professional ethics, internal control and discipline, professional development and work organization are some of the characteristics of the profession defined by sociologists and historians, which, according to her, characterize the profession of cryptologist whose development was encouraged by Renaissance Venice. Although they have been linked almost exclusively to the industrial requirements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, primarily due to the lack of institutional frameworks in which professions could develop (in pre-industrial times these were only churches and universities), Iordanou emphasizes that professionalization, just like the concept of organization and managerial practice, existed long before there was a term to define it.

The fifth chapter, “Venice’s Secret Agents”, concentrates on those who put the intelligence ideas of the Council of Ten into practice. They came from all strata of Venetian society (ambassadors, governors, merchants, wealthy Jews, commoners). But, in situations where diplomatic etiquette prevented ambassadors, governors and even merchants of patrician descent from participating in intelligence operations, the Council of Ten recruited paid agents, who were willing to embark on dangerous spy missions. Because of the pejorative meaning of the word “spy”, the Venetian government also used the terms “confidant” or “explorator”. The author concludes that the lack of professionalization, which was most visible in the parallel use of all these terms despite the difference in meaning, is the reason why contemporary historians have problems with the precise definition of the term “spy”.

The last chapter, “Extraordinary Measures”, discusses the “additional ways” of preserving numerous land and overseas possessions which the Venetian government intensified during the sixteenth century, in line with its neutral policy towards foreign countries that it began to pursue at the time. Iordanou states that the Council of Ten, ignoring a public outcry that may have been sparked by the cruelty of some of these measures, routinely legalized such acts in the name of the necessity of preventing the enemy from obtaining confidential information about Venetian affairs. Pointing to counterintelligence activities as one of the most relevant functions of the Venetian secret service, the author identifies the range of these extraordinary measures from extreme – such as assassination, to milder ones – such as intercepting letters.


Reviewed by Anja Nikolić*

Benno Gammerl is lecturer in history at Goldsmiths, University of London. His main research interests have so far been imperial history and the contemporary history of homosexuality in Germany. His work on imperial history has been focused mostly on the British and Habsburg Empires and how they administered ethnically heterogeneous groups within their imperial boundaries. His monograph *Subjects, Citizens and Others. Administering Ethnic Heterogeneity in the British and Habsburg Empires, 1867–1918* is a thoroughly reworked version of the book *Untertanen, Staatsbürger und Andere. Der Umgang mit ethnischer Heterogenität im Britischen Weltreich und im Habsburgerreich* which emerged from his doctoral dissertation in 2010.

* Institute for Balkan Studies SASA
Apart from the introductory and concluding chapters, the monograph is organized into five parts in which the author discusses the approach of the two empires to ethnic diversity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Focusing on the question of nationality and citizenship, he explores how they influence the “management” of ethnic heterogeneity in the British and Habsburg Empires. Aware of the vastness of the theme, he chooses to present the perspective of the imperial administrative and political elites and their attitude towards ethnic heterogeneity (p. 3). Given the nature of his main sources – legislations, consular reports, parliamentary debate records – any other perspective could hardly be possible. Since the theme is very broad both geographically and chronologically, the introduction, which raises the questions the author endeavours to answer in the rest of the book, is followed by case studies as a basis for a comparative look at how the two empires handled ethnic diversity between 1867 and 1918.

The focus of the first chapter is on Canada and Hungary. They achieved a level of autonomy from London and Vienna respectively in 1867, which explains Grammerl’s choice to set the lower chronological boundary of his monograph at this particular year. Focusing on two political units so far away from one another that they are seldom viewed in the same context, the author seeks to recognize similarities. It is through comparison that he succeeds in making a link between the two geographically remote units and, in that way, to depict all the complexity of handling ethnic heterogeneity. Grammerl observes that both Canada and Hungary tried to assert their distinctive position within the imperial dominion of Britain and Austria-Hungary. Recognizing the racial question in Canada, and the strong presence of other ethnic groups in Hungary as the key problem, Grammerl describes similar mechanisms used to enforce the policy of nationalization. This chapter points out the remarkably negative treatment of the native population in Canada and the process of Magyarization of other ethnic groups in Hungary. The author uses this example to challenge the usual understanding of the dynamic between nation and empire, and seeks to show how they can coexist.

The second chapter offers another specific case study, of India and Austria, a comparative look that seems more difficult to justify. The author argues that the governments of both sought to present themselves as supranational institutions (p. 96). The analysis starts from Austria, i.e. Cisleithania, the Austrian part of the Dual Monarchy. Recognizing its tremendous ethnic and linguistic diversity, Grammerl is aware that such a state of affairs inevitably led to debate. Providing examples of legislation as well as of a “revolt” against ethnic neutrality, the author points to language as the key factor in ethnic differentiation. In India, on the other hand, the central issue was racial, as it was in the case of Canada. The chapter provides interesting examples of how these differences were managed. The first comparative analysis is meant to show how ethnic heterogeneity was dealt with by the national principle, this second how it was managed by the state principle, while the third case study seeks to show the imperial way of handling the differences.

The third case study juxtaposes Bosnia-Herzegovina with British East Africa. Grammerl sees Bosnia-Herzegovina as a Habsburg colonial domain (p. 119), without dressing up the nature of the Austro-Hungarian regime in the Balkans or tending to adopt the discourse that “glorifies” the Habsburg administration of Bosnia-Herzegovina. According to Grammerl, the attempt to inaugurate a “Bosnian” nation which would smooth away religious differences was the Habsburg administration’s first attempt at “administering” ethnic differences. The concept of a “Bosnian” nation was eventually abandoned. The author contends that the promulgation of the Bosnian
constitution in 1910 took Bosnia from the imperial to the state principle of dealing with diversity, a view which is open to debate. In British East Africa, on the other hand, legislation encouraged racist policies.

The three comparative case studies are followed by two chapters which also take a comparative perspective, this time on Austria-Hungary and Britain as a whole, seeking to answer the questions raised in the introduction, especially in the light of the previous three chapters. Gammerl tracks the course of British legislation and the modes in which the empire’s subjects from the colonies were denied British citizenship. Taking a much broader perspective than the one used in the three case studies, Gammerl seeks to arrive at some conclusions as to how the two empires operated and how they dealt with ethnic diversity in their respective territories.

Gammerl endeavours not to yield to the conventional portrayal of the two empires. This can best be seen from the way in which he discusses the Austro-Hungarian administration in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Given the vast geographical area and a large time span encompassed by Gammerl’s work, it should be noted that his account of Bosnia-Herzegovina and British East Africa would have been better had he used the source materials from local archives. This is a minor criticism compared with the undertaking of writing this book. The list of sources and literature is impressive and that alone is very useful to all researchers concerned with similar topics. The comparative approach gives the author the opportunity to add weight to his propositions and to answer important questions by establishing a link between geographically distant territories which are rarely viewed in the same context. Gammerl’s monograph is a significant contribution to the field of comparative and imperial history. The comparative case studies that constitute the bulk of the book raise very interesting and very pertinent questions and the author seems to provide satisfactory answers.

**Andrea Ungari, La Guerra del Re. Monarchia, Sistema politico e Forze armate nella Grande Guerra. Milan: Lune Editrice, 2018, 272 p.**

Reviewed by Konstantin Dragas*

Andrea Ungari, professor at the Guillermo Marconi University in Rome, in his latest study examines relations between military and civilian authorities in Italy during the First World War and the role played by the king Victor Emmanuel III. He explores the scope, limitations and real power of the royal government during the crisis of the Italian political system in 1914–1918 caused by Italy’s entry into the Great War. At the same time, he studies the influence of the executive and military authorities – above all the Government and the Supreme Command – on the course of the war, as well as the contradictions of the Italian liberal system which, during this period, were an inevitable factor in final victory.

The first chapter – “La Monarchia nell’Italia liberale” – underlines the importance of the Albertinian Statute (1848) for the development of the Italian constitutional system and the contribution of this historical document to the delimitation of powers, rights and duties of the executive, legislative and military branches in Italy throughout the nineteenth century. The kings of the House of Savoy decisively interfered in foreign policy and the organization of the armed forces, overstepping their constitutional powers. In order to preserve
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