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4 May PROFESSOR GABRIELE CLEMENS (Hamburg)
Britain and the Political Unification of Europe: From the Fouchet Negotiations to the Creation of European Political Co-operation

Gabriele Clemens is Professor of the History of European Integration and European Studies at the University of Hamburg. She has published and edited a number of books, including *Britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland 1945–1949: Literatur, Film, Musik und Theater* (Stuttgart, 1997), and two volumes on Europe. Her current research focuses on Britain and the process of European unification.

11 May DR PAUL MADDRELL (Aberystwyth)
‘Wächst zusammen, was zusammengehört?’ Western and Eastern Sources for Western Espionage against East Germany during the Cold War

Paul Maddrell is Lecturer in Intelligence and Strategic Studies at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth. Among his main research interests are German history since 1945 and espionage during the Cold War. Paul Maddrell has published several articles on these topics and is currently working on a book entitled *Western Scientific Intelligence in Divided Germany, 1945–1961*.

25 May DR JAN PALMOWSKI (King’s College London)
‘Democratic Centralism’ and the Survival of Regional Identities in the GDR

Jan Palmowski is Lecturer in European Studies (German Politics) and Director of the Centre for Twentieth-Century Cultural Studies at King’s College London. He is the author of *Urban Liberalism in Imperial Germany: Frankfurt am Main, 1866–1914* (Oxford, 1999) and *The Oxford Dictionary of Twentieth-Century World History* (Oxford, 1997). His current research deals with national and regional historical and cultural identities in the GDR.

(cont.)
Seminars

1 June  DR MARK HEWITSON (University College London)
Germany and the Outbreak of the First World War
Mark Hewitson is Lecturer in German Politics at University
College London. His main interest is the intellectual, cultural, and
political history of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Germany.
Mark Hewitson is the author of National Identity and Political
Thought in Germany: Wilhelmine Depictions of the French Third
Republic, 1898–1914 (Oxford, 2000) and is currently working on
projects on German nationalism and national identity, 1800 to the
present, and on Germany, Europe and the West, 1871–1945.

Seminars are held at 5 p.m. in the Seminar Room of the GHIL.
Tea is served from 4.30 p.m. in the Common Room, and wine is
available after the seminars.
There were many motives for murdering a king. One of them has not, so far, been systematically investigated, although it was of the utmost significance for the constitutional history of Europe. This motive is the monarchy itself—its establishment on the basis of collective forms of rule at the end of Christian late Antiquity. William Shakespeare, who, among the greats of world literature, had the most profound understanding of the specific character of monarchical rule, had his Richard II acknowledge violent death as an integral part of the existence of kings:

For God’s sake let us sit upon the ground
And tell sad stories of the death of kings:
How some have been depos’d, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed,
Some poisoned by their wives, some sleeping kill’d,
All murthered—for within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court ...

The significance of this close link between kingship and violent death can already be observed among the barbarian peoples at the time of the migrations. This is connected with the way in which these kingdoms came into being, growing out of the successful conquests of groups of warriors who had come together more or less voluntar-

* Trans. by Angela Davies.
1 William Shakespeare, King Richard II, Act III, Scene 2.
ily, and whose leaders had found acclaim because of their successes. The future of such bands of warriors, however, depended largely on the fate of their leaders. If they were murdered or killed in battle, the group’s independent existence in many cases came to an end. If leaders survived, however, and left behind inheritable sons, then quite different conditions set the tone as soon as in the next generations. It was no longer a matter of joining such a band—its members were born into it, so that notions of natural as well as historical identity were developed, leading to ethnogenesis. If such a process continued undisturbed for any length of time, a people emerged, ruled by a dynasty.

Naturally, dynasties arose only retrospectively, when a long chain of succession had been realized. Because this essentially depended on biological chance, ways of regulating it were constantly being sought. The less kingship and rule were seen as an institution and an office, the more they depended on individuals, and the greater the temptation to change conditions by eliminating such people.

We will not here pursue the question of whether the Germanen, the Germanic tribes, had always possessed kingship as an ancient tradition of small kingdoms spread all over Europe, or whether it arose only as the result of expansions. In any case, the Romans made use of kingship among the barbarian peoples in order to create stable and controllable conditions on their borders. The Cheruscans had a king who received military support from Rome, and the Romans actually imposed kingship on the Bructerans. As Tacitus pointed

---

2 Reinhard Wenskus, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen ‘gentes’* (2nd edn.; Cologne, 1977), p. 68, with references to the causal connection which contemporaries saw between the death of the Alemannic king in the battle against Clovis (c. 497) and the end of Alemannic independence. See also the end of the Thuringian realm and kingship.


out: ‘The might and power of the kings depend upon the authority of Rome. These kings occasionally receive our armed assistance, more often our financial, and it is equally effective.’

Apart from this Roman acculturation (which should serve as a warning against naïve enthusiasm for the ancient Germans and ideological Germanism), the fact that not the monarchy, but the coexistence of a number of kings seems to have been the rule is important for the pre-history of post-Antiquity kingship and for our particular topic. At the Battle of Strasburg (357), Emperor Julian confronted seven Alemannic kings whose names are known, and a number of Batavian kings. Emperor Maximian and Constantine repeatedly defeated several Frankish kings at the same time; and a number of Frankish kings concluded peace with Julian in 356. It was exactly the same among the Frisians, Cimbri, Suebi,

7 Chnodomarius, Vestralpus, Urius, Usicinus, Serapio, Suomarius, and Hortarius. Ammianus Marcellinus, Römische Geschichte, ed. Wolfgang Seyfarth, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1970–1), 16,12,1. Among these, Chnodomarius and Serapio were the mightiest; Serapio, a nephew of Chnodomarius, was originally named Agenerichus and received the name Serapio after his father encountered Greek esoteric doctrines during his sojourn in Gaul as a hostage, ibid. 16,12,25. On Suomarius and Hortarius, ibid. 17,10,3, and 5. Constantius II fought two royal brothers, Gundomadus and Vadomarius, ibid. 14,10,1, and 10.
8 Ibid. 16,12,45.
10 Marcellinus, Römische Geschichte, 16,3,2.
12 In the battle of Vercellae (101 BC) their kings Boiorix—L. Annaeus Florus, Epitomae de Tito Livio bellorum omnium annorum DCC, ed. Edward Seymour Forster (London, 1929), 1,38,18—and Lugius were killed, whereasClaudius andCaesorix were captured. Cf. Orosius, Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII, ed. Carl Zangemeister (Vienna, 1882), 5,16,20.
Teutons, and Vandals. None of these men were merely principes in the sense meant by Tacitus, because they acted independently and were capable of making alliances among themselves.

These qualifications are important in assessing cases of regicide because the struggle for position in situations of collective rule is different from a dispute within a royal family (stirps regia). We cannot discuss this phenomenon fully here, but will simply mention the large number of regicides among the Visigoths, already famous among contemporaries, before concentrating on the Franks. They developed the institution of monarchy in the Latin, Christian part of

After the overthrow of Vannius, whom Drusus had installed, Vangio and Sido divided the regnum. Tacitus, Annales, 12,30,2.  
14 After the battle of Aquae Sextiae (102 BC) several of their escaping kings were captured by the Sequans and turned over to Marius. Plutarchi vitae parallelae, 3.1, ed. Konrat Ziegler (Leipzig, 1971), pp. 203-63, at p. 24.  
15 Several of their kings parleyed with Aurelian and gave their children as hostages. P. Herennius Dexippos, ed. F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1926), no. 100, fr. 7,2.  
16 We disregard the problem of ‘sacral regicide’. Wenskus, Stammbildung und Verfassung, p. 410, supposed its existence among the Herules and refers to Ludwig Schmidt, Die Ostgermanen (2nd edn.; Munich, 1934), p. 561, whose source may have been Procopius, The Gothic War (II), ed. H. B. Dewing, Procopius, History of the Wars (London, 1919), vol. 3, 2,14: ‘The Eruli, displaying their beastly and fanatical character against their own “rex”, one Ochus by name, suddenly killed the man for no good reason at all, laying against him no other charge than that they wished to be without a king thereafter.’  
17 Of 32 successions, 20 were achieved by force: Felix Dahn, Die Könige der Germanen, 5 (Würzburg, 1870), p. 122, n. 4. ‘The Goths had adopted this detestable custom of killing with the sword any of their kings who did not please them, and of appointing as king whomsoever their fancy lighted upon.’ Gregorii Turonensis Libri historiarum X, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, hereafter cited as MGH, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum, hereafter cited as SS rer. Merov., 1.1; Hanover, 1937-51), hereafter cited as Greg. Tur., 3,30. The reason for Gregory’s contempt may have been that after the murder of a rival among the Franks, only members of the Merovingian family could succeed, whereas the Visigoths accepted usurpers of different parentage. Edward Arthur Thompson, The Goths in Spain (Oxford, 1969), pp. 19 and 155. Dietrich Claude, Geschichte der Westgoten (Stuttgart, 1970), pp. 54 ff. (Chindaswind) ‘having made sure [of] his power throughout the Spanish kingdom and
the European continent, and controlled it for centuries. Their example, therefore, possesses universal-historical status.

We know very little about the early history of the Frankish monarchy.\(^{18}\) It probably began with the penetration of Gaul and the establishment of centres of rule by successful leaders. This, at least, is what the Franks themselves wanted to convey in their early historical memories. Gregory of Tours refers explicitly to a widespread tradition (\textit{tradunt enim multi})\(^{19}\) according to which the Franks had had kings only since they crossed the Rhine, and that then they had several (\textit{iuxta pagus vel civitates}). These kings were said to have been long-haired (\textit{criniti}),\(^{20}\) and all to have belonged to the same family.

knowing the Gothic weakness for dethroning their kings (for he had often been involved with them in such conspiracies), he ordered the killing, one by one, of all those whom he knew to have been compromised in rebellion against kings who had been dethroned.\(^{18}\) Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici libri IV, ed. Bruno Krusch, Fredegarii et aliorum chronica: Vitae sanctorum (MGH SS rer. Merov., 2; Hanover, 1888), 1–168 (hereafter cited as Fredegar), at 4,82. Compare the behaviour of Gunthram, who investigated his brother Chilperich’s († 584) murderer in order to kill him and all his descendants, ‘so as to put an end by their death to this evil custom and to safeguard the future kings against murder.’ Greg. Tur. 7,21.

\(^{18}\) Wenskus, Stammesbildung und Verfassung, regarded the existence of an older ‘sacral kingship’ as possible and supposed (pp. 409 ff.) that the Franks on the right bank of the Rhine might already have had kings. A later speculation is the Liber Historiae Francorum’s report (727) that the Franks gave themselves kings like the other peoples (\textit{sicut ceterae gentes}) when living in ‘the Germanic cities situated on the outermost Rhine’. Liber Historiae Francorum, ed. Bruno Krusch, Fredegarii et aliorum Chronica (MGH SS rer. Merov., 2; Hanover, 1888), 215–328, 4. The following chapter claims that they had had long-haired kings since Chlodio (\textit{crinitos reges habere coeperunt}), thus in Gaul.

\(^{19}\) Greg. Tur. 2,9.

Except for the claim that they all belonged to the same family, this tradition is credible because to start with the Franks were not one people but an alliance of various groups, each with their own name (Salii, Chamavi, Chattuarii, Bructeri, Amsivarii). Authors of late Antiquity knew them both under their individual names and under the collective name of Franci, ‘Franks’. Thus while there was an obvious trend towards unification, there was no common kingdom before the end of the fifth century. In the third century the lower Rhine and the area later occupied by the Netherlands were the heartlands of the Franks. From there, they advanced into Gaul, where a Frankish king called Gennobaudes was mentioned in 291. Constantine had the Frankish kings Acaricus and Merogaisus executed; Julian negotiated with a king of the Chamavi.

Gregory of Tours (c. 540–94) took a lively interest in the origins of kingship among the Franks. In a now lost historical work by Sulpicius Alexander he found Marcomer and Sunno mentioned as regales of the Franks for the period around 390. Gregory added critically that it was not possible to tell from this ‘whether they were kings, or merely took the place of kings’. In fact, Sulpicius Alexan-

---


der had described the two as *subreguli*, whereas the poet Claudian called them kings. Chlogio was another *rex Francorum*, whose seat was in Dis bargum on the left bank of the Rhine during the 420s, and is said to have taken the land as far as the Somme, with the town of Cambrai, from the Romans. Gregory reports the opinion that Chlogio was an ancestor of king Merovech, with whose son Childeric the historically attested line of Merovingian ruling families begins.

Childeric of Tournai († 482), whom Gregory of Tours calls a king, was most probably the administrator of the Roman province of Belgica II, yet we do not know whether he was an independent Frankish prince. Some of his grave goods suggest that he was more likely to have been a general of federated barbarian troops (*foederati*). As such, he defeated the Visigoths at Orléans under the *magister militum* Aegidius in 463, and passed on his office in Belgica II to his son Clovis I.

The formation of the greater Frankish kingdom—and the first, brief phase of the existence of the Frankish monarchy in the real sense—begins with Clovis, who succeeded his father in the realm of Tournai in 482. As we have seen, Clovis found a number of other

---

27 *Greg. Tur.* 2.9. The exact location is unknown.
28 Between 440 and 450 Maiorian and Aëtius slayed a *Francus Cloio* in the course of an assault on the company which was celebrating Cloio’s wedding near the *vicus Helena* (Elnone-sur-Scarpe in northern France). *Gai Solii Apollinaris Sidonii Epistulae et carmina*, ed. Christian Lütjohann (MGH AA, 8; Hanover, 1887), Carmen 5,21 1 ff.
royal families in Gaul as well as the Merovingian house, and his route to the monarchy took him via three stations: conquest, Romano-Christian office, and murdering the competition.

In 486–7 he conquered the rex Romanorum Syagrius and took over what was left of the Roman area of rule between the Seine, Oise, and Aisne, with its capital at Soissons. Clovis’s marriage to the Catholic Chrodechilde, daughter of the Burgundian sub-king Chilperic II, put an end to his alliance with the Ostrogoth king, Theoderic the Great, and also signified a turning against the Visigoths and the Alemannic peoples. Gregory of Tours saw Clovis’s conversion to Catholicism and his baptism by bishop Remigius of Reims, probably at Christmas 498 or 499, as causally connected with his first victory over the Alemannic peoples (496–7). From then on the Frankish monarchy was Catholic, that is, non-Arian, and its aim was to integrate Franks and Romans. In 507 Clovis moved against the Visigoths, presenting his undertaking as a war of religion against the Arians, and won a victory at Vouillé, north-west of Poitiers. In the following year the Byzantine emperor Anastasius granted him the right to the acclamationary ceremonial used for emperor and consuls, thus legalizing the establishment of Clovis’s kingdom. For the first time, it seems, the king of the Franks put on a purple tunic (tunica blatta) and cloak (chlamys), crowned himself with a diadem, mounted a horse, and

33 The names suggest that there may have been kinship, but Gregory’s allegation that all 5th-century Frankish kings belonged to the Merovingian clan should rather be understood as pointing to a cognate relationship. Ewig, Merowinger, p. 14.
38 By the transmission of codecilli de consolato. Ibid. 2,38. For the significance of this cf. Zöllner, Geschichte der Franken, pp. 67 f.
scattered gold and silver among his people, who from that time on called him *consul* or *augustus*.\(^{41}\)

We can see that Clovis had achieved the power base and all the external attributes of a monarchy except the monarchy itself: there were still other kings in the Frankish kingdom. In order to wipe out this form of collective rule which had existed for centuries and was legitimized by its very existence, its representatives had to be killed. Murder was the only path towards the monarchy that held out any hope of success.

We know three of the victims by name—Ragnachar of Cambrai, Sigebert of Cologne, and Chararic\(^{42}\)—but there must have been many more.\(^{43}\) Thus despite his victories over the Alemannic peoples and the Visigoths, Clovis’s kingship was not secure. Not even imperial recognition could achieve this. Within the extended family, it was up for grabs at any time. Clovis tried to counteract this by meticulously tracking down and eliminating all pretenders and potential rivals.\(^{44}\) “But one day, when he [Clovis] had assembled his people, he is said to have spoken to them thus about his blood relations, whom he had murdered: “Woe is me—here I stand like a stranger among strangers without any relations who, should I be overwhelmed by adversity, could come to my assistance!” But he said this not out of sorrow at

---


\(^{41}\) ‘ab ea die tamquam consul aut augustus est vocitatus.’ *Greg. Tur.* 2,38.


\(^{43}\) ‘He had also killed many other kings, even his nearest relatives, of whom he feared that they would rob him of the realm, and so he expanded his power all over Gaul.’ *Greg. Tur.* 2,42.

\(^{44}\) ‘By great resoluteness he [Clovis] spared no effort that nobody of his relatives remained to govern, except his own descendants.’ Fredegar 3,27.
their death, but out of cunning, in case there was someone else whom he could kill.  

Yet all this was in vain because the only things which could secure the monarchy, primogeniture and undivided rule, were not yet known as legal forms. Rather, all the sons of a Merovingian king had an equal claim to a share of power, even if they had different mothers who might be of low status or even unfree. Moreover, it was open to question whether the sons or the brothers of a dead king had the better right to the succession. Thus royal uncles were their nephews’ most dangerous enemies.

This became apparent soon after Clovis’s death in 511, when his sons Theodoric, Chlodomer, Childebert, and Chlotar divided power amongst themselves equally (aequa lantia). There was no longer any question of a monarchy, and Gregory of Tours observed the same situation in the Thuringian empire ‘where, at that time, three brothers [ruled]: Baderic, Herminefred, and Berthachar. And Herminefred

45 Greg. Tur. 2,42. On the importance of kinship, Fredegar 3,58: Chrodinus († 582), who held office as a dux under Sigibert I refused to become a major domus of Austrasia: ‘I am unable to establish peace in Austrasia, for I am cognate with nearly all distinguished people and their children all over Austrasia, therefore I cannot maintain order among them or kill anybody of them. They, however, owing to the kinship with me, will dare to perform outrages. May God not allow that I go to hell because of their misdeeds.’ Thus the best precondition for government was for the reigning house to have an exceptional position in respect of consanguinity.

46 Reinhard Schneider, Königswahl und Königserhebung im Frühmittelalter: Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsnachfolge bei den Langobarden und Merowingern (Stuttgart, 1972), p. 85. Brigitte Kasten, Königssöhne und Königsherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur Teilhabe am Reich in der Merowinger- und Karolingerzeit (Hanover, 1997) tried (pp. 9 ff.) to cast doubt on this principle of collecting indications of discrepancies, but what she describes are struggles for position as the consequence of the very same established law.

vanquished his brother Berthachar by force and killed him. Accordingly, collective rule displayed a tendency towards concentration which, ultimately, led towards the monarchy again. Among the Franks, too, Theodoric planned to assassinate his brother Chlotar in 531, and in the same year Childebert and Chlotar murdered their nephews Theodald and Gunthar, sons of Chlodomer who had died in 524, in order to consolidate his holdings with theirs. The third son, Chlodoald, escaped the same fate only because he had the protection of powerful men (per auxilium virorum fortium). He ‘renounced earthly power and turned towards the Lord, cut his hair off with his own hands, and became a cleric’.

We know that among the reges criniti long hair was a symbol of power. This hairstyle, not uncommon among barbarian peoples, must have been monopolized by the Merovingian family. To have one’s hair cut off meant exclusion from the circle of those capable of being kings, thus offering an alternative to murder. Clovis obviously preferred this milder solution when, around 508, he had king

48 Greg. Tur. 3.4.
Chararic’s and his son’s hair cut, and had them ordained as priests. Only when they threatened to grow their hair again and then kill Clovis were they murdered. Later, too, there were cases of people being forcibly tonsured. The best known is that of the last Merovingian king, Childeric III. In 751, ‘on the orders of the Roman pope ... he was deposed, shorn, and sent to a monastery’. But because those affected did not always accept this form of deposition, or could be reactivated as the instrument of a group of nobles, shearing the hair alone was not a secure method of keeping someone out of power, and death sometimes followed anyway. Murder and assassinations were not uncommon.

54 Greg. Tur. 2,41. As Chararic’s son became a deacon, both must have been Christians.

55 Meroweche, a son of king Chilperic I, was kept in custody as a rebel against his father (576: Greg. Tur. 5,2 f.). Afterwards he was tonsured, ordained as a priest, and committed to the monastery of Le Mans, from where he escaped (ibid. 5,14). King Theodebert II is said to have fallen into Brunhild’s hands through the treason of his entourage in 612. She had him tonsured and murdered shortly after. Ionaie Vita sancti Columbani, ed. Bruno Krusch, Ionaie Vitae sanctorum Columbani, Vedastis, Iohannis (MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, hereafter cited as SS rer. Germ., 37; Hanover, 1905), 148–294 (hereafter cited as Jonas), at 1,28. Dagobert II, son of Sigibert III († 656) was shorn and taken to Ireland by the major domus, Grimoald: Liber Historiae Francorum, ed. Bruno Krusch, Fredegarii et aliorum Chronica (MGH SS rer. Merov., 2; Hanover, 1888), 215–328, hereafter cited as LHF, at 43. In 673 his Austrasian adversaries seized king Theodoric III, cut his hair off, and banished him to the monastery of St-Denis—not, as Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii continuationes, ed. Bruno Krusch, Fredegarii et aliorum Chronica: Vitae sanctorum (MGH SS rer. Merov., 2; Hanover, 1888), 168–93, hereafter cited as Cont. Fred., says, to Luxeuil. Ibid. p. 2. LHF 45.


57 Meroweche perished after his flight from Le Mans, perhaps murdered on Fredegund’s order, perhaps murdered by one of his servants at his own request in a hopeless situation. Greg. Tur. 5,18. On suicide and killing on
sination thus remained tried and tested methods of securing or extending power, and the royals giving the orders could regard their actions as legitimate. If they had any awareness of doing wrong, recognized authorities soothed it away.

In 612, when king Theodoric II pursued his brother Theodebert II as far as Cologne, bishop Leudegasius of Mainz went to him and spurred him on: ‘Finish what you have begun; you must carry this matter through to the end with all your strength. Remember the old peasants’ tale. A wolf climbed a hill and called his cubs, who had already started to hunt, to him on the hill and said to them: “As far as you can see in all directions, you have no friends apart from the few who are your blood relatives (qui vestro genere sunt). Therefore finish what you have begun.”’58 Because Theodoric believed that Theodebert was not his real brother,59 the bishop could hold up the behaviour of the wolves as a model: kill before you are killed.

The famous sentence with which Gregory of Tours concludes his story of how the Rhinefrankish king Sigebert and his son Chloderic were murdered by Clovis is also almost a maxim on the running of the state: ‘Day after day God cast his [Clovis’s] enemies down before him and increased his kingdom because he appeared before him with a righteous heart and did what was pleasing in God’s sight.’60 This demand, cf. Margarete Weidemann, Kulturgeschichte der Merowingerzeit nach den Werken Gregors von Tours, 2 vols. (Mainz, 1982), vol. 1, p. 297.

58 Fredegar 4,38.
59 ... quod suos frater non esset: Fredegar 4,37. Brunhild, spouse of Sigibert I, had repeatedly reassured her grandson Theoderic that Theodebert was not king Childebert’s son but a gardener’s: Fredegar 4,27. Thus there is no discrepancy between the bishop’s advice and the wolf’s point of view in respect of blood-relations as seen by Godefroid Kurth, Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens (Paris, 1893), pp. 412 ff.), and the complex argument which Wolfgang Fritze, Untersuchungen zur frühslawischen und frühfränkischen Geschichte bis ins 7. Jahrhundert (Frankfurt am Main, 1994), p. 358, n. 751 puts up against Kurth is superfluous.

60 Prosternebat enim cotidiae Deus hostes eius sub manu ipsius et augebat regnum eius, eo quod ambularet recto corde coram eo et facerit quae placita erant in oculis eius: Greg. Tur. 2,40. Cf. II Par. 20,32: Et ambulavit (sc. Josaphat) in via patris sui Asa, nec declinavit ab ea, faciens quae placita erant coram domino. III Reg. 3,6: Et ait Salomon: Tu (sc. Deus) fecisti cum servo tuo David, patre meo, misericordiam magnam, sicut ambulavit in conspectu tuo in veritate et justitia, et recto corde tecum ...
was by no means intended satirically by the Gallo-Romanic writer, nor was it the anachronistic cynicism of a bishop. Rather, Gregory, who belonged to a noble senatorial family, was expressing his acceptance of the new power in a collage of two Old Testament texts. The integration of this new power into the Christian image of state and society in late Antiquity was to be achieved at all costs. The shortest and thus most striking expression of this integration was the divine right of kings, the rule of *divina favente clementia* as defined in the medieval royal charters.

It was a long time, however, before a Christian-sacralized monarchy was finally established in this form. Between 508 and 675, as far as we know, nine Merovingian kings were murdered. These included one murdered on the orders of his brother (Theodebert II, murdered by Theodoric II), and one murdered by his brother and sister-in-law (Sigibert I, murdered by Chilperic I and Fredegund). In addition, at least fourteen kings’ sons or nephews were murdered, including two sons (Chramn and Clovis) at the behest of their fathers (Chlotar I, and Chilperic I respectively), and two sons murdered on the instructions of their step-mothers (Gundobad by Marcatrud; Merovech by Fredegund). At least six, probably seven, nephews fell victim to their uncles or grand-uncles: Theodoald and Gunthar were killed by Childebert I and Chlotar I respectively in person; Chlotar and Merovech were murdered by Theodoric II; Corbus and Sigibert died on the orders of Chlotar II; while Chilperic was probably killed on the orders of Dagobert I. Moreover, four pretenders to the throne,

---


64 For sons, see table 2; for nephews, see table 4.

65 He was an infant, ‘yet lying in a white garment’ (LHF 38), and after his father was defeated by Theodoric II, was smashed on a rock by order of Theodoric II: Fredegar 4,38.
perhaps members of the Merovingian family who were to be kept away from the succession, died violent deaths.66

This drastic use of murder as a political means and an instrument for securing power would not have been possible without the basic agreement of aristocratic society, both ecclesiastical and secular. We have already heard clergy voices, and, like the rebellions of the king’s sons Chramn and Merovech, the cases of the pretenders Munderic, Sigiwald, Gundoaal, and Rauching show that there was always a large potential for opposition among the great men of Merovingian society. They could be more dangerous than local revolts because they were often more fundamental in nature. The example of Munderic shows that royal rights of rule were by no means firmly and unequivocally established at this time, and that the limitation of the royal succession to Clovis’s direct descendants was not legally prescribed, but the result of a historical development.67 As later observers of this development, we must take special care not to apply ideas of the monarchy which are familiar to us from the Carolingian period, or even later, to the history of Merovingian kingship. These kings lived and died under quite different conditions.

Sigiwald, who claimed to be a relative (parens) of Theodoric I, was probably acting as the tool of Auvergnatian aspirations for autonomy.68 Thus he was directed from outside, like Gundoaal, in whose case Byzantine interests are obvious.69 The dux Rauching, as the putative son of Chlotar I,70 created a group of conspirators among the great men

66 For usurpers/pretenders murdered, see table 5. All this must be seen against the largely unknown background of a violent society: ‘Almost all we can read about later Merovingian violence relates to that small elite whose actions are the primary focus of the narratives.’ Paul Fouracre, ‘Attitudes Towards Violence in Seventh- and Eighth-Century Francia’, in Guy Halsall (ed.), Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West (Woodbridge, 1998), pp. 60–75, at p. 61.
67 Schneider, Königswahl und Königserhebung im Frühmittelalter, p. 79.
68 Ibid. n. 2.
of Chlotar’s kingdom under the pretext of securing the peace, with the real aim of murdering king Childebert II, so that he himself could assume royal power on behalf of Childebert’s oldest son Theodebert, and thus exclude king Gunthram. Gunthram found out about the plan and conferred with Childebert, who had Rauching killed.71

Kings could never feel secure. They took precautionary measures against attacks, and protected themselves like Gunthram, who always wore a coat of mail and never entered churches or other public places without a bodyguard.72 Rebellious sons like Chramn73 or Merovech74 were simply eliminated as were any all too presumptuous heirs from earlier marriages.75 Some plots were discovered in time,76 and rivals

72 Ibid. 7,8; cf. 7,18.
73 Ibid. 4,20.
74 Ibid. 5,18.
75 Clovis, son of Chilperic I by his marriage with Audovera, was sent at Fredegund’s insistence to Berny-Rivièrè, centre of an infested area, so that he would fall ill and die there. When that did not happen, Chilperic had him seized and killed at the estate of Noisy-le-Grand (Dép. Seine-et-Marne). When a fisherman discovered the corpse in the river Marne he recognized him as a member of the royal family by the long hair and buried him. The place was indicated to King Gunthram who buried Clovis at St Vincentius Church in Paris (today St-Germain-des-Prés). Ibid. 8,10. On St-Germain-des-Prés as a Merovingian burial-place cf. Krüger, Königgrabkirchen, pp. 103 ff.; Alain Erlande-Brandenburg, Le roi est mort: Étude sur les funérailles, les sépultures et les tombaux des rois de France jusqu’à la fin du XIIIe siècle (Geneva, 1975), pp. 50 ff. and 135 ff.
76 In 584 Fredegund (Chilperich’s widow) sent a cleric to Brunhild (widow of Sigibert I) to kill her: Greg. Tur. 7,20. In the year that followed she had two poisoned daggers prepared and sent two clerics with them to kill king Childebert II or at least his mother Brunhild; the agents were intercepted, they confessed the plot, and were cruelly put to death: ibid. 8,29. In 587 untiring Fredegund sent envoys on behalf of her son Chlotar II to king Gunthram, who afterwards accused them of having planned an attempt on his life: ibid. 8,44. For the historical background cf. Anton, ‘Chlodwig’ and Heike Grahn-Hoek, ‘Chlothar II.’, Lexikon des Mittelalters, 2 (1983), pp. 1,868 f. A second
forcibly stopped on the way to success, but as time passed, less and less could be done to counter serious resistance by the great men of Merovingian society.

Sigibert II was murdered on the orders of Chlotar II in 613, but that could not happen until the Austrasian aristocracy, led by Pippin the Older and Arnulf of Metz, had switched to Chlotar’s side and the Franco-Burgundian army had dissipated without a fight. The cruel attempt was made on Gunthram in the same year: Greg. Tur. 9,3. In 589 rumours went around about a plot against Childebert II in which his marshal Sunnegisil, the referendarius Gallomagnus, the tutor of the king’s children Droctulf, and the governess Septimina were said to have been involved: ibid. 9,38. In 590 Fredegund sent out twelve men to murder Childebert II and his son, but this plot was also revealed in time: ibid. 10,8. Was the number of envoys in Gregory’s report intended to correspond negatively to the twelve apostles, in order to show up the person who had ordered the deaths as all the more wicked?

Sigibert I waged war against his brother Chilperic I, whose entourage recognized him as king, but he was stabbed to death immediately by order of Fredegund (ibid. 4,51) or Chilperic (Jonas 1,18). ‘There also perished Charegisel, his chamberlain, and Sigila, who once had come from the land of the Goths, was handled roughly. His limbs were burnt by glowing iron and torn out one by one so that he cruelly perished.’ Greg. Tur. 4,51.

Whereas Gregory’s reports (2,9) on the expulsion of Childeric († 482) to his Thuringian exile are partly legendary and may reflect a temporary loss of the command of Belgica II, the story of the bribery of Ragnachar’s entourage (2,42) is more credible. Gregory does not mention anybody who ordered the death in the case of Chilperic I, who was stabbed to death by one of his puere at Chelles on his return from hunting, but treats it as tyrannicide: ibid. 6,46. Cf. W. Jungandreas and Reinhard Wenskus, ‘Chilperich’, Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, 4 (1981), pp. 460–2 and Ulrich Nonn, ‘Chilperich I’, Lexikon des Mittelalters, 2 (1983), p. 1,825. Fredegar 3,93 names a certain Falco as perpetrator, who acted on Brunhild’s orders. The Liber Historiae Francorum trivializes the incident, mentioning Chilperic’s spouse Fredegund as the person who ordered it. It suggests that the king had discovered her adulterous affair with the major domus Landeric, so that she had to expect the worst: LHF 35. On the author of the LHF, cf. Richard A. Gerberding, The Rise of the Carolingians and the Liber Historiae Francorum (Oxford, 1987), pp. 146 ff. There was opposition to king Childeric II all along; when he had a nobleman whipped he was killed with his pregnant spouse Bilihild: Cont. Fred., 2; LHF 45. The Liber Historiae Francorum charged Brunhild with the murder of Theoderic II and his sons: LHF 39. On Chlotar II cf. Anton, ‘Chlodwig’.

21
end of queen Brunhild, who, as a prisoner of Chlotar II, was tortured, led through the army on a camel, and then dragged to her death by a wild horse, shows how the last attempt to establish a strong monarchy on the basis of Austrasian-Burgundian unity was foiled by the Frankish aristocracy.

The Merovingian kings no longer controlled the situation. After the death of Sigibert III in 656, the mayor of the palace (major domus) Grimoald had Sigibert’s son Dagobert II shorn and sent into exile in Ireland. In 675–6 Dagobert was fetched back by high-ranking Austrasians, but three years later he was murdered on the initiative of the Neustro-Burgundian major domus, and a number of dukes and bishops.

With Dagobert II’s violent death, the history of regicide in the Frankish kingdom comes to an end. Why? What had changed? Were the kings no longer worth assassinating once their power had been broken by the aristocracy? Theodoric III, son of king Clovis II († 657) and younger brother of king Chlotar III († 673) was shorn and exiled to the monastery of St Denis; he survived his rehabilitation by the major domus Ebroin only because Pippin, after his victory over the Neustrians at Tertry (687) ‘offered him and all his treasures sanctuary ... and directed everything at court’. This king had no choice ‘but to be satisfied with the mere name of king, to sit on the throne with long hair and an unshaved beard, and to play the ruler. He had to listen to the envoys who came from everywhere, and, on their departure, give them the answers that he had been taught or ordered to give as if on his own authority.’ None the less, the majores domus

80 Fredegar 4,42.
82 LHF 43.
84 Cont. Fred., 2.
85 Ibid. 5.
did not yet believe that they could legitimize their own position without the old royal house. Only after the death of Theodoric V in 737 did Charles Martel rule as a king without a Merovingian puppet.\textsuperscript{87}

For their part, the predecessors of the Carolingians did not shy away from murdering anyone who resisted their rise to power in Austrasia and the whole kingdom during the seventh and the first half of the eighth centuries. The Agilolfing Chrodoald († 624–5) is one example.\textsuperscript{88} Another is the 	extit{dux} Gundoin/Gundewin, who was killed by the 	extit{major domus} Pippin II in person, avenging the death of his father Ansegisel. The pro-Carolingian historiography praised him for it—as David slew Goliath, so Pippin slew the 	extit{crudelissimus tirannus Gundewinus}.\textsuperscript{89}

Other cases are either not mentioned at all in Carolingian historiography (King Pippin’s nephew Drogo; Charlemagne’s nephews, seized in Verona in 774), or mentioned only vaguely (King Pippin’s half-brother Grifo).\textsuperscript{90} However, the 	extit{coup d’état} by the 	extit{major domus}, Grimoald, had issued not in the murder of King Sigibert III, a minor, but in an attempt to construct a lineage, with Sigibert being forced to adopt Grimoald’s son.\textsuperscript{91} Consequently the last Merovingians were not killed by the Carolingians; nor were the sons of Pippin’s brother

Carlanon. And even as kings they did not have prominent enemies murdered—neither the Lombard king Desiderius, nor the Saxon leader Widukind, the Bavarian duke Tassilo, or Pippin the Hunchback, who had made an attempt on the life of his father, Charlemagne, in 792.

But why did they stop murdering their enemies, nephews, sons, and brothers? This new behaviour on the part of the Carolingians certainly had something to do with the growth of Christianity, but only in a very general sense. After all, there had been missionary successes, a church organization at bishopric level, monasteries sup-


93 He was locked up in a Frankish monastery. Schneider, Königswahl und Königserhebung im Frühmittelalter, p. 63; Konrad Bund, Thronsturz und Herrscherabsetzung im Frühmittelalter (Bonn, 1979), pp. 219 ff.; Jörg Jarnut, Geschichte der Langobarden (Stuttgart, 1982), p. 123.


ported by kings,\textsuperscript{99} liturgical texts, and teachings concerning Christian rule\textsuperscript{100} for a long time, and as well as the bishop who told the fable about the wolf and its cubs, we find a sixth-century bishop who warned the king against fratricide.\textsuperscript{101}

In fact, Christian impulses had already occasionally had an impact during the Merovingian period, alleviating the worst excesses. The fact that Chararic and his sons were tonsured,\textsuperscript{102} and the debate conducted by Childebert I and Chlotar I as to whether they should shear the sons of their deceased brother Chlodomer († 524) ‘and keep them like the rest of the people’, or kill them,\textsuperscript{103} should certainly be seen in this context. The institution of godparenthood also increased scruples: ‘Sigibert and Corbus, sons of Theodoric [II] were killed on the orders of Chlotar [II]. However, Merovech he had sent secretly to Neustria—he had taken Merovech to his heart for he had lifted him out of the baptismal font.’\textsuperscript{104}

But in contrast to their Merovingian predecessors, even the earliest forefathers of the Carolingians displayed a personal commitment to the Christian message and its bearers. In 629 Arnulf, a powerful man, resigned from the bishopric of Metz and entered the monastery of Remiremont in the Vosges mountains which had been founded by his friend Romaric.\textsuperscript{105} Since the days of Charles Martel, the political


\textsuperscript{100} Reinhold Kaiser, \textit{Das römische Erbe und das Merowingerreich} (Munich, 1997), p. 86.

\textsuperscript{101} Germanus of Paris to king Sigibert I (575): \textit{Greg. Tur.} 4,51.

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid. 2,41.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid. 3,18. As in the case of Chrodechild, who said she would rather see her grandsons dead than shorn, Chararic and his son were killed in response to provocation (the threat of newly grown hair).


integration of the Frankish kingdom had been closely connected with
the development of a Frankish imperial church. Consequently, con-
temporary historians had a positive view of this major domus, whose image was to be tarnished only later, when judged by even
higher standards. Under the Carolingians, for the first time we find
references to the education of future rulers in monasteries. For ex-
ample, King Pippin remembered the years he spent as a child in St
Denis, and Anglo-Saxon missionaries such as Willibrord († 739) and
Boniface († 754) passed on the definition of kingship as a Christian
officium. While this office could not be exercised without
power and force, it had to be controlled by the bishops. Charle-
magne’s reforms reinforced this notion, and Louis the Pious’s

On the veneration of Arnulf in Carolingian times cf. Otto Gerhard Oexle, ‘Die
Karolinger und die Stadt des heiligen Arnulf’, Frühmittelalterliche Studien, 1

Schiefer, Die Karolinger, pp. 42 ff.

Hans-Werner Goetz, ‘Karl Martell und die Heiligen: Kirchenpolitik und
Maiordomat im Spiegel der spätmerowingischen Hagiographie’, in Jörg

Ulrich Nonn, ‘Das Bild Karl Martells in den lateinischen Quellen vor-
70–137.

Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata, ed. Engelbert Mühlbacher
(MGH Diplomata Karolinarum 1; Hanover 1906), 1–60, at 8 (ubi enotriti
fuimus) and 12 (rex Pippinus adfirmabat, quod semper a sua infantia ipso
teloneos partebus sancti Dionisii habere et colligere vidisset).

Arnold Angenendt, ‘Willibrord im Dienste der Karolinger’, Annalen des

Theodor Schieffer, Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung
Europas (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1954), pp. 196 ff.; Josef Semmler, ‘Bonifatius,
die Karolinger und “die Franken” ’, in D. R. Bauer et al. (eds.), Mönchtum –

211–51, pp. 213 ff.; Joachim Ehlers, ‘Die Reform der Christenheit: Studium,
Bildung und Wissenschaft als bestimmende Kräfte bei der Entstehung des
mittelalterlichen Europa’, in id. (ed.), Deutschland und der Westen Europas im
pence at the synod of Attigny in 822\textsuperscript{113} shows where such a process could lead.

The Anglo-Saxons also conveyed the close ties between the Frankish church and the Pope, whose authority was so exalted that he could provide legitimacy for replacing the Merovingian dynasty. Since then, anointment has become an established part of European coronation ceremonies,\textsuperscript{114} and its commitment to protecting the pope gave the Frankish monarchy universal connections, and, ultimately, imperial dignity.

However, things remained the same as far as inheritance claims of sons and the division of power were concerned, with two crucial modifications. Unlike the Merovingians, even the earliest Carolingians decided their own succession, and recognized the rights only of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}

\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
legitimate sons. Charles Martel divided his principatus between his sons Carloman, Pippin, and Grifo (who had been born as the result of a second marriage). After the death of King Pippin in 768, there were two anointed kings of the Franks, for Pippin had divided his power between Charles and Carloman, whose rivalry came to an end only with the natural death of Carloman in 771. Charlemagne did not recognize claims by his nephews to inherit. Since the beginning of the ninth century, the ecclesiastical norms of marriage law had reduced the likelihood of inheritance disputes. Given that Charlemagne had at least eight sons, four of whom survived their father, this was significant. But even when there were succession conflicts, they no longer led to bloody solutions. After Louis the Pious was overthrown in 833, his son Charles (the Bald), who was ten years old at the time, was not killed, but exiled by his older half-brother to the monastery of Prüm, although his mere existence gave rise to serious inheritance conflicts which ultimately led to the dissolution of the Frankish Empire. Charles the Bald himself did not kill his nephew Pippin II, who stubbornly claimed the kingdom of Aquitaine. When Charles

Article


116 Schieffer, Die Karolinger, pp. 50 f. Carloman and Pippin were successful in repulsing Grifo’s claims, but it is not clear whether Carloman entered a monastery in 747 freely, in repentence for his brutality towards the Alemannic nobles, thus demonstrating the spirit of a more austere Christian ethics (ibid. 57) or unwillingly, as his brother’s failed rival (Jörg Jarnut, ‘Alemannien zur Zeit der Doppelherrschaft der Hausmeier Karlmann und Pippin’, in Schieffer (ed.), Beiträge zur Geschichte, pp. 57-66).


took him prisoner in 852, he was committed to the monastery of St Médard/Soissons.119

This situation was maintained even in the non-Frankish successor states, and stabilized further over the generations. In the east, the end of the Carolingian ruling house came about by natural means. Louis the Child died in 911 without leaving behind any successors. In the west, King Louis V died in a hunting accident in 987, and the great men of the realm voted for Hugh Capet as his successor.120 Louis’s uncle, duke Charles of Lower Lorraine, however, who tried to press his claims as the brother of King Lothar († 986), suffered a violent end. In 991 he was betrayed and fell into the hands of King Hugh, who imprisoned him in Orléans,121 where he died.122 The Capetian dynasty itself avoided murderous rivalries and from the start adopted the principle of primogeniture—not for reasons of statesmanship, but simply as a result of the banal fact that on his death in 996, Hugh Capet left behind only one son, and had secured his succession through the institution of the co-regency.123 Rulers retained this practice even against resistance and controversial attempts, and always employed it in favour of the first-born.124 Philip II (1180–1223) was the first to believe he could dispense with it, as the Capetian monarchy had by this time become an established, hereditary monarchy.

121 Richer von Saint-Remi, Historiae, ed. Hartmut Hoffmann (MGH Scriptores (in Folio), 38; Hanover, 2000), 4,47–49.
123 Ehlers, Die Kapetinger, pp. 31 f.
In the east, the law of succession introduced by Henry I in 929–30 removed the essential causes of regicide. This order was not based on a thought-out concept of the ‘indivisibility of the kingdom’, but arose out of the simple fact that, given his close co-operation with the great men of the individual dukedoms, the Saxon king had little of substance outside Saxony left to distribute. The younger Henry’s plot to murder his brother Otto I at the Easter celebrations in 941, which was discovered in time and therefore failed, is the last known attempt of its sort, and its objective was not to obtain a share of power, but to gain undivided possession of the kingdom.

Looking back, we see a long period of great security for the monarchy between the Carolingian period and Shakespeare’s reflections concerning the late fourteenth century. Until the middle of the seventh century, the violent death of a king must be seen as an established part of the system of rule, but the Carolingian laws of succession, influenced by Christian notions of morality and justice, prepared the ground for more permanent solutions, which were put in place firmly during the tenth century. North of the Alps, the assassination of a prince came to be seen as an exception that required proper justification.

### Tables

#### Table 1: Kings Murdered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim (kings)</th>
<th>Instigator</th>
<th>Ordered by</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ragnachar of Cambrai</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Chloderic</td>
<td>Servants of Chloderic</td>
<td>Greg.Tur. 2,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† after 507)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(son of Sigibert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigibert of Cologne</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Chloderic</td>
<td>Servants of Chloderic</td>
<td>Greg.Tur. 2,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† c. 508)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(son of Sigibert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chararic</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Chloderic</td>
<td>Servants of Chloderic</td>
<td>Greg.Tur. 2,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† c. 508)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(son of Sigibert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigibert I</td>
<td>Fredegund</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>pueri of orderer</td>
<td>Greg.Tur. 4,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† 575)</td>
<td>or Chilperic I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonas 1,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilperic I</td>
<td>Brunhild?</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>puer of Chilperic I</td>
<td>Greg.Tur. 6,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† 584)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fredegar 3,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodebert II</td>
<td>Theodoric II</td>
<td>Servants of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fredegar 4,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† 612)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theodoric II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fredegar 4,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigibert II</td>
<td>Chlotar II</td>
<td>Servants of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† 613)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chlotar II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagobert II</td>
<td>Ebroin/ Arnulfingians</td>
<td>Servants of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† 679)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childeric II</td>
<td>Bodilo,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cont.Fred. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(† 675)</td>
<td>Neustrian nobleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LHF 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Birth of the Monarchy*
Table 2: Kings’ Sons Murdered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim (kings’ sons)</th>
<th>Ordered by</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chloderic (son of Sigibert of Cologne, † c. 508)</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Servants of Clovis I</td>
<td>Greg. Tar. 2,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.N. (son of Chararich of Cambrai, † c. 508)</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Servants of Clovis I</td>
<td>Greg. Tar. 2,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chramn (son of Chlotar I, † 560)</td>
<td>Chlotar I</td>
<td>Servants of Chlotar I</td>
<td>Greg. Tar. 4,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundobad (son of Gunthram by 1st marriage, † c. 565)</td>
<td>Chlotar I</td>
<td>Servants of Chlotar I</td>
<td>Greg. Tar. 4,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis (son of Chilperic I by 1st marriage, † 580)</td>
<td>Chilperic I and Fredegund (3rd spouse of Chilperic)</td>
<td>Fredegund</td>
<td>Greg. Tar. 5,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meroweche (son of Chilperic I, † 577)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fredegund?</td>
<td>Neustrian nobles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Kings’ Brothers Murdered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim (kings’ brothers)</th>
<th>Ordered by</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richar (brother of Ragnachar of Cambrai, † after 507)</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 2,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rignomer (brother of Ragnachar of Cambrai, † 507)</td>
<td>Clovis I</td>
<td>Servants of Clovis I</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 2,42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Kings’ Nephews Murdered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim (kings’ nephews)</th>
<th>Ordered by</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodoald (nephew of Childebert I and Chlotar I, † 531)</td>
<td>Childebert I and Chlotar I</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 3,18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunthar (nephew of Childebert I and Chlotar, † 531)</td>
<td>Childebert I and Chlotar I</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 3,18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlotar (nephew of Theodoric II, † 612)</td>
<td>Theodoric II</td>
<td>LHF 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merowech (nephew of Theodoric II, † 612)</td>
<td>Theodoric II</td>
<td>Fredegar 4,38, LHF 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbus’ (grand-nephew of Chlotar II, † 613)</td>
<td>Chlotar II</td>
<td>Fredegar 4,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigibert (grand-nephew of Chlotar II, † 613)</td>
<td>Chlotar II</td>
<td>Fredegar 4,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilperic (nephew of Dagobert I, † 632)</td>
<td>Dagobert I?</td>
<td>Fredegar 4,67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Corbus* is the Latinized form of the name *Chramn*, perhaps the shortened form of *Gantheiran*. Cf. Ewig, ‘Die Namengebung bei den ältesten Frankenkönigen’, pp. 27 f.
# Article

Table 5: Usurpers/Pretenders Murdered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim (usurpers/pretenders)</th>
<th>Ordered by</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munderic († c. 530)</td>
<td>Theodoric I</td>
<td>Servants of Theodoric I</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 3,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigiwald († c. 532)</td>
<td>Theodoric I</td>
<td>Servants of Theodoric I</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 3,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundoald († c. 585)</td>
<td>Ollo, count of Bourges</td>
<td>Servants of Childebert II</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 7,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauching († 587)</td>
<td>Childebert II</td>
<td>Servants of Childebert II</td>
<td>Greg. Tur. 9,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Three new biographies of Gustav Stresemann were published in 2002 and 2003, and the immediate response is to ask why studies of Stresemann are still being written when there are already over a dozen works on him, some of them very good? Have we not yet reached a final verdict on this subversive Saxon syndic and Weimar politician? Has Stresemann not entered the Valhalla of ‘good’ twentieth-century Germans, as his early admirers always wanted? Perhaps it is just the date, 2003, the 125th anniversary of his birth, that has given rise to such a plethora of books? These questions are all the more pressing as there does not appear to be any cogent reason from a methodological or theoretical perspective.  

1 A first, positive response is provided by Wolfgang Michalka, ‘Stresemann im Lichte seiner gegenwärtigen Biographien: Stresemann aus deutscher Sicht’, in Karl Heinrich Pohl (ed.), Politiker und Bürger: Gustav Stresemann und seine Zeit (Göttingen, 2002), pp. 267–89.

2 A good survey of the current state of biographical research (in Germany) is provided by Christian Klein (ed.), Grundlagen der Biographik: Theorie und Praxis des biographischen Schreibens (Stuttgart, 2002).
reverse, in fact, as biographical research seems to have hardly anything innovative to offer at the moment, apart from a few indications of pioneering approaches which could, to some extent, have been ‘tried out’ on Stresemann and have made him into the subject of a lively academic debate.

Then there is the man himself. Is not Stresemann almost the case of a politician who has actually been ‘over-researched’? There are no new sources, as there are, for instance, in the case of Rathenau, and it is unlikely that there will be any more. Apart from anything else, there seems to be no need for new sources to shed even more light on his life. His papers alone are so extensive that they answer any questions—or at least so it seems. The verdict on Stresemann and his foreign policy during the Weimar Republic, on his personality, and not least on his role for Europe in the 1920s seems, quite rightly, to have been reached long ago, the chapter ‘Undiscovered Stresemann’ to be finished.

But this was not always the case and the image of Stresemann has gone through many changes, starting immediately after his death in 1929. These ranged from the admired statesman with early European ambitions to the despised forerunner of the Third Reich; fluctuated between incorrigible annexationist and active and deliberate peace-maker; vacillated between Saul and Paul. The same applies to assessments of his personality. On the one hand he was described as a warm-hearted, sensitive, but straightforward emotionalist; on the

---

3 All the more so as some of his private papers not previously available to the public (esp. personal letters to his wife) have been accessible in the Political Archive of the German Foreign Office in Berlin since the end of 2003.

4 For a summary of the discussion on Stresemann cf. Pohl (ed.), Politiker und Bürger, which also contains references to further literature.

5 This was the line taken by the early biographies written in co-operation with Stresemann himself. Cf. Rochus Freiherr von Rheinbaben, Stresemann, der Mensch und der Staatsmann (Dresden, 1928) or Antonina Vallentin, Stresemann: Vom Werden einer Staatsidee (Leipzig, 1930).

6 This was the tenor of the biography by Wolfgang Ruge, Stresemann: Ein Lebensbild (Berlin (O), 1965).

7 Annelise Thimme, Gustav Stresemann: Eine politische Biographie zur Geschichte der Weimarer Republik (Hanover, 1967).

8 Martin Göhring, Stresemann: Mensch, Staatsmann, Europäer (Mainz, 1965).
other he was exposed as a sly tactician with no backbone, to many the very archetype of the ‘ugly’ German.\textsuperscript{9}

About fifteen years ago, however, this ambivalence seemed to have been overcome. In the biographies by Manfred Berg and Kurt Koszyk, Stresemann is presented unanimously as a person who, though admittedly as hard to pin down and analyse as ever, was none the less overwhelmingly positive.\textsuperscript{10} The dispute as to whether Stresemann was a sly deceiver or became a reformed republican seemed finally to be over. According to the new, widely accepted interpretation Stresemann developed from a wild war-monger into a foreign policy realist who, from 1923 onwards, preferred peaceful forms of foreign interaction, gave internationalism precedence over national concerns, was more interested in compromise than confrontation, and put general agreement ahead of unilateral bullying. Thus he is seen today as one of the few middle-class politicians who tried to change Germany’s foreign policy fundamentally, to some extent to ‘civilize’ it, and to re-structure it on the basis of peaceful agreements in line with a grand liberal plan.\textsuperscript{11} Here these new assessments link up with that by Arthur Rosenberg, who, as early as the end of the Weimar Republic, had attributed an outstanding role to Stresemann and described him as one of the few German politicians who knew what they wanted in terms of foreign policy.\textsuperscript{12}

There is, indeed, much to be said for such a positive verdict, in particular, the fact that in the sphere of foreign policy, in which he had the greatest impact during the Weimar Republic, Stresemann does seem to have gone through a long learning process. He developed new forms of foreign policy in which economic factors were particularly important. This policy was intended to preserve peace while securing German interests. For his achievements on the world

\textsuperscript{9} For the positive image of Stresemann see esp. the book by his son, Wolfgang Stresemann, \textit{Mein Vater Gustav Stresemann} (Frankfurt, 1979).


\textsuperscript{11} This is also the view of Christian Baechler, \textit{Gustav Stresemann (1878–1929): De l’imperialisme à la sécurité collective} (Strasburg, 1996).

stage he was, quite rightly, awarded the Nobel Peace Prize of 1926.\textsuperscript{13} To sum up this point of view, therefore, Stresemann never completely lost sight of national interests during the 1920s but recognized that national (not nationalist) objectives could be achieved only by means of international agreement. For this reason he preferred a policy of peaceful co-operation to power politics—and not only because it was a clever political move, but also from inner conviction. He thus played a crucial role in establishing a new peace-time order for Europe.\textsuperscript{14}

This is why Stresemann, as a political figure, was identified with a better, democratic, and peaceful Germany after the collapse of 1945. He was the obvious political role model for future generations of Germans.\textsuperscript{15} This was not just wishful thinking, but had a basis in political reality. He was, after all, already being referred to during the Adenauer era as a great European, ‘in the sense of a politician striving for European unity, who wanted to leave the “dark days” of national policy behind’.\textsuperscript{16} Thus Stresemann has long since been commandeered as a good political example and has entered public consciousness (with or without help) as one of the few politicians who can embody democratic continuity in German history.

Thus, to repeat the question, why three more Stresemann biographies? The new international constellation from 1989, and the far-reaching changes it has brought in the international system since the last major Stresemann biography was published should be men-

\textsuperscript{13} This and the following is a brief summary of the arguments of Peter Krüger, ‘Zur europäischen Dimension der Außenpolitik Gustav Stresemanns’, in Pohl (ed.), \textit{Politiker und Bürger}, pp. 194–228.

\textsuperscript{14} This is also the view put by Gottfried Niedhart, ‘Außenminister Stresemann und die ökonomische Variante deutscher Machtpolitik’, ibid. pp. 229–42, at p. 232.

\textsuperscript{15} On this and the following cf. Andreas Körber, \textit{Gustav Stresemann als Europäer, Patriot, Wegbereiter und potentieller Verhinderer Hitlers: Historisch-politische Sinnbildungen in der öffentlichen Erinnerung} (Hamburg 1999).

tioned here. Since then German foreign policy has once again become the foreign policy of a united Germany. It has been restored as a strong nation-state in the centre of Europe, in contrast to the first forty years after the Second World War. The unadulteratedly ‘national’, and ‘the’ German nation are regaining their status. Certainly German hegemonic aspirations are not likely, as historical developments and present attempts to integrate the nation-states into Europe suggest. But Germany’s neighbours still to some extent fear such aspirations. The notion of the ‘German nation’, which has hitherto had negative connotations because of the Nazi past, has become socially acceptable again, as has a heightened German national consciousness, which is no longer confined to the far Right. This lack of historical inhibitions—to put a positive gloss on it—now extends to views of German history. And this, in turn, has consequences for how the Weimar Republic is seen, for Gustav Stresemann, and his revisionist policies.

The idea of European integration has had to undergo similarly far-reaching changes. It has lost much of the allure that still surrounded it thirty or forty years ago and influenced the way in which Stresemann’s Westpolitik was viewed. Then the Germans ‘fled’ from their ‘black national history’ to an unbesmirched European history—now virtually the reverse has happened. Detailed descriptions of German suffering during and especially after the Second World War, starvation, Allied terror bombing, and especially the expulsion of Germans from the East are dominant themes, and are often not even put into historical context. Their purpose is generally to counter-balance German guilt. In this light German revisionist policy during the Weimar Republic, the significance of defeat in the First World War for public opinion, and the desire to see Germany as having a positive history and not just as the guilty party in the war have become considerably stronger among many Germans and, above all, more understandable.

17 Koszyk, Gustav Stresemann.
18 On this cf., e.g., the many ‘Vertriebenen Serien’ made for German TV by ZDF’s chief historian Guido Knopp and the bestselling books on the air war by Jörg Friedrich, ‘Der Brand’: Deutschland im Bombenkrieg 1940–1945 (Munich, 2002), and ‘Brandstätten’: Der Anblick des Bombenkrieges (Munich, 2003).
And not least, economic expansion has become more visible. The wielders of economic power are increasingly throwing off the fetters of national policy, and pushing their interests through against those of the nation-states. In removing themselves from any control, they are also preventing themselves from becoming the instruments of national policy. This reveals the powerlessness of the nation-states—not least Germany. And it gives Stresemann’s political strategy of making use of the economy a new slant. His achievement, for instance, in including heavy industry in his political vision, is rated more highly today than it was a few decades ago, when his attempts attracted some serious criticism.\footnote{Cf. Wolfgang Ruge, ‘Stresemann—Ein Leitbild?’, \textit{Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik}, 14 (1969), pp. 468–84}

And the social costs of this policy, the weakening of the labour movement and its economic interest groups, will surely also be judged differently today from how it was when the economy was prospering. At a time of growing prosperity, when employees’ interest groups were powerful, and important parties accepted social responsibility, Stresemann’s socially backwards-looking \textit{Bürgerblockpolitik} was bound to be viewed more critically than under present-day conditions, in which trade unions are regarded as a fossilized, unnecessary organization, collective bargaining is in doubt, real wage increases are nothing but pipe-dreams, and the propertied classes are overtly given preference in economic and social policy, just as in the Weimar Republic.\footnote{Cf., as early as 1974, Claus Dieter Krohn, \textit{Stabilisierung und ökonomische Interessen: Die Finanzpolitik des Deutschen Reiches 1923–1927} (Düsseldorf, 1974).}

The upshot is that from today’s perspective, new biographies can produce new findings, which, it can be assumed, will shed an even more positive light on Stresemann than has previously been the case.

However, this is just one—albeit crucial—factor that has changed the present-day perspective. The upsurge in research on the middle classes again raises the question as to how strongly the Weimar Republic was influenced by this group, and raises the possibility of interpreting Stresemann as a representative of the German middle classes. New biographies—a totally appropriate form in which to present a liberal politician—can, therefore, over and above the purely biographical, make an important contribution to the history of the
German middle classes in the early twentieth century. Using an approach that includes generation-specific issues, a biographer could see Stresemann as the role model for an entire generation of middle-class Germans. His biography could thus help to unravel the history of the middle classes in the Weimar Republic.

How did Stresemann, a liberal member of the middle class, set about realizing his system of bourgeois values in the Kingdom of Saxony and then in the Weimar Republic in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—and what exactly were these values? To define these would provide a yardstick against which his whole policy could sensibly be interpreted. And if sufficient attention is paid to his early period, Stresemann could be used as an important test case for evaluating how middle class the German Kaiserreich was. Does he, for instance, show that during the Kaiserreich a talented outsider could achieve fame, power, and wealth by demonstrating middle-class virtues, displaying enthusiasm, and using clever tactics, while not submitting to the narrow notions of status held by the conservative notables? Did his great successes as early as in the Kaiserreich reflect purely his personal flexibility, or does his career also shed light on the structures of the Kaiserreich, which from this perspective were not just narrow and rigid, but also open and changeable?

Moreover, if Stresemann’s work is examined from the point of view of a gradual adoption of modernizing ideas, it could be established whether Saxony under Stresemann developed in a way that increasingly recognized the demands of the twentieth century, enabling Stresemann (and thus Germany as well) to survive the future in a modern, democratic, industrial society. It seems that Stresemann was early aware of progressive answers to the question, so important for Germany, of how the workers, for example (and their political and industrial organizations) could be integrated into German society. Even at such an early point in time, he advocated recognition of the Free Trade Unions, and favoured the principle of collective wage agreements, the high road to reconciling the interests of capital and labour. Thus it is no coincidence that Stresemann was the first Chancellor of the Weimar Republic who, in the crisis year of 1923, brought together a working Grand Coalition embracing parties from the DVP to the SPD.21

21 Karl Heinrich Pohl, Sachsen, 'Stresemann und der Verband Sächsischer
Even before the outbreak of the First World War, Stresemann recognized that the German Reich needed a greater input from its citizens in decision-making, that unfair electoral systems gradually had to be abolished wherever they existed in the Reich, and that the whole population had to be encouraged to participate more in politics. While his fellow party-members in Prussia were still clinging to the unfair three-class franchise, Stresemann introduced a change in Saxony which modernized the franchise, reduced the power of the Conservatives, and at a stroke gave the Social Democrats almost a third of all seats in the Landtag.22 He also changed the tone within the political parties and industrial associations when, by founding the 
Verband Sächsischer Industrieller (Association of Saxon Industrialists), he attempted to restrain the influence of the agrarian lobby, to break the alliance of iron and rye, and to overcome Germany’s social stagnation.23 And not the least of his achievements was to make an important addition to the German social welfare system. Almost single-handedly, Stresemann ensured that the growing number of salaried employees had their own social insurance scheme, and were thus integrated into the social system.24

Thus an up-to-date biography of Stresemann will be able to do him justice only if it takes sufficient account of his early period of activity. Yet almost all biographies published so far feature only half the man, the Weimar Stresemann, although to be sure, in his most recent study Kurt Koszyk shows more interest in the early years.25 In any case, Stresemann’s Saxon period needs to be more closely inves-

\[\text{Industrieller: "Moderne" Industriepolitik zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts?}, \]
\[\text{23 The first to write about this was Donald Warren, The Red Kingdom of Saxony: Lobbying Grounds for Gustav Stresemann 1901–1909 (The Hague, 1964).}\]
\[\text{24 Michael Prinz, 'Gustav Stresemann als Sozialpolitiker – Magier oder Zauberehrling?', in Pohl (ed.), Politiker und Bürger, pp. 114–42.}\]
\[\text{25 Koszyk, Gustav Stresemann, pp. 19 ff.}\]
tigated and related more tellingly to a total assessment of the man, and of the German middle classes as a whole. It is not just a matter of deciphering the early influences and his economic and political socialization; after all, Stresemann’s Saxon period was longer than his entire Weimar period. Thus Saxony was not just a ‘preparatory phase’ for Weimar, but a time with its own unique value for the person and the politics of Gustav Stresemann.

Moreover, the richness of the existing material on Stresemann could be placed in the service of innovations in the genre of biography. After all, a new Stresemann biography only to a limited extent faces the task of unearthing new details (for example, in relation to the Saxon period). Rather, such an undertaking offers the chance to go beyond the chronological reconstruction of his political actions and to do greater justice to the person. It would be a case not merely of interpreting Stresemann primarily as the human agent of an innovative foreign policy in the Weimar Republic, as has been done often enough before, but rather of acknowledging this policy as a partial aspect of Stresemann the man, as something that, while a part of him, did not make up the entire human being. This would also offer a way of avoiding the ‘biographical trap’ which is especially dangerous in the case of Stresemann on account of the control that he exercised over the papers he left on his death. It is therefore important to examine the value of these papers as sources more critically, and to use parallel sources and alternative traditions more often than has been done to date.

Thus it is time to attempt an assessment, going beyond all political and factual matters, of Stresemann not merely as a politician, but as a human being at the beginning of the modern period. Whether one wants to describe him as a ‘border crosser’, or as a man with a mask, psychological approaches hitherto shunned by historians could be used in a new biography and the traditional findings meas-

ured against them. This would not only cast light on Stresemann’s life, but also give German research on biography a boost.

II

Eberhard Kolb, the Nestor of German Stresemann studies, has undertaken in his brief biography of Stresemann to summarize the state of international research and to introduce the interested reader ‘to three decades of German politics from the Kaiserreich to the end of the Weimar Republic’ (blurb, p. 2), all in readable language not weighed down by jargon and over just 125 pages. Kolb is particularly well suited to achieve this almost impossible task. Not only is he one of Germany’s most knowledgeable experts on the history of the Weimar Republic who has studied Stresemann and his foreign policy for more than twenty years, but he is also fully familiar with Stresemann the party politician, having edited a voluminous collection of sources on National Liberalism in the Weimar Republic.

Thus we approach this slim volume with high expectations which, to anticipate, are largely fulfilled. This applies both to content and style, which is precise yet readable. It is regrettable, however, that the text is inadequately equipped with a scholarly apparatus. While it indicates quotations, it does not allow the reader to follow them up. This is probably more the publisher’s failing than the author’s. Of course, in such a brief overview we look in vain for discussion of far-reaching questions such as how Stresemann fits into a history of the Bürgertum, a general debate on the achievements of biography today, or a close examination of problems of source criticism.

29 Cf. Eberhard Kolb, Die Weimarer Republik (3rd edn.; Munich, 1993) which is in every respect convincing.
32 The blurb (p. 3) suggests that the book describes the Bürgertum taking a direction ‘which, ultimately, was unable to establish itself, to the great detriment of Germany and Europe’.
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Kolb begins with a brief prologue in which he describes Stresemann’s funeral in 1929. This is worth noting, as it means that he does not take a strictly chronological approach, but looks at Stresemann’s life, as it were, from its end. This strengthens the author’s intention to present the protagonist’s life as consistent, to confer upon it a clear logic, and to interpret it from its climax. After the prologue, Kolb’s work is divided into a total of six almost equal chapters. He describes Stresemann’s early years, looks at the young man’s rise, examines the war policy in detail, discusses the early years of the Weimar Republic, extensively treats the Republic’s crisis year of 1923, and devotes himself to the successful foreign minister only in the final chapter. A brief time chart, and an even briefer but completely up-to-date bibliography round off the account.

At first glance it is clear this biography of Stresemann does not confine itself to the Weimar politician between 1923 and 1929, but covers the whole life. Only about one third of it, much less than in all previous biographies, is devoted to the well-known Weimar period of Stresemann’s life. In this way Kolb demonstrates that he considers all phases of Stresemann’s life equally important. This undoubtedly represents significant progress in recent biographical work on Stresemann, and deserves the highest respect.

In the first part, ‘Prägungen’, Kolb looks at Stresemann’s early years from 1878 to just after the turn of the century. The reader is given information about Stresemann’s parental home and family, youth, student years, membership of a student fraternity (Burschenschaft), and his personality, all of which has been closely researched as far as this is possible on the basis of available material, which Kolb has evaluated and used in its entirety. The petit bourgeois background of a family from Luisenstadt in Berlin that traded in bottled beer emerges clearly as do the difficult circumstances within the family, such as problems with an alcoholic brother and the early death of the mother. The reader recognizes the familial surroundings in which the young Stresemann, who had many interests and a capacity for enthusiasm, grew up with his romantic ideas as a collector and writer of poems and wide-ranging literary interests. Kolb conveys a lively picture of all this, but one which is crucially shaped either by contemporary or later accounts by Stresemann himself, or by friends who were well-disposed towards him.

Kolb thus undoubtedly accepts at face value the image manufac-
tured by Stresemann and his friends. We lack a brief word (more could not be expected in an account of this sort) on the source basis, for example, some recognition of the fact that a student’s own account of his education is one of the documents in which the author almost invariably lies. No comment is made on the fact that the statements about Stresemann on which Kolb draws were often made retrospectively by teachers and fellow students writing about their famous acquaintance, sometimes shortly before or after Stresemann’s death—which has a marked effect on the tenor of the accounts. In general, Kolb—like Wright and Birkelund—accepts without comment Stresemann’s interpretation of himself as a youthful ‘Traumjörg’ (dreamer), who was not (yet) aware of the realities of life.

None the less, Kolb convincingly depicts the fascinating rise of this young man blessed with neither beauty, health, nor riches. He clearly presents Stresemann’s ambition and dynamism, and gives an adequate account of his early socialization at school, university, and in student fraternities. This also applies to his account of Stresemann’s early activities and his commitment to reforming fraternities. Kolb concludes: ‘In Stresemann’s schooldays and student years, important co-ordinates of his world image and his fundamental political convictions emerged, which remained crucial to his later life’ (p. 21). Even if this statement is qualified, much of this seems to be true.

Kolb also handles the next phase of Stresemann’s life, the Saxon period, with great expertise, although, as in the previous section, he is unable to draw on his own archival research. The various levels of Stresemann’s development are outlined and related to each other. Kolb depicts Stresemann’s rise from syndic of the Association of Chocolate Manufacturers into a powerful industrial syndic who soon had sole say in the Association of Saxon Industrialists, but was also listened to by the Association of Industrialists and the Hansa Association. His affinity with manufacturing industry, and opposi-

33 In places such as this the lack of any footnotes, however modest, is sorely felt.
34 Cf. the poetry collection with this title which Stresemann made available to a small circle of friends when he was in his early 20s. Similarly, his youthful love for a 13-year-old acquaintance is simply accepted as a fact, and accorded a great deal of significance.
tion to heavy industry becomes clear. Similarly, the genesis of his early policy of social balance, which vehemently rejected the ‘master in my own house’ attitude of heavy industry, is explained and its significance assessed. Notice is also taken of the social policy maker, who, from an early date, did not see Social Democrats just as enemies.

Kolb explains the transformation of Stresemann, member of the National Social Union, into the National Liberal Stresemann as early as 1903 among other things in terms of the hunger for power of the twenty-five-year-old, who quickly recognized that only the National Liberals could offer him a springboard into a major political career. This was, at the very least, a risky operation, for the National Liberal Party had lost considerable significance in Saxony, and especially in Dresden. Yet Stresemann made the National Liberal Party and Saxon industrialists into important factors not only of Saxon politics. Here, too, Stresemann’s career followed a steep and seemingly unstoppable rising curve until 1912, when he lost his seat in the Reichstag and a withdrawal from German politics threatened.

For Kolb, this year occupies a key position, as he asks the hypothetical question of what would have happened if Stresemann had not, ‘luckily’, entered the Reichstag in 1914. Regardless of Kolb’s controversial reply that this would have meant general failure for the great politician, the hint that a ‘favourable constellation’ (p. 40) always played an important part in Stresemann’s successful life is interesting. In general, one could have wished that the author had more often expanded his all too succinct account of Stresemann’s life development. On the whole, however, it should be said that Kolb’s presentation and weighing-up of the first two periods of Stresemann’s life with the required brevity and density is outstanding.

In the following four sections, Kolb is on familiar territory. They treat the period from 1914 to 1929, that is, the time when, in earlier biographies, Stresemann only really emerges as a person. Kolb therefore devotes himself to the self-imposed task of finding out how Stresemann’s ‘temporary fall from grace’, his excessive war aims policy, his vision of a greater Germany, and his radical attempts to silence all opponents of such a policy are to be explained (p. 41). Kolb offers a bundle of explanations, including a qualification of Stresemann’s position in the national and international war aims discussion; a constant Anglophobia, which emerged virulently here; the
desire to secure the Reich by means of further expansions; the argument that such demands would keep the flank open for internal reform; and the defence of being inadequately informed. Finally, Kolb points out that over time, Stresemann modified his demands, but that this has not really been noticed by political scientists or historians. Here Kolb displays a great deal of understanding for his protagonist—perhaps too much?

The fact that by historicizing this problem Kolb embeds it in the national and international context and thus deprives it of its uniqueness and excessiveness is certainly progressive. Indeed, Maximilian Harden and Matthias Erzberger, as well as the French and English politicians to whom Kolb refers in support of his thesis, did not essentially argue any differently from Stresemann. However, whether this is a ‘convincing interpretation that allows us to recognize the pre-1914 and post-1922 Stresemann as a personality and political actor in the Stresemann of the years from 1914 to 1918’ (p. 41) must be left to the reader to decide. For an explanation we would probably need to know more about Stresemann the man.

Continuity in Stresemann’s activities, by contrast, is much easier to find in his demands for a more parliamentary German Reich. These demands continued seamlessly from the pre-war into the post-war period, and strongly influenced Stresemann’s domestic political activity. It is the achievement of Kolb’s work to have identified the significance of this continuity. To be sure, however, a parliamentary democracy along present-day lines was never Stresemann’s goal; even the Weimar Republic went too far for him in many respects. Throughout his entire life he held to a model according to which the state was to accept a great deal of social responsibility, and entrepreneurs and unions would work together in harmony—in other words, the model of a Volksgemeinschaft which clearly privileged corporatism above individualism. Thus although Stresemann’s ideas for the Kaiserreich can be called modern, this was no longer true of almost all areas of society during the Weimar parliamentary Republic. This aspect could have been emphasized more strongly.

In one thing, however, we must agree with Kolb. In the autumn of 1918, Stresemann was confronted by

a pile of shards: instead of a German peace based on power, Germany faced total military defeat and humiliating armistice
conditions; instead of the moderate parliamentarization he had hoped for, which would have put his party in a key position and given him a greater chance to exercise influence and possibly put him line for a high office, there was a parliamentary government without the National Liberals; he himself, if not ostracized, was relegated to a marginal position. And there was more: in November 1918 his political future as a whole was on the line (p. 56).

It is no coincidence that Stresemann suffered a physical and mental breakdown at this point. Kolb is also interested in the sick Stresemann, and points out the impact of this lasting illness on his politics.

Kolb shows himself to be au fait with even the smallest details when he deals with the founding phase of the Deutsche Volkspartei (German People’s Party). He concludes that it was not Stresemann’s fault that a common liberal party was not achieved. Whether this positive assessment also applies to his behaviour during the Kapp putsch, however, is open to serious doubt. Stresemann’s preference for the ‘stab in the back’ theory, similarly, is judged by Kolb to be an aberration. Here he could have taken a closer look at Stresemann’s motives, which would have done justice to the politician’s ambiguity.

Becoming chancellor in the crisis year of 1923 represented the first climax of Stresemann’s career. Kolb, following the general trend in research, credits Stresemann with ending the battle for the Ruhr, overcoming the inflation, and confronting separatists and left- and right-wing extremists. Germany was rescued from chaos, Kolb argues, and thus Stresemann, who had still been a monarchist at the beginning of the republic, finally mutated into a Vernunftrepublikaner, a republican from reason rather than conviction. Neither Kolb, Wright, nor Birkelund criticize Stresemann for his behaviour—after all, he helped to remove the Saxon government illegally and to finish off the leftist republican project there.

In his account of Stresemann’s foreign policy too, Kolb follows the general trend in research. Stresemann is acknowledged as the ‘main architect of a republican foreign policy’ (p. 94), and the interconnections between foreign and domestic policy are knowledgeably presented. Kolb adopts the arguments of Peter Krüger and, in modified form, Gottfried Niedhart, in his benign judgement of Stresemann. Ultimately, Kolb celebrates Stresemann as probably ‘the most fasci-
nating and significant personality’ in the Weimar Republic. Few shadows fall on the protagonist of his biography.

III
In contrast to Kolb, Jonathan Wright has written a full-scale academic biography directed at an international specialist readership. Right from the start I should like to stress that this work will set new standards in research. As this is the first major biography of Stresemann by a British researcher, it is interesting to see what emphases this view from outside produces. The objective of this study is not just to sum up the results of previous research, which was Kolb’s aim. Rather, Wright also wants to discover something new, to leave the well-trodden paths, and to present a ‘different Stresemann’ from the one we know so far.

This voluminous work, which is still awaiting translation into German, is also conventionally structured. Wright does not spend much time debating recent trends in biography, but comes to the point immediately, that is, Stresemann and his life. In general it could be said that theoretical reflection is not this author’s forte, although that is what one expects from a new biography of Stresemann.

In general, the study follows a chronological scheme. The distribution of material indicates that Wright follows the old pattern in assigning relative weight to the different periods of Stresemann’s life. The Weimar politician is clearly at the centre of the study, the Saxon syndic and party politician accounts for about 15 per cent of the work, while only about 100 pages out of 525 are devoted to the period before 1918. Clearly, from the British view, the foreign policy is especially interesting. However, we must wonder whether this structure can do justice to a Gesamtbiographie of Stresemann. In this respect Wright falls below the standard set by Kolb.

Wright’s account draws on a rich basis of literature and sources. There is hardly an important work that he does not refer to, but when it comes to sources it is noticeable that none of the archival holdings relating to the ‘Saxon Stresemann’ (apart from Stresemann’s papers) are listed. The author obviously avoided the Saxon archives, with the
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exception of the university archive in Leipzig. This is probably connected with the structure of the study, which rates Saxony as a mere prelude to Stresemann’s real story. Nor does Wright refer to the German foreign office documents that concern Germany’s economic negotiations and were not dealt with in the offices of the Staatssekretär or minister. It is pleasing to see, however, that the archives of the French and the British foreign office were consulted, and that a wealth of material (Stresemann’s correspondence with Kurt Himer, Jean Stresemann papers, and Carl von Schubert papers), so far largely unknown, has been incorporated into the study. However, in Wright’s study, too, the Stresemann papers are the main source and alternative traditions are used only to a moderate degree.

The volume is divided into ten chapters of unequal weight. The first two chapters deal with Stresemann’s youth and his Saxon period in a concentrated way, but drawing on new sources, Wright presents a lively account. There is nothing essentially new here, however, and Wright largely treads the paths already mapped out by Kurt Koszyk. Even Kolb presents almost as much material. But the main thing missing from Wright’s account is systematic source criticism of Stresemann’s own statements and of the ‘friendly accounts’ by the acquaintances of his youth. Wright’s study, too, perpetuates the picture, drawn by Stresemann himself, of an essentially lonely and self-referential young man who quickly developed considerable ambition and applied a great deal of rationality to the pursuit of his goals in life.

In addressing the question of whether Stresemann was an opportunist and careerist whose main interest was power rather than ideas, Wright takes a clear position. He argues that as the result of socialization at home and at school, university studies and membership of a student fraternity, and finally the influence of Friedrich Naumann and his National Social Union, Stresemann in the first twenty-five years of his life developed a view of the world that could be described as liberal and bourgeois. Stresemann’s switch from the National Social Union to the National Liberal Party is not systematically thematized, but attributed to pure expediency, an interpretation that has much going for it.

The co-ordinates of Stresemann’s value horizon were formed by a Germany strong towards the outside and with an urge to assert, and,

37 Koszyk, Gustav Stresemann, pp. 19 ff.
Review Articles

if necessary, to prove itself against other nations, plus a readiness for
reform at home (combined with the desire to give more power to the
National Liberals) and a wish for social balance (which, however,
only conditionally included Polish citizens, for example). These,
argues Wright, had been with him his whole life long, and, with
greater or lesser variations, he always advocated them in his profes-
sion and in politics. What this account, however, does not make quite
clear is that what had once been progressive was almost backwards-
looking during the Weimar republic.

From this perspective Social Democracy, which Stresemann per-
ceived as unpatriotic and intolerant, was never a real political option
for him (p. 24). Despite the rationalism which characterized his deal-
ings with Social Democracy, even as early as in Saxony—an attitude
which, incidentally, distinguished Stresemann from many of his
bourgeois contemporaries—he always rejected the Social Democrats
and their ideology. Stresemann’s goal was harmony and the over-
coming, not the hardening, of class differences. Despite strong criti-
cism on specific points, Wright on the whole sees Stresemann in a
positive light. Thus there is only a partial openness in the assessment
of Stresemann’s life.

Wright presents Stresemann’s Saxon period knowledgeably on
the basis of existing literature, which, however, still leaves many
questions open. As in the Kolb biography, Stresemann’s rise to
become a powerful syndic and organizer of business while dominat-
ing the National Liberals, and not only in Saxony, is described. In
Wright’s account, we can also see what chances the late Kaiserreich
offered a ‘hungry’ and talented young man, even if he had no finan-
cial and social capital. The emergent organizer and party and eco-
nomic manager can be seen, the person who revolutionized Saxon
associational life in business circles and turned his party inside out,
developing an effective political party appropriate to modern mass
society out of a sleepy party of notables. No secret is made of the fact
that in the course of this he sought support from the most diverse
organizations, even from the political far right. His support for liber-
al policies, often going against the ideas of both Social Democrats and
Conservatives, and for export-orientated manufacturing industry
against heavy industry and the proponents of the ‘master in the
house’ point of view, are made clear. We are also introduced to
Stresemann as a private individual, the head of a bourgeois family
with a beautiful and creative wife and two gifted children, who was personally ambitious and not always likeable.

However, more is known about Stresemann’s networks in Saxony’s social circles than we read here. The names Ernemann and Arnhold, for instance, important figures in Saxon industry, whom he met in many associations and who exerted a strong influence on him in social policy matters, do not appear in Wright’s account. Nor does the Alldeutscher Verein (Pan-German League), of which Stresemann was a member and to which he frequently lectured. Here there are clear weaknesses in Wright’s account. Moreover, he does not take the opportunity to present Stresemann as an important representative of a new generation of young, aspiring middle-class men. In Wright’s study he remains primarily a loner, a figure to be picked out in an individual biography.

Although Wright clearly has sympathy for his protagonist, his book is definitely not a hagiography, as the section on the First World War illustrates well. Wright presents Stresemann’s almost pathological hatred of Britain, and his excessive war aims (even when concluding peace with Russia) with great clarity. He is critical of Stresemann’s role in bringing down Bethmann Hollweg, and does not shy away from calling intrigues intrigues (p. 92). Similarly, Wright gives a differentiated account of Stresemann’s dubious role in explaining unlimited submarine warfare, recognizes his totally uncritical adoption of military assessments, and points out his miscalculation in respect of the attitude of the USA.

Wright also nicely points up the irony that although Stresemann seemed to have achieved his aims with Bethmann Hollweg’s downfall, he was in fact unable to implement them. Bülow did not succeed the Chancellor, and the Supreme Army Command was not prepared to permit reforms in Prussia, perhaps Stresemann’s most important domestic political goal. We are shown Stresemann’s dual face: on the one side the desire for national, if not nationalist, expansion; on the other, the permanent and intensive quest for reforms and a gradual parliamentarization of the Reich (above all, Prussia).

How does Wright deal with his self-imposed task of explaining Stresemann’s transformation from a wartime annexationist into the European statesman of 1925–9 (p. 111)? For one thing, for Wright as for Kolb, over a twenty-five year period of political activity Stresemann did not change so dramatically as to go beyond what was
acceptable. German as well as Allied politicians (who operated in more stable democracies) went through similar changes. Secondly, Wright emphasizes Stresemann’s capacity to learn. For Wright, the period up to 1923 was to some extent an apprenticeship during which Stresemann grew into his role as a great statesman and increasingly changed himself after the crisis of 1918 which had left him profoundly insecure and depressed. It does not become entirely clear, however, whether Wright is talking only about a gradual process of learning and thus constant change which remained within the liberal range that defined Stresemann throughout his life, or whether some fundamental change is visible.

The case for continuity cites Stresemann’s socialization in Saxony, his clear and well-developed nationalism, his social openness, his conviction that only the Liberals were able to bridge the left and the right, and his inner rejection of the equal franchise although he had come to terms with democracy during Weimar. All this characterizes him as a Wilhelminian German—albeit an ‘enlightened’ one. Wright convincingly portrays Stresemann’s hesitant path towards acceptance of the Weimar Republic, and his vacillating attitude towards the Kapp putsch (p. 152).

The core of the biography is devoted to the years 1923 to 1929, Stresemann’s big years after which, according to Wright, he transformed himself into a supporter of parliamentarism. Most of Stresemann’s ideals dated from the nineteenth century, not least his indestructible affection for the Crown Prince, and he was therefore never a convinced democrat from the heart. But regardless of that—or perhaps because of it—as a minister and party leader he convincingly and successfully mastered the instruments of a political mass democracy. He also repeatedly and magnificently managed to combine party policy and national policy. With the exception of the Nazi Party, no other political party in the Weimar Republic was associated so strongly with the name of an individual party leader as Stresemann’s Deutsche Volkspartei.

Wright provides a balanced account of Stresemann’s chancellorship in 1923, doing justice to its significance. This part is not merely fundamental reading for anyone interested in Stresemann; it sets new standards for Weimar historiography. The same applies to Wright’s description and analysis of German foreign policy between 1924 and 1929. The structure of Stresemann’s strategy is revealed in an account
full of facts, but also containing far-reaching reflections. In this part of his study Wright admirably incorporates the known literature. Wright here presents a standard work on the history of foreign policy in the Weimar Republic. Given the length of the work and the detail in which negotiations are reconstructed, the events could occasionally be somewhat confusing for the non-expert. If there is too much of a good thing here, one could have done with more of it in the earlier part.

On the whole, Wright’s assessment of Stresemann’s foreign policy and party politics is extremely positive. This judgement coming from a British scholar carries a great deal of weight, all the more so as Wright can be critical at times, for example, when dealing with Stresemann’s attitude towards the covert armament of the Reichswehr. However, he uses this to raise fundamental questions concerning Stresemann as a human being and his foreign policy only from case to case, and not systematically. The same applies to the problem of whether the 1923 campaign against Saxony might not have been harmful to the future of the Republic in the long term. Wright certainly confronts Stresemann’s potential tactical errors (pp. 242 f.), but does not pursue the criticism systematically and pull it together to form a whole picture. Added to this is that Wright values Stresemann most highly as a diplomat. Stresemann’s achievement in committing German industry to his policies, even though he was no friend of heavy industry, remains very much in the background. The international steel cartel, for example, is mentioned only once (p. 375). The process by which it came into being deserves more interest.

To reiterate, Wright’s competence in this part of his study is beyond any doubt. The only thing that we might miss is a constant personal relation to Stresemann, who features less as a human being (who also has a private life) than as the agent of a highly successful (foreign) policy. This is certainly important. Yet the personality—and after all, we are dealing with a biography and not a study of German foreign policy, of which this particular foreign policy represents merely a partial (although important) aspect—remains a little in the background. This is especially regrettable because throughout the book Wright scatters clever and far-reaching comments on Stresemann’s personality, for example, when he discusses Stresemann’s relationship with the Crown Prince (p. 231), or possible anti-Semitism (p. 136).
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This shortcoming is all the more noticeable as Wright has elsewhere penned something like a psychological portrait of Stresemann. There Wright cleverly diagnosed Stresemann’s inner ambivalence, clearly brought out the difference between ‘wanting to appear’ and ‘the real I’, and, on the whole, interpreted Stresemann as a person whose defining feature was the mask that he donned. This mask was ‘one of this politician’s essential features in the interplay between his personality and the politics of his time’. The diagnosis of Stresemann as an outsider in a bourgeois world to which he only ever belonged to a limited extent could have served as a unifying line running through the interpretation of his politics. Yet Wright has chosen not to pursue this approach. None the less, this is a great work which will take some superseding in form and content.

IV
A few months after Jonathan Wright, the American John P. Birkelund published his biography of Stresemann. The author is a successful businessman from the investment milieu and also a talented amateur historian who, according to his German publisher, has been working on this topic for fifteen years. Thus we expect a study that will cast expert light on Stresemann’s economic background and policies, and possibly on German–American relations as well. And indeed, Birkelund’s aim is firstly, as expected, to place the economic aspect, and in particular, the USA as a factor at the heart of his study, and secondly and somewhat surprisingly, to take special note of constitutional aspects (p. 8). This approach, however, does not promise to reveal any completely new aspects of Stresemann’s life and work. To anticipate, Bikelund’s biography does not stand comparison with Wright’s study. Nor does it present its historical theme with the mastery achieved by Kolb.

To start with, the source base of Birkelund’s work reveals serious gaps. Of the unpublished sources, he has used only the microfilm copies of the Stresemann papers, which are not, however, complete. Beyond this, Birkelund has not consulted any further unpublished documents from a German or international archive. How anyone can expect to find out anything substantially new about Stresemann, or

38 Wright, ‘Die Maske’, p. 43.
to bring out the economic theme in particular, on this basis is a moot point. Moreover, Stresemann’s papers and the reports and statements by Wolfgang Stresemann, which are referred to relatively frequently, are used almost without any source criticism. Although the current literature is listed in the bibliography, the references make clear that only a fragment of these titles, and mostly those by American scholars, were consulted for the actual work.

Birkelund’s biography, like the two others under review, is conventionally structured and displays the ‘classic Saxon deficits’. Here, too, Stresemann’s life appears as a one-way street that necessarily led straight to Weimar and the national politician. However, Birkelund, like Kolb before him, stresses the brief period from 1912 to 1914 as one of particular crisis in Stresemann’s life, when his career was in the balance (pp. 82 ff.). Such a conclusion, however, can be drawn only if Stresemann the syndic and bourgeois politician in Saxony is considered rather insignificant. In fact, if one takes a different perspective, in 1914 Stresemann was at the peak of his effectiveness in Saxony, and not only there. At that moment, Stresemann was on the point of becoming Saxony’s political opinion-former and giving his career a further boost. This could have been mentioned.

Admittedly, for an American historian and an American readership, this part of Stresemann’s life may not be especially interesting. But four brief chapters on youth, lobbyist and politician, Reichstag, and political exile is simply not enough. However, a good twenty-five pages are devoted to Stresemann in the First World War. The other two-thirds of the book deal with the Weimar politician, looking at both domestic and foreign policy. Despite the claims made for the book, constitutional aspects are rather marginal. Yet the period between 1919 and 1923, that is, the time up to Stresemann’s period in office, is looked at intensively. Thus it could be said that the part of the biography devoted to the Weimar years is sensibly structured, and deals well with the various aspects of Stresemann’s politics.

It is clear that Birkelund wrote his study for a broad and interested American public which is not particularly familiar with German history, and is therefore grateful for additional information. At times, the book almost becomes a German history for Americans, presenting the basic issues, especially in foreign policy. This applies to the description of associational life in Saxony and the Kaiserreich (pp. 35 ff.) as much as to the detailed account of Stresemann’s cabinet and
ministers in 1923 (pp. 282 ff.). For a German reader, these basic explanations are sometimes inappropriate. In addition, there are a number of small errors. Bosch and Duisberg can hardly be counted among the leaders of German heavy industry (p. 188); Stresemann can hardly have celebrated his thirty-eighth birthday in 1923; and it was not Stresemann’s honorary doctorate, but his dissertation, that was often the subject of public derision.

If we enquire whether the book contains anything substantially new, we have to admit that there is not much. This, however, is also a reflection of the quality of Wright’s biography, which this one follows. As far as new facts about Stresemann and his life are concerned, it contains little that is unknown. It contains no new information on Stresemann’s youth; on the contrary, it does not even tell us as much as Wright’s and Kolb’s books. This is partially attributable to the fact that Birkelund did not consult the Jean Stresemann papers, which contain, among other things, Stresemann’s private correspondence with his wife. Instead Birkelund, as already mentioned, draws mainly on Stresemann’s ‘official’ statements in his papers and information provided by Stresemann’s son. More seriously, statements made by Wolfgang Stresemann about his father, whom he admired deeply, are simply reproduced. But what value can we attribute to a son’s statements about his father, in particular, a son whom Birkelund himself describes as extraordinarily loyal (p. 11)?

What is illuminating about Birkelund’s study is its American perspective. Birkelund gives the USA the value it deserves in Stresemann’s biography and his politics, in particular before 1914. Birkelund argues convincingly that despite a visit to the USA in 1912, the young Stresemann had little understanding of the American mentality. This, in turn, resulted in a catastrophic misjudgement in respect of unlimited submarine warfare, and an underestimate of the significance of the USA as an economic power in the First World War.
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(p. 85). However, Birkelund also emphasizes Stresemann’s ability to learn during the Weimar Republic.

Birkelund undoubtedly admires Gustav Stresemann’s human greatness and his politics. This is already spelled out in the Foreword (pp. 10 f.). This admiration, however, does not prevent Birkelund from criticizing Stresemann’s policies, and it is this critical perspective that distinguishes this new biography. In adopting it, the author removes himself a little from the previous biographical consensus that generally saw Stresemann’s activities as on the whole positive. Birkelund clearly calls Stresemann an annexationist and a chauvinist (pp. 98 ff.), emphasizes the failure of his policy in the First World War, discusses Stresemann’s attitude to the war guilt question in highly critical terms, and criticizes his support for the ‘stab in the back’ myth.

Birkelund also outlines Stresemann’s highly ambivalent behaviour during the Kapp putsch, and establishes that Stresemann only came to accept the republic in 1923. This allows the processual nature of the way in which Stresemann and his policies changed to emerge clearly. There was a gradual change in Stresemann’s politics, not a sudden break. In principle, this is not a new finding. Almost all recent authors see the year 1923 as representing a test for Stresemann, one which he passed brilliantly before maturing into the great Weimar statesman. Even Birkelund does not discuss further the significance of Stresemann’s suppression of the ‘Saxon experiment’ in 1923.

On the whole, it could be said that Birkelund places greater emphasis on the contradictions between Stresemann as an individual and his policies than Kolb does, for example, when he describes Stresemann’s policy for Poland and his ambivalence (pp. 410 f.). Birkelund succeeds admirably in classifying Stresemann as a representative of the middle classes, and making his attitudes recognizable as a paradigm for many others. This perspective, however, does not provide a structural element for the whole biography. The reader painfully misses a serious discussion of the economic variant of German policy, a topic for which the author would certainly have a special proclivity, given his training. Nowhere, however, does he increase our knowledge in this area, something which would certainly have been possible even without further research in German archives.
A number of insightful individual observations by Birkelund should not be overlooked. He undoubtedly recognizes the impact of ill-health on Stresemann’s life and politics (pp. 233, 363). Similarly, he goes into detail concerning Stresemann’s cultural interests, stressing, for example, his affinity with Goethe and his works (p. 235). However, he also recognizes that, from an academic point of view, Stresemann was not the Goethe expert he often liked to present himself as to the outside world. Yet Birkelund does not develop this observation into a contribution towards a psychological portrait of Stresemann; nor does he pursue this aspect throughout the entire biography.

Under these circumstances, the final assessment of Birkelund’s biography must remain highly ambivalent. It provides little that is new, and hardly opens up fundamentally new perspectives compared with what we already know. The view of an American outsider provides a variation on the known critical aspects of Stresemann’s politics, but they are not judged so gravely as to constitute a paradigm shift in the assessment of Stresemann. Despite everything, Stresemann remains a ‘good man’. In sum, it would probably not have been a great loss if this book had not been published in Germany. In any case, Birkelund’s study does not measure up to Wright’s subtle analysis.

To recapitulate briefly, it should be noted that research on Stresemann has undoubtedly been enriched by the three new studies reviewed here. The short but excellent work by Eberhard Kolb presents the current state of research on Stresemann to a broad German public. Kolb systematically and expertly paces out the present-day research horizon in terms of both contents and approaches. His book updates the reader on Stresemann and the current research on him even better than Manfred Berg’s book did in its time. The reader also finds out which problems require closer explanation (for example, Stresemann in Dresden and Saxony), which are controversial, and what the author’s opinion is on the academic debates. More could not be expected of such a short study. In sum, Kolb’s book is a

---
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high quality presentation of the current state of research which Kolb himself has helped to define with his works.

Jonathan Wright’s aim is not merely to present the state of research, but also to highlight something new. And he does, indeed, bring to light a number of hitherto unknown facts about Stresemann’s life, especially during the Weimar Republic. In his judgement Stresemann is Weimar’s greatest statesman, despite some individual criticisms. The concentration on the Weimar politician, however, robs the study of a certain openness of interpretation. Because it was seemingly of secondary significance for his politics during the Weimar Republic, Stresemann’s early period in Saxony—which lasted for fifteen years, while Stresemann was Foreign Minister for only six—is not, on the whole, given sufficient weight. Anything that pointed towards the Weimar politician is emphasized; anything that fits less well tends to be relegated to the background, though it is not passed over in silence. The openness of the British author is welcome here, as he is able to overcome some of the constrictions which the German interpretations run into. Wright’s sovereign overview and his ability to place Stresemann’s achievement in the context of European politics is revealed not least in the brilliant conclusion to his study.

It should be noted, however, that the study takes a rather conventional approach. The author launches into his theme without any preliminary theoretical reflection. Added to this is the concentration on politics, which is not systematically justified anywhere. Other aspects, whether personal or social in character, such as health, social position, mentality, or cultural status, are addressed from time to time, but do not coalesce into factors of intrinsic value. To this extent the study occasionally runs the risk of seeing Stresemann mainly as an agent of Weimar foreign policy rather than as a multi-facettted human being who was also a politician. The fact that biographies, as Niklas Luhmann suggests, are a chain of coincidences which organize themselves into something, and which then gradually become less mobile,43 is not always apparent in Wright’s study.

Compared with the works by Kolb and Wright, Birkelund’s comes off a little worse. It achieves neither the sovereign overview attained by Kolb, nor does it outdo Wright in terms of research or

interpretation. There is no theoretical reflection about biography as a genre and what it can achieve; there is often a lack of source criticism; small, careless mistakes creep in; and there is little evidence of the fresh approach that we expect from an outsider coming from industry. However, for a readership that is not so familiar with the subject, the way in which the biography is embedded in the foreign policy of Weimar as a whole must be refreshing. The readable style of this work also assists an engagement with the topic. Not least, it should be mentioned that Birkelund attempts to fit his theme into the new international situation after 1989, and to judge Stresemann in this context. What is progressive about this study is the author’s more critical view of his protagonist. Perhaps he is initiating a gradual shift in the assessment of Stresemann which might cut the ‘hero of Weimar’ down to a more normal size. About Stresemann the politician (and to some extent also the person) we are at present better informed than ever before, not least thanks to the biographies reviewed here. We know more about Stresemann than about most historical figures active during the early Kaiserreich and the Weimar Republic. None the less, what is missing is an approach that leaves old paths behind, gives the human being Stresemann equal weight with Stresemann the politician, treats his whole life as of equal value, and, not least, confronts the seeming inevitability of his career with his internal ‘brake’ and thus emphasizes the openness of his life. Perhaps it is time to abandon the chronological approach in order to avoid the ‘biographical trap’ that an author can so easily fall into when writing about Stresemann.

KARL HEINRICH POHL is Professor of Modern History at the University of Kiel. He is the editor of Politiker und Bürger: Gustav Stresemann und seine Zeit (2002).
FOOTBALL, THE NAZIS, AND VERGANGENHEITSBEWÄLTIGUNG

by Christoph Hendrik Müller


This seems to be the football version of an archetypical twentieth-century West German career: Otto Fritz ‘Tull’ Harder (1892–1956) was one of the best German strikers of his generation. He played for Hamburg (Hamburger Sportverein, HSV), won fifteen caps for Ger-
many between 1914 and 1926, and scored fourteen goals for his country. A Hamburg tobacco company even produced a brand called Tull Harder Cigarette. An open anti-Semite, Harder joined the Nazi Party (NSDAP) in October 1932, and the SS in May 1933. In 1939 he was called up by the Waffen-SS and concluded his SS career as the commandant of the concentration camp Hanover-Ahlem, a subsidiary camp (Außenlager) of Neuengamme.

In 1946, a British military tribunal sentenced him to fifteen years in prison, but he was pardoned after four and a half. In court, he tried to excuse the many deaths in ‘his’ camp by explaining that ‘the inmates’ inner organs were weakened through malnutrition in the Jewish ghetto, so that they could not take the good and plentiful food in the concentration camp.’ After his release, the Hamburg supporters frenetically welcomed him back on his first visit to their ground, the Volksparkstadion. Whenever West Germany played internationals in Hamburg, Harder was invited as a guest of honour. On his death in 1956, the HSV club flag covered his coffin at the funeral.

‘Tull’ Harder is well represented in the histories of German football reviewed here. His story gains even greater symbolic value because of unconfirmed reports of a striking encounter in one of the many concentration camps in which Harder worked. His former Hamburg team-mate, the Norwegian Asbjørn Halvorsen (1898–1955), was a fervent critic of the German occupation of Norway in 1940. Furthermore, he had been the Norwegian coach when the country defeated Germany during the 1936 Berlin Olympics in front of an enraged Adolf Hitler. Refusing to co-operate with the German occupation force, Halvorsen was sent to various concentration camps, including Neuengamme. It is still unclear, though, whether the two former team-mates ever met under these vastly different circumstances. After the war, Halvorsen became General Secretary of his country’s Football Association (FA).

There is, however, an alternative twentieth-century West German story. The Jewish-German former player Kurt Landauer (1884–1961)
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became president of the ‘Juden-Club’ FC Bayern Munich in 1913. During the First World War he fought at the front. In 1919 he was reinstated as president of the club, and remained in that position, with one brief interval, until 1933. Despite Hitler’s appointment as Reichskanzler, the club tried to persuade Landauer to remain president. In March 1933 Landauer resigned, but stayed in Munich. He remained active in the club leadership behind the scenes. In November 1938, he was arrested and deported to the Dachau concentration camp, but soon released because of the initial overcrowding of the camp after the 1938 pogroms. He subsequently fled to

3 The early football clubs in Germany, founded in the 1880s and 1890s, had a high proportion of Jewish members, as Christiane Eisenberg points out in ‘English sports’ und deutsche Bürger: Eine Gesellschaftsgeschichte 1800–1939 (Paderborn, 1999), pp. 180, 184, 213. Early football was initially a game of the new middle classes, and the percentage of working-class males was not proportional to their percentage in the general population until 1970. See Christiane Eisenberg, ‘Deutschland’, in ead. (ed.), Fußball, Soccer, Calcio: Ein englischer Sport auf seinem Weg um die Welt (Munich, 1997), pp. 115 f. Football was particularly strong in cities with Technical Universities (Technische Hochschulen) because students from those institutions, from the Trade Academies (Handelsakademien), and from Jewish families did not have access to the more prestigious traditional student fraternities. In many ways, however, early football clubs tried to emulate these student fraternities (see Eisenberg, ‘English sports’, pp. 184–6), not least in the choice of club names: Borussia Dortmund, Alemannia Aachen, Wormatia Worms, Teutonia Bremen, Victoria Aschaffenburg, and Eintracht Frankfurt. When football clubs appeared in more working-class areas of the cities in the later 1890s and the first years of the twentieth century, these new clubs often tried—informally—to distinguish themselves from the older ‘bourgeois’ and ‘Jewish’ clubs. All over Germany, certain clubs became known to local football enthusiasts and supporters as ‘Juden-Clubs’ (‘Jewish Clubs’). Supporters of Waldhof Mannheim, founded in 1907 in the working-class Waldhof district of Mannheim, began to refer to VfR Mannheim from a more affluent district as a ‘Juden-Club’ (Werner Skrentny, ‘Unendlich viel zu verdanken’—Jüdische Traditionen im Fußball-Süden’, in Schulze-Marmeling (ed.), Davidstern und Lederball, pp. 103 f.). Stuttgarter Kickers’ ground was known as the ‘Hebräerwies’ (Hebrews’ lawn), and as late as the 1970s, an official of the local competitor, VfB Stuttgart, referred to the stadium, situated above Stuttgart, as the ‘Golan Heights’ (Skrentny, ‘Unendlich viel zu verdanken’, p. 111).
Switzerland. Some Bayern Munich players allegedly visited their former president in Geneva before or after playing a friendly game in Switzerland.

Landauer and his sister were the only Shoa survivors of his family. He returned to Munich in June 1947, and instantly became club president again. Four years later, he fell victim to an internal power struggle between the football and the Olympic handball section of the club, but there are no suggestions of anti-Semitism as a reason for his election defeat. Soon after that vote, Landauer was elected honorary president for life.

This story is also mentioned in several of the books reviewed here, but it is often presented as the exception. The Hamburg weekly Die Zeit recently dedicated a whole page to Landauer’s life story. Today, however, Bayern Munich does not seem interested in reminiscing about its German-Jewish tradition and its faith in Landauer.

The aim of this article is to assess how these two very different versions of German football history fit into more general historiographical trends in portraying Nazi Germany and post-war Western Germany. When describing Nazi Germany, do they present a world of total Gleichschaltung and coercion, or do they leave room for day-to-day acts of courage and small-scale resistance? Was the Party omnipotent even in the world of sport, or was there room for at least limited independent decision-making within the ranks of the German Football Association (DFB)? When looking at post-war, pre-1968 West Germany, are we confronted with a world steeped in a culture of silence and the pretence of business-as-usual, or were attempts made to deal with questions of guilt in a constructive manner, that is, was there a willingness for Vergangenheitsbewältigung, an attempt to come to terms with Germany’s horrific recent history? Did

5 Hesse-Lichtenberger, Tor!, p. 81; Bitzer and Wilting, Stürmen für Hitler, pp. 42–9, 75–9.
7 Schulze-Marmeling, ‘“Das waren alles gute Leute”’, pp. 77–9; Faller, ‘Onkel Kurt und die Bayern’.

66
the German FA try to revive its allegedly anti-democratic structure and its history of nationalism, or did it try to reform in order to become part of a new and democratic state?

After a few general remarks about the authors and the historiographical value of the nine books reviewed, I will examine the picture of Nazi Germany and post-war West Germany that emerges when seen through the lens of these football histories. This task is more complicated because the majority of the works are not by professional historians, but by journalists, club representatives, or simply interested amateurs. This does not mean that they have no value for the historian. In fact, the only study by professional historians, that by Brändle and Koller, contains more mistakes and inaccuracies than any of the other books. It does, however, mean that the historiographical evaluation is not always as clear-cut as would be expected.

Four of the books deal exclusively with football in the relevant era. Karl-Heinz Schwarz-Pich’s monograph on the German FA in the Third Reich is highly controversial, since the Mannheim-based football historian sets out to prove that the Association remained innocent during the Third Reich. Although lacking references, the book is based on extensive source material, including the main football journals of the day and the private papers of the first two international managers of the German team, Otto Nerz (1892–1949) and Josef ‘Sepp’ Herberger (1897–1977). Schwarz-Pich totally dismisses previous historiography, accusing it of distortion. He convincingly argues that while the main FA protagonists might not have been members of the resistance, they were not hard-core Nazis either.

Gerd Kolbe attempts to demonstrate in relation to the Ruhr Valley club Borussia Dortmund that not all clubs followed orders from the Nazi leadership or its sports representatives. Although the club formally introduced the new club structures requested by the Nazis, it secretly supported members of the resistance within its ranks. Kolbe is press officer of the city of Dortmund, a former spokesperson for the club, and owns a private archive on the history of the club. Nevertheless, he relies mainly on interviews with former protagonists, which make up over a third of the book. Some sources are reproduced in print, but mostly the author forgoes references to his sources.

Gerhard Fischer and Ulrich Lindner present a book on the interaction between football and National Socialism. Fischer, a history
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graduate, works for the sports pages of the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Lindner is employed by the Goethe Institute. Some historiographical references and an extensive bibliography are included. Most of the book, including an essay by the journalist Werner Skrentny, deals with the various aspects of that difficult relationship and is complemented by interviews with former players or historians. The best known non-academic football historian in Germany, Dietrich Schulze-Marmeling, editor of another book under review here, adds a—highly simplistic—essay on post-war *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* or rather, the lack of it, within the German FA.

Dirk Bitzer and Bernd Wilting are both TV journalists. Their book on the history of German football from Hitler’s appointment to Germany’s victorious 1954 World Cup campaign was published to accompany a TV documentary on the same subject. Although at times rather superficial, it does provide references to the relevant sources and academic literature.

Two of the books cover a broader time-span, but take a more closely defined subject. Dietrich Schulze-Marmeling provides a selection of essays on the history of Jews in German and international football, containing historiographical references. An editor at the Werkstatt publishing house, he is known for a number of critical histories of German football clubs. Most of the essays are case studies or short biographies of Jewish footballers, the majority of whom went into exile or were deported by the Nazis. Unfortunately, with the exception of Schulze-Marmeling’s introduction and an essay by the journalist Erik Eggers on the German FA and how it dealt with the Nazi past after 1945, they do not offer much general analysis of the underlying structural and socio-cultural history.

The historian David Downing offers an often light-hearted account of the Anglo-German football rivalry. The book is mainly based on anecdotes and newspaper headlines and stories. The cover

---

of the book bravely (as it was written for a British audience) depicts
the infamous Hitler salute given by the English and German players
before an international friendly in Berlin’s Olympic Stadium in May
1938 (6–3 to England).

The remaining three studies provide broad surveys of the history
of football in Germany and, in one case, of the social and cultural his-
tory of football as a whole. Ulrich Hesse-Lichtenberger’s history of
German football seems to be written specifically for the British pop-
ular history market, surely with the 2002 World Cup in Japan and
South Korea in mind. The author is a German journalist who writes
for various German and English publications. After reading the book
one might be tempted to speak of yet another German Sonderweg:
Germany as a late-professionalizing football nation, its non-profes-
sional structures long protected by ‘amateurism’s double-standard
bearers’ (p. 85) within the German FA. After the Nazis had halted
attempts to establish professional football immediately on coming to
power, the first official professional league was founded as late as
1963. In the forty years since, however, the Bundesliga has been an
unstoppable success and has recently been elevated into a German lieu
de mémoire.11 Hesse-Lichtenberger’s survey seems to be the only up-
to-date English-language history of German football. And it is a pret-
ty decent history, although it lacks proper references.

The political scientist Arthur Heinrich published his highly criti-
cal political history of the German FA in 2000 to coincide with the
Association’s centenary celebrations. Heinrich works for the academ-
ic journal Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik. From an aca-
demic viewpoint, this is the most satisfying of all the books reviewed.
Well written and argued, it includes the relevant academic literature,
uses the available unpublished sources, and is extensively annotated.
Heinrich’s judgement on the association is harsh, but he argues his
case convincingly.

Unfortunately the same cannot be said for the other genuinely
academic study reviewed here. The historians Fabian Brändle and
Christian Koller provide the broadest survey among the books
reviewed here. They attempt to write a ‘cultural and social history of

11 Gunter Gebauer, ‘Die Bundesliga’, in Etienne François and Hagen Schulze
modern football’, although, as they admit in the introduction, they concentrate on Britain, Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. Both authors worked for Swiss history departments at the time of publication (Basle and Zurich respectively) and they certainly ensure that Swiss football is not underrepresented. Considering that they are the only professional historians reviewed here (Heinrich is a political scientist), the number of inaccuracies in their work is shocking.\footnote{The German international they refer to is called Felix, not Wolfgang, Magath (pp. 107 and 281). On p. 113 they name a number of great players whose presence decided international championships. Pele, Diego Maradona, and Michel Platini make sense, but ‘Jackie’ Charlton? They must be referring to his brother ‘Bobby’ Charlton. The Hamburg and Germany forward who later became a concentration camp guard was called Otto Fritz Harder, nicknamed ‘Tull’ Harder. He was not called ‘Harder Tull’ (p. 122). The Catholic cleric who founded Glasgow Celtic is not from ‘Sligo in County Donegal’, since Sligo is the capital of an Irish county of the same name (p. 137). The Belfast team Cliftonville has played its home games at its own ground ‘Solitude’, even against arch-Protestant Belfast side Linfield, since 1999, whereas the book, published in 2002, claims that Cliftonville was not allowed to do so for fear of sectarian tensions (p. 139). Also, ‘Solitude’ is in North Belfast, not West Belfast.} Since their survey traces the medieval origins of football and covers the early English Public School days of the sport as much as the transformation from amateurism to professionalism, a detailed description of football in Nazi and post-war Germany obviously cannot be expected. The focus of the book is on the slow and late professionalization of continental football, but the authors do comment on other developments in German football. Unfortunately, their judgement is often superficial and does not include alternative interpretations.

Most of the literature makes a very severe judgement on the German FA, and on football in general, under Nazi rule. Total assimilation and institutional profiteering are the main accusations levelled against the FA. A contentious issue is the question of Party, SA, and SS membership of leading football officials and the question of their National Socialist persuasion.

Since Fischer and Lindner were the first authors to attempt an overview of the relationship between National Socialism and the football world (1999), their harsh assessment is often repeated in the subsequent literature. They castigate the FA’s conduct in the early
days of the Third Reich as ‘premature self-Gleichschaltung’ (‘voraus-
seilende Selbstgleichschaltung’, p. 32), and claim that football pre-
empted Hitler’s will by banning ‘Jews and Marxists’ from the game and ordering players to give the Hitler salute before and after every
match long before the Nazis ordered such measures (p. 50). Brändle
and Koller accept the assessment of the FA’s Selbstgleichschaltung
after Hitler’s accession to power, adding that the FA showed ‘pre-
mature obedience’ (‘vorauseilender Gehorsam’) to the new govern-
ment in every respect (p. 89 f.). Although many clubs had been ready
to join a new and professional Reichsliga in October 1932, these plans
were shelved immediately after January 1933 in ‘premature obedi-
ence’ to the Nazis’ rejection of professionalism. Hesse-Lichtenberger
refers to Education Minister Bernhard Rust’s order of 2 June 1933
excluding Jews from welfare organizations, youth groups, and sport-
ing clubs, but also states that most sporting officials had by that stage
‘already hurried to insinuate themselves with the new masters’ (p.
79). On 19 April 1933 the FA had used the sports journal kicker for an
official announcement, declaring that ‘members of the Jewish race,
and persons who have turned out to be followers of the Marxist
movement, are deemed unacceptable’ (p. 80). Local associations and
some clubs had acted even earlier.

According to Heinrich, Gleichschaltung met little resistance from
the German FA. Only when the regional associations (Landesverbän-
de) were disbanded in July 1933 was there some anger. There was,
however, no general disagreement with Nazi ideas as such (pp.
127–30). Heinrich argues that Reichssportführer Hans von Tschammer
und Osten never explicitly ordered the expulsion of Jews from
German sports (p. 142), but points out that many South German
clubs, including the former ‘Juden-Clubs’ Bayern Munich, Stuttgarter
Kickers, and Eintracht Frankfurt, had offered the government their
assistance by excluding all Jews as early as April 1933. In the same
month, the German FA ordered the removal of all Jews from official
club positions (p. 143). Schwarz-Pich, on the other hand, defends the
German FA and its president Felix Linnemann (1882–1948). He com-
paries the wording of the FA’s declaration of support for the new gov-
ernment on 9 April 1933 with declarations by other sports associa-
tions and comes to the conclusion that it was highly factual and
unflattering to the Nazis, avoiding any mention either of Hitler or of
National Socialism. Even the declaration of support by the Jewish
veterans’ association Reichsbund Jüdischer Frontsoldaten on 6 May 1933, he argues, was—for obvious reasons—more enthusiastic than the FA’s declaration (pp. 33 ff.). Furthermore, Linnemann never signed off any of his articles in FA publications or international match programmes with ‘Heil Hitler’ (pp. 70 f.). If anything, Schwarz-Pich sees a case of radicalization from below, with local associations and many clubs, including Bayern Munich, far more inclined to support the Nazis than the German FA (pp. 36 f.).

At international level, Downing examines the attitudes of the English FA and the British government towards the New Germany and comes to very unflattering conclusions. In a case of football appeasement, England played Germany—the choice of location ‘unintentionally ironic’ (p. 26)—at White Hart Lane, the home ground of Tottenham Hotspurs, a club with a substantial Jewish following, on 4 December 1935, that is, after the Nuremberg Laws had been passed. The Home Office was uneasy about the game, and the TUC strictly opposed it, but the Foreign Office insisted on playing it (pp. 26–43). At the post-match banquet, the English FA’s vice-president, a certain W. Pickford, proposed a toast to Hitler (p. 42). Even more shameful was the Hitler salute given by the English team in Berlin’s Olympic Stadium in May 1938 on the explicit orders of the Foreign Office, relayed to the England tour leader by the British ambassador in Berlin, Neville Henderson (pp. 48–52).

The second major accusation levelled against the German FA is that of institutional profiteering. Bitzer and Wilting at least insinuate that the FA as an association benefited from the Nazi regime because it became more important under Nazi rule. Before 1933, the Worker’s Gymnastics and Sports Association (Arbeiter-Turn- und Sportbund, or ATSB), the Catholic sports association DJK, and the Gymnastics Association (Turnerbund) had all held their own football championships within their ranks. This was stopped for various reasons after 1933, so that the FA emerged as the sole footballing authority in Germany (pp. 32 f.). Brändle and Koller add that the FA was delighted that the Nazis destroyed the ATSB, the FA’s working-class competitor (pp. 170–5).

Thirdly, the question of the real or alleged National Socialist persuasion of leading football officials is seriously debated. Heinrich states that before 1933 very few leading FA officials were NSDAP members, but in 1933, and then again in 1937, most of them joined the
party (pp. 158 f.). This is uncontested, but the interpretation is not. Whereas Heinrich describes the FA's conduct as utterly deplorable, Schwarz-Pich defends the leadership against such criticism. In his version of events, the FA under Linnemann had one overriding aim, namely, to protect the bourgeois sports associations and clubs against attempts by the SA and later the Hitler Youth and the SS to take over the organization of German sports. Although most FA officials joined one Nazi organization or another, Schwarz-Pich argues, they had no other option while staying in their positions, and they did not do so from persuasion. Linnemann did not appoint a single pre-1933 NSDAP member to a leading position within the FA or its 1936 organizational successor, the Fachamt Fußball (pp. 23, 171 f., 183). Bitzer and Wilting also seem to defend Linnemann to some extent when reporting, like Schwarz-Pich, that the FA president did not ban games between 'ordinary' clubs and the Jewish sports associations that were tolerated until the pogroms of November 1938. However, they argue that this happened in collusion with the government because the Nazis wanted to present a decent sporting Germany to the world before the 1936 Summer Olympics in Berlin (pp. 36 f.).

Some of the books provide evidence of small-scale resistance and civil disobedience to the regime. Schwarz-Pich, for instance, claims that most players simply ignored the new Dietwart, a mandatory club official installed to oversee the ideological schooling of players and officials (p. 64). Kolbe looks at the case of Borussia Dortmund and describes it as a club steeped in an anti-authoritarian tradition that partially survived the Nazi years. Some concessions were made to the new order, and some club officials were members of the NSDAP. The players gave the Hitler salute before and after games. Saluting was, however, a precondition for remaining in the league; a refusal would have resulted in exclusion. Eighty per cent of the first team members belonged to the SA. Kolbe explains, using oral history evidence, that it was more an 'honorary membership' (p. 181) for all players in the top leagues, and had no political consequences. Club chairman Egon Pentrup refused to join the party and subsequently stepped down in 1934. However, he remained active behind the scenes. The club also retained its groundsman despite his underground activities on behalf of the German Communist Party (KPD), and even allowed him to use the club's printing machine to produce illegal material in 1944. Other members of the left-wing resistance
within the club were successfully protected, but the groundsman was murdered by the Nazis in 1945.

What Kolbe writes about Borussia Dortmund, and what Schwarz-Pich argues for the FA, cannot be generalized for all clubs, and certainly not for Dortmund’s regional rivals FC Schalke 04, as Fischer and Lindner point out (pp. 150–66). Heinrich is the harshest judge of the FA under Nazi rule. In his eyes, the performance of the German FA between 1933 and 1945 ‘could hardly have been more shameful’ (p. 219). Schwarz-Pich, on the other hand, sees no reason why the first post-war FA president Peter Josef ‘Peco’ Bauwens (1886–1963) should not have brought most of the pre-1945 FA leaders back into office (p. 215). Fischer and Lindner provide the most realistic assessment of the situation: between 1933 and 1945 the world of football acted no more courageously, but also no more despicably than the rest of the German population (p. 294). It vacillated between eagerness to integrate into the new order, attempting to keep quiet and weather the storm, and committing isolated acts of civil disobedience.

According to Downing, German football after 1945 was ‘still organised along prewar lines’ (p. 65). He refers to the lack of a nationwide league and the fact that Germany’s top footballers were still part-timers, but he could not have summed up most other books reviewed here more accurately. Most authors concerned with post-war German football dedicate many pages to the return of the old staff after the German FA was reconstituted in 1949. They also dwell on the FA’s unwillingness thoroughly to confront its own past, not only during the 1950s and 1960s, but even at the FA’s centenary celebrations in 2000. Heinrich gives the most extensive outline of the FA’s restorative tendencies: the Western Allies favoured a reorganization of German sports from below after 1945, with ‘open clubs’ offering more than one type of sport, and regional sports associations (Landessportverbände) in place of individual sports associations like the FA (p. 164). Many of the old football leaders openly opposed this and re-established the German FA in July 1949. Many former officials from the Nazi days returned (pp. 164–7). The leadership showed no will for Vergangenheitsbewältigung whatsoever, but whitewashed the FA leaders’ performance between 1933 and 1945. This continued in official association histories well into the 1990s (pp. 167–82), with very few exceptions.
phalian FA was the first official body within the German FA to mention the expulsion of Jews from German football after 1933 in a publication, and to admit ‘willing integration’ (‘bereitwillige Anpassung’) into the Nazi regime. This happened as late as 1998 (p. 181). Bitzer and Wilting also describe how most of the pre-1945 FA staff came back after the war (pp. 173–90). They provide a further example of how the Nazi past was whitewashed after 1945: the president of 1860 Munich, Emil Ketterer, had been a member of the Nazi Party since 1923 and, as a doctor, was an outspoken proponent of the Nazi euthanasia programme. He was interned by the US authorities after the war. A 1960 Festschrift for the centenary of the club complained that Ketterer had been ‘unjustly’ interned (p. 61). In his essay in Schulze-Marmeling’s collection, Erik Eggers recalls an oft-mentioned speech made by the now retired Tübingen professor of rhetoric, Walter Jens, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the German FA in Frankfurt in May 1975. In it Jens attacked the FA for its lack of will to deal with its own Nazi German past (pp. 216–18). Eggers points out that in 2000, the FA’s official publication marking its centenary seriously understated the FA’s involvement in the Third Reich (pp. 218–24). Unlike many companies compromised by its Nazi past, the FA still refuses to open its archives to all historians (pp. 224 f.), a failure publicly criticized by Germany’s President Johannes Rau at the FA’s centenary celebrations in Leipzig in January 2000. Rau called on the FA to support historians willing to research the association’s history, not to hinder them (p. 218). 13

Schulze-Marmeling’s highly simplistic chapter in Fischer and Lindner paints a grim picture of post-1945 German football. Democratization and de-Nazification almost completely passed the German FA by (p. 267). He suggests that the FA ignored the Nazi past of its post-war officials (pp. 267 f.), and that to this day the clubs are unwilling to tackle their own history critically (p. 276). That might have been true a decade ago, but the statement should not have been (re-)printed in 2002. Kolbe’s book on Borussia Dortmund is an obvious example of – admittedly rather late – Vergangenheitsbewältigung. Schulze-Marmeling must have been aware of the project as he works as an editor for the publisher of Kolbe’s book. Other clubs have at

13 According to Eggers (p. 224), the FA has now commissioned the Mainz historian Nils Havemann to write a history of the FA during the Third Reich.
least made some attempt to come clean. The centenary edition of Werder Bremen’s history contains a highly critical article on the club’s Nazi past. ‘With almost sporting dedication’ ('mit geradezu sportlichem Ehrgeiz'), its author writes sarcastically, the club went about integrating itself into the new era and fulfilled all Nazi plans for the future of sport in Germany before they were even ordered. The chronicle also contains photographs of the first team in 1933 on a ferry with a number of SS men, and the team, in 1934, giving the Hitler salute.

West Germany’s World Cup victory in 1954 is interpreted as a turning point by some, and as a continuation of the FA’s allegedly hyper-nationalist past by others. Hesse-Lichtenberger sees it as the moment when West Germany gained an identity that was not based on military achievement, but on an infinitely more civilian event like a football World Cup. Jokingly, he dismisses the term ‘Bonn Republic’ in favour of ‘Berne Republic’ (p. 159), implying that a genuinely new West German identity was born in the Swiss city of Berne that hosted the World Cup final on that rainy July Sunday in 1954. Most books, however, emphasize ‘Peco’ Bauwens’ infamous ‘Sieg-Heil speech’, as the Süddeutsche Zeitung dubbed it, at a Munich reception for the victorious team. Bauwens’ speech, the script of which is lost, was so extremely nationalist that even the reputedly arch-conservative Bayerischer Rundfunk radio station stopped its broadcast halfway through. Official Germany, however, did not stand idly by. Both the Ministry of the Interior and President Theodor Heuss felt the need to distance themselves, albeit jokingly, from Bauwens and his speech. Extreme nationalism might still have been prevalent in 1954 West Germany, but it did not go undetected and unopposed.

The picture which Brändle and Koller paint not only of the German reaction to that famous victory, but of post-war West Ger-

15 Ibid. p. 165
16 Hesse-Lichtenberger, Tor!, p. 166; Heinrich, Der Deutsche Fußballbund, pp. 211 f.; Fischer and Lindner (eds.), Stürmer für Hitler, p. 270; Bitzer and Wilting, Stürmen für Hitler, p. 230; Brändle and Koller, Gooood!!!, pp. 159 f.
many as a whole, is bleak. They claim that most Germans saw themselves as victims, not perpetrators of the Nazi crimes. Individual involvement in those crimes was hardly ever reflected upon. The main focus for most people was their economic progress (p. 153). Brändle and Koller interpret the World Cup victory entirely as a national re-awakening that frightened the international community and the German left-wing press (pp. 153–60). While this picture of a Germany unable to come to terms with its past is commonplace, and a certain tendency towards nationalist escapism in the 1950s cannot be denied, it ignores vital aspects of the 1950s socio-cultural climate. Even the football weekly *kicker* could not, and did not, ignore Germany’s problematic history. On the early death in 1955 of the above-mentioned Norwegian player, coach, FA president, and concentration camp victim Asbjørn ‘Assi’ Halvorsen, the journal’s editor-in-chief Friedebert Becker wrote in the obituary: ‘Our mourning for Assi is deepened by the knowledge that the inhuman suffering inflicted upon him in a German concentration camp must have cost the great Norwegian many years of his life, that ended so young and so suddenly.’

Unfortunately, the interpretation of West Germany in the 1950s and beyond in the monographs and surveys reviewed here is often too simplistic. It accepts the popular history clichés of a Germany absolutely unwilling to deal with its problematic past. While (rightly) emphasizing the FA’s unwillingness to do so in its official publications, the works hardly take into account other sources, such as the football press, or evidence of what the FA tried to achieve politically and educationally after 1945. The German FA, for example, was highly supportive of Israel’s integration into UEFA in the 1980s and 1990s, and first contacts were made and some games played as early as the 1960s (Eggers in Schulze-Marmeling, p. 226). While the restoration issue, that is, the re-appointment of old FA staff and the lack of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, is vital, to reduce the history of West German football to a blame game is too simple. (Schulze-Marmeling

17 ‘Unseren Schmerz um Assi vertieft das Wissen darum, daß die unmenschlichen Martern des deutschen KZ den großen Norweger wohl viele Jahre seines nun so jung, so jäh beendeten Lebens gekostet haben’, quoted in Fischer and Lindner (eds.), *Stürmer für Hitler*, p. 239.
even accuses the German FA of being dominated to this day by CDU politicians—hardly an anti-constitutional organization.) Much work remains to be done.
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BOOK REVIEWS


This joint venture by Dirlmeier, Fouquet, and Fuhrmann is one of two additions to Oldenbourg’s highly successful Grundriß der Geschichte series to have been published in 2003, the other being Christoph Schmid’s volume on pre-Revolutionary Russia. Whereas each of the other contributions to the medieval part of the series has been re-issued at least once since 1990, in some cases with substantial revisions, a noticeable gap remained between Hermann Jakobs’ Kirchenreform und Hochmittelalter, covering the period up to the Fourth Lateran Council, and Erich Meuthen’s Das 15. Jahrhundert.

The brief opening chapter of the volume under review here (‘Das Spätmittelalter—Entfaltung einer Epoche’) can be read both as an essay on methodology and an introduction to some of the key themes in European history of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: crises, internationalism, and communalism. The further the twentieth century progressed, the more medievalists sought to replace, or at least supplement, the study of high politics with a history accounting for social and economic and, from the 1960s onwards, cultural factors, ‘culture’ being understood as the conditions of everyday life and experience. In line with these trends, which have long since entered the mainstream of historiography making for a markedly increased output and specialization (this is the only multi-author volume in the Grundriß series), a substantial chapter on space, economy, and culture precedes that dealing with the political units of late medieval Europe. The authors do not, however, go so far as to abandon their chronological framework, which is defined by two key events in


Sub-sections of Gerhard Fouquet’s excellent ‘Raum, Wirtschaft und Menschen’, which forms more than half of the ‘account’ section of this volume, are devoted to climate and the environment, patterns of consumption, demographic developments, rural and urban economy, finance and trade, social relations, the aristocracy, and intellectual life. Even at this first, ‘narrative’ stage, Fouquet critically reviews the results of earlier research, modifying or refuting them where necessary. In his chapter on the ‘states’ of later medieval Europe, Bernd Fuhrmann offers a concise overview of political and administrative developments in each of the main regions of the universitas Christiana. If any criticism had to be made here, it would be that the interconnectedness of the units which made up this ‘international’ community in the period under consideration does not receive a fair share of attention; to name perhaps the most obvious example, the universalist idea of the Emperor’s potential hegemony over Europe’s individual regna is known to have had a direct impact on the formation of the idea of royal sovereignty in France and England. Dieter Berg’s 1997 book on Germany and its neighbours in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries, also published in an Oldenbourg series,2 provides a good example of how a more synchronic, structure-orientated approach can enhance our understanding of the political world of the Middle Ages.

A summary of the current state of and trends in research forms the second component of the tripartite structure of the Grundriss volumes. Given the heterogeneity of these trends, providing a pan-European overview is certainly no mean feat. Fouquet succeeds admirably in briefing his readers on the achievements of past generations of scholars and on the ongoing debates in late medieval economic and social history. Fuhrmann’s chapter on the state of research on thirteenth- and fourteenth-century political and administrative history gives due consideration to all the standard works and main controversies but his bibliographical and methodological essay is in places unnecessarily watered down by more ‘narrative’ elements which would have been better relegated to part I of the book. Anyone

2 Dieter Berg, Deutschland und seine Nachbarn 1200–1500, Enzyklopladie Deutscher Geschichte, 40 (Munich, 1997).
in need of a good short introduction to this aspect of the history of late medieval Europe would therefore be well advised to read the whole of chapter II.c. in conjunction with chapter I.c. The bibliography given in part III on sources and literature is by no means exhaustive but in view of the limitations regarding manuscript length imposed on all the authors of this series this was to be expected. However, the inclusion of illustrative material—especially maps, diagrams, and genealogical tables—would certainly have helped to enhance even further the usefulness of this volume by Dirlmeier, Fouquet, and Fuhrmann as an introduction to the field. Despite these minor shortcomings, this publication will no doubt be very warmly received by students and academic teachers.

Nowadays it seems fashionable to write about ordinary people in history. A mere decade ago Christopher Browning published a study of ‘ordinary men’ during the Second World War who, serving as policemen, played a fatal role in the Final Solution when they murdered thousands of Jews in Poland.1 Some years later Christoph Jahr wrote about ‘ordinary soldiers’ during the First World War who ended up as deserters.2 Now William Hagen presents a voluminous work on ‘ordinary Prussians’. He does not detect a story of mass murder like Browning, or phenomena of military disorder like Jahr. But he, too, tries to make out a hidden level behind the mask of the ordinary. Writing about ordinary (police-)men and soldiers, authors like Browning and Jahr reveal horror and abnormality in the ordinary. Hagen uses the same approach when he claims that pre-modern Prussians were completely different from what historians have generally thought.

Applying a fresh perspective to phenomena which had seemed undisputedly clear for so long Hagen discovers, instead of the proverbially backward East Elbian Junkers, noble landlords trying to adapt to new challenges and difficult situations; the villagers, far from being subdued by despotic landlords, appear as stubborn peasants, aware of their rights and ready to fight for them. Beyond this, Hagen finds many parallels between East Elbian society and the rural world in the western hemisphere.

The book’s findings derive not from the whole of Brandenburg-Prussia, but from Stavenow, a noble lordship in Prignitz district. In early modern times Prignitz district was in the north-western region

1 Christopher R. Browning, Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland (New York, 1992); published in German as Ganz normale Männer: Das Reserve Polizeibataillon 101 und die ‘Endlösung’ in Polen (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1999).
of Brandenburg. Stavenow was in its westernmost part, separated by the river Elbe from the Altmark district in the south and adjoining the Duchy of Mecklenburg in the north. Why Stavenow? Of course, this cannot claim to be a topic of outstanding historical significance on its own account, but it may pass for an average lordship. Furthermore, Stavenow is a microcosm whose components serve as examples of the rural world in pre-modern Brandenburg. It also has one clear advantage. Although not much of the great manorial residence survived the Second World War, the lordship’s archive has been preserved. It constitutes more than 700 files relating to pre-modern times in this Brandenburg manor, including several villages. For more than a decade William W. Hagen, Professor of History at the University of California, Davis, worked his way through this historical treasure trove. Now he has presented the results of his labours in a huge volume.

The book consists of ten chapters plus an introduction and a conclusion. The first two chapters deal chronologically with Stavenow in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Even at that early time it is clear that the noble landlords were trying to increase production and thus the profits from their land. In Brandenburg the sixteenth century was a period of economic growth. There are hardly any records of tension between landlords and their subject farmers, perhaps because the landlords did not dare increase unpaid labour service too harshly or by force. This relatively prosperous setting changed dramatically during the Thirty Years War, when death and destruction decreased the wealth of Stavenow and its villages. The Quitzow family, who owned the lordship from the beginning of the fifteenth century, were unable to keep their property. Stavenow was put up for auction and in 1647 fell into the hands of the Blumenthals, a family of a certain reputation under Frederick William, the Great Elector.

The Thirty Years War was undoubtedly a set-back in economic terms, but subsequent decades also proved difficult. A large population was required for reconstruction after the war. The surviving inhabitants demanded and got reductions in taxes and seigneurial dues, at least for some years. In some cases they were exempted altogether. Landlords had to compete for new settlers, which strengthened the position of the settlers. In addition, consistently low grain prices prevented seigneurial rents from rising. Despite this, life for the rural villagers was far from easy, as they had to cope with labour.
service and pay rents to the landlord, while the Elector’s taxes were also rising.

When the population and the economy had recovered, landlords tightened their grip on the villagers, aiming to re-establish pre-war obligations instead of the lighter ones of the second half of the seventeenth century. Not only in Stavenow, but in the whole Prignitz district these seigneurial efforts produced widespread protests among the villagers. This occurred at the very beginning of the eighteenth century, which was close to the end of the Blumenthals’ period as landlords of Stavenow. In 1717 the lordship shifted from the Blumenthal family, whose fortunes were fading, to the Kleist family. The Kleists represented the new nobility, enjoying royal favour and in return serving with unlimited loyalty. Having taken over Stavenow, the Kleists had to learn that seigneurial authority was nowhere near strong enough to impose new burdens on the villagers without provoking resistance. Or, as Hagen puts it, the relationship between the landlord and the villagers rested upon ‘a constantly tested and renegotiated manor–village power balance’ (p. 122), an experience which was reinforced throughout the eighteenth century.

The beginning of the Kleists’ lordship marked a new epoch for Stavenow. In the course of the book it paves the way for the main focus of the study, the eighteenth century, which is covered in chapters 3 to 9. This part of the work is not chronological, but takes a structural approach. It tackles different issues, deriving mainly from social history, and sometimes looks backwards as well as forwards.

Chapter 3 depicts social life and its patterns in early modern Stavenow. Not surprisingly, family and kinship were of undisputed importance to the villagers. Above them was the landlord, always ready to pursue his interests as much as possible, especially in matters relating to farm inheritance and marriage. Hagen has a special interest in the cultural practices surrounding marriage, and in particular, dowries. He addresses questions of widowhood, remarriage, and social roles, relations, and conflicts within the family (for example, between spouses, siblings, parents, and children, retired and young tenant farmers). In addition to the terms derived from family and kinship, the sources speak of ‘friends’, referring in most cases to distant relatives. Obviously there are few references to neighbourhood (Nachbarschaft), a kind of solidarity beyond kinship bonds that should not be underrated in early modern society.
In chapter 4 the study looks at rural living conditions, especially in relation to farming. Closely connected to harvests, crops, livestock, and equipment are questions of income, taxes, and costs in general. In another step the material culture of the villagers is discussed, comprising housing, fuel, furniture, and dress. The study also sheds light on special circumstances, for example, the material living conditions of non-inheriting siblings and of old farmers living in retirement, on their *Altenteil*. Finally, this chapter deals with the mortality of Stavenow inhabitants, providing much statistical data.

Chapters 5 to 7 focus on particular social groups in Stavenow, their social strategies and patterns of behaviour. Beginning at the top of the social hierarchy chapter 5 introduces the Kleists as a family open to economic innovation and agricultural improvements for the sake of increased profits. This proved necessary to enable them to afford to live in a manner appropriate to their noble status, and to support further social ambitions. Chapter 6 examines the villagers, who had a certain bond with the lordship. Though differing in profession and social status, as a group they can be taken as a seigneurial clientele which enjoyed a special advantage in the form of support from the lord. Starting at the bottom of the social scale, chapter 7 outlines the living conditions of the landless workers. Even at this level there was a broad range of possibilities, and the chance of living in modest sufficiency at least. Skilled workers employed on the manor were relatively well off. Despite this, they lagged far behind cottagers holding a hereditary farm.

The eighth chapter discusses at length the struggle for ‘gute Policey’, that is, public and, in most cases, moral order. Case studies of illicit sexuality, matters of honour, and magical practices complete the picture of social life presented in chapters 3 and 4. Behind cases of litigation the villagers’ values and their opinions on marriage, family, and property rights emerge. Soldiers posed a threat to public order from outside. There is no evidence that, after demobilization, soldiers internalized military discipline and transferred it to everyday life in the villages. This clearly speaks against the militarization thesis. In general, soldiers in the villages do not seem to have enforced discipline in Stavenow. In fact, they themselves were a force for indiscipline and threatened seigneurial interests and those of the villagers.

The landlord was responsible for public order within his realm. In the eighteenth century the manorial court was a pillar of seigneurial
authority. The pastor’s authority, on the other hand, depended largely on the incumbent’s own virtues. The pastor’s judgement was accepted in spiritual matters, but in the secular sphere his influence was limited and his authority restricted. The authority of the village mayor (Schulze) turned out to be fragile as the landlord did not want him to exert real authority and instead preferred to use the mayor as an instrument of seigneurial power. But as the landlord could not rule the villages directly and had to rely on officials such as the village mayor, reducing the mayor’s authority ultimately meant leaving a great deal of power to the farmers.

None the less, even in matters of court justice seigneurial authority was far from unlimited, as Johann Erdmann Hasse discovered. As the judge in the manorial court for forty years, he established himself as a respected authority in Stavenow. He was successful because he not only enforced the lord’s authority but also showed respect for the villagers’ interests and helped settle quarrels among them. Though the villagers had to submit to the landlord’s domination, they had power to counterbalance the lord’s authority, and unjust practices by the landlord or his court always provoked communal resistance.

Other difficulties were created by absconders, whether they were thieves or men fleeing from Brandenburg to the neighbouring territory of Mecklenburg in order to avoid recruitment. Kleist would have preferred to solve the problem by mutual agreement with the Mecklenburg authorities, but Prussian policy prevented this. Frederick II of Prussia did not consider sending runaways from other territories back home, instead welcoming anyone who wanted to stay in Brandenburg. Kleist, therefore, could not rely on the Mecklenburg authorities to return fugitive villagers and re-establish his seigneurial authority. Kleist’s own authority as a landlord was at stake, and in many cases he and his manorial court struggled not just for public order but also for his honour as a lord. This problem grew even bigger in the conflict about seigneurial rent and labour services which lasted several decades and involved royal justice, that is, the Chamber Court (Kammergericht) in Berlin.

This struggle between the landlord and the villagers is the subject of chapter 9. It had been made possible by Frederick II’s legal reforms, which enabled villagers not only to start such litigation with their landlord, but also to continue it for years and even decades.
Stavenow’s farmers were under pressure since the Kleists had imposed new work rules; complaints were made but there was no resistance to seigneurial demands. The situation changed when Friedrich Joachim von Kleist, a major in the Prussian army, became landlord. He not only increased pressure on the villagers but also used violence to implement his ideas. Having reached the level of the courts, the struggle went through several steps of litigation, sometimes with violent clashes, and culminated in an Urbarium, that is, a contract to regulate services and rent and any dispute arising from it. According to Hagen the conflict ended with ‘harmony at state command’. The solution to the conflict was an ‘embittered compromise’ (pp. 575, 590).

This story is about much more than merely rural conflict in the eighteenth century because it reveals the relationship between the lord and his subjects. Again it is clear that the landlord did not have full power over the villagers, who themselves did not question manorial authority but were aware of their own rights and interests. Over the years judge Hasse once again played a key role. Relying on his own authority, he served as a decisive agent for compromise. From Kleist’s point of view it appeared to be a sad truth that Prussian policy did not unconditionally support the seigneurial party; the state kept a vigilant and protective eye on the villagers as well.

The study ends by looking forward to the situation in the nineteenth century, ending somewhere in the 1840s. A number of changes occurred at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In 1808 Stavenow was sold to Otto Karl Heinrich Baron von Voss. The new owner belonged to the ministerial bureaucracy and favoured slight reforms, but as the reform party led by Hardenberg had taken over, Voss found himself as one of the leaders of the ‘feudal party’. This was the man who led Stavenow at the time of emancipation. Protests and strikes by the farmers, who wanted an end to unpaid compulsory labour services, were put down; some farmers were sent to jail. But brute force did not prevail as it became clear that the old regime in agriculture and social organization would not survive. Instead, the new owner started negotiations over compensation for the abolition of labour services and other rents.

Voss, of course, did not engage personally in this business, having installed a team of officials to manage Stavenow. Most important
among them was Neubauer as administrator (Ökonomie-Inspektor), who continued in post until the 1830s, thus personifying the transformation process. Ultimately, the shift from the coercive manorial lordship of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the estate management of the nineteenth century proved to be successful. Even the Junker economy had been far from backward and averse to new developments; now Voss, as the noble estate-owner, adapted to the new system. He made the best of the new social and economic configuration, and established himself as a capitalist entrepreneur. But the emancipated farmers were also aware of the necessities and perils of the new times, and bargained hard to save their position and social standing.

The conclusion recapitulates the new picture of East Elbian landlordism that emerged. The author’s undisguised aim is to dissolve untenable images and to correct existing clichés of Prussia. This revisionist attitude fits into the strategies of recent research as exemplified by the Potsdam School. As these studies concentrate on farmers and landless labourers, Frie’s book on Marwitz, a Brandenburgian nobleman, officer, and landlord must be mentioned. This is not a traditional biography, but a book which embraces Marwitz’s world by biographical means.

Whereas Frie’s study focuses on the revolutionary times at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century, Hagen concentrates on the eighteenth century, despite the title of his book, which suggests that the study’s scope is the period from 1500 to 1840. This priority is because of the masses of material available for the eighteenth century, and the corresponding lack of evidence for the time before 1648 and the second half of the seventeenth century; material for the nineteenth century is fading away, though some aspects continue up to the first half of the twentieth century (for instance, population matters, see pp. 270 ff.). Perhaps ending the book in the middle of the nineteenth century is not entirely plausible. Of course, this can be taken as a time of social change, but it would
be reasonable to stress the continuity of village life up to the twentieth century. However, it cannot be claimed that the scope of this book mirrors only the opportunities offered by the Stavenow archive because the eighteenth century is undoubtedly the crucial phase of manorialism.

On this important aspect, the author’s interests are not restricted to a particular social group. Hagen openly sympathizes with the farmers of Stavenow, but there is also some appreciation of the landlords, who unexpectedly appear as not conforming with long-lived clichés. This book does not concentrate on farmers or landless workers; rather, the author accepts that the manor of Stavenow consisted of subjects and masters.

It is a great advantage to have the Stavenow files shedding light on rural society in the ancien régime. Hagen undoubtedly makes the most of these documents which tell important stories about Stavenow and its people. There are many unusual incidents, such as the Glövzin fire of 1679 (pp. 79–81), and episodes which give detailed insight into individual cases among the ordinary Prussians, such as the case of Hans Wöhlcke, who served in the Prussian army under Frederick II during the Seven Years War (pp. 506–9), and the story of Trine Möllers, who violated seigneurial honour (pp. 522 f.). The author reveals his mastery by weaving these potentially fragmentary episodes together in the different chapters. It is the sum of these examples that ultimately makes up the story of Stavenow.

This is first-rate micro-history enriched with the classical means of social history, such as tables and lists, which provide further evidence on a larger scale. For example, there are twenty tables containing statistical data on the people of Stavenow in chapter 4, and another five tables in chapter 5 on the estate’s assets, income, and earnings etc. There are also numerous descriptions which illustrate the material culture of the common people, such as the assets of Stavenow’s tavern-keeper, Caspar Seyer, who died in 1726 (pp. 361 f.).

The research on Stavenow is not limited exclusively to the grassroots level. Hagen’s study attains the dimension of macro-history on a number of occasions when he uses the term ‘absolutism’. Of course it is important to look at the individual manor in the Prignitz district within the broader structural context of its time, just as the author is careful to broaden the scope by reflecting on comparable aspects, especially in western Europe. But given the recent discussion which
casts doubt on the explanatory value of this paradigm, it is not surprising that the term does not figure largely. As absolutism proves increasingly inadequate to explain the processes and mechanisms of power and rule, its use does not appear appropriate. In many cases it seems that absolutism actually turns out to be a pale cipher for monarchical power.

But this is the only term to give rise to doubts. Throughout the whole study many arguments are based on contemporary terms taken from the sources. Hagen displays a fine grasp of these expressions which enables him to use this evidence to explain other historical phenomena. In addition, he compares and contrasts the use of similar contemporary terms, for example, ‘Wirt’, ‘Untertan’, ‘Bauer’ (p. 126, footnote 4). Some of this evidence may not be sensational, but it confirms other findings, for instance, insults used in matters of honour (cf. pp. 511 ff.). It could be said that the results of the study relate only to a single manor. This cannot be denied, but such findings require exhaustive research, and we should be grateful that Hagen put in the effort over a number of years.

A characteristic feature of this study is its prosopographical approach. The story of ordinary people in the rural world of Brandenburg-Prussia as exemplified by Stavenow relies heavily on evidence relating to historical individuals. Surprisingly, Hagen himself does not particularly emphasize this. It might have been an opportunity to explain why he provides only a subject index. Historical people appear as sub-entries, but it is hard to trace individuals and many are left out. Prominent people like the judges and administrators are listed (as, of course, are members of the landlord’s family, especially the Kleist family), but it is a pity that non-officials such as farmers and landless labourers (not to mention women) are not. We meet some of these people twice or more in the study, as the focus on the eighteenth century means that the study concentrates on just a few generations of Stavenowers. Perhaps more evidence could be offered on common people as historical individuals.

Thus one final wish remains unfulfilled, suggesting that even after more than 600 pages of thorough research, Stavenow is still a

5 The book cites no literature on this topical debate; for a conciliatory and convincing comment on this see Peter H. Wilson, *Absolutism in Central Europe*, Historical Connections (London, 2000).
topic worth working on. Hagen’s book on Stavenow is so rich in findings that it will undoubtedly stimulate further research on this and similar topics. Two aspects should be pointed out. First, it casts new light on Prussians who resisted despotic seigneurial measures. As this was not rare but occurred throughout the decades, Hagen claims that refractoriness and insubordination were Prussian virtues (cf. p. 645). He does not rewrite Prussian history, but adds an important aspect that has been missing so far, and thereby adds another dimension to the picture of Prussia. Hagen also argues for a historical cliché to be corrected, which might serve as a moral rehabilitation as well. Secondly Hagen insists on the proximity of East Elbia to the western world; his statement that Stavenow was ‘a largely low-stage western world’ (p. 183) is but one among many. Far from being a mere assertion, this striking argument, backed by much evidence against the so-called ‘backwardness’ of the Junkers and the villagers, will give a fresh impetus to further research.

Finally, we must speak of ordinary Prussians. Drawing upon a treasure-house of files and sources, William Hagen presents a vivid and colourful picture of the East Elbian people, and is determined to reshape the old-fashioned view of this rural society. This is an extraordinary book about ordinary people.
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German-Jewish history has long emerged from the shadowy existence which it led in the historiography of the Federal Republic. It is no longer the domain of a small number of specialists, but now occupies a respected place in historical research. The social rise of the Jews and their controversial integration into an emergent bourgeois society is a theme of special interest. This was the subject of the series of conferences on ‘Jüdisches Bürgertum in Deutschland’ which Reinhard Rürup directed for the Wissenschaftliche Arbeitsgemeinschaft of the Leo Baeck Institute between 1995 and 1998. In general, younger historians presented their work for discussion at these research colloquia. The volume under review here conveys a good impression of the broad spectrum of research topics and approaches presented, ranging from social history to cultural history, and including the history of mentalities, gender, and religion. On the whole, it presents a complex picture of German-Jewish history between the Enlightenment and National Socialism. More than ever, this appears as a history of diversity and difference.

The present volume contains sixteen essays divided into two sections, entitled ‘Juden im Bürgertum’ and ‘Bürger im Judentum’. To start with, the editors outline the conceptual framework of the volume. The individual contributions, which cover a broad range of subjects and methods, are held together by a number of things. First, they address the leading question: ‘to what extent, and how, were Jews part of German bourgeois society?’ (p. 4). Secondly, they all attempt to combine research in German-Jewish history with research on the Bürgertum. Thirdly, the intention in bringing together these hitherto widely separated fields of research is not ‘to transfer the results already achieved in research on the Bürgertum to the history of the Jewish Bürgertum, but to investigate and, if necessary, to question the accepted notions of Bürgertum, Bürgerlichkeit, and bourgeois society’ (p. 5). And finally, the volume aims to illuminate the history of the German Jews as part of general German history ‘by focusing on tensions between legal equality and exclusion, and between cul-
tural homogeneity and self-determination, and on the interaction between conformity and independence’ (p. 5).

In his introductory essay ‘Von der Eintracht zur Vielfalt: Juden in der Geschichte des deutschen Bürgertums’, Till van Rahden brings out the historical dimension of these diverse tensions. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, when a lively discussion of the ‘bourgeois improvement of the Jews’ began with Christian Wilhelm Dohm’s Emanzipationsschrift, the Jews were still living on the fringes of society as a linguistic, cultural, and economically separate minority. A few generations later, the majority were already members of the German bourgeoisie. Integration proceeded step by step, and was never uncontroversial. Whereas clear divisions existed between Jews and non-Jews in the first half of the nineteenth century, the differences became increasingly blurred in the second half. An independent ‘Jewish subculture (David Sorkin) was increasingly replaced by ‘situative ethnicities’ (Till van Rahden), that is, overlapping and changing (partial) identities. Van Rahden argues that account must be taken of this general change in bourgeois society, and in German-Jewish relations, which were closely associated with it. This means abandoning the notion of a majority or minority culture for the period from around 1860. In general, categories such as majority and minority or assimilation and acculturation should be treated critically, and the concepts of inclusion and exclusion, tried out in the research on Bürgertum, used instead. This generally convincing argument leads quite abruptly to the general point that inclusion-exclusion mechanisms should not be understood ‘as a special problem of the Jewish bourgeoisie. Rather, the tension between universalism and particularism was characteristic of bourgeois society as a whole’ (p. 23).

Similarly wide-ranging conclusions are drawn by Olaf Blaschke in his essay on ‘Bürgertum und Bürgerlichkeit im Spannungsfeld des neuen Konfessionalismus von den 1830er bis zu den 1930er Jahren’. His starting point is a general criticism of research on Bürgertum, namely, that it accepts the ideal of national homogeneity, and thus pays too little attention to confessional oppositions in bourgeois society. This explains ‘first why Catholics and Jews “disappeared” from research on Bürgertum, and secondly, where this was not the case, why they were analysed only in isolated cases’ (p. 64). And thirdly, it explains why historiography is dominated by the notion that Jewish and German history can be juxtaposed ‘as if the non-Jewish Germans
formed a homogeneous bloc to which one could relate’ (p. 39). Blaschke finds the idea of ‘contributions to history’, such as ‘the Jewish contribution to German culture’, or ‘the Jewish contribution to German science’ equally questionable. ‘Studies which look more closely at Jewish history within the structure of its non-Jewish environment have turned their backs on this classical formula for dealing with “German-Jewish” history’ (p. 36).

Precisely this is the aim of the contributors to the volume under review here, as the title makes clear. Thus Ulrich Sieg asks whether, and under what conditions, Jewish scholars in the humanities were able to obtain top academic posts during the Kaiserreich. The starting point of this precise and firmly based investigation is the pre-1914 German university world, ‘which was characterized by clear patterns of exclusion, and treated the most talented Jewish scholars, in particular, with anything but justice’ (p. 95). Jewish professors had to pay a high price for their rise—more, in fact, than they wanted to admit in their memoirs. Even scholars of the rank of Harry Breslau and Hermann Cohen were never fully able to overcome their status as outsiders.

Like Jewish scholars, Jewish big bankers, the subject of Morton Reitmayer’s investigation, led an existence ‘between separation and exclusion’ that was quite different from that of their non-Jewish colleagues. It is true that bankers did not face the alternative of retaining their Jewish traditions or completely giving up their Jewish identities. ‘The framework within which they acted in the world they lived in was much more complex for the historical actors’ (p. 169). However, ever-present social anti-Semitism considerably reduced the circles within which they moved.

Just as in the universities and among the upper middle classes, Jews often faced barriers in the world of Freemasonry. Stefan-Ludwig Hoffman contributes an illuminating essay on Jews and Freemasons in the nineteenth century. Initially Freemasons’ lodges excluded Jews. Restrictions on membership were gradually relaxed, but against the background of anti-Semitic tendencies in the Kaiserreich, lodges became increasingly unwelcoming to Jews, thus creating the conditions for the foundation of separate Jewish lodges (the independent order B’nai B’rith in Germany, the subject of an essay by Andreas Reinke). Hoffman draws wide-ranging conclusions from his sophisticated empirical analyses without providing further evidence. ‘The ten-
sion between the claims of common humanity and social exclusivity, between universalism and particularism, is typical not only of the notion of Bildung. It takes us to the heart of the modern notion of Bürgerlichkeit as a system of moral values and practices’ (p. 97).

Insights into completely different worlds are provided by Marline Otte, Erik Lindner, Richard Mehler, and Michaela Haibl. In her essay entitled ‘Eine Welt für sich? Bürger im Jargontheater von 1890 bis 1920’, Otte looks at the popular theatre in Berlin. The main focus of her remarks is the pre-war period. Until 1914, the Hernfelder Theater, renowned on the Berlin cultural scene at the time, was able to combine Jewish and general themes in such a way that the foreign was featured equally with the German on its stage. Before an audience that was mixed in terms of religion and ethnicity, ‘Jews took living their difference within the familiar circle of the family for granted; they were both human beings and Jews’ (p. 143). After the First World War the atmosphere was completely different. ‘The leitmotif of the Jargontheater, community in diversity’ (p. 144), was no longer able to convince an increasingly polarized audience.

In his essay, ‘Deutsche Juden und die bürgerlich-nationale Festkultur: Die Schiller- und Fichtefeier von 1859 und 1862’, Erik Lindner presents an interesting picture of attempts to integrate on the part of middle-class Jewish circles. They believed that, ‘in line with the goals expressed by the Assembly in the Paulskirche, they were most likely to achieve emancipation in a unified Germany’ (p. 190). Thus they took an active part in the liberal and national activities of the non-Jewish middle classes. Richard Mehler investigates ‘Die Entstehung eines Bürgertums unter den Landjuden in der bayrischen Rhön vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg’. He marshals convincing arguments against the view, widely held by researchers, of rural Jews as ‘agents of modernity’. ‘This formulation’, he argues, ‘is ambiguous and, under certain circumstances, can be misleading. If it is intended to express merely that the Jews brought urban consumer goods and technical innovations to the country, then there can be no objection. But if the intention is to suggest that the rural population owed these acquisitions solely to the Jews, then we must protest’ (p. 216).

Michaela Haibl also registers a protest. Her contribution, ‘Im Widerschein der Wirklichkeit: Die Verbürgerlichung und Akkulturation deutscher Juden in illustrierten Zeitschriften zwischen 1850 und 1900’ is directed against historians who refuse to use illustrations in
nineteenth-century magazines as a source for historical research. Repeatedly expressed doubts as to the authenticity of pictures are unjustified, she suggests. However ambiguous, the image ‘must be taken seriously as an authentic contemporary interpretation of the process of Jewish emancipation and Verbürgerlichung’ (p. 235). In this way it will be possible, she claims, to expand the source base for German-Jewish history, and thus to open up new paths for historical research.

The next seven essays form a separate section, entitled ‘Bürger im Judentum’. In contrast to the essays discussed so far, which are in the section ‘Juden im Bürgertum’, they look at intra-Jewish discussions on the issue of integration. The essay by Andreas Gotzmann, ‘Zwischen Nation und Religion: Die deutschen Juden auf der Suche nach einer bürgerlichen Konfessionalität’ takes a different approach to the topic by looking at it from the point of view of religious studies. The analysis focuses on the debates of the Assembly of German Rabbis (Versammlung deutscher Rabbiner) in 1844, 1845, and 1846. Gotzmann concludes that Jews in Germany did not simply react to pressure from outside, but themselves took an active part in the process of Verbürgerlichung: ‘All constructs, even the Orthodox ones, attempted to outline the basic model of a bourgeois confession, that is, a religious system that consciously worked within a pluralistic framework and was less and less opposed to the external world. Thus the intentions and paradigms of this new Jewish religion point directly to the necessary counterpart of a middle-class community with equal rights, which did not yet actually exist’ (p. 261).

This turn towards the middle-class world had begun much earlier, namely, in the decade of upheaval around 1800. At that time Jewish reform schools were set up in the German language-area. Simone Lässig’s brilliant essay, ‘Bildung als kulturelles Kapital? Jüdische Schulprojekte in der Frühphase der Emanzipation’, impressively demonstrates what they meant for the acceptance of Jewish education and for the transition to a middle-class way of life. Like no other group in a modernizing society, Jews grasped the chance for social advancement which education offered. They founded reform schools to which the underprivileged classes in particular had access. These schools did not only transmit the elements of a middle-class education to their pupils, ‘but at the same time made it possible to acquire as a habit all the basic elements of the middle-class values’ 96
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Thus they prepared the way for the emergence of new forms of Jewish identity.

Rainer Liedtke shows very clearly that the overwhelming majority of German Jews were orientated by ‘the majority culture’, and how much effort they put into achieving ‘integration into society as a whole’ (p. 299). In his essay, ‘Jüdische Identität im bürgerlichen Raum: die organisierte Wohlfahrt der Hamburger Juden im 19. Jahrhundert’, he demonstrates, using the Jewish community in Hamburg as an example, ‘the significance of welfare organizations and institutions for the Jewish middle class in its attempts to preserve Jewish identity while also integrating into non-Jewish society’ (p. 300). Yet it was not only in Hamburg that the Jewish middle class created ‘its own, separate bourgeois sphere’ (p. 313) for itself. Jewish welfare institutions were also set up in other towns. Sometimes they were closely linked with municipal welfare, as Iris Schröder shows in her essay, ‘Grenzgängerinnen: Jüdische Sozialreformerinnen in der Frankfurter Frauenbewegung um 1900’.

From welfare organizations in the Jewish centres of Hamburg and Frankfurt, Stefanie Schüler-Springorum takes us to the world of a successful Jewish businessman in Königsberg. On the basis of Aron Liebeck’s autobiography, Denken, Wirken, Schaffen (1928), she once again shows that the established German-Jewish bourgeoisie conformed with non-Jewish society while maintaining its independence. Not only did it retain its religion, but it was also distinguished from the non-Jewish middle classes by certain attitudes and values. As the case of Aron Liebeck shows, these included ‘a decidedly liberal political attitude sympathetic to the Social Democrats, and perhaps also an ideal of masculinity that was not orientated by military models’ (p. 392).

While Aron Liebeck showed little awareness of crisis, many of his co-religionists felt that the Jews in Germany were in a position of retreat. Martin Liepach’s essay, ‘Das Krisenbewuβtsein des jüdischen Bürgertums in den Goldenen Zwanzigern’, shows how widespread this feeling was even during the stable phase of the Weimar Republic. At that time perceptive contemporaries already recognized the extent of the impact of the changes that were taking place in all areas of social life. Behind the disintegration of political liberalism, which was visible to everyone, was hidden the creeping decay of middle-class values. This announced the end of the bourgeois age. This, at least, is
how the philosophy professor Julius Goldstein from Darmstadt saw it. ‘It is a strange paradox’, he wrote in 1927, ‘that the most strongly developed völkisch type is found among the middle classes. How is it possible for a class which used the ideas of equality and freedom to fight for its own emancipation from the Estate-based state to become untrue to its own past?’ (p. 417). This question runs through the whole volume. It is the core question in the history of the Bürgertum between the Enlightenment and National Socialism, and it is, at the same time, the core question of German-Jewish history in this period. The two are inextricably intertwined. The most recent research on the Jewish middle classes in Germany has drawn the necessary conclusions from this.
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Policy-makers and managers of higher education sometimes have more than one blind spot when looking across borders (or oceans), as the current debate on university reform in Germany demonstrates. The international comparative perspective is distorted by projections no less than by aversions, while extravagant praise for foreign models as ready-made solutions to domestic crises is often dictated by short-term political interests. A few wary voices tend to warn quietly that one cannot simply lift sections out of an academic infrastructure and import them into a completely different context.

In his carefully researched and well written book on the reception of ‘Humboldt’s model’ in nineteenth-century France and Britain, Marc Schalenberg shows that these phenomena are practically as old as the modern university itself. The thesis of his study can quickly be summed up. Neither in Paris, which Schalenberg concentrates on for the case of France, nor in Oxford, which is taken as representative of Britain, he argues, was there a real reception of Humboldtian ideas. This flies in the face of current ‘fundamentally diffusionist interpretations’, which postulate the increasing ‘dissemination’ and ‘influence’ of Humboldt throughout nineteenth-century Europe.

There were very different reasons why the idea of a university that united teaching and research was greeted with scepticism, or was even rejected, in Britain and France. First, university structures in Paris and Oxford differed fundamentally from those in Germany. In France the faculties were not linked in a larger structure, while in Oxford there were no faculties at all until 1882, and the colleges, if in doubt, saw themselves as engaged in character-building through religious education. However much France and Britain differed in their étatist or non-étatist view of universities, each was dominated by an academic spirit that was as different as it could be from that in Germany. In the case of Britain, Schalenberg describes it as ‘fashionable, independent, unspecialized’.

The decisive factor in the non-reception of Humboldt’s model, however, was traditional academic self-perceptions. France was domi-
nated by the notion of the ‘primacy of training’ and the separation of teaching and research on principle. A practical orientation and a state-regulated examination system were diametrically opposed to the reception of the ‘German model’, and even Germanophile reformers such as Madame de Staël and Ernest Renan could not do much about such deeply ingrained priorities.

Oxford, on the other hand, saw itself, as Schalenberg notes, not only as a university, but as a ‘way of life’. As many nineteenth-century critics remarked, Oxford university served mainly as an institution for the education of Christian gentlemen who, it was hoped, would set out to rule the world armed with some knowledge at least of the canon, and, above all, the correct faith. Research must have seemed downright ungentlemanly. Schalenberg quotes the physicist Clifton who complained that ‘the wish to do research betrays a certain restlessness of mind’. In other words, the drive to do research could only confuse young minds and distract them from the real ideals of acquiring ‘general knowledge’, and, in particular, ‘good sense’.

Cardinal Newman and the Oxford Movement especially emphasized the ‘imperative to teach’. They defended a theologically saturated liberal education against liberal British reformers, and took no notice whatsoever of the Humboldtian model. Thus university and professors formed a front against colleges and tutors; to put it crudely, Humanism could thus, curiously, be set against Humboldt. Educationalist opposed researcher; Humboldt’s neo-Humanism and the notion of the unity of research and teaching were ignored.

The religious fixation and the exclusiveness of the ‘two great public nuisances’ Oxford and Cambridge, in Jeremy Bentham’s words, however, also prompted the foundation of new institutions like University College London and Manchester, which, according to Schalenberg, must count as the most ‘continental’ university in nineteenth-century Britain. In general, however, even the reform-minded were interested less in a philosophical ‘idea of the German university’ than in practical applications. Thus it hardly comes as a surprise that Schalenberg identifies the Royal College of Chemistry as ‘perhaps the most successful example of German–British transfer in higher education during the relevant period’. At the end of the day it was Liebig, not Humboldt, who served as a ‘model’.

One thing repeatedly becomes clear. In the skirmish of debate, accuracy in the depiction of conditions in Germany and of Humboldt’s
ideals was always the first victim. Germanophiles as well as Germanophobes used their images of Germany tactically, and sometimes strategically, to achieve their academic aims (and, not least, to pursue their own interests). According to Schalenberg, what was at stake was actual practice in French and British universities, not theoretical support for university reforms. The rules of a ‘discursive grammar of institutional reform’, it almost seems, hardly permitted a real understanding of Humboldt’s ideas. The putative characteristics of the ‘German model’, such as, for example, the freedom to teach and to learn, a ‘Faustian striving for knowledge’, and ‘the usual German virtue – Gründlichkeit’, were taken out of context and used selectively as rhetorical weapons in the battle over influence and resources.

In the contexts investigated by Schalenberg, then, the ‘German model’ was generally either ignored or misunderstood. Humboldt himself, it seems, never travelled, to answer the question posed in Schalenberg’s book title. Internationally he was known, if at all, as a philologist, not as a university reformer. And especially in Oxford, one preferred to see German professors, considered to be monsters and associated mainly with subjection to authority and a mania for novelty, stay at home.

However important and interesting non-reception may be as a research topic, one wonders whether it might not have been more rewarding to look more closely at contexts of reception that are, at first glance, rather marginal, such as Scotland and Ireland. Although Schalenberg undertakes brief excursions to these regions, it never becomes quite clear why exactly transfer was more successful there. Perhaps, from the perspective of Dublin or Edinburgh, parts of the ‘diffusion theory’ might be salvaged.

Whoever says ‘transfer’ often ends up talking teleology. Schalenberg, to his credit, is fully aware of the temptation of ‘ideal-typical teleologies’. But he still cannot always resist it. Now and then it sounds as though the German ‘research imperative’ should in turn have been subject to an international ‘reception imperative’ in the nineteenth century. In general, however, Schalenberg’s sensitivity to different national contexts is impressive. In addition to detailed and extensively documented studies of Paris and Oxford, Schalenberg looks at the French provinces and London, goes through almost a century of journals, and arrives at fundamental insights into the various structures of the media and the public sphere in the countries under investigation.
Above all, however, Schalenberg introduces the reader to a whole cabinet of rather curious figures: reformers, most of whom failed, some tragically; enthusiasts for all things German; eccentric transgressors; and traditionalist heroes stubbornly resisting any ‘transfer’ or ‘reception imperatives’. With an appealing interest in historical detail and even some humour, Schalenberg presents pioneers and prophets of transnational openness from Victor Cousins to Friedrich Max Müller and Mark Pattison. It is hard to believe that some of these Germanophiles were coldly calculating strategists of discourse in pursuit of their own interests, as one of Schalenberg’s overall arguments suggests.

Perhaps the dictum ‘less is more’ could be applied to the methodology of this study, which vacillates between theoretical abstraction and a pragmatic, even common sense, usage of concepts. One consequence of this is that perfectly straightforward insights sometimes come out sounding slightly pompous. For Schalenberg, ‘discourse’ is ultimately just a use of language directed by particular interests. Thus one of the conclusions of the book is fixed from the start: ideas were always more or less directly determined by specific interests. Curiously, the result is that Schalenberg’s book is a sometimes uneasy mixture of partly digested French sociology, with its propensity for determinism, and English pragmatism, all presented in a highly systematic framework which, if anything, is rather Germanic in nature. Perhaps a little less eclecticism would have amounted to more here. In fact, reference to the Cambridge School would have sufficed as the methodological underpinning for this sort of intellectual history. Ultimately it is not so much about ‘discourse’ as about ‘ideas in context’.

Minor criticisms aside, Schalenberg’s book is an important contribution to the transnational history of higher education. It provides a wealth of interesting insights into the conditions governing cultural transfer (or its lack). *Wahlfremdheit* (Schalenberg) and *Transferresistenz* (resistance to transfer—a useful, if ugly term) prove to be extremely complex phenomena. Schalenberg deserves credit for having carefully historicized and explained the latter in particular. Some might even be tempted to draw from it lessons for the present.
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Frank Lorenz Müller’s book *Britain and the German Question* looks at British perceptions of pre-Kaiserreich Germany from 1830 to 1863. Although of secondary importance to British foreign policy during the second third of the nineteenth century, the German Confederation and its individual member states were closely monitored by British observers. Two aspects of political life attracted particular interest: nationalism and political reform. Both played a prominent role in German politics for most of the German Confederation’s existence and were constitutive elements of the German Question. The question of how German unity was to be achieved in the context of the Austro–Prussian struggle for supremacy was shaped by the ‘tension between the challenge posed by an opposition demanding liberal, constitutional and national progress and the various governmental responses’ (p. 1). As Müller shows, British attitudes towards this problem were neither clear-cut nor static.

Aiming to emphasize ‘the multidimensional character of British perceptions’ (p. 3), Müller concentrates on ‘Britain’s foreign political establishment’ (p. 2), and especially on British diplomats to the German states. While this might at first glance look like a restriction of the source base, it in fact reflects the limited number of traceable British observers of Germany. Germany rarely impinged upon the sphere of British public opinion. Only on a few occasions was Germany the topic of parliamentary debates, and in the British newspapers which Müller draws upon in his study Germany hardly plays a prominent role. However, the foreign political establishment, that is, mainly Foreign Office officials, produced vast quantities of documents in which German affairs are dealt with not only regularly and extensively, but often also with profound knowledge. This was not least because of the long periods of time for which individual British envoys were accredited to German courts. In an appendix Müller provides a very useful list of long-serving British diplomats to the states of the German Confederation. Four British diplomats served in Germany for more than thirty years, seven for more than twenty years. It is unfortunate that we learn little about the implications which length of service had on perceptions of Germany beyond the
The fact that many diplomats certainly possessed expertise. A second reason for the extent of knowledge about Germany is the federal structure of Germany which meant that the Foreign Office sent diplomats not only to Berlin and Vienna, but also to Hanover, Hamburg, Munich, Frankfurt, Stuttgart, and Dresden. Thus the official and private correspondence of the British envoys covers the complex and often heterogeneous aspects of the political life of the individual states as well as of the German Confederation as a whole. The number of British diplomats posted to Germany at the same time—Müller counts a total of twenty-six ambassadors, envoys, secretaries of legation, and attachés for the year 1851 alone (cf. p. 5)—ensured varied assessments of German affairs.

The first of the four chronologically ordered chapters deals with the Vormärz period from the aftermath of the July revolution of 1830 to 1847. It was the European dimension of the revolutionary events of 1830 that restored the British interest in Germany. In accordance with the views of the Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, who came to office for the first time in November 1830 and shaped British foreign policy for the following decades, British observers were deeply suspicious of the national and liberal movement. The oppositional challenge was regarded, without much differentiation, as radical, anti-monarchical, and therefore potentially destabilizing. On the whole judgements of the measures taken by the German governments were equally negative. The constitutional states, seen as Britain’s ‘natural allies’ (p. 26), were condemned for their weak and passive policies. However, British reactions to the measures taken by the German Confederation, culminating in the repressive Six Articles of 1832, differed. While senior British diplomats to Germany such as Frederick Lamb in Vienna and Thomas Cartwright in Frankfurt defended the Austro-Prussian attempt to suppress civil rights in the face of revolutionary danger, Lord Palmerston rejected the measures. In his despatch of 7 September 1832, Palmerston left the German governments in no doubt of his belief in timely concessions (divide et impera). For him, Metternich’s reactionary course was counter-productive for Germany’s internal peace and potentially dangerous for Europe. Palmerston argued in terms of the European law of 1815, but his whole viewpoint was determined by the European dimension of Britain’s policy towards Germany. Primarily, the German Confederation had a functional role as a stabilizing power in the middle of
Europe between France und Russia. Throughout his book Müller takes account of the European dimension of British policy by skilfully integrating British perceptions of Germany into a wider European context. This makes the anti-revolutionary mind-set of the British observers plausible.

Even the Prussian-led Customs Union (Zollverein) was valued for its anti-revolutionary impact. Müller points out that Britain’s view of the Zollverein was far less negative than the older literature would have us believe. Britain clearly condemned any protectionist moves on the part of the Zollverein, but also had hopes that a Prussian-led Zollverein which promised fairly liberal tariffs would have a positive effect. Furthermore, unlike the Diet of the German Confederation, Britain approved of the Zollverein as an efficient way of organizing Germany. However, the frequently observed national and unifying effect was only rarely connected with the popular national movement which was boosted by the Rhine crisis of 1840–1 and the accession of Frederick William IV as Prussian king. Müller demonstrates that the popular national movement was widely ignored both by British diplomats and the British press, which left them unprepared for future developments.

Müller’s picture certainly mirrors the general interest of diplomats in high politics. There is at least one aspect of the popular movement, however, which attracted a great deal of British interest, but which Müller almost entirely ignores. During the Vormärz period religion and religious life in Germany—for example, the ultramontane movement in Bavaria, the dispute about mixed marriages in the 1830s, and the religious sects of the 1840s—played an outstanding role and had varied political repercussions on a national scale. Müller’s decision to leave aside these aspects of the Vormärz period is particularly regrettable as the interest of British observers in religious matters was clearly linked to the situation at home. Sensitized by the Catholic emancipation of 1829 and the Irish question, British observers were always aware that religion could not be separated from politics: their experiences and their self-perceptions were mirrored in their view of Germany. In general, Müller rarely makes connections with internal British events and developments which could help to explain the assessments of the individual British observers, such as, for example, the parliamentary reform of 1832. This said, Müller leaves no doubt about the convictions held by British diplo-
mats which shaped their appraisal of German politics. One which is very clearly and convincingly referred to throughout the book is the Whiggish principle of moderate reform. The measures introduced by Frederick William IV after his accession to the throne in 1840 acknowledging that there was need for political reform in Germany, the convocation of the Prussian United Diet in 1847, and the Zollverein all prompted positive responses.

A belief in the efficacy of ‘timely concessions’ (p. 58) in preventing popular uprisings also dictated the first British reactions to the revolution of 1848, which Müller deals with at the beginning of chapter two, ‘British perceptions of revolutionary Germany’. Britain’s positive and optimistic assessment of the steps taken by several of the Märzministerien in the German states, however, was short-lived and gave way to apprehension about democratic radicalization. From as early as March 1848, the governments of the German states were criticized for being short-sighted in their concessions and in danger of losing their authority. The widening of the electorate, which was regarded as totally inadequate, drew particular criticism. It was only consistent that British observers welcomed the reactionary measures which Prussia took in November 1848. These guaranteed the restoration of order and thus, in British eyes, confirmed Prussia’s leading role in Germany. The Prussian constitution of December 1848 however was considered too liberal and unsuited to serving the ultimate end of wise policy, that is, ‘containment of the opposition and consolidation of the established political system’ (p. 76). All in all British attitudes to events between March 1848 and June 1849 were similar to what they had been in the early 1830s. This also applied to the condemnation of the party of movement, which drew the special attention of British observers at the centre of the national revolution, Frankfurt.

As far as British observers were concerned, the new National Assembly in the Frankfurt Paulskirche which replaced the unpopular and, not only in British eyes, ineffective and almost obsolete Diet of the German Confederation was soon discredited by its members. Although on the whole they were not as radical as had been feared, they lacked political experience and were also considered dangerously theoretical. One of the main reasons for the condemnation of the Frankfurt Nationalversammlung, however, was the blocking resolution with regard to the ratification of the Treaty of Malmö in Sep-
tember 1848. The Frankfurt assembly, which revoked its decision two weeks later, proved to be not only incompetent but also irresponsible and a danger to European peace. Against this background, it is not surprising that British diplomats followed the proceedings in Frankfurt with the utmost scepticism and distrust. With regard to issues both of reform and of Germany’s role in European security, they welcomed the failure of the revolutionary project in Frankfurt.

As Müller shows in his third chapter, ‘British perceptions of the Austro–Prussian struggle for supremacy’, British hopes for a reformed and more closely united Germany lay with Prussia. Müller devotes special attention to the Prussian kleindeutsch plan of the Erfurt Union. For a number of reasons which reflected British perceptions of Germany since the 1830s, Palmerston approved of Prussia’s plan. Both the European dimension of a Prussian-led Germany—the securing of a Danish–Prussian peace and the creation of a counterweight to the autocratic Austro–Russian alliance—and the internal effect of calming revolutionary aspirations corresponded to the British interest in a peaceful Europe open to British trade and commerce. When developments from summer 1849 showed that Prussia’s plan did not necessarily converge with the overall goals of British foreign policy, Britain’s support for Prussia faded. Up to November 1850, when the Treaty of Olmütz settled the growing Austro-Prussian tensions, Britain again took the role of a predominantly passive observer. The failure of the project of the Prussian Union and Austria’s strengthening was followed impartially as long as European equilibrium was not endangered, as was the case with Schwarzenberg’s plan for a Reich of 70 million people. The outcome of the Dresden conference of early 1851, which simultaneously checked Austria’s quest for supremacy and restored the old German Confederation and the Federal Diet in Frankfurt was welcomed by Britain. National and political reform were of secondary importance at that time and, as described in chapter four, ‘British perceptions of the “reaction” and the struggle for federal reform’, in the years that followed.

During the Crimean War, when Britain sought allies against Russia, there was certainly a German dimension to British foreign policy, but questions of nationalism and political reform in Germany hardly headed the agenda. Not only were British observers convinced of the success of the reactionary party, but suggestions for
federal reform, such as, for example, those put forward by the Saxon Foreign Minister, Friedrich Ferdinand von Beust, were dismissed under the influence of British Russophobia. The standstill in British interest in Germany’s internal reforms, reflected in Müller’s brief account of that period, was overcome at the start of the Prussian New Era in 1858. Britain once again identified Prussia—in contrast to the incompetent German states of the third Germany and Austria—with necessary moderate political reforms. Furthermore, nationalism orientated towards Prussia was seen as an effective means of countering French aggression. Against this background the Deutsche Nationalverein, to which Müller pays a good deal of attention in the last part of his study, was perceived as something quite positive, although there was some easiness about the scale of the proposed centralizing reforms. Of course, the hopes of British observers were once again frustrated when the pendulum of Prussian policy swung back to reactionary measures in 1861. The Fürstentag of 1863, when discussion of the German Question reached another impasse, marked the end of fruitless efforts to reform the German Confederation internally.

For the British foreign political establishment, which had observed the challenges to the German states for more than thirty years, the failure of the German Confederation was only consistent. To British observers the raison d’être of the German Confederation, namely to secure internal and external peace, as expressed in Article 2 of the Act of the German Confederation, was called into question not least because Germany had proved unable to follow the British example of moderate and non-democratic reform. German nationalism, on the other hand, was approved of only as long as it did not aim for a centralized union, posed no threat to Germany’s neighbours, and generally accorded with Britain’s security and commercial interests.

Müller’s conclusions concerning the kind of united Germany that Britain would have welcomed in general follow the same lines as those in older studies such as those by Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, Günther Heydemann, Wolf D. Gruner, and Günther Gillessen. Müller’s thorough knowledge of the existing research and his wide use of source material, such as, for instance, private papers by British diplomats, which in many cases has been neglected by historians, enables him to draw an accurate and comprehensive picture of Anglo-German relations and British perceptions of Germany at a
crucial period of German history. The fact that he does not only focus on Austria and Prussia, but also includes the middling German states known as the ‘Third Germany’ is commendable. At the same time, Müller’s book leaves no doubt that pre-Kaiserreich Germany was seen as an entity that consisted of more than a loose confederation of states.

It is unfortunate that Müller does not scrutinize the patterns of British perceptions of Germany beyond the more general aspects of British–German relations. As ‘British interest in German politics between 1830 and 1863 remained somewhat theoretical and characterized by a lack of urgency’ (p. 7), we miss a closer look at why individual British observers reached specific conclusions at a given time. Given the complexity of the conditions under which the letters and despatches Müller uses were created, the individual background of the observers and connections with internal British developments would have been particularly interesting. A stronger emphasis on the circumstances of British perceptions would also have made the selection of examples appear less random than it sometimes seems, especially in chapters two and four.

Nevertheless, Müller’s book is well put together and lucidly written. Although traditional both in method and scope, it surpasses existing studies of Anglo–German relations in the period of the German Confederation. With the reservation that in most instances Müller touches upon crucial questions of perception only indirectly or inexplicitly, anybody interested in the history of national images and in a more theoretical approach to the perception of nations and countries will gain from Müller’s book as well.
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‘Africans’, the eminent Africanist historian Frederick Cooper recently claimed, ‘have not had an equal voice in determining what “universal values” are, but theirs has been a vital voice nonetheless.’ In his well-written and original contribution to the recently revitalized field of African intellectual history, Philip Zachernuk carefully analyses and contextualizes the ‘vital voices’ of the southern Nigerian intelligentsia for the period from 1840 to 1960. He examines the intellectuals’ engagement with British and Black Atlantic assumptions and assertions about Africa’s place in the world. In this context, Zachernuk argues against the old dichotomous views of African intellectuals as torn between ‘tradition’ and ‘modernity’ or as ‘deluded hybrids’ who remained ‘mentally enslaved’ to foreign ideas. According to him, their concepts and ideas were ‘neither “traditional African” nor “modern European” but … a modern African creation which has to be grasped on its own term’ (p. 9). Zachernuk shows that Western-educated Africans acted as cultural brokers or mediators between colonizers and colonized. They played with different cultural registers and repertoires and established numerous networks in an in-between space characterized by hierarchies, rejections, and contradictions. And in the process they created a distinctive intellectual culture grounded on local and European sources. Zachernuk’s intelligentsia is overwhelmingly male, while women’s voices are seldom present. However, the author makes some effort to include women in his educational statistics and he also mentions European women entering the Nigerian colonial and mission services. In his concluding remarks he openly admits that he did not examine issues of gender because this and other additional complexities, he argues, would have made his book an excessively dense survey.

During the colonial century the southern Nigerian intelligentsia formed a heterogeneous group, often riven by factional disputes. The author is particularly good in teasing out the complex relations between early Yoruba returnee intellectuals from Sierra Leone (called Saro), emerging local Yoruba and other southern Nigerian intellectual groups, outsider missionaries, and colonial administrators.
Moreover, Zachernuk attempts to define the periods at which certain self-images and views of societies within Nigeria dominated. Throughout the middle of the nineteenth century, the small coastal enclaves of Christian converts saw themselves, and wanted to be seen, as African representatives of British civilization. They held, as Zachernuk puts it, ‘the English language, the Christian church, British law, international commerce, and Western education as institutions relevant—but not always necessary—to their lives’ (p. 20). The intelligentsia, as a small and insecure community, found strength in the project of bringing ‘Western civilization’ to ‘Africa’ proffered by contemporary European and Black Atlantic thinkers. The educated élite attempted to adapt European discourse about Africa to their needs, to draw from imposed categories something more suited to their medial position between imperial discourse and African realities. Until the reinforcement of a formal colonial order in the late nineteenth century, the barrier between ‘Africa’ and ‘Europe’ was held to be cultural and historical rather than racial, a barrier seemingly surmountable by commerce and Christianity.

Zachernuk shows that throughout the mid-nineteenth century the intelligentsia even promoted the expansion of the colonial state. The colonial order offered status through careers in commerce, church, and state. A few African ‘merchant princes’ became extremely wealthy, most notably Richard B. Blaize of Lagos, whose fortune surpassed that of all but a few European entrepreneurs by the end of the nineteenth century. Other Africans filled lucrative posts in the administrative sector. The colonial government in Lagos required clerks, including senior ones. Government service, however, was soon widely regarded as an occupation which increased dependence on a government hostile to the intelligentsia’s grand ambitions. This sentiment was voiced by the Lagos Standard in September 1897, quoted by Zachernuk: ‘To many a man, rather should we say, to many an African, the Government Service is often the end of all usefulness and respectability, all manliness and independence.’ Moreover, at the turn of the century, imperial partition and deteriorating economic conditions forced a re-evaluation of initial positions, even more so as with the rise of scientific racism European colonizers began to emphasize impermeable divisions between the ‘races’. ‘Races’ were now ranked hierarchically, with Africans near the bottom. In the judgments of most British in Nigeria, the project of a ‘civilizing mis-
mission’ was an impossible mission; Africans, in short, could not be ‘civi-
ilized’. Soon after the turn of the century, Europeans in Lagos tried to
set up a colonial church and a Freemason’s lodge for whites only. In
1897 Africans were excluded from the Chamber of Commerce.
Official residential segregation was added to employment and salary
discrimination. Thus the attitude of the intelligentsia toward the
colonial order shifted from admiration to aversion. ‘The colonial
state’, Zachernuk writes, ‘was something from which the medial
classes now wanted to escape, through independent careers, eco-
nomic self-help, and Pan-African attachment’ (p. 176 f.).
From the 1880s on, the Nigerian intelligentsia faced the combined
challenge of racism and imperial control and were forced to re-exam-
ine their self-image as ‘black Englishmen’. They joined with African-
American and other writers to present themselves as members of a
racewide élite in search of their own ‘African personality’. As
Zachernuk puts it, the vague, uniformed sense of being ‘black
Englishmen’ was displaced by a sense of being black, of being part of
the rising community of diasporan Africans. The members of the
educated community in Nigeria, he writes, ‘could become a genuine
elite not by serving as agents of the Western penetration of the
African darkness but by combining Western knowledge with their
putative racial characteristics, acting in concert with other black elites
of similar mind … Whatever Yoruba or West African qualities they
held virtuous were virtues of the race affirmed against claims of
European hegemony and superiority’ (p. 67). For instance, to build
an African church in Lagos in 1901 was to lay the foundation of the
church for the ‘black race’.
Zachernuk identifies four writers who, around 1900, formulated
most cogently the southern Nigerian intelligentsia’s response to the
betrayal of the civilizing mission. The most prominent among them
was Edwin Wilmot Blyden (1832–1912), the politician, writer, and
diplomat, who spent much of his life in Liberia and who has been
regarded as one of the key thinkers in the development of Pan-
African ideas. One of the many ideas Blyden put forward was a pro-
sal for the organization of higher education within West Africa. In
Lagos, Blyden’s ideas were endorsed and popularized most notably
by three men: John Payne Jackson, editor of the Lagos Weekly Record,
a Liberian married into a Lagos West Indian family; Reverend James
Johnson, a Saro missionary; and Mojola Agbebi, a poet, writer, and
preacher and the Nigerian-born son of Saro parents. The ideas of
these men diverged on many points. However, they all endorsed
Blyden’s plea for Africans to discover the ‘African personality’ and
develop in consonance with it. In other words, Africans had to estab-
lish a church rooted in African culture, and to develop social and
political institutions suited to their ‘race’. Moreover, they had to dis-
cover their past and present to guide them in this work and to refute
European claims that Africans had nothing useful to give to the rest
of the world.

Blyden and his three Lagosian ‘comrades-in-arms’ all died
between 1912 and 1917, but they left a clear set of principles for their
followers. In fact, as Zachernuk shows in considerable detail, the
inter-war period probably marked the most promising moment of
Nigerian intellectual history, at least during colonial times. Although
this period was characterized among other things by encompassing
economic depression, unemployment for school graduates, and per-
sistent racism, their greater numbers, deeper local roots, and a more
intimate knowledge of both their Black Atlantic and British peers
helped provide the intelligentsia with a more substantial sense of
their own situation. The medial classes became more diverse, more
pragmatic, and more organized, particularly in the forums provided
by the newly consolidated colonial state in Nigeria, most notably
youth associations. The nationalist period after the Second Word
War, however, represented a considerable break. The intelligentsia
had to change agendas while undergoing complex and rapid alter-
ations in their own social makeup. Zachernuk sums up this develop-
ment: ‘More widespread recruitment, competing loyalties, diversify-
ing educational careers, a renewed attachment to the state, and divi-
sive stratification all served to disrupt established patterns’ (p. 125).
In the hectic decade preceding independence in 1960, ‘difference’
was mainly understood merely as referring to the gap between
Nigeria’s ‘underdeveloped’ present and its desired ‘modern’ future.
In the meantime, the unique perspective on African and Nigerian
problems that had fitfully emerged between the wars was lost. Thus,
Zachernuk concludes, most of the intelligentsia left the British
Empire in a state of doubt and fragmentation rather than of certainty
and resolution.
African Intelligentsia and Atlantic Ideas

In view of the vast historical literature on the relationship between religion and politics, church and state in Nazi Germany it would seem sensible to mark the position of a new contribution on this topic. The subtitle comes very close to expressing what the author has in mind: an analysis of the Nazi élite’s views on Christianity. His study is intended to be revisionist, even provocative, in the sense that it questions the general assumption that Christianity and Nazism were fundamentally incompatible. This is, indeed, the conclusion to be drawn from the many books on the persecution of both churches during the Third Reich.

Richard Steigmann-Gall’s approach is, strictly speaking, historicist in that he holds that Nazi pronouncements on religion should be taken literally. He dismisses all suggestions of opportunism and tactical manoeuvring (except when it became fashionable to leave the church) in order to avoid giving offence to the population at large. In one of his categorical statements he says: ‘Professions of Christian feelings were not the product of Nazi mendacity’ (p. 262). Several times he uses the image of the stage: declarations on the public stage were the same as those after the curtain came down. This assumption, which is bound to be disputed by many experts, is crucial for the argument about the religious roots of anti-Semitism. Subjective perceptions and professions concerning Christianity are the author’s main source material. In addition he makes full use of the relevant files of the Federal Archives in Berlin, especially regarding the quarrels among those leaders, such as Bormann, Rosenberg, Himmler, Bouhler, and Kerrl, who were competing for the movement’s ideological high ground.

The book’s striking leitmotiv is hinted at in the introduction where the author parades Erich Koch, one of the regime’s worst war criminals, as his star witness. On Luther’s 450th birthday in 1933, Koch compared Hitler and the Reformer as true believers. Later Koch became president of his provincial synod and after the war he was to claim: ‘I held the view that the Nazi idea had to develop from a basic
Prussian-Protestant attitude and from Luther’s unfinished Reforma-
mation’ (p. 2).

In his first chapter the author deals with point 24 of the party pro-
grame, its evolution and meaning for the faithful. It proclaims free-
dom for all religious confessions, and goes on to state: ‘The party as
such represents the standpoint of a positive Christianity, without
tying itself to a particular confession.’ Whereas most historians tend
to disregard the party programme as a politically binding canon,
Steigmann-Gall thinks that this pronouncement represents a wide-
spread opinion among party members, especially those who were
critical of the hierarchy of their church. This was ‘a new syncretism
that would bridge Germany’s confessional divide’ rather than ‘a cyn-
ical ploy for winning votes’ (p. 14). Nazi beliefs were derived from
the dualistic vision of the world promulgated by ‘war theology’ with
its emphasis on the fight of good against evil, which was then pro-
jected on to the political struggle in the Weimar period. Attention is
drawn to Dietrich Eckart, Hitler’s ideological mentor in the early
years, who coined the phrase ‘Jewish materialist spirit within us and
without us’. For him, Jesus himself, persecuted by the Jews, was the
leader to be followed: ‘In Christ, the embodiment of all manliness, we
find all that we need.’ Soon Jesus was transformed into an honorary
Ayrian for most of the leading Nazis, who did not wish to abandon
their traditional belief system. In a speech in 1922 Hitler referred to
Jesus as ‘our greatest Ayrian leader’. The author maintains that these
were honestly held views because in Mein Kampf Hitler gave no indi-
cation that he was an atheist or agnostic, or of believing ‘in any
remote rationalist divinity’ when, for instance, he implored ‘the cre-
ator of the universe’. By defending himself against the Jews, Hitler
claimed, he was ‘fighting for the work of the Lord’. Luther was, of
course, much appreciated for his vituperative anti-Semitism that,
according to Steigmann-Gall, ‘interwove racial and religious con-
cepts’ (p. 24). Another important ingredient of the Nazi interpreta-
tion of the gospel was the professed ethical socialism of Christianity
which permitted the rejection of ‘mammonism’ without falling for
the Marxist criticism of capitalism.

The second chapter, ‘Above the Confessions’, focuses on attitudes
to the two main churches. Because of its dogmatism and dependence
on a foreign power, that is, the Vatican, Catholicism was always
viewed with a certain hostility by Nazi leaders; the ‘church’ was
almost by definition the Catholic church. The author is not concerned
with the Concordat between Berlin and Rome but he does describe in
some detail the unsuccessful attempts to unite the Lutheran church
under one organizational and politically acceptable roof. Only the
Protestants seemed to hold out the hope of a German state church on
the Anglican model with Hitler as the *summus episcopus*. The author
does not ignore the ‘paganists’, as he calls them, who are paraded in
the following chapters. Here he concerns himself with the religious
notions of Ludendorff, Rosenberg, Himmler, Darré, and others who
favoured a German conception of God based on the *völkisch* idea, on
blood and soil, or on the cult of the Germanic ancestors. He argues
that theirs was only a partial rejection of Christianity because they
acknowledged its impact on the mind and the disposition of the peo-
ple. Nor were their hopes for recognition by the party leadership ever
fulfilled, Ludendorff being the first to be ousted. Rosenberg’s ‘myth’
was not only vehemently rejected by both churches, but also viewed
with disbelief by Hitler and his entourage.

Under the heading ‘Completing the Reformation’ attempts to cre-
ate a unified Reichskirche are explored in some depth based on ar-
chival material. The period of office of the Church Minister Hanns
Kerrl is, of course, well trodden ground. However, his failure is
depicted as a crucial watershed in the relationship between the
Protestant church and the Nazi state in that Hitler now lost all hope
of any solution other than the complete separation of church and
state as the long-term aim. The failure to arrive at a *modus vivendi*
between church and state led many leading Nazis to abandon their
link with the established religion. This chapter is entitled ‘Gottgläubig:
Assent of the anti-Christians?’ The question mark says it all. This
chapter furnishes the opportunity to stress the difference between
growing anti-clericalism and the last vestiges of Christian belief.
Believers in God cannot be compared, the author argues, to atheist
Bolsheviks or Nazi paganists. Moreover, *Kirchenaustritt* was not
imposed from above. Though it was most popular among the SS,
Himmler was concerned that his men might just be following a fash-
ion set by their leader’s decision to leave the church. To him it was
‘truly preferable if someone takes one, two or five years to leave the
Church, thus leaving it out of true conviction’ (p. 222).

In the final confrontational phase a prominent role is attributed to
Martin Bormann, the well-known arch enemy of revealed religion.
Yet the author tries to demonstrate that each step, each anti-Christian measure, was opposed and frustrated by leading Nazis such as Goebbels and Göring. Bormann’s motives are also questioned. He is depicted as a power-hungry control freak, not at all motivated by a committed ideological opposition to Christianity. His obsession with the churches, we are told, ‘although very real, was as much about asserting his position in the party as it was about a true ideological commitment to Nazism’ (p. 251).

Towards the end, and reaching the climax of his study, Steigmann-Gall reverts to Hitler with a view to interpreting and qualifying his most outrageous utterances about religion as manifested in his table talks. First of all the latter are questioned as an authentic source. Hitler takes exception only to certain aspects and his remarks are ambivalent and inconsistent when, for instance, he points to the wisdom of the Ten Commandments, or when he praises Luther’s revolt against the Pope. Above all: ‘He never demoted Jesus, regardless of his audience’ (p. 257). In short, Hitler’s furious anti-clericalism should not be confused with his ideas about Christ and his mission on earth. From Hitler’s testament the author draws the most important conclusion for his main thesis. He quotes Hitler: ‘We speak of the Jewish race only as a linguistic convenience, for in the true sense of the word, and from a genetic standpoint, there is no Jewish race ... The Jewish race is above all a community of the spirit’ (p. 258).

What should one think about this book, which is intended as a provocative revision of our understanding of Nazi anti-Semitism? In the first place, and probably for most experts, it is a comprehensive and useful survey of both positive and ambivalent statements and attitudes expressed in the Third Reich vis-à-vis Christianity. In spite of so many, often apologetic, books on the Kirchenkampf, this painful chapter has been studiously overlooked. However, at the same time there is a strong bias to which many historians might take exception. This leads the author to his main conclusions, which have also served him as his underlying assumptions. First, Nazi attitudes to Christianity, and Christ in particular, reveal that there is no fundamental gulf between pre-modern religious and modern racial anti-Semitism. Secondly, as a consequence, Christianity, that is, the sincere belief in a ‘positive Christianity’ as espoused by the Nazi faithful, was no barrier to barbarism and the Holocaust.
Like Goldhagen, Steigmann-Gall tries to re-establish the link between religious and racial anti-Semitism which had been denied by modern historiography. To the charge that he confuses Christianity as such with the pronouncements of Christian belief by the faithful at a given time he is likely to reply with some justification that as a historian he is concerned only with the historical manifestations of Christian thought and its application. Thus he would never refer to pseudo-Christian ideas or argue that Nazism was a secular religion. (This terminology and its literature are not employed at all.) Occasionally, one feels uneasy about the zest with which the author appears, as it were, to ‘save the soul’ of Nazism for Christianity in order to expose the weakness of the latter in upholding its ethical code. In the end, the conclusions of this book are perhaps less startling than the author thinks. Christianity has never been a solid barrier to the abominations of mankind as, inter alia, the crusades, the inquisition, and witch-hunts demonstrate. Besides, neither the Catholic nor the Protestant church is known to have fortified the individual conscience against the illiberal und inhuman forces of the twentieth century. On the contrary, they helped to foster the cult of the almighty, spiritual Führer.

LOTTHAR KETTENACKER is Deputy Director of the German Historical Institute London. His most recent book is Germany since 1945 (1997).
Was there a German *Sonderweg* (special path) to modernity? The persistence with which this question is still debated in Germany is somewhat surprising, given its assumption that there is such a thing as a ‘normal path’. For the advocates of the *Sonderweg* thesis, it is often Britain which—implicitly or explicitly—embodies this ‘normality’. Compared to the United Kingdom’s seemingly evolutionary and stable political and social development, Germany’s history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries appears to have gone fundamentally wrong. In her dissertation (University of Freiburg, 1999), Claudia Kaiser tests the *Sonderweg* thesis against the unemployment policies of the British Trades Union Congress (TUC) and the German Allgemeiner Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (ADGB) after 1929.

How, Kaiser asks, did the two organizations contribute to political stability in their respective countries? She shows how the TUC and the ADGB reacted to mass unemployment, compares their influence and options, and examines whether the TUC contributed to the failure of radical parties and factions in Britain, and whether the ADGB shared in the responsibility for the fall of the Weimar Republic. Kaiser suggests that neither mass unemployment nor the measures taken to combat it contributed to the differences in the political development of Britain and Germany. Rather, she argues, the equal participation of trade unions and employers in British labour market policy and the broad popular legitimacy of this arrangement separates the British example from the German.

The book covers a much longer period than its title suggests. It is, in fact, an extensive comparison of economic conditions, labour relations, unemployment, and trade unionism in Britain and Germany during the inter-war years. It is based on an impressive number of secondary sources, and on a somewhat more limited number of archive collections. In addition, Kaiser used many published sources and newspapers, and the book also includes a number of useful tables compiled by the author.

Did the German trade unions take a *Sonderweg* compared to their British comrades and were they—at least partly—responsible for
Hitler’s rise to power in 1933? Kaiser answers both questions in the negative. In her first two chapters, which cover roughly a third of the book, Kaiser compares unemployment in Britain and Germany, the social conditions and electoral behaviour of the unemployed, economic development, and economic, financial, and social policies in the two states. Based on this detailed account, she then compares the organizational scope for action of the ADGB and the TUC during the Great Depression (chapter 3), German and British labour relations (chapter 4), how the TUC and the ADGB dealt with political extremism from the left and the right (chapter 5), and their programmatic reactions to the worldwide economic crisis (chapter 6). The book ends with an overview of political culture in Germany and Britain in the inter-war years, which neatly summarizes Kaiser’s most important points and offers a final interpretation. Unfortunately, there is no index.

Kaiser systematically highlights the numerous similarities and differences between the TUC and ADGB as well as the respective environments in which the two organizations operated. According to Kaiser, both TUC and ADGB underwent a process of increasing centralization, but the TUC was more democratic, the influence of member unions was greater, and the danger of oligarchic tendencies smaller than in the ADGB. For both organizations the First World War was a watershed in terms of recognition by, and integration into, the state. After the war, the ADGB remained fixated on the state and its own established role in it, while the TUC was confident of its own strength face-to-face with the employers. According to Kaiser, British trade union leaders also had stronger personalities than their German counterparts, although great similarities existed in regard of continuity and time in office. However, in contrast to the situation in Britain, in Germany a group of younger German officials became detached from the rank-and-file trade unionists as well as from the Social Democratic Party (SPD) because of their social background and level of education.

Kaiser also finds substantial differences in the relationship between the trade union organizations and the labour movements’ political parties in both countries. For historical reasons, the TUC had much more influence and control over the Labour Party and its Members of Parliament than its German counterpart had over the SPD and its Reichstag deputies. The Labour Party was much more
deeply rooted in the trade union movement, which added to the stability of Britain’s political system.

While the TUC’s growing authority as the central voice of the British trade union movement was derived from its member unions, the ADGB achieved a comparable position in Germany through its legal position, granted by the state, within the Weimar Republic’s social constitution (Sozialverfassung). Forced arbitration (Zwangsschlichtung) in Germany increased the polarization between trade unions and employers and undermined the stability of the political system. When the British state interfered in labour conflicts, it had the same effect, but this rarely happened. Usually, British unions and employers resolved their disputes directly and without state interference. According to the author, British unions had much more confidence in their own strength than their German counterparts and continued to develop political activities of their own, while the ADGB left this field to the SPD.

Germany’s ‘political backwardness’ (p. 290) prevented the trade unions from achieving an equilibrium with the other forces in society and led to the formation of corporatist state structures (staatskorporatistische Strukturen) during the Weimar Republic. By contrast, the different traditions in Britain favoured the formation of social-corporatist structures (gesellschaftlich-korporatistische Strukturen) for the regulation of conflicts between the trade unions, employers, and the state. The same traditions also gave legitimacy to the pursuit of conflicting special interests in Britain, while the German trade unions lost much credibility because of their involvement in the corporatist state system (staatskorporatistisches System) of the Weimar Republic.

In its struggle against political extremism, the TUC received the support of the British government, and it was more successful at integrating radical minority positions into its organization than the ADGB. The British organization was also more involved in the political decision-making process and enjoyed much closer relations with the country’s civil service. By contrast, the ADGB was increasingly excluded from decision-making during the final phase of the Weimar Republic.

Gewerkschaften, Arbeitslosigkeit und politische Stabilität is a well-organized book which comprehensively covers its topic. It does not always make gripping reading, largely because of its subject, which involves numerous statistics. While the author has mastered an
admirable amount of material, her own contributions to the historical debates and controversies she addresses often remain unclear. Even in her conclusion, Kaiser relies heavily on the works of Samuel Beer, Ernst Fraenkel, and John Breuilly to explain the genesis of different political cultures in Germany and Britain. Her strong reliance on this point in explaining why Britain remained a democracy while Germany became a dictatorship in the 1930s is also somewhat disappointing. It places the explanation for the ADGB’s inability to defend German democracy back into the long nineteenth century, when the political cultures of the two countries under investigation evolved. While Kaiser rejects the idea that the German labour movement followed a *Sonderweg*, she nevertheless re-introduces the concept by emphasizing the unique political culture of the Weimar Republic. According to Kaiser, the ADGB and the SPD could have successfully defended German democracy only with the support of the Republic’s institutions and political élites. It was not the British labour movement, but the country’s ‘pluralistic political culture’ which provided ‘indispensable protection’ against political radicalism (p. 305).

As is usually the case with a book of this length and scope, one could take issue with a number of points. The National Unemployed Workers’ Movement (NUWM), for example, was more successful in achieving concrete and immediate improvements for the unemployed, and the Hunger Marchers received more grass-root support than Kaiser admits. Neither was the NUWM completely isolated from mainstream politics. Its delegates met with government officials, Members of Parliament, and on a few occasions also with the Prime Minister. As the *Sonderweg* thesis implies a positive view of British society, Kaiser does not mention that British democracy was sometimes defended by questionable means. Police frequently attacked unemployed demonstrators with excessive force and brutality, and the authorities were ready to violate civil rights to discredit Communists and their sympathizers. Tom Mann, for example, was jailed in 1932, at the age of 76, under a 600-year-old act of Edward III’s, without having committed any crime. The Council of Liberty was established in 1934 as a direct result of the rough treatment unemployed protesters received and because of ‘the general and alarming tendency to encroachment on the liberty of the citizen’.

Nevertheless, Kaiser’s work offers a number of interesting insights and illustrates the value of comparative studies. As trade
unions in Germany are once again under attack for promoting the ‘special interests’ of their members at a period of economic recession, her book also has an uncomfortable contemporary relevance. For that reason alone, it deserves a wide readership.

MATTHIAS REISS joined the GHIL as a Research Fellow in 2002. He is the author of Die Schwarzen waren unsere Freunde: Deutsche Kriegsgefangene in der amerikanischen Gesellschaft 1942–1946 (2002), and is currently working on a study of the image of the unemployed in England and Germany from the 1880s to the 1980s.
Unity and Diversity in European Culture c. 1800. Joint Conference of the British Academy and the German Historical Institute London, held at the British Academy, 26–27 September 2003.

More than fifty participants from Germany, Britain, and Ireland attended this conference to discuss whether there was a bridging period which connected the trans-European culture of Enlightenment of the eighteenth century with the Europe of national cultures of the nineteenth century. The conference featured three panels: Music and the Visual Arts; Political Culture; and The Written Word.

After a brief welcome by the two organizers, Professors Hagen Schulze (GHIL) and Tim Blanning (Cambridge), Professor James Sheehan (Stanford University) opened proceedings with his paper on ‘Art and its Publics c. 1800’. According to Sheehan, the modern art world was firmly in place by 1800. There was an accepted notion of what art itself encompassed, namely, music, paintings etc., while other areas, for example, glass-blowing, had been excluded. The emphasis was now on how art was experienced, which turned the focus on the consumer. The second consensus was that art was produced by individual artists, who were distinguished from artisans by their sensibility and autonomy in the social world. The third point was that art was to be public, open, and accessible to all, which again made sensibility the key element. These elements of the modern art world required a dense network of institutions, which was also firmly in place by the turn of the century. By that time, every major city had a museum of visual arts, or desired one. As this was also in the middle of the revolutionary period, Sheehan identified art and revolution as the central themes of his talk. The revolution did not create the art world, but changed it, and accelerated this change in three important respects. The social setting of art changed as patronage became less important, and the market more important. These were not alternatives, but formed opposite poles of a continuum within which artists could be found. The geographical centre of the art world shifted from Italy to Paris, which was not only the political centre of France, but also the home of the most important art institu-
The relationship between national themes and the visual arts changed, as the cosmopolitan aspect of art declined around 1800 and aspirations to create national art arose. Artists were attracted by nationalism as it gave their work a purpose beyond aesthetics. However, according to Sheehan, the story of nationalism is the story of disillusion, and the story of nationalism in visual arts is no exception.

In her paper, ‘Towards the Idea of a National Opera around 1800’, Professor Silke Leopold (Heidelberg) explained that the focus of the opera switched from genre in the eighteenth century to nationality in the nineteenth. However, the idea of national opera only became important in Germany. In its birthplace, Italy, the opera was a highly successful export article, and so it made no sense to define it in national terms. The situation was similar in France, where the opera became international around 1800. In Germany, however, a dense infrastructure existed and the opera became a platform for nationalism. Christoph Willibald Gluck’s *Iphigenie auf Tauris* and Carl Maria von Weber’s *Freischütz* were supposedly the first German National Operas (Nationalopern). Nevertheless, Leopold stressed that there is no appropriate answer to the question of what is German about these operas, or what constitutes a National Opera. In her view, neither the language, nor the composer’s origin, nor the topic of the opera are suitable criteria. The German National Opera, Leopold concludes, was an invention. She demonstrated her point by using Ignaz Holzbauer’s opera *Günter von Schwarzberg* as an example. At first glance, this opera, which is sung in German, had a nationalistic ending. However, the final chorus could also be seen as religious, and Leopold played the piece to show that while the text is patriotic, it is not performed in a nationalistic way. Only one aria contains a hint of patriotism, but Leopold also played this to show that it does not sound very patriotic either. What made Holzbauer’s opera different was the voices. In contrast to the Italian operas, the heroic roles in *Günter von Schwarzberg* were performed by men with deep voices. However, the reason was not nationalism, but the fact that the court at Mannheim, where it was first performed, had a famous tenor and a famous bass, who both demanded important roles for themselves. Leopold concluded that it was ultimately the reception by the audience, not the composition itself, which conferred on Gluck’s *Iphigenie* the distinction of being the first German National Opera. While...
Gluck’s opera was performed in Vienna, Holzbauer’s *Günther von Schwarzberg* was performed in Mannheim.

John Deathridge (King’s College, London) spoke on ‘The Invention of German Music c. 1800’. More specifically, he asked how the exclusive concept of German music developed out of the inclusive culture of the eighteenth century? Deathridge approached what he called ‘1800 and all that’ or the ‘Moment of German Music’ by first taking his audience to the Soviet Union in 1948. In that year, a hitherto unknown symphony by a Russian composer was discovered in an archive in Odessa which suddenly seemed to establish a Russian symphonic tradition in addition to the well-known German tradition. Until then, the symphony had been a German affair, and the Soviet Union seized on this discovery, which was eventually recognized as a forgery perpetrated by the very archivist who had claimed the discovery of the document. The predominance of the German prevailed, and a BBC survey shows that even in the United Kingdom, the most popular and best known composers of the past are almost all Germans. Deathridge then turned back to the discussions about German versus Italian music which took place around 1800. The two sides attacked each other in tracts—often satirical and polemical—and journal articles. Nevertheless, according to Deathridge there were no systematic arguments in the discussion about German music, and there was no confidence that German music would last. At the end of the eighteenth century, German composers were known for their inclusiveness and acted as head gardeners of different styles. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, the idea of German Music was constructed, and foreign music was increasingly branded as decadent. In the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung and elsewhere, it was argued that German music had to distance itself from the perceived shortcomings of foreign music. The inventors of German Music looked for a composer to symbolize the new beginning, and eventually found him in J. S. Bach, who by then had been dead for fifty years. Bach was presented as the summit of German Music, which proved to be the first step towards the fake Teutonic universalism promoted later in the century. The whole outline of German Music was in place by 1800, but there was a gulf between image and reality. According to Deathridge, Bach himself would have disagreed with the way in which he was presented as the pinnacle of German Music, whose predominance Arnold Schönberg
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John Deathridge (King’s College, London) spoke on ‘The Invention of German Music c. 1800’. More specifically, he asked how the exclusive concept of German music developed out of the inclusive culture of the eighteenth century? Deathridge approached what he called ‘1800 and all that’ or the ‘Moment of German Music’ by first taking his audience to the Soviet Union in 1948. In that year, a hitherto unknown symphony by a Russian composer was discovered in an archive in Odessa which suddenly seemed to establish a Russian symphonic tradition in addition to the well-known German tradition. Until then, the symphony had been a German affair, and the Soviet Union seized on this discovery, which was eventually recognized as a forgery perpetrated by the very archivist who had claimed the discovery of the document. The predominance of the German prevailed, and a BBC survey shows that even in the United Kingdom, the most popular and best known composers of the past are almost all Germans. Deathridge then turned back to the discussions about German versus Italian music which took place around 1800. The two sides attacked each other in tracts—often satirical and polemical—and journal articles. Nevertheless, according to Deathridge there were no systematic arguments in the discussion about German music, and there was no confidence that German music would last. At the end of the eighteenth century, German composers were known for their inclusiveness and acted as head gardeners of different styles. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, the idea of German Music was constructed, and foreign music was increasingly branded as decadent. In the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung and elsewhere, it was argued that German music had to distance itself from the perceived shortcomings of foreign music. The inventors of German Music looked for a composer to symbolize the new beginning, and eventually found him in J. S. Bach, who by then had been dead for fifty years. Bach was presented as the summit of German Music, which proved to be the first step towards the fake Teutonic universalism promoted later in the century. The whole outline of German Music was in place by 1800, but there was a gulf between image and reality. According to Deathridge, Bach himself would have disagreed with the way in which he was presented as the pinnacle of German Music, whose predominance Arnold Schönberg
thought he had secured for the next 100 years with his twelve-tone music.

The following discussion of the three papers raised the issue of whether the whole process was not much more contested than the speakers suggested? Rome, for example, was still important in the nineteenth-century art world, although in different ways. Italy itself presented a paradox, as it combined national and cosmopolitan elements. Patronage also remained significant, as the state became an important patron of the arts. In addition, it was pointed out that other forms of patronage existed. Collective private patrons, for example, were common around 1800 and acted as an intermediary between individual patrons and the public at least one generation before the latter finally participated fully through the market. Further topics of discussion were the connection between Germany, symphonic music, and German Idealism. It was replied that this connection was made with hindsight and that philosophy was imposed upon the composers. Symphonic music became identified with Germany because the few orchestras that could play this music were mainly in Germany. The discussion then focused on what Deathridge called the ‘ideology of origin’, which in his view resulted in a constant contradiction between construct and practice. Nevertheless, it was asked whether one really has to be so sceptical about the concept of national art, as there was, for example, a British school of painting around 1800. It was agreed that there was, indeed, a danger of being too sceptical, but that the practice of painting had to be separated from the debate on national art.

The second session, on ‘Political Culture’, was chaired by Hagen Schulze and opened by Professor Peter Alter (Duisburg), whose topic was ‘The Impact of Napoleon’. Napoleon helped to build a new political culture which focused on the nation, and Alter concentrated on Napoleon’s role as nation-builder or awakener of peoples and nations. The concept of the nation demonstrated a formidable power to integrate and mobilize, and its impact was felt for the next 200 years. It was formed during the French Revolution and the nation was defined as democratic, sovereign, and composed of free and equal citizens. This new concept destroyed the old system in a fundamental transfer of power and from then on became the sole repository of power. By 1807, most European regimes had been shaken, but at a crucial moment, the concept turned against its creators.
Napoleon himself did not use the nation, but chose to contain the idea when it was in his power. Nevertheless, the concept was there for others to use. Napoleon became the trigger and catalyst for the spread of the idea of the nation, a nation-builder, and godfather of national movements. The result was a novel culture of nationalism which marked a new era. Alter emphasized that there were three different responses to Napoleon’s role. One was increasing resistance in territories under his direct rule or in satellite states. In Spain, central Europe, and Italy, Napoleon served to mobilize the nation against him, even though he was also a modernizer. The second type of response was from national movements which carried on with Napoleon’s support, real or imagined. Alter cited the case of Poland and the South Slavs, whose aspirations were focused on the French emperor. However, there is no proof that Napoleon deliberately played the national card in these two cases. Alter also cited the case of Ireland, where the French Revolution had an immediate and electrifying effect. The third response to Napoleon’s presence was from nations which erected barriers against him and thereby pushed forward their own nation-building. The progressive shift from English, Welsh, and Scots towards the artificial category ‘British’ came in reaction to Napoleon, and Trafalgar and Waterloo were decisive events in building a British nation. Other examples were Russia and Austria, where Archduke Charles appealed to the country’s German population in 1809. Alter concluded that although there is evidence that Napoleon flirted with the concept of nationalism, he never took it seriously for building a new order. Napoleon underestimated, or perhaps feared, the forces of the nation and did not unleash them himself. Only with hindsight, in exile on St Helena, did he write that he wanted to liberate the European nations, but that this message had mistakenly never reached them.

PD Dr Siegfried Weichlein (Humboldt, Berlin) put the nation-state and the cultural nation at the centre of his paper on ‘Cosmopolitanism, Patriotism, Nationalism’. Weichlein asserted that German history started around 1800, when the fundamental problems evolved which the following two centuries had to come to terms with. For most educated authors of the Enlightenment, cosmopolitanism and patriotism were not opposites, but complementary concepts, and their reconciliation became a problem only after the French Revolution. In the old German Empire, patriotism became a part of the
enlightened discourse. Civic patriotism focused on enlightened legislation, a relatively modern moral code, with an enlightened monarch at the top as principal agent for constructing the nation. Choice, not birthplace, determined one’s fatherland. Prussia, especially, was regarded by some as having realized the principle of natural rights and good government. Others took the historical corporate approach to patriotism. They aimed to revive the corporate imperial institutions and criticized Prussia for disturbing the Empire’s equilibrium. This rift between the modern reformist and the historical corporate concept of the nation ran through both the political culture and the German bourgeoisie. However, the two positions had much in common. For example, they buttressed the German bourgeoisie’s subservience to state authority. Intellectual patriotism legitimized bureaucratic demands on citizens and favoured a passive rather than an active attitude towards the state. However, cosmopolitan patriotism also meant that sovereignty was transferred from the monarch to the state. Not the monarch ruled over people, but rather the ‘spirit’ as the totality of all relations within society, and the monarch had to obey the rules of this social totality. Society moved further towards autonomy, as the general public became the field of political and philosophical discourse and a force in its own right. Social communication intensified in Germany before the French Revolution, and German patriotism engaged in a highly moralized discourse that brought cosmopolitanism and patriotism together. The Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, French occupation, and the resistance to it resulted in a change from patriotism to nationalism and to the transformation of the Empire’s horizontal egalitarian universalism into a hierarchical, competitive universalism after 1800. According to Weichlein, Germany’s political culture reacted in three different ways to defeat and occupation: resignation, radicalization, or spiritualization, the last two being the most common. Weichlein concluded that the widely used dichotomy of *Staatsnation* versus *Kulturnation* is a construction made with hindsight, and that cosmopolitanism and patriotism went together until the first decade of the nineteenth century. The French Revolution brought new semantic dichotomies, reversed older ones, reconfigured them, and added new experiences.

The final paper in this session was given by Dr Peter Mandler (Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge), who spoke on ‘Art in a Cool Climate: The Cultural Policy of the British State in European
Perspective, 1780–1850. According to Mandler, there was a growing concern for the fine arts across Europe in the nineteenth century, which became a small part of the state’s functions. The context of British cultural policy, however, was different from that of Europe, as eighteenth-century Britain lacked a court like Versailles or Potsdam. Buckingham Palace was transformed from a town house into a true palace only in 1820 under George IV. Even George III, who was the British monarch most aware of his public responsibilities, was an indifferent patron of the arts. In Britain, the role of the monarch and of Parliament was governed by different norms from those current in the European states, and Britain only reluctantly followed the continental example. By the 1780s, there were four opera houses in London, but none of them was identified with the crown. George III was personally responsible for the Royal Academy of Arts, but as the financing of the Academy could bring him into conflict with Parliament, it had to commercialize its exhibitions to raise funds. The British Museum was initiated by Parliament, but endowed only with a relatively small deed. The question was whether Britain should have a Royal, Parliamentary, or no arts policy at all. Increasing aversion to the growing military–fiscal state run by Parliament led to its dismantling after it had achieved its goal in 1815, and Britain was one of the few states to reduce its expenditure after the Napoleonic wars. Revolutionary France developed quite differently. The Louvre became the largest museum in the world, and the government also established a unique network of local museums all over the country. In Prussia, a Ministry of Culture (Kulturministerium) was founded, and new public buildings like the Neue Wache in Berlin were erected. The fine arts had the potential to bind the masses together and sum up national feelings in a relatively cheap and discrete way, and they were used by bureaucracies for national integration across Europe. In Britain, however, the character of the people was regarded as so sound that it did not require education, and the focus was material. Mandler stressed that the monuments we see today in London were erected in the early twentieth century. The initial layout of Trafalgar Square, for example, was much more modest than the current one, and the monument for the Napoleonic wars in Edinburgh was never even finished. Nevertheless, private art collections grew after 1800, so that in 1813, the Royal Academy argued that the state should become involved on the grounds of market failure.
As Austria repaid its war loan, the state did, in fact, give money for a national gallery and a new building for the British Museum, but these were one-off expenditures. In general, Parliament did not have the will to buy art; nor did it regard it as its task. The rationale for state patronage became more tangible in Britain after 1830, when there was a growing sense that art could be uplifting and build a citizenry. In 1841, the Select Committee of Fine Arts was founded, and the Royal Commission for the new Parliament building marked a new degree of state patronage which again declined after 1848. Nevertheless, cultural activities flourished through private efforts in London in a public sphere which was Protestant and commercial in character. Mandler concluded that there was no consensus in Europe on the usefulness of the arts or state responsibility for them.

When the discourse on the nation becomes so universal, should historians really focus on these images at the expense of meaning and interest? This was one of the points raised in the following discussion. It was agreed that the discourses on ‘civilization’ or ‘Christianity’, for example, should not be lost for the sake of ‘nationalism’. It was also pointed out that the regional or local authorities were the point of reference for nationalism until 1803, and that it could be argued that Napoleon impeded rather than fostered German nationalism. Bavarian particularism, for example, developed into Bavarian nationalism, and the German nation-state was never a forgone conclusion. Other points of discussion were alternative models to the nation, for example, denominations, and the role of Switzerland in relation to German nationalism. It was also argued that civil war in Spain and the low level of popular resistance in Russia cast doubt on the idea that this period marked the rise of modern nationalism, and that the Napoleonic age was an ambiguous period. Nationalism came in a package with liberalism, and Napoleon himself, despite representing the victory of state power unchecked, also reformed the civil code.

The conference continued the following day with the third and final session on ‘The Written Word’, chaired by Professor Roy Foster, FBA (Hertford College, Oxford). Professor Otto Dann (Cologne) opened the session with his paper on ‘The Invention of National Languages’, in which he used Wilhelm von Humboldt’s discovery of the Basque language as a starting point. At that time vernacular languages still existed, but when the educated middle class took up the concept of the nation, a new behaviour towards language became...
The concept of a mother-tongue was constructed. The nation should encompass all social classes and was also understood as a language community. The discussion on languages intensified in the eighteenth century, according to Dann. Johann Gottfried Herder was the first to utter the idea of a national language, lexicographers produced inventories of languages, and Sir William Jones’s discovery that the European languages were related to Sanskrit had an important impact on linguistics, to which Humboldt turned around 1800. At that time interest in communication was high among the leading classes, and the market for books and newspapers expanded enormously. There was a close connection between nationality and the constitution of national languages around 1800. Dann then gave a historiographical survey of the research on national languages and contrasted developments in different European countries. France pioneered nation-formation in Europe and turned its language into a political project during the Revolution. In Greece a great debate over the issue of a national language took place at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and continued after the founding of the Greek nation-state. Like Norway, independent Greece had two linguistic options, classical Greek or the vernacular. In Wales, nationalism constituted itself as a language movement in the eighteenth century, which opened with missionaries and was brought to a close by modernization. In Bohemia, the oral Czech language experienced a revival during the Enlightenment as the result of a deliberate effort on the part of the educated élite, and both Vienna and Prague universities had a Chair of Czech in the eighteenth century. In Germany, Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock marked the beginning of German literature and language in the eighteenth century. Language was felt to be the most important tie between Germans, although almost nobody spoke German as a national language. However, a widespread literary movement pushed back other dialects. Dann concluded that all national languages arose out of vernacular languages and that their fixation in writing was always an important milestone, although not yet a political act. He emphasized that there had been no national languages before the middle of the eighteenth century, when this issue first appears in texts. The project of a national language was bound to the widespread linguistic interest of the ruling classes. The transition to an active language policy on the part of the nation-states occurred around 1800, when contemporary patriotism created the need for a
special written language for all members of the nation. However, Dann stressed that the term ‘national language’ has several meanings. Today it refers to the written language, in contrast to the language of the people or the state. Dann pointed to the European Union to show that the issue of national language cannot be regarded as solved.

Professor Marilyn Butler, FBA (Exeter College, Oxford) followed, speaking on ‘Universal History and National Histories’. In her paper she focused on the novelist Maria Edgeworth, the subjects she chose for her works and the reasons for her choices, and why she wrote as she did. In 1782 Maria Edgeworth returned with her father, Richard Edgeworth, to Ireland, where he gave her Adam Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations* and Madame de Genlis’s *Adelaide et Théodore* to read. She also translated the latter for publication, but a rival translation appeared first. Maria Edgeworth was deterred from publishing her early, mostly educational, work of the 1780s and 1790s by the hostility of her father’s acquaintance, Thomas Day, towards female writers. Day’s death in an accident in 1789 changed this and effectively released the Edgeworths. By that time Maria Edgeworth had produced a large body of work which, according to Butler, provides a fascinating contemporary archive recapturing Europe and its remote others in the 1790s. Edgeworth’s comedy *Whim for Whim*, for example, contained references to events in other parts of Europe, including St Petersburg, although it was written in the Irish Midlands at the end of 1798. Butler then spoke about the books which Edgeworth’s audience were familiar with and which are essential for an understanding of her work. *Whim for Whim* is an extreme inter-textual collage of quotations which were familiar to contemporaries, and which carried an ideological sting readers were expected to recognize. Butler also provided information on the background of other plays by Edgeworth, for example, *Castle Rackrent*, which she wrote in 1800.

Dr Vincent Morley (Micheál Ó Cléirigh Institute for the Study of Irish History and Civilization, University College Dublin) concluded the session with his paper on ‘Representations of the Past in Irish Vernacular Literature, 1750–1850’. Morley stressed that while the previous papers had focused on established culture, his paper, by contrast, dealt with people closer to the bottom. He concentrated on the vernacular literature, which was recited in Irish and circulated in manuscript form in what he described as an alternative public sphere. Rev. Geoffrey Keating’s (*c*. 1570–1646) *History of Ireland from Unity and Diversity*
the Earliest Period to the English Invasion inspired other authors to produce vulgarizations of his sympathetic account of Irish history. Seán Ó Conaill’s poem Ireland’s Dirge, written in 1655, brought Keating’s story up to the present. It attributed English victories to Irish disunity, a constant trope in Irish literature, and again inspired the composition of other works. Ó Conaill’s poem was the most popular work in seventeenth-century Ireland. Morley showed several maps to illustrate the distribution of Ireland’s Dirge on the island. As its literary respectability increased with age, the number of copies increased over time until 1800, and then dramatically between 1801 and 1825. The first printed edition appeared in Cork around 1820, and the number of manuscript copies therefore declined again between 1826 and 1850, as more printed editions became available. Morley stressed that Ó Conaill’s poem inspired copies as well as imitations which dealt with more recent events. Works like Aodh Bui Mac Cruitín’s O Ireland, I know your Story (1714), Art Mac Cumhaigh’s Having Travelled through the Provinces of Ireland (1769), Antaine Raiftearaí’s The History of the Bush (1822), and Nicholas Kearney’s Splendid, Flawless Ireland once Flowing with Milk (1850) resembled each other. By 1850 English had replaced Irish as the vernacular language. Morley concluded that Irish popular culture developed in a slow and evolutionary way, by blending traditional elements, not in sudden and revolutionary changes.

The following discussion dealt with national languages in states and empires and the link between language, poetry, religion, and denominations. It was, for example, suggested that England was unique in that the language of the state, the written language, and the language of the people were the same. The inverse vitality of the Irish compared to the English language was explained as the result of the famine, which hit monolingual Irish-speaking areas particularly hard. Professor Blanning afterwards thanked the participants and the staff of the British Academy, especially Angela Pusey, who prepared and ran this conference with great skill and efficiency. A publication of the proceedings is planned.

Matthias Reiss (GHIL)
The period between 1830 and 1930 saw the breakthrough of the printed mass media in Europe, resulting in a fundamental change in the nature of the political public sphere. After 1930 radio, film, and television became increasingly important channels of communication, but in the period before 1930 newspapers and periodicals constituted the prime source from which contemporaries gleaned information about political life. The parallel rise of mass democracy and mass print media raises fundamental questions about the relationship between the two phenomena. As there is still a lack of understanding of the changes brought about by the development of the mass media and the mediation of mass politics through the media, the one-day workshop in the GHIL on 24 October 2003, organized by Bernhard Fulda (Cambridge), Dominik Geppert (London), and Torsten Riotte (London and Cambridge) aimed to explore in greater detail the relationship between politics, media, and public during this crucial period.

The first session focused on the two decades after the July revolution of 1830 in France. The beginning of that period witnessed the Great Reform Act in Britain in 1832 and the German liberal demonstration at the Hambach Festival in the same year. In the eyes of contemporaries, freedom of the press and the extension of franchise went hand in hand, and many reactionary politicians sought to prevent the latter by suppressing the former. After the European revolutions of 1848, however, even continental political decision-makers resigned themselves to the existence of ‘public opinion’ which could not be suppressed or directed, but with which they had to engage. In this context, Abigail Green (Oxford) argued that the growth of a free press in nineteenth-century Germany went hand in hand with the growth of an official, government-sponsored press. The collapse of pre-publication censorship in 1848 prompted the development of increasingly sophisticated (and relatively successful) press-control strategies by German governments in the shape of official newspapers, semi-official newspapers, and indirect government press influence. Torsten Riotte, who introduced his new research project on the German press coverage of the revolutionary events in 1830 and 1848, focused on the media rather than the government side of the equation. He suggested that it might be useful to analyse the circulation,
content, style, and language of German newspapers which covered the events in France in order to explore the revolutionary dynamic which swept the German states in response to developments in France.

The second session dealt with the transformation of the public sphere in Britain and Germany via the vast and rapid expansion of the press between c. 1870 and 1914. The reform of the franchise in Britain (1867) and in Germany (1871) coincided with the emergence of a popular mass press. Within a few decades, newspapers were omnipresent and had created a political mass public that was distinctly different from that of the 1850s, as evident, for example, in the contrast between British reactions to the Crimean War and the Boer War. In his paper James Thompson (Bristol) analysed the relationship between ideas about ‘public opinion’ and views of the press in Britain in that period. He not only looked at the changing shape and contested character of the term ‘public opinion’, but also investigated understandings of the press, in particular, the extent to which the press was viewed as the maker or the mirror of ‘public opinion’. Moreover, he discussed the changing accounts of the respective value of the metropolitan and provincial press as well as the structural changes in the ownership of newspapers and the market for the developing mass press towards the end of the century. Frank Bösch (Bochum) focused on the increasing number of scandals which were a striking feature of German politics in the period between 1890 and 1914. He claimed that this phenomenon could not sufficiently be explained by the traditional reference to the rise of a commercial press. Instead, he argued, it should be interpreted as a new form of political communication designed to achieve political goals by overstepping the existing limits of what could be said in public and what had to be kept secret.

The three papers in the third session discussed the communications revolution of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and how it affected different spheres of politics and public life. Dominik Geppert showed how the traditional conduct of foreign policy and secret diplomacy was increasingly subject to the perceived demands of ‘public opinion’. Investigating the interdependencies between governments and newspapers in Britain and Germany, Geppert argued that the story of the role of the press in British-German relations was at least partly dominated by a misunderstand-
ing. British officials and journalists chronically overestimated the German government’s influence on the press and, at the same time, underestimated the impact which published opinion had on official German policy. On the other hand, the German side took it for granted that British policy was largely dictated by public opinion as expressed in the press. In his paper, Dan Vyleta (Cambridge) investigated the relationship between readers and the wider public invoked by Vienna’s sensationalist press around 1900. He argued that the illustrated press implicitly framed the reading public as made up of atomized individuals who were disconnected from the public at large. While this role imposed upon the reader seemed to embrace a positive ethos of active vigilance and resistance to manipulation, Vyleta further argued that it in fact relied on the readers’ passivity and disengagement, and that the apparent educational dimension latent in the reports was no more than a rhetorical gesture. In his concluding paper on the Weimar press, Bernhard Fulda (Cambridge) argued that newspapers were considerably less influential in determining electoral outcome than most contemporaries thought. Readers treated newspapers not as political guide-books but as consumer products, which resulted in the decline of the traditional political press. Traditional political newspapers, however, exercised considerable influence on politicians who continued to believe in the persuasive powers of the press and who took newspapers as surrogates for public opinion.

Four closely related themes ran through the discussions on all the papers. First, there was the relationship between decision-makers and the media: how did politicians’ ideas about the press develop? What was their assessment of the importance of the media? How did politicians’ perceptions of the political importance of the media change the way politics was conducted? A second complex of questions focused on the contested relationship between public and private in political life. Tensions between secrecy and publicity were a general phenomenon in this transformative period when the scope and limits of the public sphere were re-defined. A third recurring topic was the connection between the written word and pictorial representations (cartoons, photographs, cinema). The increasingly visual nature both of newspapers and politics in the later nineteenth century seemed to be of particular importance. A final theme of the discussions was the theoretical framework. The contributors agreed that
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Jürgen Habermas’s *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, originally published in German in 1962, was still stimulating (for example, with regard to the personalization of politics), but deficient in important aspects. His description of the transition from an informed bourgeois public sphere which degenerated through expansion into a non-political system of cultural consumption reflected the suspicions which 1950s political sciences had of ‘the masses’, and was often not borne out by historical evidence. Most participants took a more optimistic view of a historical development which, in their interpretation, could not be reduced to the catchphrase ‘commercialization of the press’. Instead, it was suggested, it made more sense to speak of new strategies of communication which were designed to achieve both political and commercial aims.

Dominik Geppert (GHIL)
Publishing, so goes the constant complaint, is in crisis. Representatives of institutionalized history claim the same thing for their discipline. Is history publishing therefore in the vortex of a crisis, or are these complaints exaggerated and merely the continued expression of a pessimism which has been cultivated for decades? Historians and publishers met at the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung’s Studienzentrum Karl-Marx-Haus in Trier in order to discuss the present and future of history publishing. The conference was initiated and financed by the German Historical Institute, and organized by Olaf Blaschke (University of Trier). Hagen Schulze (Director, GHIL) and Blaschke opened the conference by welcoming the participants. Blaschke emphasized that this conference was in the nature of a workshop as there was no institutionalized debate to which it could refer, and to this extent it was breaking new ground. He also regretted that many British participants had been unable to attend.

Alexandra Fritzsch (Institute of Communications and Media Studies, University of Leipzig) opened the session on ‘Historical Dimensions’ (chaired by Hagen Schulze and Olaf Blaschke) with a paper on ‘Der Bücher-Streit: Wissenschaft, Verlage und Buchhandel im Deutschen Kaiserreich’. She explained the origins of the Akademischer Schutzverein, founded in April 1903 to represent the interests of academic writers. On behalf of this organization, Karl Bücher published a fierce polemic against the German book trade in the same year. The indignant reaction of booksellers and publishers to Bücher’s piece precipitated the ‘Bücher-Streit’, named for both its originator and the subject of the controversy. Bücher sharply criticized high book prices, low sales figures, a lack of commitment on the part of publishers and booksellers, low author royalties, the inflated self-image of booksellers, the abuse of power by the Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler (Association of German Booksellers), and the cartelization of the book trade. In Bücher’s view, the reason for the deplorable state of affairs he had diagnosed was excessively high print-runs and the existence of too many booksellers. The academics were able to press home only some of their demands as outlined by
Bücher, but the controversy resulted in the permanent introduction of fixed prices for books, the establishment of a joint arbitration court, and the founding of the first professorship of bookselling in Leipzig. Fritzsch ended by looking at the opportunities or threats presented by the new media and the internet. These, in fact, will make it easier to meet some of Bücher’s demands, such as private publishing and direct sales.

Florian Triebel (BMW Historical Archive), standing in for Winfried Schulze who was unable to attend, followed with a paper on ‘Krisenmanagement in der Bücherkrise: Der Eugen Diederichs Verlag 1930 bis 1933’. In the middle of a serious business crisis, the publisher Diederichs Verlag also had to deal with a generational change. While the book trade in general suffered from the economic downturn between 1925 and 1933, publishers had banked on quantity rather than quality. Responding to the craze for new things, they had swamped the market with too many new books too rapidly, and thus distorted it. Diederichs Verlag began to concentrate on völkisch, nationalist titles from the mid 1920s. When Eugen Diederichs died in September 1930, the general opinion was that the future of the publishing house was grim, and the expectation was that it would be sold. Diederichs’s sons, however, tightened up the lists and made them more up to date. The monthly Die Tat was an unprecedented commercial success, and the politics list was successfully expanded. The fiction prize offered by the publishing firm signalled the contemporary connection that it was able to establish without losing its own profile. In the middle of the crisis of the book trade, Diederichs’s sons thus managed to stabilize the firm, although the economic turnaround was made more difficult by the fact that the retail trade did not pay its bills on time.

Hans Altenhein (Historical Commission of the Association of German Booksellers, Bickenbach) spoke on ‘Der Börsenverein als geschichtswissenschaftliches Verlagsunternehmen zwischen 1953 und 2003’. The Association resumed its historical work after the Second World War by re-establishing the Historical Commission in 1953. It met for the first time on 5 November 1953, and the first thing it did was to call for the Association’s library and the archive to be re-established. Yet it made no attempt to address the recent past, and there was no appeal to Leipzig traditions. The Commission’s first publishing ventures were not successful, and input from outside was re-
quired to change this. As by this time the Börsenblatt (German Book Trade Gazette) consisted largely of advertising, the post office was threatening to make it ineligible for cheap journal postage rates. The Börsenblatt needed to be about 800 printed pages long to prevent this, which was achieved by incorporating the Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens. These supplements, edited by the Historical Commission, were also available to a wider public in bound form. When the historical part of the Börsenblatt ceased publication in January 1973, the Archiv did not establish itself on the free market. Altenheim then reported on a work-in-progress, Geschichte des Deutschen Buchhandels im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, which was started in 1983. However, the Association of German Booksellers relinquished responsibility for its publishing projects in 2003. Its library and archive were passed on to the Deutsche Bibliothek.

Wulf D. von Lucius (Lucius Verlag, Stuttgart) closed the session with a paper on ‘Verlagstypen und Verleger, gestern, heute, morgen’. Lucius emphasized that, as an economist, he did not want to speak of a crisis, but preferred the terms structural and market change. He suggested that what we are seeing is a switch from businesses run by the owner to businesses run by management teams, and that this is a general development not confined to publishing. Since the 1960s the trend has been away from overall to partial responsibility. This is not necessarily negative, but does bring problems with it. The coherence of decision-making is more questionable, deliberation and reflection have disappeared, and events are moving more and more quickly. Yet a relationship of trust between author and publisher, which is so important, is most likely to be established in a small publishing company run by the owner. In many cases, however, the children of the owner do not want to take over the business, he pointed out, which results in a loss of continuity and tradition. Unlike large publishers, middle-sized companies cannot build up a second level and thus offer chances for career progression. Digitalization requires specialists, whose services small publishers can often only buy in. And the increasing dominance of the English language poses another problem for small publishers, as do hybrid products (print and online). However, Lucius saw desktop publishing as a positive development which has saved specialized publications in the face of falling print-runs. Further, he criticized the legal framework which is looking increasingly shaky. Lucius argued, however, that the services tradi-
 tionally offered by publishers would continue to be indispensable in future. Middle-sized publishers were equipped for the competition that would ultimately decide what services were required.

On the second day of the conference Olaf Blaschke opened the session on ‘International Perspectives’ (chaired by Richard Bessel, University of York) with a paper on ‘Geschichtspublikationen in Deutschland und England seit 1945: Probleme des Vergleichs, Tendenzen und offene Fragen’. Blaschke took as his theme the notion of crisis, which implies a contrast with allegedly better times. Statistics show, he claimed, that despite all complaints, the market for historical books in Germany and in Britain is still growing. In Britain, for various reasons, there has been a veritable boom since the 1980s. The publishing market in Britain is less fragmented than in Germany, and history books fulfil some of the functions of Belletristik (literature). He pointed out that good, readable history books were produced in Britain, while German publishers were less market-orientated and relied on subsidies. In Germany, therefore, more specialist academic work could be published. Blaschke explained that in Germany media events and other factors had repeatedly revived the interest in history books. He stressed the many changes that had taken place in Germany since the 1960s. In addition to a stronger profit motive and events with shorter half-lives, for example, he also suggested that the publishing world was being split along class lines. Not only what one published, but also where had become important. In parallel, there was an increasing separation between authors writing for the mass market and authors producing for a specialized readership.

Nicole Reinhardt (Maison des sciences de l’homme, Paris) then spoke on ‘Probleme der Übersetzungen in den Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften’. The Maison des sciences de l’homme (MSH) was established in 1963 as a charitable foundation. In the early 1970s, it set up its own academic publishing house, with the help of state subsidies, to promote translations into and out of French. As distribution is the Achilles’ heel of the French system, MSH set up its own distribution company in 1981. In addition, MSH began co-operation with Cambridge University Press and Campus Verlag. Reinhardt explained that one of MSH’s main tasks is to profile authors who would otherwise be unknown in France by translating their works. The tremendous nationalism of the French book market and the French univer-
History and Publishing in Crisis?

Lutz Raphael (University of Trier) spoke on ‘Die nouvelle histoire und der Buchmarkt in Frankreich’. He emphasized that the publishing side is indispensable for an understanding of the history of nouvelle histoire, which had laboriously established itself alongside the established system. Initially, the Annales project had been a failure. After the Second World War, however, a more modest beginning was made under Braudel. The Centre Recherches Historiques became a small, effective publishing house and, from 1965, the established publishers also discovered the Annales. In the course of a shift towards the social sciences in France, its representatives were able to make inroads into the market. Paperback editions of Annales works did extremely well, and books of nouvelle histoire were reviewed on popular radio and then television programmes. This success was echoed in the press. Raphael emphasized, however, that the Annales works are only relative bestsellers, and that media success has not been limited to nouvelle histoire. Over the last twenty years the French book market has changed radically, Raphael suggested, and the market for nouvelle histoire has collapsed again. Mainly because of problems in distribution, it has not been possible permanently to raise the profile of academic publications in France.

The session on ‘Market Perspectives: From the Golden Age to a Gloomy Future?’ (chaired by Lothar Kettenacker, GHIL, and Christiane Ruhrberg, Reclam, Ditzingen) was opened by Andreas Fahrmeir (University of Frankfurt), who spoke on ‘Umschlaggestaltung und Vermarktung: Der Unterschied zwischen “speziellen Monographien” und Bestsellern’. Fahrmeir pointed out that an academic discipline is only relevant if it has a public impact. Therefore if people choose to buy popular works, academic historians suffer. As a rule, academic literature in contrast to commercial literature is accused of four things: excessive length, a scholarly apparatus, specialist themes, and an unreadable academic style. The first two points, however, are not a barrier to sales, as the statistics show. In relation to themes, too, the difference between the two genres is not conclusive. The only major difference is in presentation and price. Thus to distinguish between academic and commercial literature is
not terribly useful. From the start, the publisher’s commitment dictates how well a book sells, Fahrmeir claimed. In addition, popular books are deliberately written with a particular group of buyers in mind, whereas the situation is quite different with academic works, where the publisher acts as a gate-keeper. Fahrmeir finished by asking whether publishers’ royalties or university publishers could contribute to the financing of universities, and whether the increasing commercialization of university structures at all levels is legitimate. The market and academia can tolerate each other, he suggested. The partnership between publisher and author/historian, and how it can be made profitable for both sides, needs to be discussed.

Christoph Cornelißen (University of Kiel) spoke next on ‘Ein “Erfolgsautor” und seine Verleger: Das Beispiel Gerhard Ritter’. By the time of his death, Gerhard Ritter had sold 200,000 books. His biography of Luther, which sold 30,000 copies, was his best selling work. It is typical of the academic market, Cornelißen said, that Ritter’s career had begun with recommendations. After the success of his biography of Luther, which grew out of an essay, publishers were more interested in competing for him and offered improved material incentives. Ritter reached the third stage of his career after the Second World War. Wearing the halo of the resistance fighter, he became an even more successful author. Cornelißen reported on the dialogues between Ritter and his publishers which took the form of dense correspondences. Publishers knew that it was worth being patient with Ritter, as his books sold well. Ritter, in turn, was not oblivious to the material benefits his work could bring, and after the war drew a considerable and constant supplementary income from his books. There was a market for an author who primarily addressed a national conservative readership. Ritter tried to boost the sales of his works, but also confidently defended academic standards. Three quarters of his books were sold between 1945 and 1960, but the market for his works cooled towards the end of his creative period.

Walter H. Pehle (Fischer TBV, Frankfurt) spoke on ‘Erfahrungen mit der “schwarzen” Reihe zum Nationalsozialismus und der “Europäischen Geschichte”’. The first volumes in the series Europäische Geschichte were published in 1996. The books were intended to cast an unorthodox light on their subjects and to reach as wide an audience as possible. To date 33 volumes have been published; about 60 in all
are planned. At least half of the authors are not from Germany, which involves additional costs for the publisher. Sales figures are lower than expected, despite the low retail price of 12.90 Euros. Pehle considers that one reason for this is that damaging discussions about the series had taken place within the publishing house, undermining the confidence of those working on the project. The first title in the series *Schwarze Reihe* was published in 1977, one year after Pehle started working for Fischer Verlag. Almost 200 further volumes have followed. The series is now in the black financially, which means that earlier losses will soon be recouped. Sensational topics have deliberately been avoided in order to raise the reputation of the series. Pehle finished by observing that historians do not write well enough, and do not address a specific market. The result is small print-runs. In addition, he said, books by German historians are too long. He suggested that we need to think about a reduced format for work that has to be published as part of a degree qualification. If changes are made, historians could again reach more people by way of their books.

Dietrich Kerlen’s (Institute of Communications and Media Studies, University of Leipzig) topic was ‘Die Allgegenwart des Rechenstiftes: Zur Ökonomie von Wissenschaftsbüchern’. According to Kerlen, academic literature consists of various sub-genres, each of which has its own economy. Kerlen divided books up in the humanities according to the size of the market to which they appeal: specialist monographs which support only small print-runs; edited volumes on specialist topics with a similar appeal; textbooks; large-scale handbooks with a long publishing life and broad appeal; and popular non-fiction books. The economy of these five ideal types is determined by publishing life, cost, print-run, and conditions. Kerlen emphasized that even small print-runs could be profitable. Publishers, he claimed, often exploit the pressure on academics to publish and the availability of funding for conference volumes in order to demand subsidies. Often, however, it would also be possible to finance publications by means of a higher selling price, which he illustrated with an example. Sales figures and the publishing life of a book are determined by marketing, he explained. As factors external to the works themselves are crucial to their success, Kerlen suggested, academic books are also subject to the market. He concluded with some observations on digital technology which makes new methods
of publication possible. Direct selling over the internet, he pointed out, is especially suitable for small, clearly defined groups of specialists. The psychology of authors, however, in particular of monographs, as well as career pressures oppose this development. Thus Kerlen predicted that traditional publishers still have a long future ahead of them.

Diethard Sawicki (Schöningh, Paderborn) closed the session with a paper entitled ‘Das Textbook erreicht Deutschland: Zukunftsperspektiven geschichtswissenschaftlicher Literatur’. Sawicki explained that as far as Schöningh and other middle-sized German publishers were concerned, the chances of growth in history as a market segment were slight. Funds for advertising, royalties, and licences were strictly limited. Schöningh Verlag, however, considered that student literature as a segment of the market offered opportunities. The crisis in the universities offered chances here, just as the crisis in schools had opened up potential for an ‘after school market’. In addition, universities were becoming more like schools, so that experience in the school market will be helpful. The traditional canon can no longer be assumed in first semester courses, which makes the introduction of textbooks at German universities likely. Books for students have to be presented in a visually attractive way. A few years ago, computer typesetting allowed Schöningh to begin producing typographically innovative and high quality books which are among the most successful published under the UTB imprint. These books demand a great deal of the authors, but publishing an introductory work is an advantage for young scholars on the job market. However, the abolition of the middle tier in the academic structure of universities is robbing Schöningh of perhaps the best group from which to recruit further authors for this specific genre.

The closing discussion was chaired by Gangolf Hübinger (University of Frankfurt/Oder). Ernst Schulin (University of Freiburg), Detlef Felken (C. H. Beck, Munich), Ludger Claßen (Klartext, Essen), and Horst Zimmerhackl (Hahnsche Buchhandlung, Hanover) each gave their views of the relationship between publisher, author, and public in the second half of the twentieth century. The tensions between pluralization and concentration, commercial and subsidized publications, and popularization and specialization dominated their comments and the discussion that followed. Widespread support for what Felken called the book mid-way between the popular market
and the academic ghetto, however, also underlines the need to overcome these oppositions. Thus the plea for better written books was the most striking constant in this conference. Publication of the proceedings is planned.

Matthias Reiss (GHIL)
Research Seminar

The GHIL regularly organizes a research seminar at which recipients of grants from the Institute, Fellows of the GHIL, and other scholars report on the progress of their work. Any postgraduate or postdoctoral researchers who are interested in the subjects are welcome to attend. As a general rule, the language of the papers and discussion is German.

The following papers will be given this term. Further meetings may also be arranged. Future dates will be announced on each occasion, and are available from the GHIL. For further information, contact Dr Dominik Geppert on 020 7309 2016. Please note that meetings begin promptly at 4 p.m.

27 Apr.  Roland Schuknecht
          Koloniale Entwicklungspolitik in Ostafrika, 1945–1951

18 May  Dunya Bouchi
          Winston Churchill als britischer Erinnerungsort

8 Jun.   Dr Tatjana Tönsmeyer

15 Jun.  Ruti Ungar
          ‘Boxing Clever’: Jewish Boxers in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century England and their Integration into Society

22 Jun.  Sünne Juterczenka
          ‘We had a blessed meeting’: Europäischer Dialog und Netzwerke der Frommen in William Penns Account of my Journey to Holland and Germany (1677)
29 Jun. Dr Patrick O. Cohrs

As a matter of interest to readers, we record the following papers which were given before the publication date of this Bulletin:

20 Jan. Julia von Dannenberg
Der Moskauer Vertrag (1970): Ein Beitrag zur internationalen Entspannung oder zur nationalen Wiedervereinigung?

27 Jan. Bernhard Gißibl
Jagd und Naturschutz in Deutsch-Ostafrika

3 Feb. Andreas Rose

17 Feb. Anna-Katharina Wöbse
Die erste Internationale des Naturschutzes? Natur, Kreatur und Umwelt im Völkerbund

2 Mar. Carsten Fischer
Heersteuer und Scutage: Zur Entwicklung lehensrechtlicher Strukturen im angevinischen England (ca. 1154–1189) und im staufischen Reich (ca. 1150–1250)
Scholarships awarded by the GHIL

Each year the GHIL awards a number of research scholarships to German postgraduate and postdoctoral students to enable them to carry out research in Britain, and to British postgraduates for research visits to Germany. The scholarships are generally awarded for a period of up to six months, depending on the requirements of the research project. British applicants will normally be expected to have completed one year’s postgraduate research, and be studying German history or Anglo-German relations. The scholarships are advertised in the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* and *Die Zeit* every September. Applications may be sent in at any time, but allocations are made for the following calendar year. Applications, which should include a CV, educational background, list of publications (where appropriate), and an outline of the project, together with a supervisor’s reference confirming the relevance of the proposed archival research, should be addressed to the Director, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2 NJ.

During their stay in Britain, German scholars present their projects and the initial results of their research at the Institute’s Research Seminar, and British scholars do the same on their return from Germany (see above for the current programme). For the year 2004 the following scholarships have been awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo-German relations.

**Ph.D. Scholarships**

*Dunya Bouchi*: Winston Churchill als britischer Erinnerungsort

*Carsten Fischer*: Heersteuer und Scutage: Zur Entwicklung lehensrechtlicher Strukturen im angevinischen England (ca. 1154–1189) und im staufischen Reich (ca. 1150–1250)

*Bernhard Gißibl*: Deutsche Jagd in Afrika: Herrschaftsinszenierung, Wildschutz und der koloniale Umgang mit Natur zwischen 1884 und 1945

*Claire M. Hall*: Gestapo Informants in the Third Reich, 1933–1945

*Marc Hieronimus*: Krankheit und Tod 1918/19: Eine vergleichende Studie zum Umgang mit der Spanischen Grippe in Frankreich, England und dem Deutschen Reich

*Simone Laqua*: Women and the Counter-Reformation in Münster, 1535–1650
Postdoctoral Scholarships

Dr Frank Peter: Vom Anti-Kolonialismus zum ethischen Islam? Eine Untersuchung des Wandels islamistischer Ideologien in Großbritannien am Beispiel der ‘Islamic Foundation’ in Leicester
Dr Tatjana Tönsmeyer: Adel und ländliche Gesellschaft in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts: Böhmen, Großbritannien und Preußen im europäischen Vergleich

Postgraduate Students’ Conference

The German Historical Institute London held its eighth postgraduate students’ conference on 8–9 January 2004. Its intention was to give postgraduate research students in the UK and Ireland working on German history an opportunity to present their work-in-progress, and to discuss it with other students working in the same field. The Institute also aimed to present itself as a research centre for German history in London, and to introduce postgraduates to the facilities it offers as well as to the Institute’s Research Fellows.

In selecting students to give a presentation, preference was given to those in their second or third year who had possibly already spent a period of research in Germany. Students in their first year were invited to attend as discussants. Eleven projects in all were introduced in plenary sessions held over two days. Sessions were devoted to the Middle Ages, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the nineteenth century, the First World War, and the Weimar Republic.
As well as discussing their subjects and methodologies, the participants exchanged information about practical difficulties such as language and transcription problems, how to locate sources, and finding one’s way around German archives. Many comments came from the floor, including information about language courses and intensive courses for the reading of German manuscripts, references to literature already published on the topic, and suggestions about additional sources. Information about institutions that give grants for research in Germany was also exchanged. The German Historical Institute can offer support here by facilitating contact with German archives and providing letters of introduction which may be necessary for students to gain access to archives or specific source collections. In certain cases it may help students to make contact with particular German universities and professors. The German Historical Institute also provides scholarships for research in Germany (see above).

The GHIL is planning to hold the next postgraduate students’ conference early in 2005. For further information, including how to apply, please contact the Secretary, German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ.

Prize of the German Historical Institute London

The German Historical Institute London awards an annual prize, known as the Prize of the German Historical Institute London, for an outstanding work of British or German historical scholarship. The prize was initiated in 1996 to mark the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the GHIL. In 2003 the prize was awarded to Kristin Anne Semmens for her thesis, entitled ‘Domestic Tourism in the Third Reich’, submitted to the University of Cambridge.

To be eligible a work must be:

1 a Ph.D. thesis written at a UK or German university and, as a rule, submitted to the university within the 12 months prior to the closing date
2 on a subject matter taken from the field of UK or German history or UK-German relations or comparative studies in the nineteenth or twentieth century
3 unpublished.

An entry which has been submitted to a UK university must be in English and on German history or UK-German relations or a comparative topic; an entry which has been submitted to a German university must be in German and on British history or UK-German relations or a comparative topic.

To apply, please send the following to reach the Director of the German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, by 1 September 2004:

1 the complete text
2 all relevant reports from the university to which it is being submitted
3 a declaration that, if a work in German is awarded the prize, the author is prepared to allow the work to be considered for publication in the series Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts London, and that the work will not be published elsewhere until the judges have reached their final decision
4 the applicant’s current curriculum vitae.

The Prize will be presented on the occasion of the Institute’s Annual Lecture in November 2004. Future awards will be advertised in the Bulletin of the GHIL.

No member of the Committee of Judges and no employee or blood relative of an employee or ex-employee of the Institute or any member of the Committee shall be eligible as a candidate for the Prize.
The academic staff of the Institute changes from time to time, as most Research Fellows have fixed-term contracts of three to five years’ duration. During this time, along with their duties at the Institute, they work on a major project of their own choice, and as a result the Institute’s areas of special expertise also change. We take this opportunity to keep our readers regularly informed.

DOMINIK GEPPERT, who joined the GHIL in 2000, studied history, philosophy, and law in Freiburg and Berlin, where he also worked as a research assistant for four years. His main fields of interest are British and German contemporary history, international history, and the history of the press. He is currently working on British–German press relations, 1890–1914. In addition, he is editing a volume on neutralism in the Cold War. His most recent publications include Maggie Thatcher’s Roßkur: Ein Rezept für Deutschland? (2003); Die Ära Adenauer (2002); Thatcher’s conservative Revolution: Der Richtungswandel der britischen Tories 1975–1979 (2002); and (as editor), The Postwar Challenge: Cultural, Social, and Political Change in Western Europe, 1945–58 (2003).

LOTHAR KETTENACKER is Deputy Director of the Institute and apl Professor at the University of Frankfurt/Main. From 1973 he ran the London office of the Deutsch-Britischer Historikerkreis, which was later to develop into the GHIL. His Ph.D. (Frankfurt, 1968) was on Nazi occupation policies in Alsace (1940–44), and he also completed a B.Litt. at Oxford in 1971 on Lord Acton and Döllinger. He has written a major study of British post-war planning for Germany during the Second World War, as well as various articles on National Socialism and on British history in the 1930s and 1940s. He is currently working on a study of German unification for the Longmans series, Turning Points in History. His most recent publication is Germany since 1945 (1997).

MARKUS MÖSSLANG, who came to the GHIL in 1999, studied modern and social history at the University of Munich. After completing his MA he was a research assistant in the history department. His Ph.D. thesis on the integration of refugee teachers and scholars in West German schools and universities (1945–61) was published in
2002 as Flüchtlingslehrer und Flüchtlingshochschullehrer. He is co-editor of British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866, vol. 2: 1830–1847 (2002) and is currently editing British Envoys to Germany, vol. 3: 1848–1850. His main fields of interest are history and the new media, the history of universities, and nineteenth-century British and German history.

KARSTEN PLÖGER joined the GHIL in January 2003 as a Research Fellow in late medieval and modern history after completing his doctoral thesis at Balliol College, Oxford. Prior to that he studied history, English, and philosophy at the University of Kiel and at the University of Aberdeen. His main fields of interest are the intellectual, cultural, and diplomatic history of Europe in the Middle Ages. In addition to continuing his work on English medieval diplomatic communications in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, he is currently producing a study on the discourse of boredom in early and high medieval Europe. His most recent publication is Die Entführung des Fieschi zu Avignon (1340): Zur Entwicklung der diplomatischen Immunität in der Frühphase des Hundertjährigen Krieges (2003). His D. Phil. thesis on the organization of Anglo–Papal diplomacy in the mid-fourteenth century is currently being prepared for publication.

REGINA PÖRTNER, who was a Research Fellow at the GHIL from 1998 to 2003, took an MA in history (medieval, modern, economic) and German at the University of Bochum. She was a visiting student at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1988–89, and took her D.Phil. (Oxford) as a Rhodes Scholar in 1998. She is the author of The Counter-Reformation in Central Europe: Styria 1580–1630 (2001) and edited the latest issue of the Institute’s bibliography, Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1998–2000 (2002). Since October 2003 she has been teaching early modern British and European history at the University of Bochum, has has recently been awarded a Duke Ernest Scholarship by the Thyssen Foundation.

MATTHIAS REISS joined the GHIL as a Research Fellow in 2002. He studied history, political science, and economics at the University of Hamburg, before changing to the University of Cincinnati (Ohio) in 1993, where he received an MA two years later. His main fields of interest are American, British, and German history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries up to the Second World War. His Ph.D. was
TORSTEN RIOTTE joined the GHIL in January 2003. After finishing his Ph.D. at Cambridge University he is now, with Markus Mößlang, in charge of the Institute’s four-volume edition *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*. The results of his research on Hanoverian Britain are about to be published in various forms, including a monograph entitled *Hannover in der britischen Politik (1792–1815): Dynastische Verbindung als Element außenpolitischer Entscheidungsprozesse* and, with Brendan Simms, an essay collection published as *The Hanoverian Dimension in British Policy, 1714–1837*.

MICHAEL SCHAICH, who joined the GHIL in 1999, was a student of history and media studies at the University of Munich. After completing his MA he became a research assistant in the history department. His Ph.D. thesis on Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment in Bavaria was published in 2001 as *Staat und Öffentlichkeit im Kurfürstentum Bayern der Spätaufklärung*. During his time at the Institute he is working on the relationship between monarchy and religion in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England.


Noticeboard

published in 2002 as *Die Schwarzen waren unsere Freunde: Deutsche Kriegsgefangene in der amerikanischen Gesellschaft 1942–1946*. He is currently working on a study of the image of the unemployed in England and Germany from the end of the nineteenth century to the 1980s.
KARINA URBACH joined the GHIL in January 2004 as a Research Fellow in twentieth-century history. She studied modern history and political science at the University of Munich and took an M.Phil. in international relations and a Ph.D. in history at the University of Cambridge. She taught at the University of Bayreuth and was awarded the Bavarian Ministry of Culture’s Habilitationsförderpreis in 2001. Her fields of interest include British–German relations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and she is currently working on a book about the international networks of the European aristocracies in the inter-war years. She is the author of Bismarck’s Favourite Englishman: Lord Odo Russell’s Mission to Berlin (1999) and co-editor of Der Zeitgeist und die Historie (2001) and Birth or Talent? A Comparison of British–German Elites (2003).

Willy Brandt—a German Hero?

On 13 February 2004 the German Historical Institute London, in co-operation with the German Embassy London, hosted a panel discussion entitled ‘Willy Brandt—a German Hero?’ It was inspired by the great success of Michael Frayn’s play Democracy, which deals with Willy Brandt’s chancellorship and the Guillaume scandal. Starting with the question of why a British author and the British public should be so fascinated by this period of German contemporary history in general, and Willy Brandt in particular, the discussion chaired by Daniel Johnson (Daily Telegraph) centred on Brandt’s posthumous reputation, not only in Germany, but also in Britain.

To start with Michael Frayn himself explained that the play was about the complexity of human relationships and how difficult it is to reach decisions, in both the personal and political spheres. He stressed that in his view the most remarkable aspect of twentieth-century German history was not the barbarism of Nazism, but the creation of a functioning democracy from its ruins. Professor Arnulf Baring (Free University of Berlin) took up the theme of defeat and new beginning, seeing here the leitmotiv of Willy Brandt’s biography. His life, more than that of virtually any other politician, was marked by a series of defeats repeatedly followed by remarkable new
starts. Jürgen Krönig (*Die Zeit*) recalled Brandt’s weaknesses and mistakes, how he avoided taking decisions, and his penchant for alcohol and women, which are just as much part of the picture of the man as his charisma, his visionary political style, and the breakthrough in *Ostpolitik* achieved during his time in office.

There were objections from the auditorium to the idea that Brandt was hesitant about making decisions. It was claimed that at the crucial moments of his political career—the formation of a government in 1969, during the implementation of *Ostpolitik*, and also during the upheaval in the GDR 1989/90—he showed himself to have a sure instinct, staying-power, and the ability to assert himself. In this connection the turn of the tide in 1973, when the breakthrough in *Ostpolitik* had been achieved, was important as domestic and economic problems were starting to get out of hand. This crisis year was a turning point not only for Brandt personally, but for the history of the Federal Republic.

**Luxury and Integration: Material Court Culture in Western Europe, 12th–18th Centuries**

This international colloquium, arranged jointly by the German Historical Institute London, the German Historical Institute Paris, and the Free University of Berlin, will be held at Cumberland Lodge, Windsor, on 1–4 July 2004. The conference will look at the problem of the integration of power from a cultural historical perspective, and aims to understand pomp at court in terms of its function. The focus will be on the distribution of material objects such as artifacts, money, etc., as a means of achieving social integration and, ultimately, the consolidation of political power in the context of the medieval and early modern court. There will be four sections, each consisting of six parts (I. Communal Action: Between Service, Feast, and Leisure; II. Gifts: Between Dotation, Salary, Symbolic and Real Capital; III. Expenditure: Between Economics and Honour; and IV. Results: Power Systems between Success and Failure).

Contact: Dr Karsten Plöger: Ploeger@ghil.ac.uk
The Hanoverian Dimension in British Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics, 1714–1837

The Centre of International Studies, Cambridge, in conjunction with the German Historical Institute London announces a two-day conference to be held at Peterhouse, Cambridge, on 17–18 September 2004.

The conference aims to re-evaluate the importance of Britain’s German connection during the period of Hanoverian Britain. Addressing political and cultural aspects of the dynastic union and its implications for foreign and domestic policies, experts from Britain, Germany, and the United States will discuss a wide range of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century history. Speakers will include Mijndert Bertram on the end of the dynastic union, 1820–37, Thomas Biskup on Britain and Göttingen, Jeremy Black on Walpole and Hanover, Clarissa Campbell Orr on dynastic perspectives, Nicholas B. Harding on Hanover and British republicanism, Richard Harding on Hanover and the maritime strategy, Bob Harris on the public sphere and Hanover, Torsten Riotte on George III and Hanover, Hamish Scott on Hanover in Anglo-French geo-politics, Brendan Simms on Pitt and Hanover, and Andrew Thompson on the confessional dimension.

Booking details. Places at the conference are strictly limited by space. The price (£55 for two days) includes a conference dinner on Friday night, and lunch and refreshments on both days. No single day tickets are available. To obtain a booking form, which should be returned by 15 August 2004, contact Torsten Riotte at the GHIL, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ.

Contact: Dr Torsten Riotte: triotte@ghil.ac.uk
European Aristocracies and the Radical Right in the Inter-War Years

This international conference will be held at the German Historical Institute London, 29–30 October 2004. To date the role of the aristocracy—its collaboration with, or scepticism towards, radical right-wing parties—has not been studied in a European context. Authoritarian governments and fascist movements were a European phenomenon of the inter-war years with which, in some countries more than others, aristocratic circles felt an affinity.

The aim of the conference is to look at the political reactions of the higher and lower aristocracies of western, central, eastern, and southern Europe towards the crisis of the inter-war years. The conference will ask what social and political alliances these former élites formed and how their actions encouraged (or hindered) the rise of radical right-wing movements.

Contact: Dr Karina Urbach: kurbach@ghil.ac.uk
LIBRARY NEWS

Recent Acquisitions

This list contains a selection of recent publications in German and English, primarily on German history, acquired by the Library of the GHIL in the past year.


Appelius, Stefan (ed.), ‘Der Teufel hole Hitler’: Briefe der sozialdemokratischen Emigration (Essen: Klartext, 2003)


Arnold, Klaus, *Kalter Krieg im Äther: Der Deutschlandsender und die Westpropaganda der DDR*, Kommunikationsgeschichte, 16 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2002)

Aust, Stefan and Stephan Burgdorff (eds.), *Die Flucht: Über die Vertreibung der Deutschen aus dem Osten* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2002)

Library News


Bendel, Rainer (ed.), *Die katholische Schuld? Katholizismus im Dritten Reich zwischen Arrangement und Widerstand* (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2002)


Recent Acquisitions


Bouvier, Beatrix, Die DDR, ein Sozialstaat?: Sozialpolitik in der Ära Honecker (Bonn: Dietz, 2002)

Brandt, Hartwig, Europa 1815–1850: Reaktion, Konstitution, Revolution (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002)

Brandt, Kersten, Hanno Loewy et. al (eds.), Zanim odeszli.... Fotografie odnalezione w Auschwitz, Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum (2nd edn.: Munich: Kehayoff, 2001)


Brunn, Gerhard, Die europäische Einigung von 1945 bis heute (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2002)


Chiari, Bernhard with the assistance of Jerzy Kochanowski (eds.), Die polnische Heimatarmee: Geschichte und Mythos der Armia Krajowa seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, 57 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)


Conway, Martin and José Gotovitch (eds.), Europe in Exile 1940–45: European Exile Communities in Britain (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001)


Library News


Durrani, Osman and Julian Preece (eds.), *Travellers in Time and Space: The German Historical Novel*, Amsterdamer Beiträge zur neueren Germanistik, 51 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001)


Eggers, Erik, *Fußball in der Weimarer Republik* (Kassel: Agon Sportverlag, 2001)


Fleckenstein, Josef with the assistance of Thomas Zotz, *Rittertum und ritterliche Welt* (Berlin: Siedler, 2002)


Fricke, Karl Wilhelm, Peter Steinbach, and Johannes Tuchel (eds.), *Opposition und Widerstand in der DDR: Politische Lebensbilder* (Munich: Beck, 2002)
Library News

Göthel, Thomas, *Demokratie und Volkstum: Die Politik gegenüber den nationalen Minderheiten in der Weimarer Republik*, Kölner Beiträge zur Nationalforschung, 8 (Cologne: SH-Verlag, 2002)
Recent Acquisitions


Gutman, Israel and Bella Gutterman (eds.), The Auschwitz Album: The Story of a Transport (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 2002)


Haffner, Sebastian, Churchill: Eine Biographie (3rd edn.; Berlin: Kindler, 2001)


Hamann, Brigitte, Winifred Wagner oder Hitlers Bayreuth (Munich: Piper, 2002)


Library News

Hecht, Cornelia, Deutsche Juden und Antisemitismus in der Weimarer Republik, Politik- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte, 62 (Bonn: Dietz, 2003)

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, Über die Reichsverfassung, ed. Hans Maier, Bibliothek des deutschen Staatsdenkens, 10 (Munich: Beck, 2002)


Heinemann, Isabel, ‘Rasse, Siedlung, deutsches Blut’: Das Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt der SS und die rassenpolitische Neuordnung Europas, Moderne Zeit, 2 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003)


Hermand, Jost, Zuhause und anderswo: Erfahrungen im Kalten Krieg (Cologne: Böhlau, 2001)

Hermeler, Ludwig, Die Euthanasie und die späte Unschuld der Psychiater: Massenmord, Bedburg-Hau und das Geheimnis rheinischer Widerstandslegenden, Rheinprovinz, 14 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2002)


Hilberg, Raul, Sources of Holocaust Research: An Analysis (Chicago, Ill.: Dee, 2001)

Hobsbawm, Eric John, Interesting Times: A Twentieth-Century Life (London: Lane, 2002)


Recent Acquisitions


James, Pierre, *The Murderous Paradise: German Nationalism and the Holocaust* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001)

Jessen, Ralph and Jakob Vogel (eds.), *Wissenschaft und Nation in der europäischen Geschichte* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2002)


Knigge, Volkhard and Norbert Frei with the assistance of Anett Schweitzer (eds.), *Verbrechen erinnern: Die Auseinandersetzung mit Holocaust und Völkermord* (Munich: Beck, 2002)


Lamott, Franziska, *Die vermessene Frau: Hysterien um 1900* (Munich: Fink, 2001)


Looz-Corswarem, Clemens von, with the assistance of Rafael R. Leissa and Joachim Schröder (eds.), *Zwangsarbeit in Düsseldorf: ‘Ausländer einsatz’ während des Zweiten Weltkriege in einer rheinischen Großstadt*, Düsseldorfer Schriften zur neueren Landschichte und zur Geschichte Nordrhein-Westfalens, 62 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2002)


Library News

Malet, Marian and Anthony Grenville (eds.), Changing Countries: The Experience and Achievement of German-speaking Exiles from Hitler in Britain, from 1933 to Today (London: Libris, 2002)
Mergel, Thomas, Parlamentarische Kultur in der Weimarer Republik: Politische Kommunikation, symbolische Politik und Öffentlichkeit im Reichstag, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 135 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2002)
Michman, Dan, Die Historiographie der Shoah aus jüdischer Sicht: Konzeptualisierungen, Terminologie, Anschauungen, Grundfragen (Hamburg: Dölling und Galitz, 2002)
Recent Acquisitions


Mommsen, Wolfgang J., *Der große Krieg und die Historiker: Neue Wege der Geschichtsschreibung über den Ersten Weltkrieg*, Stuttgarter Vorträge zur Zeitgeschichte, 6 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2002)


Müller, Sven Oliver, *Die Nation als Waffe und Vorstellung: Nationalismus in Deutschland und Großbritannien im Ersten Weltkrieg*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 158 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002)

Murphy, David Thomas, *German Exploration of the Polar World: A History, 1870–1940* (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 2002)


Perels, Joachim and Rolf Pohl (eds.), *NS-Täter in der deutschen Gesellschaft*, Diskussionsbeiträge des Instituts für Politische Wissenschaft der Universität Hannover, 29 (Hanover: Offizin Verlag, 2002)


Pfister, Peter, Susanne Kornacker, and Volker Laube (eds.), *Kardinal Michael von Faulhaber 1869–1952*, exhibition catalogue, Ausstellungskataloge der Staatlichen Archive Bayerns, 44 (Munich: Generaldirektion der Staatlichen Archive Bayerns, 2002)


Pohl, Karl Heinrich (ed.), *Politiker und Bürger: Gustav Stresemann und seine Zeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002)

Polian, Pavel, *Deportiert nach Hause: Sowjetische Kriegsgefangene im 'Dritten Reich' und ihre Repatriierung, Kriegsfolgen-Forschung*, 2 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2001)


Saville, Annette, Only a Kindertransportee (London: New Millennium, 2002)

Schäfers, Stefanie, Vom Werkbund zum Vierjahresplan: Die Ausstellung Schaffendes Volk, Düsseldorf 1937, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Niederrheins, 4 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2001)


Scheidemann, Philipp, Das historische Versagen der SPD: Schriften aus dem Exil, ed. Frank R. Reitzle, with an intro. by Claus-Dieter Krohn (Lüneburg: zu Klampen, 2002)
Recent Acquisitions


Library News

Schubert, Ernst, Alltag im Mittelalter: Natürlihches Lebensumfeld und menschliches Miteinander (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002)


Schwendemann, Heinrich and Wolfgang Dietsche with the assistance of Bozena Görczynska-Przybylowicz, Hitler's Schloß: Die ’Führerresidenz’ in Posen (Berlin: Links Verlag, 2003)


Shionoya, Yuichi (ed.), The German Historical School: The Historical and Ethical Approach to Economics (London: Routledge, 2001)

Siedler, Wolf Jobst, Ein Leben wird besichtigt: In der Welt der Eltern (Berlin: Berliner Taschenbuch Verlag, 2002)


Stephan, Gerd-Rüdiger, Andreas Herbst et al. (eds.), Die Parteien und Organisationen der DDR: Ein Handbuch (Berlin: Dietz, 2002)

Recent Acquisitions


Studt, Christoph with the assistance of Daniela von Itzenplitz and Henriette Schuppener, Das Dritte Reich in Daten (Munich: Beck, 2002)


Tholander, Christa, Fremdarbeiter 1939 bis 1945: Ausländische Arbeitskräfte in der Zeppelin-Stadt Friedrichshafen (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2001)

Thompson, Bruce (ed.), Oskar Schindler (San Diego, Calif.: Greenhaven Press, 2002)

Tilitzki, Christian, Die deutsche Universitätsphilosophie in der Weimarer Republik und im Dritten Reich, 2 vols. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002)


Tofahrn, Klaus W., Chronologie des Dritten Reiches: Ereignisse, Personen, Begriffe (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003)

Tömmel, Ingeborg, Das politische System der EU (Münster: Oldenbourg, 2003)


Wehr, Laura, Kamerad Frau? Eine Frauenzeitschrift im Nationalsozialismus, Regensburger Schriften zur Volkskunde, 16 (Regensburg: Roderer, 2002)
Recent Acquisitions


Wette, Wolfram, Ricarda Bremer et al. (eds.), Das letzte halbe Jahr: Stimmungsberichte der Wehrmachtpropaganda 1944/45, Schriftenreihe der Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte, NS 13 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2001)


Wilde, Manfred, Die Zauberei- und Hexenprozesse in Kursachsen (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003)


Yelton, David K., Hitler’s Volkssturm: The Nazi Militia and the Fall of Germany, 1944–1945, Modern War Studies (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2002)


PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Vol. 1: Wilhelm Lenz (ed.), Archivalische Quellen zur deutsch–britischen Geschichte seit 1500 in Großbritannien; Manuscript Sources for the History of Germany since 1500 in Great Britain (Boppard a. Rh.: Boldt, 1975)


Vol. 4: Paul Kluke and Peter Alter (eds), Aspekte der deutsch–britischen Beziehungen im Laufe der Jahrhunderte; Aspects of Anglo–German Relations through the Centuries (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978)

Vol. 5: Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Peter Alter and Robert W. Scribner (eds), Stadtbürgertum und Adel in der Reformation: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Reformation in England und Deutschland; The Urban Classes, the Nobility and the Reformation: Studies on the Social History of the Reformation in England and Germany (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1979)


Vol. 43: Knut Diekmann, Die nationalistische Bewegung in Wales (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998)


Vol. 50: Jörn Leonhard, Liberalismus: Zur historischen Semantik eines europäischen Deutungsmusters (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2001)


Vol. 57: Ulrike Lindner, Gesundheitspolitik und ihre Umsetzung in der Nachkriegszeit: Großbritannien und die Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Vergleich (Munich: Oldenbourg, forthcoming 2004)

**STUDIES OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON—OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**


Alfred Haverkamp and Hanna Vollrath (eds.), *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1996)


FURTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds.), *The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany* (London: Croom Helm, 1981)


Adolf M. Birke, Hans Booms and Otto Merker (eds.), *Control Commission for Germany/British Element: Inventory; Die britische Militärregierung in Deutschland: Inventar*, 11 vols (Munich etc.: Saur Verlag, 1993)

Günther Heydemann and Lothar Kettenacker (eds.), *Kirchen in der Diktatur* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)


HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Two Centuries of Anglo–German Relations: A Re-appraisal (London, 1984)

Adolf M. Birke, Britain and Germany: Historical Patterns of a Relationship (London, 1987)


Adolf M. Birke and Eva A. Mayring (eds), Britische Besatzung in Deutschland: Aktenerschließung und Forschungsfelder (London, 1992)

Gerhard A. Ritter, Big Science in Germany: Past and Present (London, 1994)

Adolf M. Birke, Britain’s Influence on the West German Constitution (London, 1995)


Annual Lectures of the German Historical Institute London


1990 Not available


2002  *Not available*


*Bulletin of the German Historical Institute London*, Issue 1 (Spring, 1979)-