



first publication

in cooperation with the *Institute for Strengthening Democracy in BiH / Presentation at the Sixth International Seminar Democracy and Human Rights in Multiethnic Societies, Panel Publishing a New Europe*

* The author would like to thank Nadežda Kinsky and Raleigh Whiting for their professional revision of the English text.

1 Rásky, Béla: Publishing Diversities, Diverse Publishing Spaces in a New Europe. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/BRasky1.pdf>, 10.09.2003.

2 Cf. e.g. Blumenberg, Hans: *Arbeit am Mythos*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1995.

3 At the time of writing in July 2003, *Kkrev's* editorial team slightly differed from the current team. Members of the editorial board were Angela Eder, Peter Plener, and Ursula Reber. Currently the team consists of (still) Peter Plener, Ursula Reber, as well as the Bohemianist and Russist Annette Höslinger-Finck, and the Political Scientist, Slavist and Historian Nadežda Kinsky.

The phrase »Publishing a New Europe« is fraught with difficult meanings and implications. For one thing, the term ›publishing‹, as Béla Rásky¹ has shown, always implies an act of defining, no matter what the publishers intend. Writing about phenomena, naming them, is also an act of fixing and restricting them. This is evident without having to look back to ancient biblical or mythic times, when the act of naming was a powerful magical formula, conferring upon the things and beings named their very existence²: the ongoing theoretical reflections on the power of language and coding testifies to this lasting, life-giving power of language and discourse – a fact that we of the editorial team of the academic website *Kakanien revisited* (www.kakanien.ac.at) had to face ourselves. Accordingly, we had to think about our own ideological backgrounds and about which ideologies we would support, and this made it apparent from early on that we would have to abandon our initial notions of »objectivity« and mere spectatorship, especially when our act of »publishing« (Central) Europe made us active and willing participants in the shaping of Europe.

Anyone who has visited the website and seen our presentations and CVs is likely to ask how a postgraduate in German literature, a classical philologist, and a specialist in theater studies all became involved in CEEC studies.³ As with most people, our attractions are in part a product of our individual histories – the years that the project's leader, Peter Plener, spent in Hungary, for example, or that I lived in Estonia – and friendships and emotional engagements also contributed to our new interests. In addition, there was our shared interest in the processes and problems of »Othering,« both of us being aware of the existence of »Otherness« and of the abundance of similarities, and both of us having experienced being »the Other« when we struggled with the strategies of participating in everyday life elsewhere and encountered difficulties simply because the language was not our own.

But there are also compellingly relevant reasons for devoting an Internet platform to Central European research. *Kakanien revisited* hopes to contribute constructively to the attempt to redefine Europe in the context of the expanding EU community, namely by focussing on how the »Gaze of the Newcomers« beholds a Europe that, in the minds of the cultural and political authorities, is a long-established entity. While offering a forum for scientific study, the website also aims to foster awareness of the histories and cultures of the acceding countries, granting space to the reciprocal gaze and to a variety of perspectives and voices. Yet this undertaking could strike as presumptuous and naive, since the establishment of any academic website – no matter how open – involves, by definition, an attempt to institutionalize, and therein lurks the inherent and constant danger that the undertaking might fall into the various traps of building a dysfunctional community. What, then, does it mean to »publish Europe« or even a »new Europe«? I shall begin by taking a step back to consider some concepts of Europe and how they have roots or connections in the discursive formations of knowledge. Then I shall turn to the special case of *Kk.rev* and the ways of dealing with those problems, dangers, and traps.

Speaking of Europe, we must face the fact that there is no Europe. On the contrary, Europe exists only through the discourse about it. Thus it makes no difference whether we consider Europe to be a geographical set of countries or a discursive set of cultures that, more than simply existing beside each other, constitute a kind of »collective entity« in terms of culture, political values and practices (democracy), history and heritage, or ethnic and migrational geographical distribution. Drawing the outlines and boundaries of »Europe« on a map demands consideration of the respective inclusionary strategies of Europe's limits. For example, do we see Europe extending to the mountains of the Urals and the Caucasus, as the myth of the Argonauts treats Europe's mapping? Or should we go back to a still more distant past and regard *Europa*, the cow's territory – Crete, Greece, and Turkey – as Europe? Today, the latter solution is obviously out of the question.

On the surface, Turkey's difficulties in gaining membership in the European Union stem from its way of dealing with human rights. Akin to this objection to including Turkey in Europe is the exclusion of her on the basis of her Muslim culture, which Western thought holds responsible for every offense against human rights. Muslim culture's archaic and bloody structure and its non-secular law were too often emphasized by such scholars as Gerhard

4 The review of Latour's *Kampf dem Terror – Kampf dem Islam?* on www.inkultura-online.de/kampfer.htm offers a good impression of this kind of closeness to people: »[...] neben einer immer wieder mit Humor zu lesenden, fast Gutsherrlichen Art zu schreiben [...] Diese Mischung aus Biografie und Politik, aus Beruf(ung) und Geschichte machen seine Reportagen und Bücher so überaus lesenswert und interessant. Einen großen Teil dieses weiten Horizontes wünscht man gerade deutschen Politikern, die sich in der aktuellen rot-grünen Regierungskoalition mit selbstgerechter Nabelschau zufriedengeben, anstelle unser Land auf die zweifellos kommenden Probleme vorzubereiten. Dieses Buch von Peter Scholl-Latour ist jedenfalls eine, wie gewohnt, brillante Analyse der politischen Verhältnisse in den zukünftigen Konfliktstaaten.«

5 Detrez, Raymond: *Die Sündenböcke Europas*. Dt. v. Jan Ceuppens. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/RDetrez1.pdf>, 01.10.2001.

6 Cf. Petkova, Lilia: *The Integration Process of the Turkish Minority in Bulgaria in the Post-Cold War Era*. Parallel Trends in Minority Treatment in Greece and Turkey. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/LPetkova1.pdf>, 27.06.2002.

7 For the shifting orientalisation of cultures and their ensuing division into »Eastern« and »Western« cultures, cf. RDetrez1, 01.10.2001; Detrez, Raymond: *Colonialism in the Balkans. Historic Realities and Contemporary Perceptions*. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/RDetrez1.pdf>, 15.06.2002; Said, Edward: *Orientalism*. London: Penguin 1975.

8 Cf. in addition to the already mentioned articles e.g. Langhammerová, Radka: *The European Dimension of the Czech Identity in the Process of the Czech Accession to the European Union*. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/RLanghammerova1.pdf>, 27.06.2002; Forbrig, Jörg: *The Nexus Between Civil Society and Democracy. Suggesting a Critical Approach*. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/JForbrig1.pdf>, 11.06.2003; Narozhna, Tanya: *Failed Expectations Or What is Behind the Marshall Plan for Post-Socialist Reconstruction*. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/TNarozhna1.pdf>, 29.11.2002; Langer, Josef: *Towards a Conceptualization of Border: The Central European Experience*. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/JLanger3.pdf>, 01.10.2001.

Konzelmann and Peter Scholl-Latour. Yet while their books are indeed rich in »facts« and easy to read, they use an ordinary language that often quotes common stereotypes and in doing so occasionally leave readers uncertain as to whether they are reading non-fiction or a detective story.⁴ Undeniably, these books, like many a well-written historical novel, travelogue, or biography, harbor the fruits of serious and academic work. Nor should a fluent style of narrative automatically be considered deceptive. Yet there is little honesty to be found in a use of clichés, archaic concepts, and lack of historicity that repeatedly foster the same old conclusion that, for some people, the Middle Ages last forever.

Thus while Germans look to Turkey as a favorite holiday destination, they revert, once back at home, to an antipathy towards that foreign culture – targeting its most visible sign, the head scarf of Muslim women. The prejudices we learn are long-lasting obstacles both to cultural transfer and even to our own efforts to take seriously this mythic space and cultural geography of Europe. Raymond Detrez⁵ discusses the recurring suggestion that »Europe« be limited to those countries and cultures historically rooted in the Holy Roman Empire, with European states adopting a constitution marked on the one hand by Roman law – meaning that constitutional civil rights are restricted to a more or less limited number of a country's inhabitants – and on the other hand by the tradition of the German and French Enlightenment, which gives the imperial and élitist Roman law its »European« democratic character, based on the right of the individual and on individual responsibility for the personal welfare, happiness, and freedom of life-style of all. This solution also involves a close connection between Europeaness and a Christianity that happens to be restricted to Protestantism and to liberal forms of Catholicism, while Orthodox Christianity is definitively excluded. Obviously, a problem arises at this point, since the concept of a Europe rooted simultaneously in ancient Greece and in an enlightened and modernized Holy Roman Empire relates very problematically to Europe's oldest component: modern Greece. Neither Lutheran nor Catholic, Greece is the only EU-member whose majority religion is Eastern Orthodoxy, and this, surprisingly, causes more problems for the inclusionist strategies than does its ancient paganism.⁶ For while Greek paganism is seen to have offered the pre-Christian conception of logocentrism – and thus anti-irrationalism – Orthodox Christianity, with its »oriental« touch,⁷ with its so-called »mysticism«, strikes as incompatible with enlightened Christianity. Nowadays Greece, so close both to the Balkans and to Muslim Turkey, violates the European paradigm, its current special value to the community at best forgotten, or substituted by her »great past«.

As well as documenting and reflecting the debates about the economically and politically adjusted areas of European countries that could be included in the process of accession to the EU, articles on the website *Kakanien revisited*⁸ also deal with the term »common Europe«, a concept implying that something called »Europe« belongs to one person willing to share that possession with others. Accordingly, we can talk about a »common« or shared Europe, a special field of diversity that has different users, or perhaps – because there is still no clarity about the claims of ownership – visitors to a single host or certain trust of hosts. When somebody shares something with someone else, this does not necessarily mean, that »the Other« will also gain any possessive right. This is exactly the case with the ongoing discussion about Europe: the need and right to assume the role of national supporter and host for other nationalities, as well as to consider different fields of interest and influence with respect to Europe as a sociological, legal, and cultural sphere. Both sides of the European coin are imbued with hegemony. The efforts to do justice to the newcomers to the EU in an economical, legal, and cultural sense often merely extend the rights of the stronger nations (especially of France and Germany, the countries of paradigmatic moral and political enlightenment). These efforts are often made on the basis of ideological principles that by no means have to be compatible with those of the so-called »newcomers«.⁹ Thus, justice can easily become injustice, since the justice applied is usually that of the privileged.

These fundamental ideological principles are revisited in the context of »publishing« a new Europe, and ultimately traced back to Europe's relationship to the concept of history. History is an essentially European concept, culminating in 19th-century historicism and its view of Europe as the theoretical subject of all histories, the cradle of reason, progress, enlightenment, and modernity, prescribing the only acceptable way of writing history on those terms, and evaluating the »other« according to that primordial reference and matrix. Well-known since colonialism, this outlook is reflected in Postcolonial Studies that try to overcome

9 Cf. for example Peterková, Jana: European Cultural Identity. The Role of Cultural Heritage in the Process of Mutual Communication and Creation of Consciousness of Common Cultural Identity. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/JPeterkova1.pdf>, 20.08.2003; Sucháček, Jan: European Identity: Something New on the Horizon? In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/JSuchacek1.pdf>, 18.07.2002; Sucháček, J.: European Integration After World War II: The Way to the Treaties of Rome. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/JSuchacek1.pdf>, 01.11.2002.

10 Cf. on this topic Pavlović, Srdja: Teze o Pripadnosti ili Istorija Medjuvremena [Thesis on Belonging or the History of the Mean Time]. In: Ogdalala, Iza: Eseji o Identitetu i Politici Pripadnosti [Behind the Mirror: Essays on Identity and the Politics of Belonging]. Podgorica: CID 2001, pp. 53-80. – This is a proper place to thank Srdja Pavlović in general for the manifold and helpful comments, discussions, and »food for thought« he offered *Kkrev* during the last years.

11 Czerwiński, Maciej: Discursive Constructions of European Identity in Croatian Media. Recent Media. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/MCzerwinski1.pdf>, 30.10.2003.

12 Cf. also BRasky1, 10.09.2003, who criticises the term and its production of Othering on a second level that separates a more or less coherent region. The question of an East, less Eastern than the rest, but nevertheless not Western enough to be pure Western Europe, remaining still (Western) Balkans, leads to nowhere. – Particularly the Balkans serve as the negative pole of Europe's positive rationality and multiculturalism: »It is a drastic example of all the dangers brought on by heterogeneity and efforts to preserve various national and cultural identities that exist within such a heterogeneous place.« In: Pavlovic 2001, p. 64 [Transl. SP]. Cf. also RDetrezi, 01.10.2001.

the Europe-centered history with the help of (likewise European) postmodernism and that re-evaluate, in addition to histories bound to pre-colonial modes of dealing with communities that tell the story of one's family, clan, tribe, or nation, various concepts of time and chronology. Within Europe itself a similar process is taking place: while East European scholars are advised to study »great« European historians, the Western academic discourse usually does not address the scholarly achievements from the East, and as long as publishing centers remain in Western Europe this »asymmetrical ignorance«¹⁰ will not change, with the result that Easterners seeking accession to the EU will be recognized as innovators only after they practice various discourses originally developed for analyzing (framing) Western European history and that in turn produce mainly narratives about the peripherality of Eastern countries and their historical, societal, and cultural transition to the Western goods of modernization and capitalism. Otherwise, Eastern research has only a marginal existence that does not reach a wide public. As Srdja Pavlović notes, the threefold domination of the West over the East (1. asymmetrical ignorance, 2. imposition of research topics and the inherent approbation of the supremacy of the West, 3. reverse strengthening of that supremacy) can be sustained only with the help of the »others« who accept that discourse. A vivid example of the phenomenon of a »run on Europe« is given by Maciej Czerwiński's case study on the recent shifts of the *Discursive Construction of European Identity in Croatian Media*,¹¹ which analyzes the use of terms such as the »Balkans« vs. the »Western Balkans«.¹²

Ultimately there are many obstacles against publishing »the Gaze of the New Ones«, and apparently there is no escape from being part of the discourse on Europe and History, not even for *Kakanien revisited* and its – so far – purely Western European editorial team. Due to our location in Vienna we chose the keyword »Kakanien« to indicate our projects' ironic perspective on that part of Europe divided into the West and the Balkans by the Viennese »Rennweg« (Karl Renner). The use of Robert Musil's term »Kakanien«, which he coined as a label for the Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy, is not intended to imply that research on the Central and Eastern European countries (CEEC) today is limited to the area of this former federation. Rather, the point is – with reference to Musil's ironic and perceptive characterization (combined with the English »revisited«) – to document other perspectives and highlight cross-references that do not adhere to the usual borders. As to the question of what Middle, Eastern, South-Eastern, or Central Europe actually is – whether, as the various terms suggest, it is »the centre« (an Eastern borderland, a geographical location with a sunny climate and fertile land), which is understood as the centre of Europe or, even more precisely, as a methodological challenge – »Kakanien« leaves open.

The »revisiting« of a place – which geographically, based on the choice of languages offered on the platform, stretches approximately from Estonia to Albania and from Romania to Belgium – is reflected both in the methodological and theoretical quest for a »Europe« as centre (central Europe) or periphery (the Balkans) – together with the suggested ideological and discursive implications – and in individual case studies. Being occupied with this difficult set of questions is definitely »cathartic«; it requires »exactitude and soul« and often demands »the ecstasy of sobriety« (Musil).

The openness to a large variety of languages shows another conviction of the website's editors, who believe in the good of something like »multiculturalism« or cultural diversity. In the strict sense of the term, »cultural diversity« means the maximum possible form of democracy: the participation of different groups, communities, and individuals in communication with each other without being forced to adapt to something like a »Leitkultur«, which is implied in concepts of a »common Europe« with a common »European identity«. Thus, to strengthen the »common« part of the phrase »common Europe« is helpful only within the lines of political manifestos. As I tried to show at the beginning, neither a mythic past nor a geographical and cultural neighborhood within the same continent is sufficient to gain a common identity, and I seriously doubt the sense of such an undertaking. Collective identity should not be overemphasized, since the outcomes of national identity-building are ambiguous; they do not always lead to aesthetic forms and solid communities, and at times they lead instead to exclusions, individual and collective suffering, and even war. On the other hand, diversity for its own sake has no constructive impact on the artificial operator »Europe«. From my point of view, dealing with the Europe of today requires both a willing confirmation of what cultural goods are to be shared, as well as a self-conscious space of diversities. However, since Europe

13 Cf. Pavlović, Srdja: Euthanasia for Old Rockers. In: <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/SPavlovic2.pdf>, 01.08.2002.

14 One of these can be found on the website as a material, documenting the exchange of emails between a Croatian colleague and myself: Vidulić, Svetlan Lacko / Reber, Ursula: Bizzarerien in Gewandfragen – Deutsche Pullover & südslavische Röcke. Identitäten explizit-implizit. In: http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/materialien/SVidulic_UReber1.pdf

is not on her own, but rather a member of a globalizing world, there is also the need to link her to a wide range of phenomena, some of them created by herself, and some of them forced upon her. The most obvious example for Europe outside European borders is the history of migration, exile, diaspora.¹³

Since I am moreover convinced that both individual and collective identities do exist, but are in constant flux, the nature of the research subject as a linguistic quantity also appears to be desirable and important for raising the profile of European diversity. This is the reason why the abstracts of all articles published on *Kakanien revisited* are provided in two languages. Without wishing to encourage respective national pride too much, this diversity of languages is a necessary part for such a platform to take as a reflection of the diversity of cultures, quite apart from the fact that ever-increasing multilingualism ought to make *Kakanien revisited* more accessible and familiar to more CEEC researchers. We try hard to avoid exclusion even of rare and small languages – meaning those languages that are only spoken by a small number of people. We had a number of discussions with users of the website in order to prevent misunderstandings and to do justice to recently diversifying languages.¹⁴

However, this partial multilingualism of *Kk.rev* that gives evidence of our – Western? – belief in the fruitfulness of diversity is limited to the very first informational site and the abstracts. The articles, reviews, and materials themselves are published in the website's *linguae francae* German and English. This is so in order to communicate their scientific content as widely and comprehensively as possible. That could not be guaranteed by using all the languages to the given degree, as it is not yet standard practice to learn the so-called »small« languages of the EU-acceding countries. Whether Czech or Romanian is really harder to learn than German or English or not, the ruling scientific discourse has, at least until now, decided to favor the latter two languages (as well as their scientific cultures?), a problem of hegemony against which we are not able to revoke. The best way of dealing with that seems to be the frank confession of our own involvement in discursive rules (even if we are not as open as, for example, the editorial team of the highly recommendable literary website [*house*], whose entire correspondence is available to the public). We want to encourage especially young researchers, regardless of their being part of academic networks and life or not, to present their thoughts and ideas on *Kk.rev*, although we do restrict those ideas to academic rules of presentation and use of discourse. In order to properly decide what is »worth« being spread out of those submissions that are presented as academic research, we employ common strategies of guaranteeing the scientific value of the articles to be published by anonymous peer review. However, the (postmodern) taste for cultural studies (in a wider sense) is dissolving the conservative boundaries of disciplines and their proper methods, and is strengthening interdisciplinary research. This means also that text genres are becoming more open. Hence, we especially encourage the submission of essays, the traditional genre for transgressing textual borders (combining research, biographical segments, utopianism, report, analysis, and poetry).

The articles on the website are classified into the three categories »Theory«, »Case Study« and »Materials«. This guarantees an initial categorisation, which must, however, by definition remain a rough one. In many cases, the distinction between a »theory« article and a »case study« reflects textual markers indicating either a theoretical or exemplary status as well as the author's or editor's subjective interpretation. At the same time, we regard the dissolution of such rigid categories – which is proceeding ever more strongly under the influence of cultural studies methodology and – as a creative challenge, to which our chosen classification probably does more justice than a more pedantic classification without meaningful outcome would do.

There are established on the website some focal topics, such as »Cultural Transfer« and »Post/Colonial Studies«, in order to fulfil the need for an ongoing reflection on terms like ›diversity‹, ›multiculturalism‹, or ›multi-ethnicity‹. These function as scientific *fora*. Articles, reviews, and materials are reciprocally linked in order to mark the ongoing debate and intertextual qualities. We have chosen this restrictive form of »emotional coldness«, an academic exchange in substitution for a forum with the spontaneity of real-time, because *Kk.rev* is first and foremost linked to the scientific community. To mention in passing one of the discussed topics as a particularly significant phenomenon: The struggle against the surplus of Western researchers who are engaged in post-/colonial studies – quite in a sense of overcoming the history of colonialism as collective »guilt« – is not over. Critical views on this phenomenon are to be found on the website as publication or via link to document the ideological difficulties of such methodologies.

15 At the original time of writing.

16 At the original time of writing, the conference was still in its planning stages. In December the conference NCS/NKW was successfully held with the participation of over 90 academics from around the world. The conference papers, programme, supplementary texts as well as an introduction by the organisers are published in the new category NCS/NKW:
<http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/ncs>.

17 Peter Plener: The Impact of New Media on Communication and Science. In:
<http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/PPlener1.pdf>, 30.11.2002.

The website's main aim is to support networking among researchers and research projects. Since experts and research teams are increasingly both geographically and thematically divided, optimal synergy can only be guaranteed via the contemporary solution of the Internet. We are attempting to reduce the immobility and organisational division of individual initiatives via the platform's second function next to publication and communication: the presentation of institutes and projects. These presentations should give the projects and organisations – irrespective of their size, geographical location or technical set-up – the opportunity to call attention to themselves, explain their objectives and methods, and look for new networking possibilities. On the other hand, the website's users can get an overview of the projects and organisations that might be of interest for their own research. *Kakanien revisited* is itself also always looking for collaborations, and has indeed several cooperating partners, guaranteeing the comprehensive integration of essays, research projects and new resource options. The networking with and partial integration of different CEEC projects on such a platform can greatly improve external and internal institutional and trans-border communication by enhancing the possibilities of avoiding a standstill.

Looking back onto two and a half years of networking activities¹⁵, there have been some encouraging and some disappointing results. Within Austria itself – *Kakanien revisited* is an Austrian project, subsidised by the Austrian *Bundesministerium für Bildung, Kunst und Kultur (bm:bwk)* (Ministry for Education, Art and Culture) and the University of Vienna, on whose server it is hosted – it was easy to bring various experts together in order to discuss CEEC topics, and there was a broad willingness to share one's own information and research with others. Thanks to our Austrian cooperation partners we had the opportunity to come into contact with quite a considerable number of researchers from the Central and Eastern European countries, who seized the opportunity for publication at once. On the other hand, especially young researchers, for whom the platform should be particular useful, often were too shy to contact us, although they were, as became obvious in conversations with students and researchers at conferences in these countries, they were familiar with the website. To our great pleasure, a number of persons from abroad (including but not limited to CEEC) took the opportunity to contact us and offered us their appreciation of our work, their criticisms or asked for cooperation or for the establishment of contact to specific authors on the website during these years of *Kk.rev*'s existence. Although we had to face the fact that smooth and productive networking and cooperation is heavily dependent on face-to-face meetings, these people have proved that »anonymous« networking via the Internet is possible as well.

In the future we will have to think of new ways of productive networking beyond the archival character of the platform in its current form. Next to the constant growth of the virtual library, there have to be new ways of networking that give the researchers the chance to do more than to publish their articles. For example, the experience of immobility, should be taken more clearly into consideration, leading directly into practice. Therefore, the future *Kk.rev* that I dream of would invest more capacities into networking activities via »real« meetings of our cooperating partners. A beginning for the realisation for this dream is set with the organisation of the conference *NetCultureScience*, which will take place in Budapest on December 10-13, 2003.¹⁶

In order to establish a well-functioning network in a narrower sense, another sort of administrative structure is needed: If anybody is to be honored and supported personally and institutionally as is his and her merit, a kind of member's board would be needed to take care of regular meetings, funding of activities and travels, and who would be willing not only to review research output, but also to take an interest in helping individuals plan their careers, not drawing a dividing line at private lives, as promisingly as possible. These are tasks that cannot be achieved via an Internet platform alone.

This leads to my last, but most important point: When we are talking about »publishing a new Europe«, using the example of a website, it is necessary not only to address the »scientific community«, and the sense and nonsense of networking projects, but also the media of networking and networks: On this topic, please, see Peter Plener's contribution on *The Impact of the New Media on Communication and Science*.¹⁷



Ursula Reber is currently research fellow at the Wirth-Institute for Austrian and Central European Studies at the University of Alberta, Edmonton; since 2001 editor of the internet platform Kakanien Revisited; PhD project on *Visual and Narrative Discourses of Metamorphoses*.
contact: usha.reber@kakanien.ac.at

