



CHICAGO JOURNALS

Dominique Kirchner Reill, Norman Naimark, and Larry Wolff, eds., *Nationalists Who Feared the Nation: Adriatic Multi-Nationalism in Habsburg Dalmatia, Trieste, and Venice*

Nationalists Who Feared the Nation: Adriatic Multi-Nationalism in Habsburg Dalmatia, Trieste, and Venice by Dominique Kirchner Reill; Norman Naimark; Larry Wolff

Review by: Nick Miller

The Journal of Modern History, Vol. 86, No. 1 (March 2014), pp. 154-156

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/674254>

Accessed: 25/03/2014 13:29

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Modern History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

the canal. Asking that we not lose sight of either the physical or of the social production of urban space, Craig Colten compares three different rivers and their respective river basins to explain the divergence between what happens in urban centers and what happens downstream. In the final essay, Shannon Stunden Bower looks at the concept of the watershed to decipher the intricate interrelationship between politics and science in Manitoba during the second half of the twentieth century.

Curiously, apart from Colten, whose essay compares three US rivers, none of the contributors pursues an explicitly comparative perspective. This is somewhat surprising, since many rivers traverse borders and since, as the book in its entirety poignantly demonstrates, the study of rivers lends itself very well to comparative approaches. Future scholarship could, and most likely will, turn toward more explicitly comparative examinations of urban rivers. Moreover, it would be interesting to broaden the geographical horizon to include non-Western perspectives on the history and contemporary use of urban rivers. A more global approach could shed new light on the chronological development of riverine cultures and their impact on urban growth. This is, of course, a vast subject matter—my point here is not meant as a critique of the current volume but, rather, as a suggestion for future work in this area, especially with regard to the global South, which is facing the most pressing problems concerning river pollution and water scarcity.

Urban Rivers is an excellent contribution to the scholarship on the history of urban industrialization, especially as it relates to the use of water, the history of urban-rural relations, and the history of riverine technology and land-use policy from the seventeenth century to the present. As such, the book should be of interest not just to scholars with a direct interest in the history and geography of rivers. Every urban scholar will learn a great deal from this collection, both from the concrete content of the essays and from their divergent methodological and conceptual approaches, which remind us of the necessity to look beyond the merely humanly constructed built environment to consider as well the natural remnants that affect our urban living and that should inform our scholarship. Many of the essays would work well in teaching the subject matter on the college or graduate level.

DOROTHEE BRANTZ

Center for Metropolitan Studies, Technische Universität Berlin

Nationalists Who Feared the Nation: Adriatic Multi-Nationalism in Habsburg Dalmatia, Trieste, and Venice. By *Dominique Kirchner Reill*. Stanford Studies on Central and Eastern Europe. Edited by *Norman Naimark* and *Larry Wolff*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012. Pp. xx + 313. \$65.00 (cloth); \$65.00 (e-book).

A forty-year-long outpouring of writing and theorizing about nationalism is behind us, and for many its attendant debates about modernism, perennialism, primordialism, ethnic and civic nationalism, and the like are shopworn at best, misleading at worst. There have been remarkably few case studies, as nationalism is one of the more overtheorized topics in modern history. Nowadays historians and others have begun to chip away at the grand nationalist narrative, mining the past for flaws in this or that national story, movements not understood or properly credited, or evidence shunted aside. This mining can take the form of nit-picking, but it can also result in the unearthing of truly vital alternatives that were expressly not national or that, as in the title of this new book, were led by movers and thinkers who did in fact see their world through the prism of the nation but recognized there could be a better way to organize peoples than in nation-states. Such people—who

have not all been lost to history (note the Austro-Marxists)—recognized the existence of nations while trying to deal with their existence in what now seem to be nonconformist ways. One such group is the focus of Dominique Kirchner Reill's *Nationalists Who Feared the Nation*.

Reill's book examines the central role of Niccolò Tommaseo—born in 1802 to an Italian father and a Slavic mother in Šibenik, Dalmatia—in the formulation of an approach to the organization of nations that she calls “Adriatic multi-nationalism.” Tommaseo was a passionate advocate of the idea that the Adriatic's essence was in its mixture of Italian culture and Slavic culture, neither of which should be considered superior to the other. His approach can be seen as a reaction to “Mazzini's insurrectionary, top-down, centralist, rationalist, internationalist strategy,” with Tommaseo's being “slower, reform-oriented, bottom-up, federal, cultural, multi-national” (57). Over the course of the 1830s and 1840s, Tommaseo accumulated a group of acolytes who promoted this or that version of his vision. Two of them (Francesco Dall'Ongaro and Pacifico Valussi) were from the Italian milieu, while others (Medo Pucić, Ivan August Kaznačić, and Stipan Ivičević) came from Dalmatia's Slavic-speaking population.

What united them, aside from their links to Tommaseo? They were never a cohesive group, movement, or school, but Reill does make a case for their shared experience as a generation: “Born during or immediately after the Napoleonic Wars, these figures participated in a world so different from that of the parents who raised them and from that of the children they would raise that we can see them as members of a unique generation” (32). Being brought up in a plural cultural environment also mattered: “Maritime polyglottism was not just passive. A resident of Trieste did not just ‘hear’ lots of languages; he or she also spoke them.” A shared view of the nature of their community also may have prevailed: “Nineteenth-century residents along the Adriatic argued that water mixed nations up, making them interdependent, not just in terms of trade but in terms of family connections and linguistic backgrounds” (20). As for Reill's subjects in particular, “all were told of the financial hardship caused by the continental blockade and its corresponding freeze on maritime trade. All were schooled on the great costs of the wars. The conclusions that children of the wars took from these lessons varied, but most showed a marked sensitivity to the potential of political reorganization to create violence and economic instability” (32–33).

Tommaseo's influence worked in ways that ranged from the relatively trite to the profound—Dall'Ongaro, for instance, did not fully embrace Tommaseo's vision but did eventually express willingness to write about Marko Kraljević, which was a sign of at least some sympathy to the shared Italian/Slavic experience (105). Valussi, on the other hand, developed a sophisticated understanding of the Adriatic as a borderland region that could easily serve as a model for others in Europe:

Valussi maintained that distinct nations formed on the borderlands in conjunction with other nations would secure peace for all—that peace within the borderlands meant peace between neighboring nations and peace for Europe. Thus, Trieste, Dalmatia, Tyrol, Istria, and Corsica should be the real workshops of nation building, not Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Milan, Budapest, Zagreb, Athens, or Belgrade. The heart of a nation was not in the center but on the border . . . where “different languages, customs, and climes are in continual contact, [where] one can better see and study through comparison the original characteristics of the different nations and work to harmonize them.” (111)

For their part, the Dalmatian Slavs were not initially “in” with the Italian Triestines and Tommaseo. “Before late 1844,” Reill writes, “Pucić, Kaznačić, and Ivičević all spoke of how the Italian national presence along the eastern Adriatic had impeded the advancement of a Slavic nation. . . . These activists considered ‘Italians’ the historic competitor of the

Slavs" (119). Tommaseo was able to bring them into the fold but not long before the revolutions of 1848–49 tore apart their fragile commitment: "In the early 1840s, Dalmatia, Trieste, and Venice had been economically, politically, and socially interconnected" but "after 1848 this was no longer the case" (233). The 1848 revolutions then scattered Tommaseo's group, whose members mostly returned to their "own" nations. And, in consequence, "Adriatic multi-nationalism has been lost from the historical record" (241). Reill notes that each of her subjects is now known for something more exclusive than his earlier commitment to regional rather than national solutions. As with the Austro-Marxists and other nonconforming approaches to the nation, we are left wondering "what if?" I am not sure there is much more for us to make of this exceptional approach.

While the Tommaseo group did not ultimately solve the Adriatic dilemma, Reill's treatment of them is erudite, full of clear explications of often-complicated ideas, and the fruit of many years' labor in multiple languages and many archives. As a student of southeastern Europe, I thank her for situating the region and its history in a broader European context. I would think that students of Italian history would feel the same gratitude.

NICK MILLER

Boise State University

Mobilizing Money: How the World's Richest Nations Financed Industrial Growth.

By *Caroline Fohlin*. Japan-US Center UFJ Bank Monographs on International Financial Markets. Edited by *Akiyoshi Horiuchi* et al.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xiv+263. \$99.00 (cloth); \$41.67 (Mobipocket e-book); \$79.00 (Adobe e-book).

The relative merits of national financial systems have been important sites of political-economic controversy since the nineteenth century. Caroline Fohlin's *Mobilizing Money* is a provocative and stimulating intervention in the most recent of these debates. Her core concerns are to explain variation in the features and historical development of financial systems and to assess the contribution of these systems to economic growth.

According to Fohlin, previous work on these topics has been vitiated by fundamental conceptual difficulties. Part 1 of her text, therefore, addresses a problematic binary that has until recently structured much of the literature. At one pole stand overall bank-dominated financial systems, constituted by large-scale institutions that combine commercial and investment practices and are, in this sense, "universal banks." Typically, these features are associated further with expansive branching networks and formalized relations with nonfinancial firms, through which banks allegedly perform critical corporate governance functions. At the opposite pole are overall securities-market-mediated systems, which are associated with specialized banking institutions, "arm's-length" relations between industry and finance, and unit (as opposed to branched) banking. Fohlin's strategy is to confront this binary with an empirically far more variegated, heterogeneous, and hybrid array of historical institutions. To this end, she initially focuses her comparative analysis on Germany and Britain (often taken to embody, respectively, the bank-based types and the market-based types), as well as the Italian, Japanese, and American cases during the industrialization of the mid-nineteenth century through the First World War.

There are many fascinating highlights in these stretches of the text. In some cases, Fohlin emphasizes counterintuitive combinations within national systems. For example,