

France is usually the exception that proves the rule. Katrin Rücker's "Why was there no 'Accidental Armageddon' Discourse in France? How Defense Intellectuals, Peace Movements, and Public Opinion Rethought the Cold War during the Euromissile Crisis", confronts us with this phenomenon. The closing article by Enrico Böhm entitled "Building Trust: The G7 Summits and International Leadership in Nuclear Politics" reminds us of the nuclear origins of institutions to which we have grown accustomed and that have lost their "nuclearity"³ in today's public discourse.

Alongside the ever-changing narratives of nuclear vices and virtues,⁴ shifting nuclearity is probably one of the most interesting topics to study in nuclear history. What better way to start exploring such avenues than by reading the widely-appealing articles in this book.

Notes

- 1 B. Greiner/Ch. Th. Müller, D. Walter, *Angst im Kalten Krieg*, Hamburg 2009.
- 2 R. Graf, *Gefährdungen der Energiesicherheit und die Angst vor der Angst. Westliche Industrieländer und das arabische Ölembargo 1973/74*, in: P. Bormann/T. Freiberger/J. Michel (eds.), *Angst in den internationalen Beziehungen*, Göttingen/Bonn 2010, p. 73–92.
- 3 For the concept of nuclearity, see G. Hecht: *Nuclear Ontologies*, in: *Constellations* 13 (2006), pp. 320–331.
- 4 K. Kalmbach: *Revisiting the Nuclear Age. State of the Art Research in Nuclear History*, in: *Neue Politische Literatur* 1 (2017), pp. 51–52.

Matthew Frank: Making Minorities History. Population Transfer in Twentieth-Century Europe, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2017, 464 p.

Reviewed by
Umut Özsü, Ottawa

In this new and exciting work of political and diplomatic history (and also intellectual history), Matthew Frank, an associate professor of international history at the University of Leeds, sets out to provide a history of population transfer in Europe during the course of the twentieth century. Rather than focusing exclusively on a specific socio-historical context marked by a particular experience of population transfer – movements envisioned or coordinated by Nazi-affiliated Romanian officials, say, or the forced migrations that accompanied the dissolution of Yugoslavia in the 1990s – Frank elects to chart the rise and fall of what many jurists, historians, and sociologists, not to mention diplomats and journalists, have long understood as a specific mode of nation-state-building. Much of this ground is well-trodden, with key stops on Frank's journey – the Greek-Turkish population exchange, the first large-scale legally sanctioned compulsory exchange of its kind, population transfers and related deportations and expulsions in the Soviet Union before and after the Second World War, Allied-organized expulsions of ethnic Germans from central and eastern Europe after 1945, and various transfers, some implemented and others

merely proposed, in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and elsewhere in central and eastern Europe – having been examined in detail by a range of other scholars. Frank draws dutifully from this secondary literature but reinforces and supplements it with an exceptionally impressive range of materials from state, personal, and international archives. The writing is precise, the research is meticulous, and the basic objective – to map the extensive use to which an idea of marginal significance at the turn of the twentieth century came to be put during the decades that followed – is both eminently important and commendably clear. I enjoyed reading it a great deal.

The book raises a host of questions of general theoretical and methodological interest. Two such questions are especially worth noting here. First, the scope of any history of the sort that Frank sets out to provide will turn to a significant degree on the way in which its central organizing concept – which, in this case, happens to be a euphemism for legally formalized dispossession and displacement – is understood by the scholar in question. The phenomena captured by a term like “population transfer” are many and varied, and one may, therefore, broach the topic from a host of disciplinary and inter-disciplinary perspectives. Still, notwithstanding its origins in several obscure and largely unread writings from the final decade of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth which Frank has rescued and which he analyzes quite nicely (pp. 18–32),¹ “population transfer” is at root a term of preponderantly legal usage and significance, one elaborated and popularized in the vocabulary of the technocratic international law sponsored by the League

of Nations after the disintegration of the Concert of Europe system. Post-Second World War treaties like the 1948 Genocide Convention and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 ultimately prohibited forcible transfer of peoples, either expressly or impliedly, and they were accompanied by a litany of oft-quoted but legally non-binding instruments like the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But twentieth-century international lawyers – practising lawyers, law professors, legal advisers, and other state functionaries, and those who performed some combination of these roles – have had a fair deal to say about population transfer, and the inter-war period was certainly no exception to this rule. This is so not least on account of the central role that lawyers have played in drafting, interpreting, and implementing the treaties and other legal instruments that justify and sometimes even formally authorize such movements.

Frank is admirably forthright about how he understands population transfer. He defines it on the book's first page as “the idea that, in order to construct stable and homogeneous nation-states and a peaceful international order out of them, national minorities could be relocated en masse in an orderly way with minimal economic and political disruption as long as there was sufficient planning, bureaucratic oversight, and international support in place” (p. 1). This formulation makes for tidy functionalism: institutional coordination of en masse displacement is used to craft nation-states whose ethno-confessional homogeneity promises to ensure social cohesion, political stability, and economic development. Yet it misses what is arguably the most crucial feature of what has come

to be called “population transfer”, namely that it is constituted, sanctioned, and legitimated in and through international law. The absence of any reference to law in this definition sheds light on the limitations of Frank’s general approach to the historical record. Frank attends to treaty-making conferences and the basic terms of certain treaties at several points in the book, but with the exception of a brief and tellingly insightful discussion of Nicolas Politis, an international lawyer who represented Greece as a foreign minister, ambassador to the League, and in various other capacities, there is little direct engagement with the specifically legal dimensions of population transfer. This, in my view, is a lost opportunity, especially given Frank’s talents and skilful craftsmanship. The movements Frank examines would not have been undertaken or entertained in the way they were, nor possibly as intensively and frequently as they were, had it not been for a general willingness on the part of all relevant actors to rely heavily upon treaties, agreements, and all manner of other legal instruments, including pieces of domestic legislation. It is interesting, at any rate, that the term “international law” surfaces only rarely in the book after putting in an obligatory brief appearance in its very first sentence.

The second point of general theoretical and methodological interest must, unfortunately, be expressed even more directly: *Making Minorities History* is an essentially Eurocentric book. An exceedingly good one, outstanding at times in its command of obscure unpublished sources in multiple languages, but one that is marked by an oddly persistent indifference toward the extra-European world. The difficulty

here is that it is no longer possible to write about a phenomenon that is intrinsically and definitionally international, in the double sense of being about mass movements across borders and being made possible through legal rules and institutions for managing inter-state relations, without situating “specifically European” developments in a broader comparative context. Flat assertions to the effect that “this book limits its scope to Europe for the most part” (p. 5) are not enough to justify such neglect of the broader global framework, particularly since countless waves of “global history” and “international history” have established that technologies of state-building, even those of specific regional provenance or application, may be understood adequately only within larger frameworks for analyzing their similarities and differences. On this point, Frank appears to think otherwise. There are passing references to the partition of British India in 1947 (e.g. pp. 365–367, 369), and slightly more about the expulsion of Palestinian Arabs the following year (e.g. pp. 181, 365–369). But little attempt is made to situate the history of “population transfer in twentieth-century Europe” (itself a somewhat overdrawn categorization given that, as he too agrees, legally organized inter-state transfers owe their modern origins to a region on the periphery of Europe and known widely at the time as the “Near East”) in a modular theory of the different modes of nation-state-building in global circulation in the early twentieth century. Lacking such comparators, the specificity of population transfer is occluded, a superabundance of empirical data being provided at the expense of a real explanation of population transfer’s struc-

tural role in the creation and recreation of states and societies alike. In order to provide such an explanation, Frank would have had to transform the suggestive observations in the book's brief conclusion (pp. 407–415) into a robust guiding argument, to be threaded from one end of the book to the other. He also would have needed to have been less given to accepting the orientalist views of Western diplomats like Joseph Grew at face value (p. 68), and less inclined to gloss the work of Giulio Cesare Montagna, an Italian official who played an important role in preparing the treaty for the Greek-Turkish exchange, as having “carried out his task with equanimity, fairness, and good humour” (p. 70). Perhaps most tellingly, he would need to have been less insistent on downplaying Fridtjof Nansen's role in its design and implementation as the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (even as he documents in great detail how Nansen threw his weight behind the idea, laid the groundwork for its acceptance, agreed that it could be compulsory, championed it before statesmen, diplomats, and journalists, expressed dismay when initially unable to conclude a treaty that would formalize it, intervened powerfully in the Conference of Lausanne in December 1922 to underscore its urgent necessity, made glowing references to the resettlement efforts with which it was accompanied in his Nobel Peace Prize speech later that month, helped to secure the financial and institutional support of the League and foreign governments, and claimed partial responsibility for it for years to come (pp. 50–58, 61–70, 88–89, 410–411).

Making Minorities History is a deeply researched and carefully constructed work

that will be of great interest to scholars and students of state-building, forced migration, minority politics, empire and decolonization, and twentieth-century European history. Like any book, it is not without its limitations. But it is a valuable and enriching contribution to the growing literature on population transfer's manifold histories, and it should be consulted by all those interested in the study of “nations and nationalism”, broadly understood. Once again, I benefited from it a great deal.

Note

- 1 Here Frank refines and augments a discussion initially sketched in his first book. See M. Frank, *Expelling the Germans: British Opinion and post-1945 Population Transfer in Context*, Oxford 2007, pp. 15–16.

**Tanja Bühner / Flavio Eichmann / Stig Förster / Benedikt Stuchtey (eds.):
Cooperation and Empire: Local
Realities of Global Processes, New
York: Berghahn Books 2017, 392 p.**

Reviewed by
Satoshi Mizutani, Kyoto

In this age, when colonialism is universally condemned, why do we study those indigenous peoples who are seen to have cooperated with European colonial empires? Why not just focus on ‘subalterns,’ dissidents, or revolutionaries? Ever since Ronald Robinson famously brought the issue to the forefront of academic debate in the 1970s, with his theory of ‘collabora-