



Provided by the author(s) and NUI Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Investigating colonialism within Europe
Author(s)	Healy, Róisín; Dal Lago, Enrico
Publication Date	2014
Publication Information	Healy, Róisín, & Dal Lago, Enrico. (2014). Investigating colonialism within Europe. In Róisín Healy & Enrico Dal Lago (Eds.), <i>The shadow of colonialism on Europe's modern past</i> . London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Publisher	Palgrave Macmillan
Link to publisher's version	https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9781137450746
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/15413

Downloaded 2019-10-17T15:50:04Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



Chapter One

Investigating Colonialism within Europe

Róisín Healy and Enrico Dal Lago

“With nearly every great European empire today walks its dark colonial shadow ...One might indeed read the riddle of Europe by making its present plight a matter of colonial shadows, speculating on what might happen if Europe became suddenly shadowless.” W. E. B. Du Bois (1925)¹

In this quotation, premier African-American intellectual W. E. B. Du Bois described the state of the European-dominated world of the 1920s as haunted by the shadow of colonialism. He could foresee an eventual end to European colonial dominance, but could not imagine how Europe and much of the world would look after decolonisation, so intrinsic was Europe’s relationship with its colonies to its identity in the early decades of the twentieth century. This volume, *The Shadow of Colonialism on Europe’s Modern Past, 1860-1960*, attempts to pursue the field of inquiry that he called for, “of likening and contrasting each [European] land and its far-off shadow.”² We intend to explore the reverberations of the colonial experience across the European continent in the modern period. The image of the shadow, so eloquently invoked by Du Bois, highlights the complexity of the relationship between the European metropole and its hinterland. With its connotations of darkness, distortion, and elasticity, the shadow functions as a useful metaphor for the negative and variable impact of colonial practices on Europe. The shadow is intrinsic to the object that projects it in the same way that colonial practices are an intrinsic feature of the mind of the coloniser, whether directed overseas or closer to the metropole.

One of the major areas of current scholarly debates among modern Europeanists is the relationship between overseas colonialism and expansion by European states at their frontiers. Traditionally, overseas colonialism has been seen as the logical consequence of the limits of state expansion within Europe and the redirection of expansionist impulses to overseas territories.³ Building on recent interpretations and reassessments of the expansionist ambitions of European states, we believe that it is best to consider these as a single phenomenon that, between 1860 and 1960, reduced the territorial complexity of the globe and divided it into a handful of spheres of influence ruled largely from Europe. As a result, colonial discourses and ideologies came into broad circulation within Europe and influenced how Europeans came to see their neighbours in frontier regions.

The interconnections between Europe's frontiers and overseas colonies were the starting point for a conference that took place at NUI Galway in June 2012. The conference was called "Colonialism within Europe: Fact or Fancy?" and was sponsored by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. It featured papers by a range of historians of Europe who examined this theory in the case of various frontier situations. Scholars working on European overseas colonies provided critical responses that helped to identify similarities and differences between state expansion inside and outside Europe. This collection of essays, *The Shadow of Colonialism on Europe's modern past, 1860-1960*, builds on the discussions held at the conference and examines the transfer of colonial discourses to the frontiers of nineteenth- and twentieth-century European states. Most of the chapters in the book are revised versions of papers given at the conference. We also commissioned two additional essays. The first of these deals with the paradigmatic role of Ireland in debates on

colonialism within Europe. The second investigates the notion of “classical colonialism” from the South Asian perspective.

There has been a long tradition of studies of colonialism as a theoretical concept and its significance in the world history of empires. Debates about the relationship between colonialism and imperial expansion date back to the classic works by Hobson and Lenin, which provided opposing views of the origins of European overseas empires rooted in economic analysis of the costs and benefits of colonial acquisition from liberal and Marxist perspectives respectively.⁴ Subsequently, sociologists such as André Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein have elaborated a Marxist theory of European economic expansion on a global scale and the resultant division of the world into cores and peripheries.⁵ In connection with these economic arguments, Michael Hechter and Eugene Weber developed models of state modernisation that focused on the relationship between the administrative centre and the ethnic fringes, as applied to economic and cultural policies respectively. However, scholars have distanced themselves in recent years from these models in light of criticisms of the teleological basis of modernisation theory.⁶

More recently, postcolonialism, which emerged from the regions of former European influence overseas, has directed attention towards the cultural aspects of colonialism. This has been particularly significant in explaining the dissemination of colonial categories through discourse and its impact on both the coloniser and the colonised. A good example of this is the 1997 collection edited by Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler.⁷ The most recent global surveys of colonial empires integrate economic and cultural perspectives. Among the best of these are works by Anthony Pagden, H. L. Wesseling, Jürgen Osterhammel, John Darwin, James Belich, and Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper.⁸ Studies of the British Empire in particular have

incorporated postcolonialism's insights in relation to specific mechanisms of rule to great effect. For instance, Both Chris Bayly and John Darwin have highlighted the importance of information exchange and circulation in the British Empire and have emphasised the crucial role of the colonised in shaping colonial rule.⁹ The historiography of the Atlantic world, as pioneered by British and Irish historians, has demonstrated the importance of transfer of colonial ideas from the Old World to the New and back again and structural parallels in practices between metropolises and colonies, whether intended or subconscious. In this respect, particularly innovative has been John Elliott's comparative examination of British and Spanish expansion in the Americas in the early modern period.¹⁰ For a later period, Ulrike Lindner analyses the transfer of colonial ideas between European colonisers, specifically British and German officials in Africa, in her recent work.¹¹ Particularly ironic is the reappearance of practices derived from Germanisation by Polish Jews in Palestine, specifically settlement as a tool of ethnic demography.¹²

An increasingly large body of scholarship has clearly demonstrated the impact of the overseas colonial experience on domestic culture. Practices ranging from urban reform, eugenic planning, political competition to the arts and leisure all bore marks of Europe's colonial engagement with overseas territories. Specifically for the German case, Birthe Kundrus has edited a collection that documents the influence of German's brief colonial experience on advertising, gender and foreign policy.¹³ For the British case, particularly important is the work of Catherine Hall, who has investigated the impact of colonial discourses of race and slavery on political and cultural debates in mid-nineteenth-century Britain.¹⁴ A recent example that builds on literature on France is Alice Conklin's study of the influence of the French colonial empire on anthropology and science.¹⁵ An edited collection entitled *Russia's Orient*

explores how perceptions about the civilised or savage character of non-Russian peoples at the borders of the Russian empire determined the extent of autonomy allowed them within the imperial system.¹⁶ By pointing to the pervasiveness of colonial thinking in these realms, these studies suggest the potential for considering colonial transfer in other contexts.

Currently, scholars working on Germany, drawing on earlier work by Hannah Arendt on the origins of totalitarianism, have posited a connection between colonial practices in Germany's overseas empire and in European territories under Nazi rule. Specifically, Jürgen Zimmerer's research has sparked a debate about links between the German genocide of the Herero and the Nama in Southwest Africa in the first decade of the twentieth century and the Holocaust four decades later. In various publications, Zimmerer has consistently argued for a clear causal connection from Windhuk to Auschwitz, both in terms of ideology and practice. He has maintained that know-how moved from Germany's African colonies to its eastern frontier through inter-generational and institutional continuities.¹⁷ This contention has been addressed in mainstream German historiography, as evidenced in the most recent surveys of German colonialism, such as those by Winfried Speitkamp, Gisela Graichen and Horst Gründer and Sebastian Conrad.¹⁸ Scholars of the Holocaust have also addressed this debate, as have scholars of comparative genocide.¹⁹ Ben Kiernan and Robert Gellately have built on the continuity debate in order to explore the possibilities of links between genocides committed against indigenous peoples in European colonies and ethnic minorities in Europe in the twentieth century.²⁰ The most recent survey of Germany from unification to the Second World War by Shelley Baranowski has stressed continuities between the colonial activities of the German Empire and the later Nazi regime, which, scholars have suggested, has echoes of the

Sonderweg thesis. Drawing on Zimmerer and American scholar Benjamin Madley, she has argued that “the African connection emerged as well through figures important to the early history of the Nazi movement, among them Hermann Göring, whose father was the first colonial governor of Southwest Africa.”²¹

The continuity thesis has, however, been hotly contested. Sebastian Conrad pointed out important differences between German colonial genocides and the Holocaust, which undermines Zimmerer’s continuity thesis. He notes specifically the highly industrialised character of the Nazi murder machine and the deliberate attempt to annihilate the entire Jewish population, by contrast with the incidental deaths of large numbers of Herero and Nama women and children.²² Birthe Kundrus has argued that Zimmerer confuses colonial rhetoric with colonial practices, and she emphasises the differences between the racial policies of Imperial and Nazi Germany.²³ Robert Gerwarth and Stefan Malinowski point in particular to the tenuous personal links between German officials working in the colonial and Nazi periods, which were separated by several decades. They also note that other colonial empires committed atrocities against indigenous populations. Nonetheless, these practices did not culminate in the mass murder of Europe’s Jewish population.²⁴ In fact, the German mistreatment of the indigenous population of Southwest Africa did not differ substantially from the mistreatment of indigenous peoples throughout the colonial world. One only has to think about the case of the Belgian Congo, where about 10 million Africans died as a result of slave-like labour conditions in the reign of King Leopold II.²⁵

It should be pointed out, however, that the debate about the links between Germany’s colonial past and its ultimate consequence represented by the Holocaust is singular in European historiography. The exceptionality of the Holocaust has led

scholars to overlook other possible long-term and less lethal legacies of colonial practices, whether in German-occupied territory or other European regions, and to other possible roots of Nazi genocide from other empires' colonies. The anti-Semitism of the Nazis marks a significant rupture in ideology and policy towards outsider groups in that it constituted a systematic and determined attempt at mass elimination of a single ethnic group as opposed to the pragmatic type of violence involved in removing colonial populations. Yet it is apparent that a similar pragmatic approach to subject populations informed everyday Nazi policy in the East, for instance, the deterrence of resistance through mass reprisals against civilians. Despite their scepticism regarding the Windhuk to Auschwitz thesis, Gerwarth and Malinowski believe that "it remains plausible to assume that the ideas and practices that characterised Europe's colonial mastery over the world had *some* repercussions on inner-European history and that "knowledge transfers" occurred in some areas."²⁶ Likewise, the authors of a recent article on continuities in German history, Winson Chu, Jesse Kaufman and Michael Meng acknowledge "the similarity that existed in German imaginations of the region as an imperial space to be dominated" and, despite their reservations about the levels of violence and anti-Semitism that separated the wars, therefore allow room for an interpretation of German rule of the East in both world wars as colonial.²⁷ Sebastian Conrad has also emphasised the connections between colony and metropole and has pointed to several publications that have attempted to overcome this conceptual dichotomy.²⁸ He himself has made a case for the colonial character of Prussian rule in Poland.²⁹ In addition, David Furber has unearthed examples of everyday practices evident in both the German colonies and Nazi-occupied Poland, such as the prohibition on using footpaths and the obligation to salute Germans they encountered.³⁰

While the debate on the continuities cannot be settled until a much more thorough investigation of such practices has been conducted, it is very likely that scholars have not yet discovered the full extent of the influence of the colonial experience on the German heartland. In fact, despite Gerwarth and Malinowski's claims, it is likely that German genocidal practices within Europe were informed by the knowledge of precedents in colonies governed by other European powers. Jeff Bowersox has recently observed that the experiences of colonies held by other European powers had a significant impact on Germans' colonial thinking, even in the period before World War One. Jens-Uwe Guettel has identified the racist segregationist system of the post-Reconstruction U.S. South as a source for imperial German policy towards the indigenous people of southwest Africa. The potential of the American model appealed even to southern blacks, who, in an intriguing example of cross-fertilisation, brought an alternative system of labour organisation to another German colony in order to improve the lives of Africans there.³¹ Scientific racism was endemic to American and European scholarly and political discourse and informed various discriminatory policies and practices against groups constructed as inferior races. As Sven Lindqvist has provocatively claimed, in his *Exterminate All the Brutes*, "Auschwitz was the modern industrial application of a policy of extermination on which European world domination had long since rested."³²

Our case for the shadow of colonialism on Europe's modern past rests primarily on identifying instances of 'discursive colonisation', a term used by literary historian Kristin Kopp to describe "a historically situated process that repositions a specific relationship between self and Other into colonial categories". This entails the creation of an image of the incoming people as colonisers, the indigenous people as the legitimate targets of colonisation and consequently the justification of the

civilising by former of the latter.³³ We believe that such constructions of hierarchy were pervasive to the point of becoming reflexive. Moreover, they were not limited to relations between Europeans and non-Europeans, but also applied in certain circumstances to relations between Europeans and their neighbours at the frontier. Leading postcolonial scholar, Gayatri Spivak, has acknowledged the elasticity of the terms ‘coloniser’ and ‘colonised’, provided the following preconditions are present: “When an alien nation-state establishes itself as a ruler, impressing its own laws and system of education, and re-arranging the mode of production for its own economic benefit, one can use these, I think.”³⁴ The essays in this collection document numerous instances of this phenomenon.

They also point to situations within Europe where these reflexive hierarchies were accompanied by conquest and the implementation of practices borrowed from colonial settings. These included, firstly, the imposition of new decision-makers, whether foreign or indigenous loyal to the incoming regime; secondly, the consistent privileging of the culture of the coloniser over that of the indigenous peoples; thirdly, the systematic economic exploitation of the indigenous labour and land by the incoming power; and finally, a unusually high degree of physical and institutional violence in the everyday practice of rule. This corresponds to what Kopp terms ‘material colonization’, involving “various forms of economic, political, and/or cultural subjugation of a native population by a foreign minority entering their space”.³⁵ Some of the essays in the book demonstrate the presence of some of these features of ‘material colonization’. However, it was not necessary for discursive colonisation to become material colonisation, although it always had the potential to do so. This volume aims to demonstrate that this potential was present and, even when

unrealised or realised only partially, colonial rhetoric had a major impact on the culture of European states.

Chronologically, the volume examines a century that experienced the maximum expansion of European colonial power in other continents. See Map 1. It was also a time when many European states were confronted with the challenge of incorporating territories that they acquired as a result of the era's numerous border changes. Several historians have pointed to the mid-nineteenth century as a key period of state-building. Eric Hobsbawm has identified the central decades of the century as crucial in the development of the financial and economic infrastructure necessary for the creation of strong states and their subsequent expansion in what he called 'the age of empires'.³⁶ Key to this process was the impact and spread of industrialisation from Britain to a handful of regions in continental Europe, especially Belgium, France and Germany. This phase of industrialisation was accompanied by a spate of state-formation that saw the unification of Italy and Germany and the consolidation of the Second Empire in France. After a temporary setback with the Great Depression of 1873, the next phase of industrial expansion featured acceleration in the acquisition of overseas territories, as first described by Lenin. Michael Geyer and Charles Bright have pointed to the importance of military developments in driving the process of state-formation that provided the preconditions for large-scale expansion of colonial empires between 1840 and 1880.³⁷ Chris Bayly also sees this process of national consolidation as the precondition for the nationalising impulses and colonial expansion of the state, which accelerate in the 1870s. Given this volume's focus on colonialism *within* Europe, the 1860s are an obvious starting point, in that they witnessed the beginning of a process of national consolidation, as evident in the

unification of Italy and Germany, the Ausgleich in the Habsburg Monarchy, and the rapid acceleration of colonial acquisitions in the following decade.

MAP 1 GOES HERE

The volume documents many manifestations of the state's nationalising impulses at the frontier in the century from the 1860s to the 1960s. These impulses reached their peak in the First and Second World Wars. While the collapse of European empires in the First World War allowed for the creation of smaller successor states (see Map 2), these continued the nationalising impulses and colonial ambitions of their former rulers, until they were overcome by the military might of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. The defeat of Nazi Germany did not allow for the re-assertion of nationalising impulses in the east, where the emergence of the Cold War led to the hegemony of the Soviet Union and a new phase of colonisation. While the Soviet hegemony prevailed in eastern Europe until 1989, the volume ends in the 1960s, when Soviet policy moved from active colonisation to the maintenance of colonial rule.

MAP 2 GOES HERE

Part One of the volume contains essays that deal with colonialism in Asia and a specific colonial practice in Europe. Building on both subaltern and postcolonial approaches, Mridu Rai interrogates the notion of a classical form of colonialism practiced by Europeans over non-Europeans. Her work on South Asia suggests that there were considerable varieties in colonial relations across the subcontinent and,

moreover, that Asians themselves also practised forms of colonialism against other Asians, both before and after the arrival of Europeans. This insight opens up the possibility that colonialism also characterised the relations between neighbouring peoples on the frontiers of Europe under certain circumstances. By examining a series of case studies of different frontiers, this volume demonstrates that colonialism did indeed operate, to varying degrees, within Europe.³⁸

The third chapter by Gearóid Ó Tuathaigh complements the general chapter on the historiography of colonialism by Rai by providing an examination of the specific case study of the debate about Ireland's 'colonial' status within the British Empire. As early as the 1960s, historians have raised the question of the nature of English rule in Ireland from the early modern period, with some suggesting that it constituted a unique instance of colonialism within Europe. The debate has focused in recent years on the nineteenth century, especially on British economic policy in Ireland around the time of the famine.³⁹ It has been suggested that Britain obstructed Ireland's economic development in order to privilege its own. Historians of Ireland, following insights generated by postcolonial studies of non-European peoples, have addressed questions of agency.⁴⁰ The particular prominence of India within the scholarship on postcolonial theory has inspired frequent comparisons between the roles of the Irish and the Indians as 'colonial' subjects of the British Empire.⁴¹ With his essay, Ó Tuathaigh has provided us with an indispensable link between discussions of colonial relationships, including discourses, economic policy, practices and popular responses, inside and outside Europe.

Whereas Part One provides a theoretical basis for the study of colonialism, Part Two deals with seven specific cases drawn from central and eastern Europe and north Africa. Informed by the some of the nuances of the theoretical approaches

debated in Part One, scholars in this section investigate instances of colonialism as nationalisation, that is, the incorporation of populations on the frontier into the state, resulting in varying degrees of subordination. In his classic 1976 study of modernisation in France, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, Eugen Weber described a process of incorporation of outlying provinces into a national French culture, which he termed colonial. In describing the historical development of the French state, he argued that “the famous hexagon can itself be seen as a colonial empire shaped over the centuries”.⁴² Intermediate groups, who could plausibly belong to one nation or another or constitute a nation of their own, encountered particular problems. For example, many Silesians who themselves were nationally indifferent came under pressure to accept the culture and legitimacy of either the German or Polish states in the early twentieth century.⁴³ Weber provides the basis for comparative studies of similar phenomena in other parts of Europe, as several chapters in this volume demonstrate. We are, furthermore, seeking to identify structural parallels between colonial practices evident within European metropolises and in their colonial peripheries.

In the first five cases in this section, states attempted to homogenise cultural minorities on their peripheries. These cases reveal a high degree of tension between the state and peoples at the frontier, which sometimes escalated into violence and war. It is useful to think of these as operating upon a continuum of colonial intensity, based on the criteria outlined above, ranging from low to high. Schleswig falls at the lowest point on the continuum in virtually all respects. The other four cases studies in this section—Alsace from 1871 to 1918, Prussian Poland from 1772 to 1918, southern Italy from 1861 to 1865, interwar Poland—occupy a higher position on the continuum, although vary according to the individual criteria. Regarding the level of

decision-making at the metropole, Alsace represents the highest degree. Prussian Poland and interwar Poland demonstrate the strongest evidence of claims of cultural superiority. Subject to continuous brutal warfare in the period under consideration, southern Italy exhibits the strongest degree of violence in the continuum.

Focusing specifically on southern Italy in the post-unification period, in Chapter Four Enrico Dal Lago looks at the relationship between the Italian nation and the southern part of the country and asks if it is useful to consider it as an example of colonialism in one country. He acknowledges the long tradition of historians and intellectuals who have referred to southern Italy as a sort of colony and markedly different from the north. In particular, he looks at the violent process of incorporation of the south through a five-year civil war and the deaths of several thousand Italians that led to ‘conquest’ of the southern regions as a possible example of colonial practice. In the end, however, he concludes that, even though “the historical process of foundation of the Italian nation-state exacerbated perceived differences between northern and southern Italy, it did not result from a colonial image of the south and did not involve distinctively colonial practices, but encouraged a colonial image that proved enduring.”⁴⁴

Assessing the colonial features of rule of territories annexed as part of a process of state-led unification, this time by Prussia, in Chapter Five historical linguist Nils Langer acknowledges that the preconditions for colonialism existed in the case of Schleswig-Holstein, insofar as the region was subject, from the 1840s, to efforts to incorporate them into the nationalising states of Denmark and Germany and align their culture to that of the state by imposing official languages on communities speaking other languages. However, he concludes that “the case of Schleswig-Holstein fails to demonstrate clearly any kind of religious or civilisatory mission and

also offers no evidence for Osterhammel's stipulation that, in colonialism, the colonisers reject "cultural compromises with the colonized population, [and] [...] are convinced of their own superiority and of their ordained mandate to rule"⁴⁵.

Therefore, in the case of Schleswig-Holstein, the degree of tension between the state and the people at the German-Danish frontier was considerably less at the German-Polish frontier.

Looking at attempts at homogenisation of another frontier region acquired, like Schleswig-Holstein in the process of German unification, in Chapter Six, Detmar Klein examines Alsace. He demonstrates that Alsace, because of its strategic location on the German-French border, was subjected to exceptional constitutional arrangements, which undermined its bargaining power in competing for the advantages of membership of the German Empire. His "investigation into the political-administrative, economic and cultural developments shows that Alsace was both integrated into the Reich and disadvantaged and discriminated against by Germany."⁴⁶ With respect to decision-making powers, Alsace thus occupies the highest point on the continuum.

A third German periphery forms the subject of Chapter Seven, in which Róisín Healy examines West Prussia and Poznania, provinces acquired by Prussia from Poland in the late eighteenth century. She uncovers evidence of claims of cultural superiority, often by means of racial tropes drawn from colonial settings not limited to the overseas territories under German control from 1884 to 1919. As she argues, "discursive colonization helped prepare the ground for an acceleration of the material colonisation evident in cultural, settlement and labour policies in particular."⁴⁷ Already in evidence from the initial acquisition of these provinces, both discursive and material colonisation intensified around the time of unification and became even

sharper at the very moment of German colonial acquisition, if not directly tied to the expansion of the German state.

Following on from Róisín Healy's examination of Poland under Prussia, in Chapter Eight, Christoph Mick investigates the new Polish state in the interwar period for evidence of colonialism. He shows that, despite their common Slavic heritage, the Poles believed that they were superior to the Ukrainians living in eastern Poland and attempted in several waves to impose Polish culture and institutions on them. Yet in ways reminiscent of Prussian Poland, the Ukrainians resisted the nationalising policies of the Polish state, leading the Poles to resort to drastic measures such as the mass incarceration of Ukrainians. Indeed, Poles also sought overseas colonies, most famously Madagascar, in the same period. Like Alsace and Prussian Poland, interwar Poland, thus, rests at the highest end of the continuum of colonial characteristics.

The failure of Poles to win over the populations of the eastern regions that they colonised is mirrored in the failure of metropolitan France to frenchify the Algerians of French descent, when they were obliged to relocate to France as a result of the collapse of French colonial rule. In Chapter Nine, Aoife Connolly shows that the *pieds-noirs*, originally from France but living over several generations in Algeria, were subjected to the nationalising policies of the French state in the 1960s in a process similar to the one described by Eugene Weber for the peripheries of France in the nineteenth century. Ironically, these *pieds-noirs* included Alsatians, who had been themselves displaced by the creation of the German empire in 1871 and its nationalising policies. Yet the French state succeeded in nationalising the *pieds-noirs*, but the metropolitan French continued to see them as *unFrench*. As Connolly writes: "Ultimately the fact that the metropolitan French began to refer to the *français*

d'Algérie as pieds-noirs at this time is indicative of a reluctance to acknowledge them as fully French.”⁴⁸

Providing a strong counterpoint to the previous six cases, the last chapter in Part Two by Clemens Ruthner describes a case in which the expansion of the state did not lead to homogenisation, but rather the preservation of perceived differences as a rationale for discriminatory practices. The case of Habsburg rule in Bosnia-Herzegovina occupies a place close to the highest point on the continuum in terms of two of the four indices of colonialism, specifically the level of decision-making at the metropole and the claims of cultural superiority. Bosnia-Herzegovina appears to be an obvious case of colonial rule, given the centralisation of power in Vienna and the strength of the Austrian impulse to defend Christian Europe from the perceived threat of Islam. The incoming Germans saw themselves as continuing their mission to defend Christian Europe in a formerly Ottoman province. They conscripted natives into infantry regiments in order to ‘civilise’ them, while reserving officer positions for Germans, in a practice analogous to the Gurkha regiments in British India. Moreover, they re-oriented the economy and local government to meet the needs of the metropole. At the same time, it marks a departure from the previous case studies in that it examines the incorporation of new territory into a multinational empire rather than a nationalising state. Interestingly, despite the long tradition of inclusiveness that characterised multinational imperial practices, the actual mechanisms of colonisation did not differ a great deal from the ones previously analysed. Ruthner argues that Bosnia-Herzegovina functioned as an ersatz colony of the Habsburg Empire in the decades up to its collapse. The Habsburg Monarchy was hardly unique as a multinational empire in Europe at this time. Its neighbours to the south and east, Ottoman Turkey and Russia, were also large multinational empires, which had

expanded in the past through policies of incorporation and inclusion of neighbouring regions.

Following from this examination of colonialism within a multinational imperial state, Part Three addresses the Soviet Union's expansion of territory and communist influence on the eastern European frontier. See Map 3. Given the prominence of colonial expansion as a characteristic of tsarist Russia, it is not surprising that the successor communist state, despite its anti-imperialist rhetoric, followed a similar path. Until the 1990s, it was difficult for historians to claim continuities between the tsarist and Soviet eras, especially in terms of colonial rule. While still controversial, this idea is currently taken more seriously by scholars in Russia and abroad.⁴⁹ Since communism differed from other imperialist ideologies in not relying on claims of ethnic difference between the coloniser and colonised, cultural superiority played an understandably marginal role in justifying the Soviet colonial enterprise. The contributions in this section build on the latest scholarship and show the relative unimportance of cultural claims of superiority in colonialism under communism. They deal with colonial ideas and practices in three locations in eastern Europe—Ukraine, Poland and Hungary. In relation to the three remaining indices of colonialism, the evidence shows that Soviet control was strongest in Ukraine, which was fully incorporated into the Soviet state, but diluted in Poland and, even more so, in Hungary by the greater co-optation of local elites. Clearly, economic exploitation played a strong role in the Ukrainian case, given the wealth of natural resources and availability of agrarian produce there. The Soviet Union oriented eastern bloc economies towards its needs, creating a situation of dependency of its satellites and, furthermore, in the immediate postwar period, stripped certain border areas of movable economic resources. Violence lay at the heart of Soviet direct

acquisition and indirect control of all these territories, but particularly in the Ukrainian case. Stalinist policies notoriously caused millions of deaths in peacetime, most notably in the Ukrainian famine of the 1930s.

In Chapters Eleven and Twelve, Mark von Hagen and Guido Hausmann look at the relationship of the Ukraine to the Soviet Union, specifically in the interwar period. They both build on the 'imperial turn' in Soviet historiography and trace early antecedents of debates about the colonial character of the Soviet rule outside ethnic Russian territory, going back as far as the early aftermath of World War One. Von Hagen identifies the failure of the 'Wilsonian moment' to deliver widespread national self-determination in Europe as the starting point for a challenge to Bolshevik claims on eastern European territory from an anti-colonial perspective. He points to the role of historian Pavlo Khrystiuk in developing a Ukrainian critique of the outcome of the 1917 Russian Revolution, which he interpreted as the creational moment of an imperial regime which blocked the creation of a Ukrainian nation-state, keeping it in a condition of colonial subjection. Hausmann examines the same debate about the colonial character of Russian rule in the Ukraine in the field of historical geography. On the one hand, Russian cartographer Vladimir Semenov used his maps to argue for natural, historical borders for Russian imperial expansion into the Ukraine and elsewhere. In response, Ukrainian Stepan Rudnyc'kyi created his own maps to support Ukrainian claims to the same territory and depict the Russian presence there as a form of colonial rule.

Chapters Thirteen and Fourteen also address the spread of Soviet influence, specifically the creation of satellite states in eastern Europe. Paul McNamara argues that a dual process of colonisation took place in Poland after World War Two, firstly the expansion of Soviet influence through the installation of a communist government

and secondly the efforts by Poles to assert their sovereignty over lands formerly owned by German through resettlement. Ultimately, McNamara argues, “between 1945 and 1956 the Baltic Recovered Territories comprised the region in which Poles moving west, either as “pioneers” or expellees, simultaneously acted both as colonisers and colonised”.⁵⁰ Balazs Apor draws attention to continuities in imperial rule from tsarist Russian to the Soviet Union, which was enforced by military means, but conversely, “the cultural aspects of Sovietisation included the implementation of a universal ideology (Marxism) in different socio-cultural contexts ...and the spreading of Soviet rituals”.⁵¹ Among these was the leadership cult modelled on Stalin.

MAP 3 GOES HERE

Our hope with this volume is to stimulate a debate on colonial dimensions at the frontier of various European states and therefore open up new avenues of research for the new brand of transnational historian. This volume contained a broad range of case studies at the frontier, but future research is necessary to confirm the representativeness of our sample. The overall objective of this line of enquiry is to relocate Europe within the historiography of colonialism, understanding it not solely as the source, but also the recipient of colonial ideas and practices. Ultimately, this project forms part of a historiographical trend, championed by postcolonial scholars and anthropologists, such as Dipesh Chakrabarty and Jack Goody, to relativise the historical experience of Europe and put it into a global context.⁵² In this view, Europe is no longer exceptional, even at the very time of its global ascendancy, but subject to the same historical forces that shaped other civilisations and continents at the same

time. In this connection, we can envision future volumes that deal with the shadow of colonialism on other continents.

¹ W. E. B. Du Bois, *The New Negro, An Interpretation* (New York: Albert and Charles Boni, 1925), 385.

² W. E. B. Du Bois, *The New Negro*, 385.

³ Marc Ferro, *Colonization: A Global History* (London: Routledge, 1997).

⁴ John A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (London: Cosimo Classics, 2005, orig. pub. in 1902); Vladimir Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (London: Penguin, 2010, orig. pub. in 1917).

⁵ Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System, vol. I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* and *vol. II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600-1750* (New York: Academic Press, 1974 and 1980).

⁶ Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* (London: Routledge, 1975); Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976). For a critique of internal colonialism, see John R. Chávez, “Aliens in Their Native Lands: The Persistence of Internal Colonial Theory”, *Journal of World History* 22: 4 (2011), 793-4.

⁷ Eduard Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1978).

⁸ Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, 1492-1830* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998); H. L. Wesseling, *The European Colonial Empires: 1815-1919* (London: Longman, 2004);

Jürgen Osterhammel, *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, N. J.: Marcus Wiener, 2005); John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: The Rise and Fall of Global Empires, 1400-2000* (London: Penguin, 2008); James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Angloworld* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

⁹ C. A. Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World, 1780-1830* (London: Longman, 1985); John Darwin, *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830-1970* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) and *Unfinished Empire: The Global Expansion of Britain* (London: Allen Lane, 2012).

¹⁰ J. A. Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006).

¹¹ Ulrike Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen: Deutschland und Großbritannien als Imperialmächte in Afrika 1880-1914* (Frankfurt a. M.: Campus, 2011).

¹² Shalom Reichman and Shlomo Hasson, "A Cross-cultural Diffusion of Colonization: From Posen to Palestine", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 74:1 (1984), 57-70.

¹³ Birthe Kundrus, ed., *Phantasiereiche: Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt a. M.: Campus, 2003); Kristin Kopp and Klaus Müller-Richter, eds., *Die 'Grossstadt' und das 'Primitive': Text, Politik und Repräsentation* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2004) and Deborah J. Neill, *Networks in Tropical Medicine: Internationalism, Colonialism, and the Rise of a Medical Speciality, 1890-1930* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012); Pascal Grosse, *Kolonialismus, Eugenik*

und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in Deutschland 1850-1918 (Frankfurt a. M.: Campus, 2000).

¹⁴ Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (Oxford: Polity, 2002). See also Peter Cain and Tony Hopkins, *British Imperialism 1688-2000*; John M. MacKenzie, *Empires of Nature and the Nature of Empires: Imperialism, Scotland and the Environment* (Edinburgh: Tuckwell, 1997).

¹⁵ Alice Conklin, *In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire in France, 1850-1950* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).

¹⁶ Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini, eds., *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1997).

¹⁷ Jürgen Zimmerer, *Von Windhuk nach Auschwitz? Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Kolonialismus und Holocaust* (Berlin: LIT, 2011).

¹⁸ Wolfgang Speitkamp, *Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005); Gisela Graichen and Horst Gründer, *Deutsche Kolonien: Traum und Trauma* (Berlin: Ullstein, 2007); Sebastian Conrad, *German Colonialism: A Short History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

¹⁹ Dirk Moses and Dan Stone, eds., *Colonialism and Genocide* (London: Routledge, 2007); Ben Madley, "From Africa to Auschwitz: How German South West Africa Incubated Ideas and Methods Adopted by the Nazis in Eastern Europe", *European History Quarterly* 35:3 (2005), 429-64.

²⁰ Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan, *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

-
- ²¹ Shelly Baranowski, *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 140. Daniel Becker, "A Postcolonial 'Sonderweg'?", Review of Shelly Baranowski, H-German (July 2013) <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=36423>.
- ²² Conrad, *German Colonialism*, 161-62.
- ²³ Birthe Kundrus, "Kontinuitäten, Parallelen, Rezeptionen. Überlegungen zur 'Kolonialisierung' des Nationalsozialismus", *Werkstatt Geschichte* 43 (2006), 45-62; Birthe Kundrus, "Von den Herero zum Holocaust? Einige Bemerkungen zur aktuellen Debatte", *Mittelweg* 36, 14 (2005), 82-91.
- ²⁴ Robert Gerwarth and Stefan Malinowski, "Hannah Arendt's Ghosts: Reflections on the Disputable Path from Windhoek to Auschwitz", *Central European History* 42 (2009), 279-300.
- ²⁵ Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghosts: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (Chicago: Mariner, 1999).
- ²⁶ Gerwarth and Malinowski, "Hannah Arendt's Ghosts", 298.
- ²⁷ Winson Chu, Jesse Kauffman and Michael Meng, "A *Sonderweg* through Eastern Europe? The Varieties of German Rule in Poland during the Two World Wars", *German History* 31:3 (2013), 318-44, at 344.
- ²⁸ He cites Brower and Lazzerini, eds., *Russia's Orient*, John Dickie, *Darkest Italy: The Nation and Stereotypes of the Mezzogiorno, 1860-1900* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999) and Johannes Feichtinger, Ursula Prutsch and Moritz Czáký, *Habsburg postcolonial* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2003). See Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 168.
- ²⁹ Conrad, *Globalisation on Poland*, 144-202.

-
- ³⁰ David Furber, "Going East: Colonialism and German Life in Nazi Occupied Poland, 1939-1945." Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo (2003).
- ³¹ Andrew Zimmerman, *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the American South* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 2010).
- ³² Sven Lindqvist. *Exterminate All the Brutes*. New York: New Press, 1992.
- ³³ Kristin Kopp, *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012), 5-6.
- ³⁴ See contribution by Gaytari Spivak to Roundtable, "Empire, Union, Center, Satellite: A Questionnaire", *Ulbandus* 7 (2003), 15.
- ³⁵ Kopp, *Germany's Wild East*, 6.
- ³⁶ Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Capital, 1848-1875* (London: Abacus, 1988).
- ³⁷ Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, "Global Violence and Nationalizing Wars in Eurasia and America: The Geopolitics of War in the Mid-Nineteenth Century", *Comparative Studies in History and Society* 38:4 (1996), 619-57.
- ³⁸ See Chapter 2 in this volume.
- ³⁹ Terence McDonough, *Was Ireland a Colony?: Economics, Politics and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2005); Denis O'Hearn, *The Atlantic Economy: Britain, the US, and Ireland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).
- ⁴⁰ Brian Casey, *Defying the Law of the Land: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin: History Press, 2013).
- ⁴¹ See, for example, Barry Crosbie, *Irish Imperial Networks: Migration, Social Communication and Exchange in Nineteenth-Century India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

⁴² Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 485.

⁴³ James Bjork, *Neither German Nor Pole: Catholicism and National Indifference in a Central European Borderland* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008).

⁴⁴ See Chapter 4 in this volume.

⁴⁵ See Chapter 5 in this volume. The quotation is from Osterhammel, *Colonialism* (2005), 16.

⁴⁶ See Chapter 6 in this volume

⁴⁷ See Chapter 7 in this volume.

⁴⁸ See Chapter 9 in this volume.

⁴⁹ See Ronald Suny, “The Empire Strikes Out: Imperial Russia, ‘National’ Identity, and Theories of Empire” in Ronald Suny and Terry Martin, eds., *Empire and Nation-Making in the Soviet Union, 1917-1953* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 23-66; Andreas Kappeler, *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History*, trans. Alfred Clayton (Harlow, England: Longman, 2001). See also the following journals: *Ab Imperio*, *Kritika*, and *Slavic Review*.

⁵⁰ See Chapter 13 in this volume.

⁵¹ See Chapter 14 in this volume.

⁵² Jack Goody, *The Theft of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).