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In the 1930s a Russian-Jewish female doctor named Sara Brojdo was working in a public hospital in French Morocco. Ewa, a Polish-Jewish women's monthly, ran a feature on Brojdo's career in North Africa and placed its female emancipatory message with a peculiarly East European-flavored perspective on the Orient. Ewa argued: “After a few years in Marrakech, a beautiful city at the foot of the Atlas in which one lives . . . under the constant threat of typhus, Dr. Brojdo was finally moved . . . to Casablanca, where life now assumes almost European forms, where one cannot complain about the lack of European comforts.”1 To Ewa it was natural that Brojdo should feel more at ease in the European-style Casablanca than in Marrakech, a city that in Brojdo's narrative represented the most primitive and backward aspects of Arab lives. The magazine continued: “Dr. Brojdo . . . goes every day to the hospital where she manages to continue her work for these poor, miserable and unenlightened people. . . . Medical work is difficult among patients who are so difficult to accustom to the most basic cleanliness, whose stories about their disease and its symptoms are so far removed not only from matter-of-factness but from the simplest adherence to the truth.” Arabs and Moroccan Jews are portrayed here as disease prone and entirely different from Dr. Brojdo, who is the embodiment of European reason, hygiene, and civilization. Brojdo’s perspective on North Africa illuminates how in the early twentieth century Eastern Europeans established discursive constructions about the non-Western world to boost their own identity and status within the evolving world hierarchies. By constructing this binary opposition between “unenlightened” Moroccan patients and “enlightened” Eastern European women, Ewa inscribed its upper-class Polish-Jewish readership into the dominant Western supremacist discourses on Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America. In this context, Brojdo’s intersectional marginality as a Jewish woman from Eastern Europe faded away.

This volume brings together contributions discussing how, over the past two centuries, Eastern Europeans have conceptualized themselves within
the social and cultural matrix of their relations with lands and people outside this region and beyond the West. In analyzing how diverse East European actors, from travelers and businesspeople to lobbyist groups, have related to developments outside Eastern Europe, this collection at once expands our understanding of the region’s history and moves beyond the essentialist labeling that has defined the region as passive concerning global developments in the last two hundred years. By focusing on both Russia—which exerted its imperial power over the East European lands and nations that it dominated throughout much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—and the countries under its political domination, such as Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Czechoslovakia, as well as minority groups within these larger political entities, this volume speaks both of hegemonial and marginal experiences. In that sense, this volume offers both a geographic and ethnic/status-related multiperspectivity. The contributions in this collection give the margins (both those of Europe and those within East European societies) a voice and interweave those voices into a fabric of both regional and global connections. Our emphasis is on historical studies, which complement the literary examinations that are definitely more numerous in the scholarship, especially in the case of countries other than imperial Russia.

*The World beyond the West* connects regional developments with global processes and phenomena. We argue that the East European condition, shaped by its self-perceived and externally ascribed peripherality, in-betweenness, and Otherness, has defined the way this region has shaped its relations with lands and people outside Europe. The goal of this volume is to reexamine how we think about discourses and practices in which Eastern Europeans have related to racial and ethnic diversity, Orientalism, colonialism, exoticization, and ethnic Othering. We do not include voices speaking of how Eastern Europe has positioned itself toward the West, focusing instead on lands and people (in the Middle East, Central Asia, Latin America, and Africa) that shape the region’s hierarchies and linkages by significant ambivalence and complexity. While the first studies of Orientalism were limited to the French and British Empires (a fact that has its roots in Edward Said’s classic 1978 study), newer studies have also looked at Central (imperial Germany and Austria-Hungary) and Eastern Europe as producers and reproducers of Orientalist content and Orientalist hierarchies. The homogeneity of Orientalism has now been definitively dismantled, and Central and East European Orientalism, less bound up with colonialism and fertile concerning the scientific discourse within Oriental studies or travel literature, has become prominent, revealing a rich subfield of literary, historical, and cultural studies. Following Bourdieu’s theory of symbolic violence, we suggest that diverse East European actors learned
how to claim belonging to Western cultural capital, which allowed them to imagine themselves as being on a par with Western dominators. In that sense, Eastern Europeans used Occidentalism in the way defined by Fernando Coromin; that is, shaping an Occidental sense of self and defining Occidental values as superior while simultaneously enacting Oriental Oth-
ering of people whom they perceived to be “more Oriental.”3

Eastern Europe as approached in this volume is a diverse conglomera-
te of concepts, identifications, and contesting visions. Its borders and char-
acteristics are vividly discussed not merely as geographical landmarks but also as loaded terms that established hierarchies and asymmetries between various parts of the world. Eastern Europe’s ambivalent status is discussed here above all in the context of Orientalism. Since Western Europe often defined itself as the embodiment of the Enlightened West and reduced Eastern Europe to its opposite, the East European case elucidates how cultural hegemonies are at work within not only regional but also global his-
tory. This has been eloquently argued by Larry Wolff, who recreated the process of defining Eastern Europe in the period of the Western Enlight-
enment, or by Maria Todorova, who showed how the West reduced the Balkans to “semi-European” and “semi-civilized.”4 While Western Europe ascribed civilizational inferiority to Eastern Europe as a whole, Western discourse-shaping actors have also attributed specific stereotypical “Eastern” characteristics to individual countries. One very helpful instrument for understanding how these processes work is imagology, a discipline ex-
amining discourses on images of nations. Imagology, by looking at both hetero-images and self-images, offers a perspective on examining and ex-
plaining the discourse around difference.5 Imagology has been a productive field in showing how East European countries were excluded from “Eu-
ropeanness,” displaced to the margins of Europe, and, last but not least, shifted in mental maps further toward the Asian Orient.6

In speaking of Eastern Europe’s linkages to lands and people outside of it, we shall delineate the region precisely. Political and geographic lines were redrawn after 1989, and while some scholars define Eastern Europe in a broader sense (usually as all the formerly communist countries),7 others prefer to add a middle region, East-Central Europe (which does not include the post-Soviet countries),8 and some place Russia as a separate geographic and cultural entity.9 Before the political reconstruction of Europe in 1918, diverse areas of what is understood as Eastern Europe were shaped by various imperial regimes (the Russian, Ottoman, Habsburg, and Prussian Em-
pires). Historian John M. Roberts noted that “Europeans have long been unsure about where Europe ‘ends’ in the east. In the west and to the south, the sea provides a splendid marker . . . but to the east the plains roll on and on and the horizon is awfully remote.”10 Historically, Eastern Europe has of-
ten been identified with “Slavia,” which underlined the linguacultural division of Europe into Slavic, Germanic, and Romance language spheres. We understand Eastern Europe instead more broadly to include all of Russia’s territory during its imperial era.¹¹ Before 1939, Eastern Europe was characterized by an ethnic diversity unknown in the West, with “titular” groups often perceiving the “nontitular” ethnic minorities as “alien” and even subjecting them to social exclusion or forced assimilation. The ethnic tensions that shaped much of East European history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries contributed to the further Othering of the region as chaotic and violent, detached from what was perceived as “European” at the time. In particular, revolutionary and later Communist Russia was conceptualized as fundamentally different from the democratic and capitalist West.

In-betweenness and marginality are central terms in discussing the location of Eastern Europe. Homi Bhabha refers to the “in-between” spaces as “terrain[s] for elaborating strategies of selfhood—singular or communal—that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself.” These “interstices”—overlaps of domains of difference—are fora for negotiation of cultural values and community interests.¹² Eastern Europe has been defined by a constant production and reproduction of such overlaps of simultaneous belonging to the East and to the West. As Stuart Hall noticed, “the West produced many different ways of talking about itself and ‘Others.’”¹³ In the Western discourse, the notion of Eastern Europe has been shaped at least in part by a discourse of Othering and questioning of the region’s full belonging to the West. Both east European ideas of selfhood and Western ideas of Eastern Europe’s deficiency and inferiority have defined it as an “in-between” space. In this context we find the term “margins” very useful for discussing Eastern Europe’s ambivalent status. Margins are defined by their distance from the center, by their weaker resonance, by their dependence and fragility. We not only define East European “marginality” within the binary division of Eastern and Western Europe but also draw attention to “derivate marginalities” within Eastern Europe, i.e., the perspective of those marginalized within specific countries (Jews or exiles, to give two examples¹⁴). The relationship of margins to metropolises is not solely a unidirectional one, however, in which the former are constituted by the latter; the margins can also influence “their” centers. Approached from the marginal perspective, the center gains a new face.

Eastern Europe’s self-perceived and externally ascribed peripheral situation and imaginary encouraged scholars of postcolonial studies to examine the region’s history and literature through this lens.¹⁵ As Tomasz Zarycki has suggested, since any discourse on Eastern Europe and its dependent position in respect of the Western core will result in reproduction
of Orientalist stereotypes, the postcolonial approach can offer a reflexive perspective for deconstructing the Orientalist dynamic. Since the eighteenth century, Eastern Europe has been increasingly defined as the less developed part of the continent, where instead of the “West European” values of democracy, reason, and moderation, primitive barbarism, repressive politics, or belligerent chaos reigned supreme. Easternness and Westernness were conceptualized as dichotomous, inherently different, and conflicting. This binary, patronizing attitude was reinforced during the Cold War, when Europe’s East and West were attracted to the two poles of a political conflict. Consequently, Eastern Europe has been identified in the West with the same values as the “actual” Orient (the Middle East or North Africa). Rethinking East European perspectives on this phenomenon enables researchers to question these established dichotomies. Both pre-partition Poland (before 1772) and imperial Russia (1721–1917) developed a network of relationships with the “neighboring Orient.” For several hundred years the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth bordered the Ottoman Empire and was involved in the process of cross-border cultural exchange. Imperial Russia developed a means of colonizing “its” Orient by conquering and managing the Crimea, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Siberia. In that sense, both Poland and Russia were simultaneously “perpetrators” and “victims” of Orientalist debates on Easternness, and both emerged as complex case studies that afford us better insight into the intricacies of European Orientalism. Thus we postulate, echoing Madina Tlostanova and Yulia Komska, a “decolonization” of the perception of Eastern Europe in order to bring a halt to identification of the region through this narrow, dichotomous lens.

In the last thirty years an impressive body of scholarship concerning Russian Orientalism has been produced. There has also been extensive research demonstrating that Russian Orientalism mirrored the way in which West Europeans sought to research and describe the Orient. This was especially visible in the so-called Silver Age (1890s–1917) among the Russian cultured elite, in its art scene, and in Orientology circles. The relationship between Russia and its “internal Orients” (the Crimea, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Siberia) informed the discussion about the Russian national identity, its own “Easternness,” and its degree of belonging to Europe. Yet most studies focusing on Russian Orientalism leave aside the role of ethnic minorities in establishing systems of cultural hierarchies within the Russian Empire. In our collection, the contributions of Mateusz Majman on Mountain Jews and Russian academia, and of Curtis Murphy on Polish exiles in the nineteenth-century Caucasus and Kazakhstan, enrich the discussion on the ways in which subordinated groups engaged in Russian debates concerning the empire’s ethnic diversity.
In-betweenness also characterized the Jewish experience in Eastern Europe and the Jewish encounter with global developments. Most studies of east European Orientalism include no reference to the role of Jews within the workings of Orientalism or to the emergence of linkages and dependencies between Eastern Europe and the Orients (including Russia’s aforementioned internal “Orients”). By the same token, studies concerning Jewish involvement in colonialism and Orientalism tend to focus on German, British, or French Jews rather than Jews from Eastern Europe. East European Jews at the turn of the twentieth century continued to be excluded from the “right” of involvement in Orientalism, colonialism, and exoticization and seem to be perceived only as passive victims of antisemitism and pogroms who either suffered in barbaric Russia or fled the region. At the same time, Jews were Orientalized across Europe, presented as a foreign and Asian (hence Oriental) element within the Christian continent. Some members of the East European Jewish cultural elite absorbed Orientalism as part of a broader idealization of “Westernness” or “modernity” and practiced it themselves. We argue that Jewish history in Eastern Europe and the history of Eastern Europe’s global linkages were interconnected. As Jonathan Hirsch convincingly shows in his contribution on the East European Jewish encounter with Egypt, East European Jews revealed there the structural firmness of the imagined cultural superiority that they had assumed in Eastern Europe despite being members of a discriminated ethnic minority.

In this volume we argue that Eastern Europeans have forged and maintained a complex network of relations with lands and people both outside the immediate region and outside the West. Many of these connections came about as a result of emigration following military or economic crises in Eastern Europe. In our volume this is exemplified by the East European Jewish immigrants to Palestine who found themselves refugees in Ottoman Alexandria, or the Polish exiles in the Kazakh territories and the Caucasus who capitalized on the ethnographic knowledge they had obtained and joined the imperial Russian *mission civilisatrice*. In their writings about Kazakh or indigenous Caucasian populations, Russian and Polish travelers, merchants, exiles, and researchers were quick to leverage the identification with whiteness that in their eyes represented power and civilization and positioned them closer to the colonizing power center. In the study of East European Orientalism and self-Orientalisms, scholars have focused on internal East European Orients, meaning areas bordering on Eastern Europe yet through the process of Othering defined as Oriental spaces. This refers to the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Siberian and Central Asian lands within the Russian Empire. While this process of “internal Othering” is an important seat of East European Orientalism, our volume seeks to combine this approach with research into the relations between Eastern Europe and lands that were not part of the same political structure.
Ethnic Othering—understood as transforming a difference into an Otherness that then became the salient characteristic of the Other—has developed as a central term in the study of travel writing. Our volume inquires to what extent ideas of Otherness were formed differently in Eastern Europe than in the West. This aspect issue is particularly visible in the post-World War II context. When the French and British Empires collapsed and dozens of countries in Asia and Africa gained independence, the Soviet Union and its satellites embarked upon a period of engaged involvement with former colonies of these Western countries. A particularly useful notion here is the “Second World,” understood as the communist camp, which lies between the “First” and “Third” Worlds. Eastern Europe thus engaged in the production of knowledge concerning the “Third World” and developed economic and political ties with Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This new era, described by Adam Kola as “socialist postcolonialism,” allowed Eastern Europeans to shape discourses of analogy between their experience and the experiences of the decolonized countries. Examples include parallels drawn between the economic devastation in Poland following World War II and that caused by the disastrous wars in Indochina, Vietnam, and Korea, or the perception of Soviet-influenced East European countries as colonized and dependent in a way similar to African or Asian states. By drawing on analogies between the “Second” and “Third” Worlds, Eastern Europeans established new patterns of forging Otherness, different from those that originated in the colonialist West, and visibly marked their presence within the global order. In our volume, Barbora Buzássyová and Jill Massino provide a perspective on the tensions between propaganda and the sense of shared experience using case studies from Czechoslovakia and Romania.

We suggest that in order to better comprehend the complexity of the East European experience in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries it is important to look at a wider spectrum of relations with “non-Europe” rather than to limit the research perspective to the study of Orientalism. This can be achieved by observing two conditions. First, it is important to explore how Eastern Europeans produced knowledge about, researched, explored, and narrated lands and peoples located outside the Orient, the West, and their own region. Second, the relations between Eastern Europe and these countries should be explored in a broad context encompassing both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and should go beyond the “hyper-Orientalist” period of the turn of the twentieth century. For although Latin America attracted hundreds of thousands of East European migrants (both Jews and peasants), this continent remains outside the scientific scrutiny concerning East European involvement in shaping cultural and civilizational hierarchies. Its presumed “Europeanness,” especially that of Argentina, Brazil, or Uruguay, have made it more difficult to define as a
region of Orientalist or colonialist fantasies. This has led to relatively few studies examining how Eastern Europeans conceptualized this region. The contributions of Marta Grzechnik (on the interwar era) and Balázs Venvovits (on the second half of the nineteenth century) in our collection reveal Latin America as a key region for thinking around Eastern Europe’s linkages with global developments and develop our awareness of the mechanisms of its encounter with foreign lands and peoples. While Poles did not define Latin America as “Oriental,” they did conceptualize it as a space for Polish expansion, betraying the East European interest in being on the strong side in a world shaped by symbolic violence.

This volume addresses several specific issues with the hope of bringing them into the scholarly discussion. One of them is “fantasies of greatness.” In using the term “fantasy” after Suzanne Zantrop, we want to focus on two important aspects of Polish colonial stories: their purely whimsical and abstract character, and their sexual connotations linking erotic fascination with the Other with the urge for power and control. East European expansionism, we shall argue, was shaped by very real phenomena within the Russian Empire, but also by unrealized fantasies. Polish colonial expansion might seem to be a notion at odds with the country’s poverty and relative weakness following World War I, but such projects speak of the very real discourses of injustice, lack of compensation, or disadvantage that circulated after 1918 in many East European countries. The complexities of these Polish “fantasies” are clearly visible in the contributions of Piotr Puchalski and Marta Grzechnik. These scholars, who look at Poland in the interwar years, suggest that the postimperial condition of the newly reunited country after 1918 motivated both researchers and politicians to claim a more prominent place for it within the Western world, which in many respects was defined by colonialism. Whereas Polish relations with the world outside Eastern Europe have usually been studied from the literary angle, our collection places this issue within the historical developments of interwar Europe. And where most travelogues inform us about their authors’ personal relationships with the lands they explored, the Polish research expeditions scrutinized by Grzechnik and Puchalski offer a perspective of organized and structured link-building between Eastern Europe and other parts of the world.

The Contributions

Our book is divided into three parts. Part I, “Affirming and Contesting the Empire,” introduces readers to some of the new concepts shaping the discussion on Russia’s Europeanness and Asianness. Further, this part focuses on “peoples on the margins” of the Russian Empire, above all Poles and Jews
who themselves contributed to the adoption of an Orientalist gaze in respect of groups that were identified to be even farther from the center. Thus we suggest that the research tradition of studying “internal Orientalisms” in Eastern Europe, which has focused on studies of learned societies with a history of contribution to mainstream Western culture and perceived as elites (see Vera Tolz or David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye) should be complemented by attention to “peoples on the margins” of the empire.

The chapter by Batir Xasanov, “Constructing Aziatchina: An Apology for Perceived Own ‘Emptiness’ in Russian National and Imperial Discourses, 1828–1918,” discusses the term Aziatchina, coined in the early nineteenth century, when intellectual circles of Russian society were preoccupied with positioning their homeland vis-à-vis Europe. The chapter acknowledges the importance of Aziatchina and the prevalence of concepts relating to “emptiness” in the intellectual mapping of the Russian empire in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Xasanov shows that from the second half of the nineteenth century Aziatchina was used by Russian imperial thinkers to claim that Russian colonization was nothing more than the nonviolent absorption of “empty” spaces or territories.

In chapter 2, “Involuntary Orientalists: Polish Exiles and Adventurers as Observers of the Kazakh Steppe and the Caucasus,” Curtis G. Murphy looks at the numerous ethnographic accounts of the peoples living along the Russian Empire’s Central Asian and Caucasian borderlands produced by Polish freedom fighters turned exiles. Murphy’s chapter adds a new dimension to our focus on looking at the Other by analyzing these encounters between members of different suppressed groups in the Russian Empire. Murphy argues that Polish observers of Eurasia broadly shared the assumptions and solutions of the Russian civilizing mission rather than subscribing to some notion of a common anti-imperial front. The chapter explores how assumptions about race played an immense role and how the imperialist view of Caucasus highlanders and Kazakh nomads proved influential.

In chapter 3, “These Sufferers, Constantly Lamenting Their Bitter Fate’: The Image of the Mountain Jews in the Writings of Joseph Judah Chorny and Ilya Anisimov,” Mateusz Majman explores two little-known works portraying the Mountain Jews written in Russian by emancipated Russian Jews in the second half of the nineteenth century. Both works were pioneering contributions to what was then the emerging Russian Oriental studies field. They are not examples of classical Orientalization, yet they strongly influenced the formation of the image of the Caucasian Jews in late nineteenth-century Russian society. Majman’s work illuminates how Jews engaged in the production of scholarly knowledge within Russian Caucasiology and shows how their status as knowledge producers influenced their writing.
Part II, “Creating the Other: Travel and Migration,” addresses the interplay between space and the sense of superiority. This section comprises chapters that focus scholarly attention on reconfiguring yet another conceptual template related to Orientalism. Not only has scholarship historically privileged study of travel accounts from the West, but it has also, and more significantly, passed over minorities’ testimonies. This section explores how membership of an ethnic minority/citizenship of a colonized country shaped the discourse of difference and led (or did not lead) to the process of ethnic Othering. What happened to the power hierarchy when Eastern Europeans related to lands that could not be essentialized as “Oriental” or simply areas where Polishness or Hungarianness was not immediately identified with privilege? What was the role of Jewishness in the accounts of migrants and travelers?

Balázs Venkovits’s chapter, the fourth in the volume, “The East-West Dichotomy Disrupted: Triangulation and Reflections on the Imperial View in Hungarian Perceptions of North America,” argues that Hungarian travelers in Mexico represented both the privileged West and what some perceived to be a backward periphery. To define their status, they needed to position themselves between the dominant culture and their native home one (Hungarian culture). Therefore, they adapted the vocabulary of Western travel writers and wrote in a style reflecting the imperial view and colonial discourse despite the fact that they were not colonizers in these regions and that their own country was often depicted by travelers from the West in analogously simplistic and negative ways.

Jonathan Hirsch, in chapter 5, “Negotiating Empires: Eastern European Jewish Responses to the Expulsion of Jews from Palestine to Egypt in 1914–15” explores the events of the winter of 1914/15, when more than ten thousand Jews, the majority of them of East European origin and subjects of the Russian Empire, were expelled to British-occupied Egypt. Hirsch focuses on the refugee crisis that occurred in the Middle East from the perspectives of East European Jewish observers. His research illuminates that the expulsion of Russian-Jewish settlers from Palestine to Egypt strengthened acceptance of Western cultural supremacy over the East among some prominent Zionist activists. Hirsch shows eloquently how Vladimir (Ze’ev) Jabotinsky imagined East European Jews as actors within the British colonial project and argued for separation between Jewish immigrants from Poland or Russia and the native Arab population.

In chapter 6, “From Exotic Adventure to Victimization to Estrangement: Imagining ‘Africa’ through the Eyes of Czechoslovak Travel Writers (1950s–1980s),” Barbora Buzássyová examines the discourse of representation of “Africa” adopted by Czechoslovak travel writers during the period when socialist Czechoslovakia was reopening to the rest of the world.
She shows that such travelogues often not only served a “transnational” function of familiarizing the domestic readership with the outside world but also responded to “national” needs for positive self-representation of socialist Czechoslovakia. Buzássyová illustrates, for instance, how the language and visual designs of internationalist campaigns embedded traditional dichotomies between “white saviors” and “helpless black victims.”

Part III, “Representations and Fantasies,” foregrounds the focus on “colonial fantasies” and political ambitions, which still have not been explored comprehensively with regard to Eastern Europe. Two texts discuss post-1918 Poland’s colonial plans and examine the tension between the images of Poles as champions of independence movements on the one hand and envisioned colonizers on the other. Jill Massino’s chapter adds another layer of medial representation in the process of shaping popular Romanian perceptions of the Vietnam War.

Chapter 7, Marta Grzechnik’s “Land Flowing with Milk and Honey: Polish Maritime and River/Colonial League’s Depictions of South America,” shows how South America became a forum for Poland’s colonial fantasies. She scrutinizes texts written by members of Polish research expeditions to Brazil and Peru and places them within the context of exoticization and susceptibility to subordination. Grzechnik investigates the shaping of the image of the continent, its nature, and its native inhabitants and the supposed role of Polish citizens there. For instance, Polish peasants, identified in Eastern Europe by both the Polish cultured classes and external actors as primitive and passive, in Latin America were transformed in the eyes of the Polish interwar elite into conquerors and pioneers, as Marta Grzechnik convincingly argues in her chapter. Furthermore, this chapter illustrates that the Polish colonial discourse also needs to be conceived as stories of sexual conquest and surrender.

In “Between Postimperial Expansion and Promethean Mission: Africa and Africans in Interwar Polish Colonial Discourse” (chapter 8), Piotr Puchalski continues the investigations into the various forms of colonial discourse that supported Polish interwar policies in Africa. As Puchalski suggests, this discourse ranged from championing Western imperialism to supporting indigenous anticolonial independence movements. Puchalski’s article examines diverse types of sources, ranging from diplomatic correspondence to travel literature, and demonstrates continuities and changes within Polish conceptions of Africa and dreams of empire. He argues that, depending upon their geopolitical and diplomatic prerogatives, visiting Polish writers imagined their compatriots in Africa as either colonialists or anticolonial agents, redeploying their particular perspective as a formerly partitioned nation looking to expand in Angola, Liberia, and elsewhere.
Jill Massino’s “Eastern Promises: Romanian Responses to the War in Vietnam” (chapter 9) analyzes official representations and popular perceptions of the Vietnam War in Romania during the mid-1960s. She investigates the complex relationship between socialist ideology, the imagined Other, and the attention shift. She also focuses on personal reflections to illustrate the degree to which state media shaped popular understandings of the war and the way in which Vietnam became part of the everyday imaginary in Romania.
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**Notes**


8. See for example: Irina Livezeanu and Arpad von Klimo, eds., *The Routledge History of East Central Europe Since 1700* (London: Routledge 2007). It is worth noting that some historians prefer to use the term “Central Europe” to define this region. For instance, the revised and expanded edition of Paul Magosci’s *Historical Atlas of East Central Europe*, which first came out in 1994, was republished later under the title *Historical Atlas of Central Europe* because “articulate elements in many countries of this region consider eastern or even east-central to carry a negative connotation and prefer to be considered as part of Central Europe.” See Paul Magosci, *Historical Atlas of Central Europe* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002), xiii. The evolution of the term “Central Europe” is defined in Larry Wolff, “The Traveler’s View of Central Europe: Gradual Transitions and Difference in European Borderlands,” in *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands*, ed. Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 23–41.


14. Studies show that a perspective similar to that taken in our volume was also embraced by Muslims living in eastern Europe; cf. Mary C. Neuburger, *The Orient Within: Muslim Minorities and the Negotiation of Nationhood in Modern Bulgaria* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 12–13.


26. For the Polish case, see Marek Arpad Kowalski, Dyskurs Kolonialny w Drugiej Rzeczpospolitej (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2010).

27. Much research has been devoted to Jan Potocki’s travelogues. Several edited volumes dealing with Eastern European Orientalism include only literary studies. The cultural and social history of Polish Orientalism remains underresearched. For instance, in Der Ost des Ostes: Orientalismen in slavischen Kulturen und Literaturen (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012), Eastern Europe is equated with “Slavia,” and Slavic languages are unconvincingly established as the defining feature of the region (as if language played any role in shaping Orientalism).
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