

nation” that ushered in the early success of Hungarian sound film. The Hungarian answer to the Jewish question, however, was the exclusion of Jews from the industry (as well as the rest of Hungarian society). The result was the decline in the financial and artistic success of Hungarian film by the late 1930s. This in turn drove the Hungarian government and film industry into a closer relationship with Germany. Frey’s examination of the process opens up the question of why Hungary, while becoming more aligned and dependent on Germany and becoming more openly antisemitic, nonetheless fought so long for an independent Hungarian film industry, including the surreptitious employment of Jews. Why did the Hungarians not simply nationalize their film industry along the model of Goebbels? For starters, Frey shows that Hungary lacked the economic strength to make such a project work. Nationalization would have meant turning the Hungarian film industry into a pawn of Germany. Such a move would have meant ending the Hungarian “elite” dream of employing film to promote viable, Christian nationalism and would have excluded Hungary from any cultural leadership in Central Europe.

More importantly, Frey argues that the competitive, market-based structure of the industry and the artistic contribution of writers, directors, and actors schooled in a modernist, urbanist European aesthetic created a conflicted, but innovative, Hungarian style that tempered radical remaking of the industry—both in an artistic and economic sense. “In resisting the zealots,” Frey argues, “government and industry leaders grudgingly accepted the economic realities of the late 1930s and early 1940s. They realized it was impossible to remove risk and speculation, the so-called ‘Jewishness’ of capitalism, from a creative economy” (258). Frey’s nuanced telling of the contradictions and catch-22s of Hungary’s nationalist dreams and the technical, economic, military, and political realities (domestic and foreign) that frustrated them is fascinating. Such subtleties make the book an important contribution to the national histories of Hungary and other Central European states, which too often appear only as prologue or postscript to the striding behemoth of National Socialist Germany.

Frey’s book is a welcome contribution to the interwar history of how Central European nation-states came to grips with the issues of defeat, ethnicity, economic collapse, and rising German power. The book will be most welcomed by historians, but it provides well-documented and detailed facts on the key personalities, films, and events of Hungarian cinema in its initial sound development. Though not a film studies monograph, it does engage with the necessary theory fully enough to make it a valuable read for anyone researching Hungarian film of the interwar period. The book also clearly engages the questions of antisemitism and the Holocaust in Hungary, but it does so from a distance and by showing how film laid much of the cultural groundwork for anti-Jewish policies of Hungarian state during World War II.

Donald Wallace
United States Naval Academy

Suttner, Andreas. *Das schwarze Wien. Bautätigkeit im Ständestaat 1934–1938.* Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2017. Pp. 288.

doi:10.1017/S0067237819000493

The pre-Nazi era of authoritarian/dictatorial rule in Austria from 1933/34 to 1938—usually termed either “Austrofascism” or the “Corporate State” depending on one’s political orientation—remains a deeply contested issue in Austrian political society and hence a fundamentally underdeveloped area of historical research. For this reason alone, Andreas Suttner’s first monograph *Das schwarze Wien*—the title plays on the much more well-known era of “Red Vienna” in the 1920s and the identification of Austria’s conservative right wing with the color black—breathes new life into an otherwise rather deadlocked area of contemporary Austrian history. As a detailed topographical

survey of architecture and urban planning during the Austrofascist regime, this work moreover constitutes an innovative thematic and chronological contribution to the recent boom in the study of Vienna's historical cityscape, particularly under National Socialism (I think here for example of the recent works by Architekturzentrums Wien, ed., *Wien. Die Perle des Reiches: Plänen für Hitler* [Vienna, 2015], or Dieter Hecht, Eleonore Lappin-Eppel, and Michaela Raggam-Blesch, *Topographie der Shoah. Gedächtnisorte des zerstörten jüdischen Wien* [Vienna, 2015]). *Das schwarze Wien* demonstrates the widespread intervention in Vienna's urban landscape undertaken by the Austrofascist regime, its ideological underpinnings, and, significantly, its continuities with both the Social Democratic and National Socialist regimes that preceded and succeeded it.

The book comprises only two hundred pages of analysis, complemented by a roughly sixty-page index of construction projects, sorted according to a typology devised by the author, and a map plotting these across the cityscape. As such, it is really more of a survey, and the author presents his work as a preliminary study inviting further and more detailed research in the future. Even if regarded as a survey, however, this work offers innovations to a number of facets of Vienna's political and urban history, the novelty and topicality of this research focus being underscored by the many recent *Diplomarbeiten* (graduate theses) referenced in the footnotes: evidently, a younger generation of scholars is beginning to reassess this disputed and long-neglected area of recent Austrian history. As such, this work should be read as an original and welcome stepping stone on a path to a more critical engagement with Austria's contemporary history beyond the years of Nazi rule.

The author's principal conclusion is that—against all assumptions—the Austrofascist regime indeed evinced an ideological building program, which was rooted in both national and international urban planning movements, either inspired by or set in competition against the architectural programs of neighboring regimes in Germany and Italy and as far away as the United States. Suttner, moreover, infers from the ideological and politicized character of this building program that it proves the essentially dictatorial nature of the Austrofascist regime, albeit that many of its projects could never be realized due to the incessant economic crises that characterized its short-lived rule. Along with manifold road and bridge constructions aiming to transform Vienna into a modern *Verkehrsstadt* (see especially 53–74), one of the perhaps more surprising findings presented here is the scale of residential housing projects initiated under Austrofascism (75–107, 128–64). These aimed primarily at “de-proletarianizing” Vienna's worker suburbs while evincing a striking continuity in administration, financing, and even architectural heritage with the hated predecessor regime of “Red Vienna,” that had originally politicized the urban space of the city (24–43).

To this is added a layer of more obvious ideological construction projects such as memorials and monumental administrative buildings (114–24, 166–92), of which many were either destroyed during the Nazi regime (with some notable exceptions, such as the Dollfuß memorial in the Michaelerkirche) or were ultimately not realized due to economic restraints and finally the Anschluss. Aside from individual exceptions such as the Rundfunkgebäude, today the seat of the Österreichischer Rundfunk, in the Argentinierstraße, the greatest and most significant exception is the string of churches built throughout Vienna's suburbs that were intended to “re-Catholicize” the urban population and demonstrate the connection between church and state that was idiosyncratic to this regime. A particularly innovative aspect of Suttner's analysis relates to the attempts through various, mostly unrealized memorial and/or urban planning projects to inculcate a conservative nationalist *Österreich-Bewusstsein* during the interwar period (see especially 169–74, 188–92)—a topic that is deserving of far greater attention for its role in the bumpy and conflicted development of the Austrian republican idea through the twentieth century.

The inclusion of historic photographs, maps, and blueprints throughout the work adds a striking visual dimension to the documentary analysis, moreover making plainly visible the surprising stylistic continuities from the “Red” through the “Black” regimes, reaching even through Nazism

and beyond to the postwar era. This latter aspect in particular, which is only cursorily addressed in the conclusion by reference to the many architects, artists, and city planners (most notably Clemens Holzmeister) who continued to design, build, and decorate municipal housing blocks with implicitly Austrofascist symbolism into the 1950s (199–201), would make a fascinating follow-up study for continuities in the urban landscape reaching through and beyond National Socialism.

Those familiar with Vienna's urban topography in the present day will be interested to (re-) discover the areas of the city that were shaped by Austrofascist city planners, such as the Operngasse area in the fourth district or, somewhat more implicitly, the Austrofascist forerunner proposals of the only recently completed Hauptbahnhof project at the Wiedner Gürtel. The analysis of medieval and Christian-inspired public artworks as quintessentially Austrofascist expressions in public space should raise some eyebrows with regard to their continued proliferation in municipal housing projects through the 1950s. All in all, this is a fine and original survey of the politics of urban planning during Austrofascism and its (often subtle) impact on Vienna's urban landscape that can be observed to this day. As such, this work should be read as an inspiring contribution to contemporary Austrian history and as an impetus toward new research into the understudied era of Austrofascist rule.

Tim Corbett
Museum of Jewish Heritage

Fillafer, Franz Leander, and Thomas Wallnig, eds. *Josephinismus zwischen den Regimen: Eduard Winter, Fritz Valjavec und die zentraleuropäischen Historiographien im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2016. Pp. 326.
 doi:10.1017/S006723781900050X

Franz Leander Fillafer and Thomas Wallnig's anthology *Josephinismus zwischen den Regimen: Eduard Winter, Fritz Valjavec und die zentraleuropäischen Historiographien im 20. Jahrhundert* is a unique, long-overdue contribution to the research of Josephinism and the Austrian Enlightenment. This book aims to examine the development and reception of Josephinism during National Socialism. In the introduction, co-written with Wallnig, and the first chapter, Fillafer defines and summarizes the terms "Josephinism" and "Austrian Enlightenment." There are two commonly accepted periods of Josephinism: temporally extended periodization and person-centered periodization. According to Fillafer, Josephinism begins with either the inauguration of Emperor Joseph I (1678–1711) in 1705 or the inauguration of Emperor Charles VI (1685–1740) in 1711 and lasts until the nineteenth century.

The anthology analyzes how historians from East-Central Europe and from southeastern Europe interpret Josephinism in the twentieth century. More precisely, the chapters scrutinize the divergent interpretations on Josephinism by Eduard Winter (1896–1982) and Fritz Valjavec (1909–60), which emerged during the National Socialist era. Winter's and Valjavec's careers greatly benefited from the advancement of the National Socialist German Workers Party. Although Winter lost his position as the Chair of the History of the Church, he was appointed a professorship of European Intellectual History in Prague. Valjavec was appointed to a professorship in Munich, before he went to the Institute for International Studies in Berlin to work on his studies of racial ideology. Both men interpreted the Josephinism differently. Winter describes Josephinism as a reform Catholicism and Valjavec as a result of different intellectual and ecclesiastical currents. In contrast to all previous interpretations, they both consider Josephinism to be part of the Catholic Enlightenment.

Two other chapters by Jiří Němec and Norbert Spannenberger discuss the influence of Nazism on Winter's and Valjavec's interpretations of Josephinism. Němec points out that Winter's book about Josephinism from 1942–43 is not a National Socialist interpretation of history and that the fact that