomed.

2. State of the Art of Globalizing Russian History

At a first glance one is tempted to say that historians of Russia have been latecomers to the field of global history. Asian History to a very large degree dominated the heralds' of global history departure from eurocentrism.¹⁵ Only the third volume of the *Journal of Global History* included the first contribution by a historian of Russia.¹⁶ However, a second glance reveals shared agendas of Global history and Russian history to the effect that the two of them were working independently but along the same lines. They were moving on separate tracks but heading towards the same destination: the deconstruction of national frames and centrisms in the study of the past. These imperatives have been on the agenda of some historians of Russia at a time when the term global history was not yet coined. In 1992, Andreas Kappeler published his magisterial book on Russia as a multiethnic empire.¹⁷ Following Kappeler's lead, historians in Russia, the USA, Europe and Japan have developed a historiography on Russia's past which is critical towards national frames as is global history and which deconstructs a russocentric reading of

genfurt 2003; F. B. Schenk, *Mental Maps. The Cognitive Mapping of the Continent as an Object of Research of European History*, <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/theories-and-methods/mental-maps/frithjof-benjamin-schenk-mental-maps-the-cognitive-mapping-of-the-continent-as-an-object-of-research-of-european-history> (accessed 27 March 2019).

- 14 D. Lambert (ed.), *Colonial Lives across the British Empire. Imperial Career in the Long Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge 2006; Aust, Schenk, *Imperial Subjects*.
- 15 J. Osterhammel, *Die Entzauberung Asiens. Europa und die asiatischen Reiche im 18. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1998; K. Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence. China, Europe and the Making of the Modern World Economy*, Princeton, NJ 2000.
- 16 A. Stanziani, *Serfs, Slaves or Wage Owners? The Legal Status of Labour in Russia from a Comparative Perspective from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Centuries*, in: *Journal of Global History* 3 (2008) 2, pp. 813–202.
- 17 A. Kappeler, *Russland als Vielvölkerreich: Entstehung, Geschichte, Zerfall 1552–1917*, Munich 1992.

Russia's multiethnic past as global historians deconstruct a eurocentric interpretation of the past of the world.¹⁸

Further, there have been some precursors to global history in the field of Russian history. This argument can be made due to a broad scope of issues which in the early days of global history were claimed as fields informing the global history project: Wallerstein's world system especially in terms of economic history, empires and imperialism as well as the history of civilizations.¹⁹ Over the decades, historians of Russia have made significant contributions to these fields. It may suffice to recall Dietrich Geyer's inquiry into late tsarist Russian imperialism, Hans-Heinrich Nolte's work applying the world-system-approach to the study of Russia and the Soviet Union, and last but not least Marshall Poe's contribution to a comparative history of empires and civilizations.²⁰ In Poe's reading there is something unique to Russia in world history from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. In comparison to other regions and countries beyond Europe Russia – according to Poe – were not colonized by European powers. Instead Russia met the European challenge and became herself a mighty empire.

In the meantime, global historians have proposed more focused definitions of global history. Sebastian Conrad declared structural causality emerging from a global context the ultimate hallmark of global history.²¹ Further, historians and scholars from disciplines once referred to as area studies have also discussed the relations between the local and the global, between area studies, regions and global history more broadly.²² Last but not least, historians of Russia and the Soviet Union have become fully engaged in exploring the global dimensions of Russian and Soviet history. There are numerous examples which can be cited here, including histories of infrastructures, ethnic cleansing, international law, and many other subjects.²³ Historians of Russia have also capitalized on an advantage which global history offers to them: to emancipate from the burden of the age-old subject of "Russia and Europe" which framed Russian-European relations in terms of transfers running from supposedly civilized Europe to supposedly backward Russia. Steven Marks has written on a broad range of innovations – some of them creative and inspiring, others destructive – which made their way from Russia into the world to leave

18 M. Khodarkovsky, *Russia's Steppe Frontier. The Making of a Colonial Empire 1500–1800*, Bloomington, ID 2002; J. Burbank, M. von Hagen, and A. Remnev (eds.), *Russia. Space, People, Power 1700–1930*, Bloomington, ID 2007; I. Gerasimov (ed.), *Novaia imperskaia istoriia Severnoi Evrazii*, 2 vols, Kazan' 2017; V. Kivelson and R.G. Suny, *Russia's Empires*, New York 2017; K. Matzusato (ed.), *Russia and its Northeast Asian Neighbors: China, Japan, and Korea 1858–1945*, Lanham 2017.

19 S. Conrad and A. Eckert, *Globalgeschichte, Globalisierung, multiple Modernen: Zur Geschichtsschreibung der modernen Welt*, in: S. Conrad, A. Eckert, and U. Freitag (eds.), *Globalgeschichte. Theorien, Ansätze, Themen*, Frankfurt a.M. 2007, pp. 7–49.

20 D. Geyer, *Der russische Imperialismus. Studien über den Zusammenhang von innerer und auswärtiger Politik 1860–1914*, Göttingen 1977; H.-H. Nolte, *Geschichte Russlands*, 3rd edn, Stuttgart 2012; M. Poe, *The Russian Moment in World History*, Princeton, NJ 2003.

21 S. Conrad, *What Is Global History?*, Princeton, NJ 2016.

22 Schäbler, *Area Studies und die Welt*; Beckert and Sachsenmaier, *Global History Globally*.

23 Aust, *Globalisierung imperial und sozialistisch*.

their mark in history from the late nineteenth century throughout the twentieth century: from art to antisemitism and ballet to bolshevism.²⁴

The future development of scholarship in Russia will have a very profound impact on the prospects of a global history of Russia. Across the political watersheds of the Russian Revolutions in 1917 and the end of the Soviet Union in 1991 a tradition of historiography has survived in Russia. The tsarist university statute from 1835 differentiated chairs at Russian universities in Russian history (also referred to as history of the fatherland, *otechestvennaia istoriia*) and general history in terms of world history (*obshchaia istoriia*, *vsemirnaia istoriia*).²⁵ Up until today textbooks, journals, and chairs in Russia have followed that model which limits reflections on Russian history within the confines of global and world history. However, it might be that change is on the way. In recent years there has been a significant output of Russian books which explore connections between Russia and other world regions and countries, e.g. the Americas, Japan, China, Egypt, and South Africa. These titles mostly discuss the history of Russian communities in these countries and histories of mutual perceptions, cultural transfers, migrations and trade.²⁶ In addition there are international titles which either relate diversities within in the Russian Empire to communities abroad, or produce entangled histories of Russia and her neighboring countries and regions.²⁷

Another indicator of overcoming the established divide between Russian history and world history might be the latest Russian volume of a history of the world in the nineteenth century.²⁸ The volume is informed by many threads of historiography: there is a clear focus on economic history triggering social change. The question of how industrialization came into being takes centre stage in the volume. This echoes the tradition of twentieth-century historiography. At the same time, the editor references historians as diverse as Fernand Braudel and Jürgen Osterhammel to sketch out the volume's frame of world history. Be that as it may, it is, however, interesting to see established historians of Russia proper – such as Alexei Miller – contributing to this volume of world history²⁹

24 S. Marks, *How Russia Shaped the Modern World. From Art to Anti-Semitism, Ballet to Bolshevism*, Princeton, NJ 2003.

25 T. Bohn, *Writing World History in Tsarist Russia and in the Soviet Union*, in: B. Stuchey (ed.), *Writing World History 1800–2000*, Oxford 2003, pp. 197–212, at p. 199.

26 To give just a few examples: K. Cherevko, *Rossia na rubezhach Iaponii, Kitaia i SShA (2-ia polovina XVII–nachalo XXI veka)*, Moscow 2010; I. Vinkovetsky, *Russian America. An Overseas Colony of a Continental Empire 1804–1867*, Oxford 2011; A. A. Khisamutdinov, *Russkaia Japoniia*, Moscow 2010; S. Iu. Nechaev, *Russkie v latinskoj Amerike*, Moscow 2010; A. Davidson and I. Filatova, *Rossia i Iuzhnaia Afrika. Tri veka sviazei*, Moscow 2010; M. Matusevich (ed.), *Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa. Three Centuries of Encounters*, Trenton, NJ 2007. This list could easily be continued.

27 S. Urbansky, *Kolonialer Wettstreit. Russland, China, Japan und die Ostchinesische Eisenbahn*, Frankfurt a. M. 2008; F. Grüner (ed.), *Borders in Imperial Times. Daily Life and Urban Spaces in Northeast Asia*, Leipzig 2012; F. Davies, M. Schulze Wessel, and M. Brenner (eds.), *Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union*, Göttingen 2015.

28 V. S. Mirzekhanov (ed.), *Vsemirnaia istoriia v shesti tomakh*, vol. 5: *Mir v XIX veke. Na puti k industrial'noi tsivilizatsii*, Moscow 2014.

29 A. I. Miller, *Imperiia i nacija v "dolgom" XIX veke*, in: *ibid.*, pp. 246–263. Informed by this publication see also A. Miller and S. Berger (eds.), *Nationalizing Empire*, Budapest 2015.

– an indicator that the established divide between Russian and World History might be bridged. If this indeed indicated change, the prospects of a globalized history of Russia in the Russian Federation would look promising. Further, these prospects are underscored by contributions by Russian historians in the journal *Ab Imperio*,³⁰ the PhD-programme Global History of Empires which is jointly hosted by HSE St. Petersburg and Università degli Studi di Torino.³¹ Last but not least, the Paulsen programme at the London School of Economics supports young Russian scholars who work on the period from the middle of the seventeenth to the early twentieth century to undertake research and visit conferences abroad.³²

However, there are also restraints on the horizon. They mainly emerge from history being used in Russian political discourse on a new world order and on how to position Russia in that new world order. Forums such as the Valdai Club, where politicians meet the press and academics for debates, and journals such as *Russia in Global Affairs* contribute to a political discourse which is characterized by a strong use of historical arguments.³³ These uses of the past reaffirm notions of Russia as a civilization – juxtaposed to Europe and the West – and as a sovereign great power which are challenged to uphold their purity as a civilization and status as great power in a hostile world viewed through the lens of the realistic school of International Relations and its assumption of international politics as a zero sum game. It is these specific frames of civilizations as delimited and power as a force and source of national greatness which global historians seek to challenge by highlighting interactions and connectivity. It might be that the Russian political discourse and its uses of the past infringes on opportunities to globalize the Russian past in the Russian Federation.

3. Temporal and Topical Issues of Russia in Global and World History

Applying global approaches among others to the study of the past encourages me to embrace a variety of pathways of world and global history to advance my inquiries into the past of Russia. My basic questions are: what is peculiar about Russia in history and how was Russia entangled with other world regions and global processes? These questions lead me to value both comparisons of imperial rule and entanglements in a *longue durée* and global history approach to study how Russia affected and was affected by processes of internationalization and transcontinental and global entanglements. The remaining part of my contribution will be limited to the latter issue by exploring how actors from Imperial Russia were engaged with the world and were both affected by and contributed

30 From the editors, *The Global Condition: When Local Becomes Global*, in: *Ab Imperio* 19 (2017), pp. 9–14.

31 <https://www.globalhistoryphd.unito.it/do/home.pl> (accessed 5 April 2019).

32 <http://www.lse.ac.uk/International-History/Research/Paulsen-Programme> (accessed 5 April 2019).

33 <http://valdaiclub.com/> (accessed 5 April 2019); <https://eng.globalaffairs.ru/> (accessed 5 April 2019). On Russian foreign policy think tanks, see also A. Graeff, *Denkfabriken und Expertise. Russlands außen- und sicherheitspolitische Community*, in: *Osteuropa* 8–9 (2018), pp. 77–98.

to processes of internationalization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Travel writing and international law will be highlighted as two exemplary case studies.

3.1. Transcontinental Travel Writing as Autobiographical Practice: Princess Ol'ga A. Shcherbatova and Her Voyages to Syria, Palestine, Arabia, India, and Java (1880s/1890s)

In recent times, historians of Russia and the Soviet Union have studied the history of travel and tourism both in the late Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. As to the Russian Empire, tourism transformed former spaces of imperial expansion into destinations of Russian national travel. This holds especially true for the Volga and the Crimea.³⁴ Yet in the late nineteenth century, Russian preferences for traveling within the Russian Empire were highlighted by the ironic novel *Ours Abroad* (*Nashi zagranitse*) by Leikin.³⁵ It is the story of a Russian bourgeois couple visiting Paris and getting frustrated by never ending cultural misunderstandings. In her book *Russia at Play* Louise McReynolds concluded – following Leikin – that Russians indeed subscribed to the slogan “home is best” when it came to determining whether to travel in Russia or abroad.³⁶ Being interested in the global dimensions of Russian history, I have wondered why there has been less focus on Russian imperial subjects travelling around the world or at least across continents than on Russians vacationing either at renowned places in Europe or within the Tsarist Empire. Thus, my curiosity was sparked when I came across the following title: *In the Land of Volcanos. A Travel Account from Java in 1893* by Princess Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Shcherbatova. My enthusiasm increased further when I realized that Princess Shcherbatova had also published books on a handful of other voyages that had brought her to Syria, Palestine, Arabia and India.³⁷

Princess Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Shcherbatova began life as a Stroganova, born on September 9, 1867 into the family of Count Aleksandr Sergeevich Stroganov. In her childhood days everything related to horses became a passion of Ol'ga Aleksandrovna. She was married to Prince Aleksandr Grigor'evich Shcherbatov – as early as 1879 – who shared her interest in horses and horseback riding. Their estate Vasil'ev in the vicinity of Ruza – located to the west of Moscow – offered everything one might expect from a true nest of the gentry. Vasil'ev also included a horse breeding farm and an orangery. In addition

34 G. Hausmann, Mütterchen Wolga. Ein Fluss als Erinnerungsort vom 16. bis ins frühe 20. Jahrhundert, Frankfurt a.M. 2009, chapter 7; K. Jobst, Die Perle des Imperiums. Der russische Krim-Diskurs, Konstanz 2007, chapter IV; A. E. Gorsuch (ed.), *Turizm. The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism*, Ithaca, NY 2006; A. A. Ivanov (ed.), *Istoriia Rossiiskogo Turizma* (IX–XX v.), Moscow 2011.

35 N. A. Leikin, *Nashi zagranitse*. Iumoristicheskoe opisanie poezdki suprugov, Nikolaia Ivanovicha i Glafiry Semenovny Ivanovykh, v Parizh i obratno, 9th edn, St. Petersburg 1893.

36 L. McReynolds, *Russia at Play. Leisure Activities at the End of the Tsarist Era*, Ithaca, NY 2003, chapter 5.

37 O. A. Shcherbatova, *Po Indii i Tseilonu. Moi putevyia zametki 1890–91 gg.*, Moscow 1892; Idem, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov. V poiskakh za krovnymi arabskimi loshad'mi*, St. Petersburg 1903; Idem, *V strane vulkanov: putevye zametki na Jave 1893 goda*, Moscow 2009 (first published 1897).

to the equestrian life, the couple loved to travel. All in all, they spent 17 years travelling together within and beyond Russia and Europe.³⁸

While travels to Crimea and the Caucasus and to European metropolises such as Vienna, Paris and London were common destinations for Russians of their class, some of their other travels are more unusual. In 1888, the Shcherbatovs travelled from Beirut via Palmyra to Dair az-Zaur on the Euphrates and back. The years 1890/91 took them to India and Ceylon. In 1893 they voyaged to Java. 1895 saw the Shcherbatovs travelling through Syria and Palestine. In 1899 came Egypt, while in 1900 they repeated their 1888 trip from Beirut to Mesopotamia. In 1912, just three years before Prince Aleksandr Grigor'evich's death, the couple made their last trip abroad, this time to England and Cyprus. The Shcherbatovs seem to have had varying motivations in making their frequent trips. In 1888, the idea to travel from Beirut to Mesopotamia appears to have come about quite spontaneously – at least this is how Shcherbatova puts it in her travelogue. Killing time on the yacht of her brother in the Mediterranean Sea, the Shcherbatovs came across a book by Lady Ann Blunt: *Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates*, 2 volumes, London 1879. Without any hesitation, they promptly decided to embark on a trip following the route Lady Ann Blunt had taken. Shcherbatova dispatched her husband to the Beirut-based office of Thomas Cook to arrange the voyage. Prince Shcherbatov lost no time, and very soon the couple was off on its journey to Mesopotamia.³⁹ Although the decision to undertake this journey in 1888 seems to have come completely out of the blue it also gave them the opportunity to buy Arabic horses on yet another journey onto the Arabian peninsula in 1900. Added to the travelogue there is a list of all in all 27 horses which were acquired and transferred to Vasil'ev, the Shcherbatovs' estate.⁴⁰ In addition to travelling to acquire horses, Princess Shcherbatova displayed an erudite interest in botany. On all the voyages she took along a camera to take photographs not merely of well-known sites but also of a huge range of plants. Some of the photographs she took are displayed in her travel accounts. Thus, erudition and exploration seem to have combined as motives for her travel to far-away regions and continents.

As for the infrastructures of travel, the voyages undertaken by the Shcherbatovs displayed aspects that were both typical and particular. The Shcherbatovs travelled by sea as did all their contemporaries with mobility becoming ever more global over the course of the late nineteenth century. The Shcherbatovs boarded ships from the renowned Peninsula and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, also the choice of Jules Verne's hero Phileas Fogg during his travels *Around the World in Eighty Days*.⁴¹ As they cruised the Mediterranean Sea, the Suez Canal, and the Indian Ocean, the Shcherbatovs traveled

38 On the biographies of Princess Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Shcherbatova and Prince Aleksandr Grigor'evich Shcherbatov, see O. A. Shcherbatova, *V strane vulkanov*, pp. 5–10; A. Shcherbatov, *Pravoslavnyi prikhod – tverdnyia russkoi narodnosti*, reprint Moscow 2010, pp. 5–18; http://old.superstyle.ru/25aug2008/olga_scherbatova?print=1 (accessed 5 April 2019).

39 Shcherbatova, *Verkhom ra rodine beduinov*, pp. 3, 4.

40 Ibid., pp. 199, 200.

41 Ibid., p. 4.

as part of an international mobile European community. Nobles, bourgeois capitalists and businessmen, upper class tourists, journalists, military officers, diplomats, colonial administrators, planters and grocers – men and women from these groups and professions socialized on board, sharing meals, engaging in conversation, and playing cards and other games late into the evening.⁴² This social style was typical of transcontinental travel around 1900. Another typical aspect is the accompanied form of traveling beyond Europe. The Shcherbatovs were never on their own in provinces of the Ottoman Empire, British-India and Java. Translators, Ottoman dragomans, and representatives from the colonial administrations of India and Java always accompanied them, providing both local knowledge and the colonizer's view of India and Java.⁴³

The specifics of the voyages by the Shcherbatovs derived from their immense richness. Money simply didn't matter. They frequented the most luxurious hotels. If there were no hotels up to their accustomed European standard, they would avoid local hotels, such as Ottoman travel hostels known as Khans, which European travelers usually described as filthy. Instead the Shcherbatovs would stay in their own tent village. When they travelled, they took along both personnel and tents: a cook and servants to provide a pleasant way of life.⁴⁴

Princess Shcherbatova published her travel accounts in 1892, 1897 and 1903 with three different publishers based in Moscow and St. Petersburg. *Through India and Ceylon. My Travel Notes from 1890–1891* (*Po Indii i Ceilonu. Moi putevye zametki v 1890–1891 gg*) appeared in 1892 with Kushnerev publishers (Moscow). *In the Land of Volcanos* on her voyage to Java in 1893 (*V strane vulkanov*) appeared in 1897 with Goppe publishers in St. Petersburg. *On horseback through the Lands of the Bedouins in Search of Arab Thoroughbred Horses* (*Verkhom na rodine beduinov v poiskakh za krovnyimi arabskimi loshad'mi*) appeared in 1903 with Benke publishers in St. Petersburg.⁴⁵ She must have been inspired by exemplary travelogues she had read in advance of her voyages. In her travelogue on her voyages to Syria and the Arabian peninsula, Shcherbatova mentioned Lady Ann Blunt's *Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates*, 2 volumes, London 1879. Her books on India and Java each included a chapter called "sources" (*istochniki*) where she lists a few mostly English-language titles dealing with the geography, history, culture, and politics of the destinations in question.⁴⁶

42 Shcherbatova, *V strane vulkanov*, pp. 71–86.

43 Shcherbatova, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov*, pp. 4, 5 on the dragoman, an Ottoman interpreter and travel guide; Shcherbatova, *V strane vulkanov*, pp. 104 and 114 ff. on the Dutch consul Baud and the Dutch General Gouverneur Pinaker Khordik; Shcherbatova, *Po Indii i Tseilonu*, p. 339 on a meeting with Sir Auckland Colvin thanks to a letter of recommendation the Shcherbatovs had received from the former vice-roy of British-India Lord Litton.

44 European-style hotels in colonial cities were frequented by the Shcherbatovs throughout their travels and are referenced across the travel accounts. For a description of an ensemble of five tents for usage on the road see Shcherbatova, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov*, p. 6.

45 O. A. Shcherbatova, *Po Indii i Tseilonu*; Idem, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov. V poiskakh za krovnyimi arabskimi loshad'mi*, St. Petersburg 1903. Idem, *V strane vulkanov: putevye zametki na Jave 1893 goda*, Moscow 2009 (1897).

46 Shcherbatova, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov*, p. 3 citing Lady Anne Blunt. The "sources" are referenced in Shcherbatova, *V strane vulkanov*, p. 253 and Shcherbatov, *Po Indii i Tseilonu*, pp. 567, 568.

All three publications by Princess Shcherbatova shared common characteristics. In each case, her diaries served as the basic source for her material. The books even retained the form of a diary, including entries organized by time and place. Only a few thematic chapters appeared that departed from the diary format. All three publications highlighted the identity of the author as the first-person narrator and protagonist, all of which served as a clear indicator of the autobiographical character of the travelogues. Throughout the books Shcherbatova referred to her husband Alekandr Grigorevich with the letter "S.", the initial of her husband's pet name Sasha which added some intimacy to the text. Additionally, Shcherbatova's texts reveal insights into her emotions. She described her passage through the Suez Canal on January 7, 1893 as a *rite de passage* from cold Russia and Europe to her beloved warm Orient, a region she had longed to visit ever since her first travels there in 1888.⁴⁷ Last but not least the books were richly illustrated with Shcherbatova's own photographs. Tourist features, landscapes and plants made up for the majority of images.

As to gender issues, here were two dimensions: one was explicitly addressed by Shcherbatova herself and the other one follows from questions asked by historians. The voyages through Mesopotamia were undertaken on horseback. In her travel account, Shcherbatova time and again blamed men for delays en route. Being an experienced rider, she had numerous occasions to lament the poor performance of men on horseback. On the road they often did not know how to handle horses. And in the evening men all too often lamented being completely exhausted and tormented by muscle aches. In Shcherbatova's view, the supposedly stronger sex did not live up to its own self-imagination.⁴⁸ Here we can add her to a prominent group of European women who experienced Oriental travel as a departure into a realm of freedom.⁴⁹ In the Orient, European women found themselves freed from gendered European constraints. Gendered European norms of how to dress became quite impractical when traveling through the desert. To adapt to these circumstances, both male and female European travelers tended to dress in more or less similar ways.⁵⁰

Of more importance, Oriental travel opened up spaces of opportunity. Beyond Europe European women could more easily become engaged on fields held under firm male control in Europe and Russia: academia is a case in point here. Princess Shcherbatova often explicitly mentioned that they came across places where hitherto no Europeans had ventured.⁵¹ The photographs she took were not only designed to serve as nice illustrations in her books. Shcherbatova had a very focused interest in botany and photographed plants and described them in her travelogues in a way which came close to reporting on

47 Shcherbatova, *V strane vulkanaov*, p. 74.

48 Shcherbatova, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov*, pp. 11, 12.

49 B. Hodgson, *Die Krinoline bleibt in Kairo. Reisende Frauen 1650–1900*, German edition Hildesheim 2004; Eadem, *Die Wüste atmet Freiheit. Reisende Frauen im Orient 1717 bis 1930*, German edition Hildesheim 2006.

50 Shcherbatova, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov*, p. 21.

51 *Ibid.*, p. 79.

an expedition.⁵² Thus, she slipped into the role of explorer of foreign and uncharted spaces. Similar to the large group of amateur orientalist in the Russian Empire, we can refer to princess Shcherbatova as an amateur botanist who set out to enlarge human knowledge of the world. The Orient provided an opportunity to adopt this role, whereas in Russia universities and learned societies – such as the Imperial Geographical Society – were dominated by men. In Russian Asia only men performed the roles of discoverers, whereas Russian noble women were limited to perform the role of their husband's helpful support.⁵³

Let us now turn to notions of empire. Princess Shcherbatova describes empires in a way which completely fitted into the standard pattern of European visions of empire. The Ottoman Empire and the colonial empire of the Netherlands served as the two utmost opposed types of empire in Shcherbatova's travelogues. In tune with European mainstream images of the Ottoman Empire, Shcherbatova labelled Ottoman rule as an example of despotic rule. This becomes clear when she described an episode from her travels through Palestine and Syria in 1888.⁵⁴ An Ottoman *pasha* urged the Russian travel group to stop and ordered the Russians to submit their weapons to him. According to the *pasha*, foreigners with weapons represented a danger to the Ottoman Empire which required prompt action. The Shcherbatovs opposed the order and said that their weapons only served the purpose of hunting on their long trip through unsettled parts of the Ottoman Empire. A stand-off developed, which lasted for some days. Finally, the Shcherbatovs managed to dispatch a member of their group to a nearby town. From there a telegraph was cabled to the Russian Ministry of Foreign affairs, which in turn informed the Ottoman Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Finally, Ottoman diplomats ordered the *pasha* to let the Russians have their way and keep their weapons. Princess Shcherbatova recounted this episode in her travelogue as a telling example of arbitrary rule and thus Ottoman despotism. As to Dutch colonial rule on Java Shcherbatova was full of praise. She devoted some chapters to politics and the economy on Java. To put it short, she considered Dutch rule over Java to exemplify what we would call a true win-win situation. Local rule was exercised in traditional ways by the Javanese, while the Dutch restricted their rule to suzerainty over the colony. At the same time the Dutch uplifted the economy with benefits for both the Javanese and the Dutch – according to princess Shcherbatova.⁵⁵ This was imperial ideology in its purest form: economic bargains and the unspoken, yet clearly palpable notion of civilizational superiority of European Empires. To put it short, princess Shcherbatova's take on empire did not differ one iota from what male Europeans would have written about the Ottoman Empire and the Dutch colonial

52 Shcherbatova, *V strane vulkanov*, pp. 140–143; Shcherbatova, *Po Indii i Tseilonu*, pp. 59–64.

53 F. B. Schenk, "Ich bin des Daseins eines Zugvogels müde." Imperialier Raum und imperiale Herrschaft in der Autobiographie einer russischen Adelligen, in: *L'homme* 23 (2012) 2, pp. 49–64; M. Golbeck, *Doppelter Aufbruch. Russlands Vordringen nach Turkestan und in neue Räume der Autobiografik*, unpublished PhD manuscript, Bonn 2018.

54 Shcherbatova, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov*, pp. 56–69.

55 Shcherbatova, *V strane vulkanov*, p. 40.

empire. Clearly, empire was on princess Shcherbatova's mind and she put herself in the camp of those Europeans who contributed to exploring uncharted spaces beyond Europe, thus being a part of the imperial endeavour of exploring the world.⁵⁶

It fits into this picture that princess Shcherbatova's accounts of non-European countries and their people displayed all indicators of orientalism. In the eyes of Shcherbatova, these countries were beautiful and exotic in terms of landscape and culture, yet backward in terms of indigenous economies and despotic in terms of politics.⁵⁷ In recent times, historians have enlarged our knowledge about how women became engaged with imperial and colonial projects. For instance, in the German Kaiserreich women supporting the German colonial project in Africa pointed out that women should be fully included in creating German settler colonies in Africa as only women could contribute to the reproduction of German colonizers, thus helping to establish German rule in Africa in the long term.⁵⁸ In this case, women relied on female agencies to make their claim in supporting colonial rule. Princess Shcherbatova emulated the dominant masculine discourse of empire while at the same time she was aware of gender issues given her critique of men in her travel group.

There is even more insight into gender issues with regard to the Shcherbatovs and their travels. Prince Aleksandr Grigorevich contributed a chapter on India being colonized to his wife's account on India and Ceylon.⁵⁹ This chapter makes for fascinating reading in relation to other publications by Aleksandr Grigorevich on Russia and her future. It seems that looking into the Indian mirror Prince Aleksandr Grigorevich saw all his anxiety about Russia's destiny. Although his chapter on India made no direct reference to Russia, it shared common topics with his writing on Russia. The common denominator was the fear of being colonized. An orthodox monarchist by heart, one of the greatest fears of Prince Aleksandr Grigorevich was that Russia could – although formally independent and a great power – be colonized financially by other European powers. Thus, a noble conservative whom we would usually suspect to speak out in favour of the Russian Empire's greatness and strength was full of fear of Russia being overwhelmed and exploited by the industrial and financial forces of late nineteenth-century globalization.⁶⁰

It is worth comparing the Shcherbatovs' views of empire against commonly held assumptions of gender, empire and nation. In his book *Natasha's Dance* Orlando Figes pointed out that concepts of the Russian empire displayed notions of masculinity while visions of the Russian nation were characterized by notions of femininity. Thus, the masculine

56 J. Osterhammel and B. Barth, *Zivilisierungsmissionen. Imperiale Weltverbesserung seit dem 18. Jahrhundert*, Konstanz 2005.

57 Shcherbatova, *Verkhom na rodine beduinov*, pp. 5, 11, 18–20, 22, 40.

58 B. Kundrus, *Weiblicher Kulturimperialismus. Die imperialistischen Frauenverbände des Kaiserreichs*, in: S. Conrad and J. Osterhammel (eds.), *Das Kaiserreich transnational. Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914*, Göttingen 2004, pp. 213–235.

59 Aleksandr G. Shcherbatov contributed chapter XV on History, the Current State of Affairs and the Significance of English Rule over India to Shcherbatova, *Po Indii i Tseilonu*, pp. 535–566.

60 Aleksandr G. Shcherbatov elaborated on this in his publication from 1908, *Obnovlennaiia Rossiia*. It was reprinted in: *Russia as Pravoslavnyi prikhod – tverdnyiia russkoi narodnosti*, Moscow 2010.

empire was the force of order whereas the feminine nation was to be loved and defended. Men reached out to enlarge the empire while women and especially Russian nannies instilled love to the Russian nation into the noble sons of the fatherland.⁶¹ The Shcherbatovye completely fell out of this picture. Princess Ol'ga Shcherbatova subscribed to the masculine discourse of empire while her husband lived rather in fear of the Russian nation being colonized by European financial imperialism. Thus, the Shcherbatovs' story invites us to reconsider our assumptions about gendered visions of empire and nation in a globalized world.

3.2. Russian Contributions to the Development of International Law: The Cases of Fedor F. Martens (1845–1909) and Andrei Mandel'shtam (1869–1949)

The development of international law around 1900 is just one of many examples of how Russian actors contributed to globalizing the world in the nineteenth century. In the late nineteenth century, Russia was among the founding members of the International Telegraph Union and International Postal Union. Russia also participated in the Washington Conference which established the Greenwich Meridian and thus the time zones of the world.⁶²

It is a generally accepted view that in the last third of the nineteenth century international law took a significant step forward in terms of both becoming a distinguished academic discipline and an ever more elaborated system of international rules.⁶³ Late imperial Russia contributed its share to this development.⁶⁴ The following paragraphs focus on two jurists from the late Russian Empire: Fedor F. Martens (1845–1909) and Andrei Mandel'shtam (1869–1949). It is due to their partisanship of international law that the Russian Empire significantly contributed to the advancement of international law in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The histories of international humanitarian law, of the advancement of the laws of war, of international arbitration and of human rights – they all could not be written without considering contributions by Martens and Mandel'shtam as jurists from the Russian Empire. To drive the point home that

61 O. Figes, *Natasha's Dance. A Cultural History of Russia*, New York 2002, pp. 126, 127.

62 Russia as a co-founding member of the Postal Union: http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Vertrag,_betreffend_die_Gründung_eines_allgemeinen_Postvereins (accessed 12 April 2019); International Conference Held at Washington for the Purpose of Fixing a Prime Meridian and Universal Day, October 1884. Protocols of the Proceedings, Washington 1884, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17759/17759-h/17759-h.htm> (accessed 17 December 2011). On Russia and the International Telegraph Union: M. Siefert, "Chingis-Khan with the Telegraph". Communications in the Russian and Ottoman Empires, in: J. Leonhard and U. von Hirschhausen (eds.), *Comparing Empires. Encounters and Transfers in the Long Nineteenth Century*, Göttingen 2011, pp. 78–108, at p. 96; M. Herren, *Internationale Organisationen seit 1865. Eine Globalgeschichte der internationalen Ordnung*, Darmstadt 2009, p. 21.

63 M. Koskeniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations. The Rise and Fall of International Law 1870–1960*, Cambridge 2002; B. Fassbender and A. Peters (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of International Law*, Oxford 2012.

64 M. Aust, *Das Zarenreich in der Völkerrechtsgeschichte 1870–1914*, in: M. Aust (ed.), *Globalisierung imperial und sozialistisch. Russland und die Sowjetunion in der Globalgeschichte 1851–1991*, Frankfurt a.M. 2013, pp. 166–181.

the Russian Empire contributed to international law requires a look at self-descriptions by Fedor Martens and Andrei Mandel'shtam and their pledges of loyalty to the Russian Empire – otherwise they could be perceived as mere international experts without any affiliation to a country or an empire. Further, the stories of Martens and Mandel'shtam implicate four ongoing historiographic debates.

(1) Subjectivity: Autobiographical Practices in Late Tsarist Russia

The last two decades witnessed a significant upsurge in studies of autobiographical practices and self-descriptions by subjects from the Russian Empire. At first, historians focused their attention mostly on members of the elites. The basic assumption was that the dawn of modernity in nineteenth-century Russia doomed religious and service autobiographies. Instead of an orthodox self-description as that by Avvakum or a service autobiography as the one by Andrei Timofeevich Bolotov from the late eighteenth century, new models of self-description were emerging. Scholarship grouped them into types of intelligentsia or revolutionary autobiographies.⁶⁵ However, recent studies shed light onto a broader variety of autobiographical practices in late Tsarist Russia. Subaltern autobiographical practices have moved Russian peasants into focus.⁶⁶ Edited volumes such as *Empire Speaks Out* and *Imperial Subjects* heralded the advancement of inquiries into the empire's imprint on autobiographical practices and vice versa how they reshaped visions of empire.⁶⁷ There is still a need for studies which provide insight into the degree to which people attached significance and meaning to imperial ideologies. How did people respond to concepts of imperial ideology which both tsarist officials and the public offered? Did people make these concepts their own? Did they think of themselves as imperial subjects in a double sense: as subjects first of all defined by loyalty to the empire and the emperor and at the same time as actors who tried to shape imperial visions and concepts of how the empire might work?

(2) The History of Human Rights

There is currently a debate going on as to when the history of human rights does begin. Some argue that modern notions of human rights are merely secularized visions of protection of human beings yet contained within various religions since the ages.⁶⁸ Others claim that the enlightenment established notions of human rights, most arguably highlighted by the French Declaration des droits de l'homme in 1789.⁶⁹ Further, the

65 U. Schmid, *Ichentwürfe. Die russische Autobiographie zwischen Avvakum und Gercen*, Zurich 2000; J. Hellbeck and K. Heller (eds.), *Autobiographical Practices in Russia. Autobiographische Praktiken in Russland*, Göttingen 2004.

66 J. Herzberg, *Gegenarchive. Bäuerliche Autobiographik zwischen Zarenreich und Sowjetunion*, Bielefeld 2013.

67 I. V. Gerasimov et al. (eds.), *Empire Speaks Out. Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*, Leiden 2009; M. Aust and F. B. Schenk (eds.), *Imperial Subjects. Autobiographische Praxis in den Vielvölkerreichen der Habsburger, Romanovs und Osmanen im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 2015.

68 H. Joas, *Die Sakralität der Person. Eine neue Genealogie der Menschenrechte*, Berlin 2011.

69 L. Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights. A History*, New York 2008.

nineteenth century has come into the focus of historians writing the history of human rights. Especially the fight for the abolition of the slave trade and slavery, but also interventions into the Ottoman Empire document notions and agencies of human rights in the nineteenth century.⁷⁰ However, there are historians claiming that the global history of human rights only came into being rather recently, i.e. in the 1970s.⁷¹ These debates provide an opportunity to stress the significance of Andrei Mandel'shtam in legal history in general and in helping to stress the global notion of human rights yet in the middle of the twentieth century.

(3) Empire and International Law

Another debate concerns the significance of empire on the history of international law and human rights. Empires have moved into focus as contributors to nineteenth-century internationalization and to the issue of human rights. Especially the history of interventions in the Ottoman Empire has especially been highlighted as a history of human rights emerging in the nineteenth century.⁷² At the same time, empires have been subjected to postcolonial scholarship arguing that empires created and used principles of international law to sustain their power and status across the globe.⁷³ Russian direct and indirect rule over Iran in the very early twentieth century serves as an example of how international law could be turned into a tool of imperial rule.⁷⁴ After World War One, the League of Nations appears as another case in point. Recent historiography discusses the League of Nations as a sphere where advocates of principles as different as internationalism, empire, the nation state, decolonization, civil society and human rights were engaged in arguments with each other.⁷⁵ Fedor Martens' writings and agencies allow deep insights into how advancing international law and using it as an imperial tool were closely linked to each other.

(4) Globalizing the History of International Law

As to academic international law it is still debatable, if and how a global history of international law beyond a Eurocentric master narrative can be written.⁷⁶ This issue includes

70 F. Klose, *The Emergence of Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas and Practice from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*, Cambridge 2015.

71 S. Moyn, *The Last Utopia. Human Rights in History*, Cambridge, MA 2010; J. Eckel, *The Breakthrough. Human Rights in the 1970s*, Philadelphia, PA 2014.

72 G. Bass, *Freedom's Battle. The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention*, New York 2008; D. Rodogno, *Against Massacre. Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire 1815–1914. The Emergence of a European Concept and International Practice*, Princeton, NJ 2012.

73 C. Douzinas, *Human Rights and Empire. The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, London 2007.

74 M. Deutschmann, *An den Grenzen des Völkerrechts. Recht und internationale Anerkennung in den Beziehungen des Zarenreiches zum Iran*, in: M. Aust and J. Obertreis (eds.), *Osteuropäische Geschichte und Globalgeschichte*, Stuttgart 2014, pp. 49–68.

75 M. Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace. The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations*, Princeton, NJ 2010; S. Pedersen, *The Guardians. The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire*, Oxford 2015.

76 B. Fassbender and A. Peters, *Introduction. Towards a Global History of International Law*, in: Idem (eds.), *The Oxford History of International Law*, pp. 1–24.

the question how to integrate the past of Russian jurisprudence into the history of international law. There are yet accounts of international law characterized by a resilient robustness of eurocentrism and the master narrative of the West. This holds true for introductions into international law such as a classic German piece by Matthias Herdegen, but also for accounts by global historians such as Bruce Mazlish.⁷⁷ In critique of such accounts Francine Hirsch has highlighted Aron Trainin's significant contribution on behalf of the Soviet Union to the advancement of international law in preparing the Nuremberg trials.⁷⁸ Be that as it may, recent contributions to the field of Russia and international law frame the story in terms of "Russia and Europe" or "Russia and the West", thus highlighting encounters between supposedly separated entities and looking into differences between Russian, European, and Western understandings of international law.⁷⁹ Lauri Mälksoo once put it this way: "The big question was whether they [Martens and his disciples, M. A.] really represented Russia in European international law or rather European international law in Russia."⁸⁰ This contribution argues that the history of Russian international lawyers is not only about either Russians adopting European innovations or about Europe being embodied by Russian actors. Martens highlights the advancement of international law in terms of multiple transfers of knowledge, of circulating knowledge from Europe to Russia and from Russia to Europe and – most importantly – into a globalizing world. Russian international lawyers should not be reduced to actors on the classic playground "Russia and Europe". They should be recognized as agents contributing to globalizing the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

3.3. Fedor Fedorovich Martens (1845–1909), the Russian Empire, and International Law

On June 21, 1909 the *New York Times* issued an obituary. The day before Fedor Martens had died at the railway station Valk, which is located in the Baltic provinces of the Russian Empire. The obituary listed the institutions Martens had served and the functions he had fulfilled: permanent member of the Council of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, professor of international law at the University of St Petersburg, permanent member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, Russian plenipotentiary at many international conferences.⁸¹ The list could easily be continued in more detail: Martens' membership with the Ghent based Institut de Droit International and his ser-

77 M. Herdegen, *Völkerrecht*, 6th edn, Munich 2007, chapter 2; B. Mazlish, *The Idea of Humanity in a Global Era*, New York 2009, p. 47.

78 F. Hirsch, *The Soviets at Nuremberg. International Law, Propaganda, and the Making of the Postwar Order*, in: *American Historical Review* 113 (2008) 3, pp. 701–730.

79 L. Mälksoo, *Russian Approaches to International Law*, Oxford 2015; R. Allison, *Russia, the West, and Military Intervention*, Oxford 2013.

80 L. Mälksoo, *The History of International Legal Theory in Russia: A Civilizational Dialogue with Europe*, in: *The European Journal of International Law* 19 (2008) 1, pp. 211–232, at p. 221.

81 Frederick de Martens Dead, in: *New York Times*, 21 June 1909.

vice with the International Committee of the Red Cross come to mind.⁸² But yet those few examples from the obituary are telling. Martens was in the service of two masters: on one hand of the Russian Empire and its ministry of foreign affairs and on the other hand of the academic community and institutions of international law. Martens' childhood did not provide any hint that such a career was ahead of him. His parents were Estonians and died yet in his childhood days. Nine-year-old Martens found shelter at a Lutheran orphanage in St. Petersburg. After that he was lucky to be educated at a German Baltic school in the capital of the Russian Empire. He was able to take up his studies of law at St. Petersburg University in 1863 to finish them in 1868. The early 1870s marked the starting point of his career at St. Petersburg University and at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Martens was very well connected within the community of international law. This holds true on both the academic as well as the diplomatic level. His publications were reviewed by the leading journal *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée*. The journal was dedicated to advancing the cause of comparative jurisprudence and international law. It tried to transfer one of the basic principles of world exhibitions to the field of law. It should serve as a kind of forum, a kind of marketplace where experts from all countries of the world could communicate with each other and unite to learn from each other. In this marketplace international law was not only traded as a set of rules of diplomacy and interstate relations. It also considered issues of humanity, society and individuals.⁸³ This kind of liberal turn of international law was also reflected in Martens' *oeuvre*. In his *opus magnum* – a two-volume textbook on international law from 1882/83 – Martens stated that a state's participation in international law necessarily required that the state obeyed basic principles of humanity and of the *Rechtsstaat*: only those states which were ruled by law could participate in international law.⁸⁴

But Martens' dedication to the field of international law did not stop at academic endeavours. As a diplomat of the Russian empire Martens tried to advance international law in two fields: international humanitarian law and international arbitration. In the last third of the nineteenth century, what jurists called *ius in bello* moved increasingly onto the international agenda. At this point Martens shared the roadmap laid out by the International Committee of the Red Cross. The Red Cross was eager to improve the lot of wounded soldiers on the battleground and also to establish rules which should protect civilians from being affected by military action.⁸⁵ Further, Martens made it his cause to advance and to institutionalize international arbitration. In 1899, the Hague Conference

82 The basic biography is V. V. Pustogarov, *Fedor Fedorovich Martens. Jurist, Diplomat*, Moscow 1999.

83 G. Rolin-Jaequemyns, *De l'étude de la législation comparée et du droit international*, in: *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée* 1 (1869), pp. 117.

84 On Martens and the notion of civilization, see *Völkerrecht. Das internationale Recht der civilisirten Nationen. Systematisch dargestellt von Friedrich von Martens. Deutsche Ausgabe von Carl Bergbohm*. 2 vols, Berlin 1883/86. See also Pustogarov, *Fedor Fedorovich Martens*, pp. 118 ff.

85 On Martens and humanitarian law, see Pustogarov, *Fedor Fedorovich Martens*, pp. 98 ff. and chapter VI. See also I. S. Rybachenok, *Rossiiā i Pervaia Konferentsiia Mira 1899 goda v Gaage*, Moscow 2005.

established a Permanent Court of Arbitration. Several states, among them Great Britain, Venezuela, the USA, and Mexico engaged Martens as arbitrator of their conflicts.⁸⁶

Martens had the idea that serving the Russian empire and advancing international rule of law would not urge him to take sides. There are at least two answers to the question as how Martens thought about the two roles he was playing. Firstly, he might have believed that he could deliberately switch from one role to the other. And secondly, he must have subscribed to the firm belief that the Russian empire ultimately was acting in favour of international law. Martens followed a line on which his two affiliations were to reinforce each other. Whenever the Russian ministry of foreign affairs or such high ranking and prominent figures as Count Witte asked him for an advice or a favour, Martens was convinced that this was the appropriate way to acknowledge his international experience and reputation. Conversely, whenever Martens participated in international conferences he introduced himself as a professor from St. Petersburg University and as permanent member of the Permanent Council of the Russian ministry of foreign affairs.⁸⁷

How Martens tried to switch between his academic and diplomatic roles is also illustrated by portraits from his early career in the 1880s. Both photographs are obviously part of a larger series of photographs which show Martens displaying different dresses and attributes.⁸⁸



86 On Martens and arbitration, see Frederic de Martens, in: *The American Journal of International Law* 4 (1909), pp. 983–985; Pustogarov, *Fedor Fedorovich Martens*, chapter VII.

87 Pustogarov, *Fedor Fedorovich Martens*, p. 116.

88 Source: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedrich_Fromhold_Martens (accessed 23 April 2019).



The first photograph shows Martens as a scholar with a doctoral cap, a kind of robe (an academic gown) and a book. This photograph depicts Martens in pure academic terms. There are no visual signs of Russia or the state. The second photograph shows Martens wearing a kind of uniform adorned with medals. Indeed, Martens had received several medals, among them the order of Aleksandr Nevskii and the order of the White Eagle.⁸⁹ These attributes signify that Martens was in search of official recognition of his position. He was keen to be rewarded and honoured by the state, the Russian Empire he was serving.

There are numerous examples which illustrate how Martens put his loyalty to the Empire on display and how he documented it in his autobiographical texts. One example leads us to British-Russian relations and Central Asia. Generally, British and Russian images of the self and the other mirrored and reinforced each other. Both empires perceived themselves as just and peaceful whereas the other power in each case was portrayed as aggressive und suppressive. British publications from the late nineteenth century were convinced that Russian foreign policy pursued a master plan to conquer India. At least to the British public the “Great Game” – originally a literary term referring to Russian skills at playing chess – became a political metaphor of British-Russian rivalry in Central Asia.⁹⁰

89 https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedrich_Fromhold_Martens (accessed 12 April 2019).

90 On imperial mirror images in Great Britain and Russia, see M. Aust, *Rossia i Velikobritaniia. Vneshniaia politika i obrazy imperii. Ot krymskoi voiny do pervoi mirovoi voiny*, in: Aust et al. (eds.), *Imperium inter pares*, pp. 244–265.

In 1879/81 Martens and John Westlake – professor of international law at Cambridge University – became involved in the “Great Game”. British public opinion had been stirred up by a Russian expeditionary force in Kabul, which was warmly received by the Afghan Emir Shir Ali who stubbornly refused to accept a British deputation on the same terms as the Russian one. While newspapers were speculating on a Russian-British war, Martens suggested a new approach to Central-Asian politics by Great Britain and Russia. He proposed that the two powers the sooner the better might come to fix a Russian-British border across Central Asia. According to Martens the benefits of such a border were first a guarantee of peace in the region and secondly it offered to Russia and Great Britain an opportunity to commit themselves to their true destiny in world history: Namely a civilizing mission among the muslim and nomadic peoples of Central Asia. Martens appealed to Russia’s and Britain’s sense of responsibility as great powers (*velikie derzhavy*) that the abundance of Central Asian space allowed them to display the forces of both the English as well as the Russian people (*angliiskii i russkii narody*) in terms of equality and mutually assured honesty and confidence.⁹¹

Rather than shaking Martens’ hand, Westlake engaged in an argument with his Russian colleague. Westlake claims that he was not speaking out in favour of actual British foreign policy, especially with regard to Afghanistan. But he was sure that in writing *Russia and England in Central Asia* Martens was trapped by Russian patriotism. Directly responding to Martens, Westlake claimed that contrary to Martens there was no evidence that Great Britain had violated any treaty on Afghan neutrality. What Martens had referred to as a text with a treaty-like quality was rather – according to Westlake – evidence of ordinary talks (French: *pourparlers*), which the Indian viceroy Forsyth had led in St. Petersburg. Thus, Martens was simply incorrect. The Cambridge professor went on to point out that rather than blaming Britain, it was time to acknowledge an aggressive design of Russian expansion. To temper this argument, Westlake continued to point out that in both empires there were some men of low instincts trying to aggressively expand their country’s domains wherever possible and other men of good will. Westlake quickly reassured his readers that Martens probably would belong to the good-will-party. But nevertheless, Westlake insisted: There was a very long way ahead of British-Russian reconciliation and any kind of incorrectness à la Martens in his *Russia and England in Central Asia* would do harm to it.⁹²

Martens felt the urge to answer. In his reaction to Westlake, Martens tried to map some common ground. Both of them, according to Martens, were convinced that a Russian-British clash in Central Asia probably would have disastrous consequences for both sides. But finally, Martens refuted that Russia was an aggressive power. Martens ended up declaring that with regard to Afghanistan, first Great Britain had changed the *status quo* so

91 F. de Martens, La Russie et l’Angleterre dans l’Asie Centrale, in: Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée 11 (1879), pp. 227–301.

92 J. Westlake, La Russie et l’Angleterre dans l’Asie Centrale. Réponse à M. Martens, in: Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée 11 (1879), pp. 401–410.

that Russia was forced to respond by conquering Merv. Martens had reached out to calm great power rivalry by means of international law. He ended up legitimizing Russian expansion. The dispute between Martens and Westlake had taken place on the pages of a journal which was dedicated to the cause of international law. In this case, two renowned international lawyers lost common ground and spoke out in favour of their countries. Martens had given insight into his loyalty to the Russian Empire.⁹³

In turn, the Russian Empire did not always meet Martens' expectations. The Empire knew when and how to make use of Martens' services. In 1906, French financiers were discussing another large French loan to Russia with Count Witte. It turned out that the French were willing to fix the deal but they came up with one last demand. They asked the Russian side to provide an official letter by Martens which was to state that any changes of the deal were out of reach of the Russian Parliament, the Duma. Witte did his best to make Martens produce such a text. Martens felt honoured and delivered what he was asked to do. On April 4, 1906 the deal was fixed. Russia received 2,25 billion Francs.⁹⁴ On April 27, 1906 there was a grand ceremony to open the Duma in the Winter Palace. Martens hoped to be invited – but he was not. It came as a further blow to him that he did not receive a seat in the State Council (*Gosudarstvennyi Sovet*). Thus, Martens realised that his international reputation and his service to the empire were not freely convertible into the degree of official acknowledgement he had hoped for in Russia. Martens turned to his diary to pen down his disappointment.⁹⁵

His diary did not fit the model of the diary of the Victorian age. In his diary, Martens did not dive into all facets of his professional and private life to explore and describe himself as a modern, emotional, and complex character. Rather, the diary was strictly limited to his professional life. It was all about his work, the university, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the recognition Martens expected others to pay to his work. It comes as no surprise that many pages of Martens' diary were dedicated to the frustrations of such high-flying expectations. However, his diary was characteristic of the bureaucratic diary of late Tsarist Russia. These diaries displayed loyalty to the Tsar and the Empire. At the same time, they can be characterized as a prolonged version of the service autobiography. Thus, Russia still offered opportunity to link one's hopes and loyalty to the empire. Martens did so and used his diary to document his imperial loyalty.⁹⁶

The community of international lawyers offered much more recognition to Martens. Ever since the Institut de Droit International had been founded, Martens' major works were reviewed by the journal of the institute, the *Revue de Droit International et de Lé-*

93 F. de Martens, *La Russie et l'Angleterre dans l'Asie Centrale*. Réplique à M. Westlake, in: *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée* 12 (1880), pp. 47–59.

94 Russia's Policy in 1905–1907 from a Diary of F. F. Martens, in: *International Affairs* 2 (1996), pp. 240–249, at pp. 243–245.

95 *Ibid.*, p. 246.

96 P. Holquist, *Bureaucratic Diaries and Imperial Experts*. Autobiographical Writing in Tsarist Russia in the late Nineteenth Century; Fedor Martens, Dmitrii Miliutin, Petr Valuev, in: Aust and Schenk (eds.), *Imperial Subjects*, pp. 205–232.

gislation Comparée. I will focus on reviews of three titles by Martens: his second book *The Office of Consul and Consular Jurisdiction in the East*, a multi-volume series of treaties Russia had concluded with other powers edited by Martens, and last but not least his *opus magnum*, a general outline of international law.

In 1873, Martens published his second book *O konsulakh i konsul'skoi iurisdiktсии na vostokey* (*The Office of Consul and Consular Jurisdiction in the East*). It was soon translated into German.⁹⁷ This monograph discussed a century-old privilege of non-Muslims within the confines of the Ottoman Empire. From the fifteenth century onward, Ottoman sultans had conceded privileges to European merchants. Since the eighteenth century, European ambassadors had turned these former privileges into their right to protect non-muslim subjects in the Ottoman empire.⁹⁸ Thus, a christian-muslim divide within the Ottoman judicial system was reinforced. European tradesmen and visitors and even non-muslim subjects were out of reach of Ottoman courts.

In 1874, the *Revue* published two reviews of Martens' book on the office of consul. The first one reviewed the Russian book, the second its translation into German.⁹⁹ Both reviews, which were written by one reviewer, agreed that Martens' book was worth some accolades. The book was said to be both of high academic value and of particular interest to all those who were in need of information on judicial proceedings in the muslim East. The reviews included a special praise of Martens' juristic sense (French: *le sens juridique*). Martens' contribution was praised for covering the legislation of many countries with regard to the office of consul. These were: France, Great Britain, Germany and former Prussia, Austria, Italy, Spain, Belgium, the Netherlands, the USA, and Russia. The reviewer fully agreed with Martens' vision of development. For the time being – according to both Martens and his reviewer – there was still a cultural divide between the above-mentioned civilized states and the islamic world. But both anticipated a future time in which islamic countries would come into touch with history and would thus abandon the immobility of the Koran to build relations with western states which deserved the title of true international relations (French: *rapports internationaux*). So, Russia was not merely a part of the international club, her international lawyers, represented by Martens, also participated in the global project to spread civilization in islamic countries.

Yet in the same year, 1874, the *Revue* reviewed another work prominently connected with Martens: the first volume of the *Recueil des traités et conventions conclus par la Russie avec les puissances étrangères*. Martens edited this series of documents on behalf of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. From 1874 to 1909, 15 volumes appeared in print. The order of these 15 volumes was not chronological, but spatial and political: the series was grouped into treaties with Austria, Great Britain, France, and Prussia/Germany.¹⁰⁰

97 F. F. Martens, *O konsulakh i konsul'skoi iurisdiktсии na vostokey*, St. Petersburg 1873, German edition: *Das Consularwesen und die Consularjurisdiction im Orient*. Mit Ergänzungen des Autors, Berlin 1874.

98 S. Faroghi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World around it*, London 2006, p. 61.

99 *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée* 6 (1874), pp. 145–147, 705, 706.

100 *Recueil des traités et conventions conclus par la Russie avec les puissances étrangères*, 15 vols, St. Petersburg 1874–1909.

The review in the *Revue de Droit International* concerned the first volume, which included Russian-Austrian treaties from 1648 to 1762.¹⁰¹ It concluded that the series had started under excellent conditions. Martens was applauded for the political order of the series, which he seemed to have adopted from an American edition of treaties. Further, Martens' introduction into the diplomatic history of each treaty was highly welcomed. Finally, the reviewer wished Martens and the series a happy future and recommended other governments to follow the Russian example.

Thirdly, a few words on the perception of Martens' *opus magnum*, *International Law of Civilized Nations* (1881, 1882), are in order.¹⁰² When Martens had continued his studies of international law at the universities of Leipzig, Vienna, and Heidelberg in 1868/69, he had the opportunity to listen to lectures delivered by Johann Caspar Bluntschli. At that time, Bluntschli had just finished his systematic account of international law. It appeared in print in 1868¹⁰³ and was soon translated into several languages, among others also Russian. It took Martens roughly a decade to follow Bluntschli's footsteps and to come up with his own general outline of international law. The *Revue de Droit International* was quick to review its first volume in 1882.¹⁰⁴ The reviewer – A. Bulmerincq from Heidelberg – first acknowledged that prior to Martens' *opus* there only had been a few works on international law and no monograph on the whole body of international law written in Russian. Although Bulmerincq hesitated to pronounce a final statement on the book prior to the second volume being published, he was ready to acknowledge Martens' sovereign mastery of the subject. According to this review, the first volume had to be counted among Martens' merits. Discussing the second volume of Martens' work, Bulmerincq readily underscored the merits which Martens deserved.¹⁰⁵

All in all, these three reviews allow to refer to Martens as a lawyer's lawyer, highly accepted among his peers. And by the works of Martens, Russian scholarship was regarded as a significant contributor to the advancement of international law. There are yet two episodes to relate which highlight Martens' reception across the globe. Martens' textbook on international law was broadly received in many countries. It was translated into many languages, among them Persian, Chinese, and Japanese. In 1905, on the occasion of his release from Russian war captivity, a Japanese soldier said that due to Martens people in Japan was familiar with standards of international law, as it was studied in Japan on the basis of Martens' book.¹⁰⁶ In its obituary, the *American Journal of International Law* (1909) paid tribute to Martens as an international arbitrator:

101 *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée* 6 (1874), pp. 709, 710.

102 F. von Martens, *Völkerrecht. Das internationale Recht der civilisirten Nationen*, 2 vols, Berlin 1883, 1886 (first published in Russian in 1881, 1882).

103 J. C. Bluntschli, *Das moderne Völkerrecht der civilisirten Staaten. Als Rechtsbuch dargestellt*, Nördlingen 1868.

104 *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée* 14 (1882), pp. 444–446.

105 *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée* 15 (1883), pp. 630–632.

106 This anecdote can be found in Martens' diary. He penned it down on 17 March 1906 upon being informed by the Empire's General Staff about it: Russia's Policy in 1905–1907 from a Diary of F. F. Martens, in: *International Affairs* 2 (1996), pp. 240–249, at p. 243.

*The death of Professor Frederic de Martens on June 20, 1909, has deprived international law of one of the admitted masters of the science, and international arbitration of its most distinguished and experienced partisan.*¹⁰⁷

These voices from America and Japan indicated the scale of Martens' global perception. As a Russian scholar, Martens not only represented international law in Europe. His works were well perceived beyond Europe. Martens contributed to advancing and globalizing international law. Through the prism of Martens and international law it also becomes clear that the Russian Empire was an active player in advancing international law and bringing about the globalized world around 1900.

3.4. Andrei Mandel'shtam (1869–1949): From Minority Protection to Human Rights

Andrei Mandel'shtam received his academic training as a jurist from Fedor Fedorovich Martens at St. Petersburg University. At the Hague Conference 1907, Mandel'shtam served as assistant to Martens. From 1898 to 1914 he was posted to the Russian Embassy in Constantinople. In 1913, he authored a plan for an Armenian province in the Ottoman Empire under joint international supervision by the Sultan and the European Great Powers. The plan did not materialize, but marked Mandel'shtam's point of departure into the field of minority rights and minority protection. Instead of being protected, Armenians suffered atrocities in World War One, which the Allies Russia, Great Britain, and France described as "crimes against humanity" in their note from 24 May 1915 to the Sublime Porte:

In view of these new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization the Allied governments announce publicly to the Sublime Porte that they will hold personally responsible for these crimes all members of the Ottoman government and those of their agents who are implicated in such massacres.

This view prolonged and further elaborated some of the principles of interventions into the Ottoman Empire during the course of the nineteenth century. Yet in 1877, Fedor Martens had justified the Russian war against the Ottoman Empire on the grounds of Christianity and humanity.¹⁰⁸

In the summer of 1917, the Russian Provisional Government asked Mandel'shtam to serve as minister of foreign affairs. At that time Mandel'shtam was busy finishing his book on the fate of the Ottoman Empire: *Le Sort de l'Empire Ottoman*. The atrocities

107 Frederic de Martens, in: *The American Journal of International Law* 4 (1909), pp. 983–985.

108 On Mandel'shtam, see H. Aust, *From Diplomat to Academic Activist: André Mandelstam and the History of Human Rights*, in: *European Journal of International Law* 25 (2014), pp. 1105–1121. Martens legitimizing Russia's war against the Ottoman Empire in 1877: *Die russische Politik in der Orientalischen Frage. Eine historische Studie von F. Martens, Professor an der St. Petersburger Universität, St. Petersburg 1877* (Separat-Abdruck aus der *Russischen Revue*, Bd. XI). On Russia, France, Great Britain, and their Allied Note from May 1915, see Mazlish, *The Idea of Humanity*, p. 31.

against Armenians in the Ottoman Empire had become a major factor in Mandel'shtam's work. In his book on the Ottoman Empire Mandel'shtam described himself as a liberal Russian and Jurist in favour of the law, having spent 16 years in a country declaring war on the idea of law. Mandel'shtam attached his hopes to the words of the British foreign minister Lord Grey who had declared on 23 October 1916 that the war would be carried on until the supremacy of law over force would be reinstalled. Mandel'shtam had his very own interpretation of that statement. In Mandel'shtam's eyes, these words foretold a union of nations whose power should stand above that of national states. Mandel'shtam imagined the reduction of state sovereignty in the name of law and internationalization.¹⁰⁹ However, in the 1920s being both an emigrant in Paris and a member of an international group of jurists (most notably in the Institut de Droit International), Mandel'shtam first had to deal with issues more down to earth. Minority protection, conflicts between states and their interaction with the League of Nations ranked high on his agenda. Mandel'shtam arrived at the conclusion that minority protection triggered conflicts between states and that the issue of protection would be better served moving it from minority protection to a general protection of human rights. This inspired Mandel'shtam's contribution to a declaration by the Institut de Droit International at its meeting in New York in 1929. This declaration highlighted the idea of rule of law in a civilized world. The declaration envisaged the guarantee of the rights of life, freedom and property, equal protection of rights for all human beings regardless of sex, language, religion, nationality, and race, and the individual freedom to choose religion and language. Last but not least states should be prohibited from discriminating their citizens. The New York declaration from 1929 was not written into positive law at that time. However, the declaration's significance should not be underestimated. The declaration and Mandel'shtam's works relating to it belonged to jurists' basic reading well into the 1960s. International lawyers authoring the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights had read Mandel'shtam's works. Thus, Mandel'shtam's biography and his work as a jurist appear to be a link between legal scholarship and diplomatic agency of late Imperial Russia and the coming into being of global human rights protection by the UN in the middle of the twentieth century. Thus, the history of international law cannot be written without taking into account late Imperial Russia's contribution to the advancement of international law.¹¹⁰

4. Conclusion

From the point of view of a historian of Russia the major challenge in applying global history approaches to the study of Russia's past is to address local and regional specifics on the one hand and global factors and developments on the other, while at the same

109 A. Mandelstam, *Le sort de l'empire Ottoman*, Lausanne 1917, p. IX.

110 Aust, *From Diplomat to Academic Activist*, pp. 1110–1115; J. H. Burgers, *The Road to San Francisco. The Revival of the Human Rights Idea in the Twentieth Century*, in: *Human Rights Quarterly* 14 (1992) 4, pp. 447–477, at pp. 450–454.

time exploring the connectivity between them. Another tightrope walk balances large-scale comparisons of Russia in world history and the synchronicity and connectivity of the global history project. To be sure, the latter is on the agenda of historians of Russia. However, explorations of Russian connectivities in a globalizing world run the danger to reproduce findings which historiographies of other empires, most notably of the British Empire, have long come up with.¹¹¹ Running on parallel tracks, sometimes the train of global historians seems to be ahead of the train of Russian historians with the passengers of the global train asking the driver of the Russian train: what is peculiar about connectivity? Would it not rather be interesting to learn more about what is peculiar about Russia? Historians of Russia have for quite a while – with good reasons – been trying to normalize Russian history by renouncing notions of a Russian *Sonderweg* or Russian backwardness.¹¹² However, historians of Russia should not forget to explain to the academic community what makes Russian history worth studying in comparison to other histories. Current projects by historians of Russia show a lot of potential in becoming engaged with the research agendas of global history. Examples include histories of economic growth, infrastructures of communications as well as the history of the Russian state budget.¹¹³

These examples share a common denominator: the return of financial and economic history to historiography on the Russian Empire. In the USA and Europe, the cultural turn had nearly transferred economic and financial history to oblivion. Engaging with global history will allow historians to readdress old themes of Russian history in a new way. Economic histories of Russia have stressed the Empire's shortness of capital. Without sufficient Russian capital to drive heavy industrialization from ca. 1890 onward, the Russian State jumped in to attract capital from abroad, especially from Russia's new ally France. This at least is the way classic historiography of Russia puts it.¹¹⁴ This contributed to the notion of Russian backwardness from the perspective of macroeconomics. However, L. I. Borodkin and A. V. Konovalova have recently shown that big Russian industrial enterprises fared very well at the St. Petersburg stock exchange when it came to acquiring fresh capital on the Russian and international financial markets.¹¹⁵ Their

111 N. Ferguson, *Empire. How Britain Made the Modern World*, London 2007 (2003); G. B. Magee and A. S. Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation. Networks of People, Goods, and Capital in the British World, c. 1850–1914*, Cambridge, UK 2010.

112 M. Aust, *New Perspectives on Russian History in World History*, in: *Kritika. Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 17 (2016) 1, pp. 139–150.

113 A. Stanziani, *Russian Economic Growth in a Global Perspective*, in: *Kritika. Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 17 (2016) 1, pp. 151–162. At the University of Basel, Frithjof Benjamin Schenk and Boris Belge are currently working on Russian and international hubs of communication. Ekaterina Pravilova, *Finansy Imperii: Dengi i vlast' v politike Rossii na natsionalnykh okrainakh* [Finances of Empire: Money and Power in Russian policy in the imperial borderlands], Moscow 2006.

114 A. Gerschenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge, MA 1962; Idem, *Europe in the Russian Mirror. Four Lectures in Economic History*, Cambridge, UK 1970; D. Geyer, *Der russische Imperialismus. Studien zum Zusammenhang von innerer und auswärtiger Politik*, Göttingen 1977; M. Hildermeier, *Geschichte Russlands. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Oktoberrevolution*, Munich 2013, p. 1155.

115 L. I. Borodkin and A. V. Konovalova, *Rossiiskii fondovyi rynok v nachale XX veka. Faktory kursovoi dinamiki*, St. Petersburg 2010.

book can be read as an imperative to depart from macroeconomics and the whole economic system and instead look at specific economic actors and their agencies. At the same time it is worth investigating how individual entrepreneurs and individual banks in Russia acted to participate in the globalized economy and on international financial markets around 1900. The Russian State Historical Archive (*Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii Arkhiv*, RGIA, St. Petersburg) has a collection on Russian private banks which promises to shed new light on Russian agencies on the international financial market.¹¹⁶ Eleven banks are of special interest. These are either Russian banks engaged in railroad construction, heavy industry and international trade or banks operating bilateral commercial relations between Russia and other countries. Among the latter are Dutch-Russian, Russo-British, Russo-French, Russo-Asian and Russo-Chinese banks. Both types of banks display archival holdings on meetings, reports and – most importantly – correspondence with business partners abroad. Studying these materials will be only one way to increase communications between the trains of Russian history and global history on parallel tracks.

116 Russian State Historical Archive (*Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii Arkhiv*) RGIA, inventories of private banks (*fondy chastnykh bankov*), <http://fgurgia.ru/showObject.do?object=33730880> (accessed 5 May 2014).