CONTENTS

**Special Theme: The Sounds of the First World War**

Introduction (Felix Römer) 3
War Noises on the Battlefield: On Fighting Underground and Learning to Listen in the Great War (Julia Encke) 7
Reflections of War Sounds in German Concert Halls (Stefan Hanheide) 22
War, Impression, Sound, and Memory: British Music and the First World War (Jeremy C. Dibble) 43

**Review Article**

‘When Saturday Comes’: New Books on German and International Sports History (Kay Schiller) 57

**Book Reviews**

*Chartularium Sangallense*, i: 700–840, ed. Peter Erhart with Karl Heidecker and Bernhard Zeller (Jinty Nelson) 73

Tom Scott, *The Early Reformation in Germany: Between Secular Impact and Radical Vision* (Gabriele Haug-Moritz) 78

David Scott Gehring, *Anglo-German Relations and the Protestant Cause: Elizabethan Foreign Policy and Pan-Protestantism*; David Worthington, *British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe, c.1560–1688* (Alexander Schunka) 81

(cont.)
Contents

Anorthe Kremers and Elisabeth Reich (eds.), *Loyal Subversion? Caricatures from the Personal Union between England and Hanover (1714–1837)* (Torsten Riotte) 87

Uwe Ziegler and Horst Carl (eds.), *‘In unserer Liebe nicht glücklich’: Kultureller Austausch zwischen Großbritannien und Deutschland 1770–1840* (John R. Davis) 91

Leighton S. James, *Witnessing the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in German Central Europe* (Michael Sikora) 96


Egbert Klautke, *The Mind of the Nation: Völkerpsychologie in Germany, 1851–1955* (Nicolas Berg) 104

Stephan Kurt Westmann, *Surgeon with the Kaiser’s Army*, ed. Michael Westman (Frank Lorenz Müller) 110

Britta Schilling, *Postcolonial Germany: Memories of Empire in a Decolonized Nation* (Marie Muschalek) 115

Conference Reports

Making Winners? Transforming Individuals through Education in Colonial and Post-Colonial Contexts (Alva Bonaker) 119

All At Sea: The Prize Papers as a Source for a Global Microhistory (Margaret R. Hunt) 124

‘Only doing my duty’: Defining Perpetrators in Relation to State-Sanctioned Violence (Gaëlle Fisher) 136

Inside World War One? International Workshop on Ego Documents and the Experience of the First World War (Dorothee Wierling and Richard Bessel) 140

Society, Rule, and their Representation in Medieval Britain (Martin Stier) 146

Noticeboard 150

Library News

Recent Acquisitions 159
On 7 June 1917 the sound of the Great War was carried back to Britain. When British troops south of Ypres detonated about a million pounds of explosives packed in mine chambers under the German trenches at Messines, the blasts reverberated across the Channel. According to newspaper reports, Prime Minister David Lloyd George had ordered that he was to be roused in the middle of the night to listen to the unprecedented operation in Flanders from his residence in Surrey. For eyewitneses on the ground the detonations felt like an ‘earthquake’ and looked like ‘volcanoes’ that ‘leaped roaring upwards’ before the ‘echoes of the awful explosions’ shaded into the thunder of the unfolding artillery barrage: ‘It was all blinding shimmer and noise and stupefying splendour.’ Typically, even this account dwelled more on the sights than on the sounds, just as the acoustics of the battlefield long featured only as background noise in modern historiography.

Sound and hearing, however, have received increased academic attention in recent years. The multidisciplinary field of sound studies emerged from disciplines such as media studies, musicology, and anthropology, but it was not until a decade ago that it also attracted historians. Sound history studies revolve around questions about

---

2 See ‘The Messines Battle: A Brilliant Success So Far’, *Manchester Guardian*, 8 June 1917: ‘He was roused at that hour, and he and others heard clearly the tremendous shock. Other people in the district were awakened by it and persons in the neighbourhood of the Premier’s official residence in London also heard what they judged to be heavy guns across the Channel.’
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the historical specificity and cultural variability of hearing, the perception of sound in its specific social and political contexts, the utilization of sound for political purposes, and the long-term impact of sound on culture, arts, and collective memory. Historians apply this approach to a growing spectrum of themes and fields, ranging from urban history and media history to the history of collective violence. Some historians are also starting to explore the sound history of the First World War.

As historians are rediscovering the auditory dimension of their subject, the German Historical Institute London marked last year’s centenary with a special lecture series devoted to this new strand of research, entitled ‘First World War Noises: Listening to the Great War’. This themed issue of the GHIL Bulletin brings together contributions by British and German scholars analysing the significance of sound, in both contemporary experience and the aftermath of the war, from different angles and disciplinary backgrounds.

The series was opened by Mark Connelly (Canterbury) with a lecture on ‘War Noises in Silent Films’, focusing on British instructional films from the inter-war era. These largely forgotten films were hugely successful portrayals of battle reconstructions, attempting to depict the realities and costs of the war. Sound effects and music were added to enhance the viewing experience. The frequent use of soldiers’ songs in the musical accompaniment encouraged audiences to sing along, turning a screening into a community experience resurrecting memories and emotions. The lecture demonstrated how...


representations of sound in popular media contributed to shaping the way the war was understood and remembered in its immediate aftermath.\textsuperscript{7}

The scrutiny of the connections between the soldiers’ experiences on the battlefields and their reverberations in culture, media, and science continued in the lecture delivered by Julia Encke (Berlin) on ‘The Beleaguered Ear: On Fighting Underground and Learning to Listen in the Great War’. Based on her original research on the sensory perception of the First World War and its echo in inter-war Germany, she combined historiographical methods with approaches from literary studies to analyse how soldiers in the trenches, engineers, physicists, acousticians, and novelists responded to the hitherto unheard-of importance and ubiquity of war noises.\textsuperscript{8}

The question of how war noises resonated in the arts was pursued by Stefan Hanheide’s (Osnabrück) lecture from the perspective of musicology. Drawing on extensive research about the relations of music and war, his ‘Reflections of War Sounds in German Concert Halls’ traced how composers in the belligerent countries commented on the hostilities in their works, using a variety of war noises and their musical representation as semantic symbols.\textsuperscript{9} As the war progressed, more and more tones of sorrow, grievance, and denunciation entered the music. After 1918, sarcastically distorted military music and noises from military life were used to express criticism of the unprecedented carnage. Astonishingly, German composers picked up many sounds from military life and played with patriotic wartime anthems, but mostly refrained from incorporating noises from the battlefield into their music, even though the musical means to depict the sounds of bursting shells or machinegun fire were available at the time. As Hanheide argues in his article, this was mainly due to stylistic considerations.

\textsuperscript{7} For this paper, not included in this issue of the GHIL Bulletin, see Mark Connelly’s book, Creating Celluloid War Memorials: British Instructional Films and the Great War, 1921–1929 (Exeter, forthcoming 2016).
\textsuperscript{8} See Julia Encke, Augenblicke der Gefahr: Der Krieg und die Sinne, 1914–1934 (Paderborn, 2006).
\textsuperscript{9} See Stefan Hanheide, Dietrich Helms, Claudia Glunz, and Thomas F. Schneider (eds.), ‘Musik bezieht Stellung’: Funktionalisierungen der Musik im Ersten Weltkrieg (Göttingen, 2013).
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Mirroring Hanheide’s analysis of German musical history, Jeremy Dibble (Durham) pursued the same questions, focusing on the British case. In his lecture ‘War, Impression, Sound and Memory: British Music and the First World War’, he discussed the impact of the war on British composers and traced what composers made of the war in their works. As he demonstrates in his article, British composers not only adopted a new cultural nationalism, but also attempted, in different ways, to represent the sights and sounds of the war in their music. Like their German counterparts, however, they made hardly any references to combat noises. Whether this followed from artistic conventions or arose from trends in the remembrance cultures of both countries remains a fascinating conundrum that demonstrates the potential of sound history to open up new avenues for research, not least in comparative perspective.
WAR NOISES ON THE BATTLEFIELD:
ON FIGHTING UNDERGROUND AND LEARNING
TO LISTEN IN THE GREAT WAR

JULIA ENCKE

‘During long periods of history, the mode of human sense perception changes with humanity’s entire mode of existence. The manner in which human sense perception is organized, the medium in which it is accomplished, is determined not only by nature but by historical circumstances as well’, wrote Walter Benjamin in his essay ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’.1 Above all, the hierarchy of the senses itself is historically determined. The eye has dominated the discussion of perception since Antiquity, and thus sight ranks at the top of the hierarchy of senses.2 But if we take the historical circumstances of perception into account, in this case, the First World War, we can see how, within a specific period of time, the ear challenges the eye for domination, and the ear gets ahead. With the beginning of trench warfare in the autumn of 1914, soldiers who disappeared into the earth in the ‘underground war’ and could see no further than the trench wall followed the motto: ‘Those who cannot see must hear.’ The roar of battle, the thundering of cannons, the whistling, whizzing, and crashing of shells, and the rattling of machine guns ‘beleaguered the ear’ in an unprecedented way.3 According to the psychologist Paul Plaut, ‘living through war has caused the sensory apparatus to function in new ways which, under different existential and psychological conditions in normal life,

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL). This article is based on a paper delivered at the German Historical Institute London on 10 June 2014.

1 Walter Benjamin, ‘Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit’, in id., Gesammelte Schriften, i. pt. 2 (Frankfurt am Main, 1974), 471–508, at 478.
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would not have been so important’. He describes a historical-psycho-
logical situation associated with a differentiation in the sense of
hearing. This article will investigate the special significance of the
sense of hearing between 1914 and 1934 from a cultural studies per-
spective that will juxtapose literary texts with sources from the histo-
ry of mentalities and the history of science, drawing mainly on the
experiences of the Western Front.

I.

They do not hesitate for long, it is not like them to shilly-shal-
ly. They start. Down into the earth! It is a hole, a well, a shaft.
As deep as houses. Ladders lead down. Then it goes forward,
under the trenches and through the barbed wire entangle-
ments. From there it branches left and right. The tunnel grows.
A number of shafts are dug into the ground, the tunnels go out
from them. Pickaxes and spades and pneumatic drills eat their
way through earth and stone, creating a real mine. ‘We set off
a mine or two.’ Who thinks anything of it? Nobody. Who
knows this terrible job? They are not looking for ore under-
ground here, they are looking for people. They want to take
them from below, from above is not enough.

‘Der Krieg unter der Erde’ is the title of an article which the war
reporter and writer Bernhard Kellermann wrote for the Berliner
Tagblatt in 1915. Kellermann had made a name for himself two years
earlier as the author of a bestseller, Der Tunnel, a technological–utopi-
an novel which, even before the war, transferred the ‘battlefield of
work’ to subterranean passages, into the tunnel under the sea that
was to connect Europe with America. Kellermann now left the realm
of visibility behind in a work of non-fiction. He plunged into the
opacity of the trenches and galleries, and wrote about underground
mine warfare.

4 Paul Plaut, ‘Psychographie des Kriegers’, Zeitschrift für angewandte Psy-
chologie, 21 (1929), 1–123, at 33.
5 Bernhard Kellermann, ‘Der Krieg unter der Erde’, in id., Der Krieg im Westen
(Berlin, 1915), 159–65, at 160.
Eyes were useless in the dark, and even in the illuminated shaft it was hardly possible to see further than the next trench wall. All perception was concentrated on hearing. The sapper, who had to protect himself against the danger of an approaching enemy and assess how far away he was, set up a ‘watchfulness front’. To quote Kellermann again:

He listens with his sensitive ears and says to himself, four metres, six metres. Is he left, right, up, down; his ears are part of it. The officer is lying asleep on his camp bed in a dugout when the phone goes off: it is four metres, I think he is above us. Good, says the officer, I’ll be there first thing in the morning. Now it is time to act! It is a matter of working and scraping so that he over there does not notice that we have heard him. After all, it is likely that he has heard it too, with his sensitive ears. The big moment has arrived. It is a matter of minutes. The explosive charge is brought. Sandbags, mountains of sandbags are carried down into the tunnel. Sappers swarm like rats in the dark, but those out in front continue to work. They are only pretending, but it has to be done damned skilfully. The cutting and scraping, although it is only simulated, cannot differ from real work in any way because he over there in the tunnel is as cunning as a fox. He will laugh into his beard and say to himself: they are pretending now, but I will set my charge off five minutes earlier. Then farewell sapper, officer, and men!

Strategies of concealment emerged during the First World War, ‘techniques for disappearing’, designed to withdraw one’s forces from the enemy’s sight. Troop movements, munition and artillery transports were rescheduled from day to night time, and soldiers and their positions fully camouflaged. But, above all, they went underground. A type of warfare that began in 1914 with quickly dug foxholes and ended with ‘galleries dug by miners’ was soon popularly

---

7 Kellermann, ‘Der Krieg unter der Erde’, 162.
known as ‘trench warfare’. In the autumn of the first year of the war, the first continuous trenches deep enough for soldiers to stand upright in and shoot from were dug, and covered trenches with seating and dugouts for sleeping in were constructed. By the middle of the following year, a typical section of the Western Front on the German side consisted of a trench, with a second one twenty-five to sixty metres behind it, and a third at about the same distance behind that. The small distance between the trenches was intended to make it easier to move up reinforcements. But it soon became apparent that the range and enormous explosive power of projectiles meant that all three trenches could be destroyed with one hit. The Germans therefore began to build trenches at much greater distances from each other. And linear trenches were developed into deep complexes of trenches. As more and more mined dugouts were constructed, trench warfare soon came to resemble fighting in fortresses.

The use of mines turned the earth into a listening space. ‘Sight is a superfluous sense, your whole being is concentrated in the faculty of hearing; you close your eyes to hear the better’, noted one of the miners. Yet there are limits to human hearing. Where every subterranean vibration was a question of survival, where everything depended on the softest, most distant stirring, listening posts must have considered their sense of hearing deficient. Amplifiers, electrical listening instruments, and microphone systems were therefore in demand. Max Praßler, a businessman from Hamburg, sent some samples of his patented sound locators into the field. They allowed knocking signals to be picked up, loud and clear, from a distance of more than 1,000 metres from the source. His device proved its worth and more were ordered. ‘General Command considers the apparatus suitable for listening in tunnels and mine galleries as well as anywhere where firm ground, such as stone, clay, or chalk, will conduct sound’, we read in a report by the Guards Corps General Command.

9 Ibid.
The acoustician Erich Waetzm ann developed the ‘geophone’, based on the principle of the stethoscope, to ‘capture the sound of underground mining in wartime’. It was equipped with a microphone diaphragm so that sounds could be recorded electro-acoustically. The ability to transmit sound meant that listening posts in the underground galleries could be replaced with listening devices, saving sappers and making it possible to reduce the unnecessary presence of soldiers in danger zones. Underground explosions could happen at any time; the enemy could anticipate and pre-empt one’s own destructive intentions. Again and again, accounts by sappers mention being prepared for an explosion at any time, and describe the strain on their nerves and the over-exertion of their hearing. Everything was both improvised and carefully calculated because it was important to be prepared for the worst at any moment.

II.

While the eye can look at something separate from and external to itself, hearing cannot withdraw in this way. Unlike the eye, the ear cannot turn away or close, unless it is deliberately plugged, as in the case of Odysseus. Nineteenth-century ear specialists defined the eardrum as a ‘protective device for the ear’. As the eyelid protects the eye from light that is too bright, they argued, the eardrum protects the hearing organ from dangerously loud noises. Seeing acoustic perception in analogy to optical perception, they regarded the eardrum not primarily as a membrane for transmitting acoustic vibrations, but as a protective membrane between the outer and middle ear. The ear, however, is at the mercy of the noise that penetrates it; it has no lid that can protect it from outside. Hearing thus has a very different structure of attention from seeing. ‘It is not focused, but scattered; it does not act, but listens in order to absorb the sounds around it; it does not touch the surface of something, but enters into what is heard in order to interpret it.’ Thus ‘the dichotomy of observation’ is not

13 Erich Waetzm ann, ‘Zur Ausbreitung elastischer Wellen in der Erdoberfläche’, Naturwissenschaften, 15/16 (6 May 1927), 401.
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one of its characteristics.\textsuperscript{15} The ear does not work at a distance. The hearing individual is always already involved in the action.

‘The Ear in the War’ is the title of a contribution, dating from 1916, to the trade journal \textit{Artillerie- und Geniewesen}, in which the sense of hearing is the protagonist. This title is symptomatic of a time when living through war had caused the sensory apparatus to function in new ways. Where machine guns forced soldiers into the trenches, the war became an anonymous blanket of sound made up of weapons and projectiles that required combatants to ‘practise listening’ if they wanted to assess the level of danger threatening them.\textsuperscript{16} The battle of \textit{matériel} multiplied many times what so far had been experienced only as the traffic and industrial noise of a modern city. Claiming the ‘right to silence’, anti-noise societies and noise protection associations had been founded at the beginning of the twentieth century to curb the general attack on hearing. On the battlefield, however, noise was no longer a mere by-product of progress and industrialization. It was not just a backdrop to war, but a method in itself. ‘Drumfire’ was the name given to the tactic used to prepare infantry attacks, when artillery companies directed their fire, from the smallest calibre to the heaviest guns, in a heavy barrage at the enemy’s defensive lines and positions. The Germans ‘drummed’ for three and a half days during the offensive at Verdun in the spring of 1916. Barely six months later, preparing their summer offensive, British forces discharged more than 1.7 million shells in eight days, and more than 4.3 million in Flanders in the following year.\textsuperscript{17}

The destruction was deafening. ‘Drumming’ first of all put a strain on the soldiers’ eardrums. It was impossible to exaggerate the terrifying impact of the shelling, wrote Philip Gibbs, a British war correspondent in 1914. The noise, he went on, was more depressing than the prospect of imminent death.\textsuperscript{18} The effects of the noise were


\textsuperscript{16} Christoph Hoffmann, \textit{Der Dichter am Apparat: Medientechnik, Experimentalpsychologie und Texte Robert Musils 1899–1942} (Munich, 1997), 114.

\textsuperscript{17} Kaufmann, \textit{Kommunikationstechnik und Kriegsführung}, 172.

appalling. But there were some who got used to it, and were able to sleep through ‘drumfire’. As the artillery accumulated and enormous amounts of ammunition were expended, casualties also rose rapidly. Hospitals diagnosed hearing impairments, organic damage such as perforations of the eardrum, middle ear infections, and trauma to the ossicles. Patients were treated for ‘hysterical deafness’ and shell-shock with its heightened sensitivity to noise. After the noise, the soldiers’ ears were beleaguered by medicine.

With the intermingling noises in their ears, soldiers had to learn to discriminate between various sounds and to take note of special auditory events amid the general noise. After just two weeks in the field, some were able to identify the projectiles they heard in the air with absolute certainty. Skilful listeners, such as the violinist Fritz Kreisler, were invaluable to the unit. While serving on the Eastern Front, Kreisler was able to identify, from the sound made by an approaching shell, exactly where it would reach the highest point in the curve of its flight. A few days after he had told his officer of this, he was instructed to mark these points on a map, which made it possible to calculate the distance and position of the Russian batteries. Kreisler’s work was not in vain: ‘It was later on reported to me that I had succeeded in giving to our batteries the almost exact range of Russian guns. I have gone into this matter at some length, because it is the only instance where my musical ear was of value during my service’, he noted in his memoirs, which were published in America in 1915.

The theoretical foundations of phonometrics had been known in Germany before 1914, but they were not tested in practice until the war. In May 1915 the experimental psychologists Erich Moritz von Hornbostel and Max Wertheimer put the ‘directional hearing device’ they had invented at the service of the War Ministry. It was first test-

---


20 Fritz Kreisler, *Four Weeks in the Trenches: The War Story of a Violinist* (Boston, 1915), 28. After his honourable discharge from the Austrian army, Kreisler went to the USA which, as is well known, had not entered the war at the end of 1914. He donated his fees to the wounded and Austrian war orphans. After the USA entered the war, Kreisler suffered so much abuse for this that he had to cancel all performances. Harald Eggebrecht, *Große Geiger: Kreisler, Heifetz, Oistrach, Mutter, Hahn & Co.* (Munich, 2000), 146.
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ed under battle conditions in November, and became part of the regular kit of sound-ranging parties in the following year.21 Equivalent devices in France were known as ‘Sagnac’, ‘Perrin’, or ‘Baillaud’; in Britain, a device with conical trumpets was developed.22 In his war memoir, Martin Bochow, one of the first soldiers to be assigned to the newly formed sound-ranging parties, wrote: ‘In the midst of a war of shelling and machine guns, hand grenades and mortars, we, as a technical special force, equipped with the most modern observational devices, sat and worked with the precision of a modern engineer or physicist in the laboratory . . . except that the object of our observation was not some material or other, but the enemy batteries.’23

III.

There are many contemporary sources describing new auditory experiences in the trenches and in mountain warfare, but also in the ‘war underground’, where it was not brutally noisy, but silent. What was required here in order to be aware of an imminent threat was to listen, not in a noisy environment, but in a quiet one. The phenomenon of listening in silence has probably never been described better than by Franz Kafka in his story ‘Der Bau’, which was written in the winter of 1923–4. Kafka himself never took part in the underground war, but ‘absolutely wanted to be a soldier’.24 He was first mustered in June 1915 and had already bought some strong boots in case he was drafted. He was found fit to serve in the Landsturm, the reserve, and was assigned to the army. But in the same month, the workers’ accident insurance company for which he worked filed an application for, its vice-secretary, Kafka, to be exempted from military serv-

22 For how the various listening devices worked, and how they were developed further after the war, see Heinrich Hunke, Luftgefahr und Luftschutz (Berlin, 1935), 85–98.
23 Martin Bochow, Schallmesstrupp 57: Vom Krieg der Stoppuhren gegen Mörser und Haubitzen (Stuttgart, 1933), 51, 61.
24 Franz Kafka, Briefe an Felice und andere Korrespondenz aus der Verlobungszeit, ed. Erich Heller and Jürgen Born (Frankfurt am Main, 1967), 511.
ice as he was considered indispensable and irreplaceable in the office.\textsuperscript{25} Another call-up on 21 June 1916 had the same result. By the time Kafka’s exemption was lifted at the end of 1917 and he had to make himself available again, he had been diagnosed with consumption and knew that he would not be considered for service on health grounds.

Kafka therefore had no personal experience of trench warfare. But he had a copy of Bernhard Kellermann’s ‘Der Krieg unter der Erde’ in his library. And he might have visited a reconstruction of a trench, which had been installed outside the city for the edification of the people of Prague. It attracted thousands of visitors. On 6 November 1915 Kafka noted in his diary that he had seen ‘the ant-like movement of people in front of the trench and in it’. A mole-like creature that lives underground narrates ‘Der Bau’. It has entrenched itself in subterranean passages and has constructed an earth fortress to protect itself from the ‘external enemy’ and an enemy, never seen, ‘in the interior of the earth’.\textsuperscript{26} Every hundred metres the passages open into small round spaces where the animal can curl up comfortably, rest, and sleep. The best thing about the burrow, according to the animal, is its silence. But this does not last long. It is disturbed when a ‘barely audible hissing’ wakes it from sleep. Listening at the walls, the animal moves through the passages and digs test pits to establish where the noise is coming from so that it can eliminate it. But the noise never gets closer, ‘it always sounds unchanged, thin, coming at regular intervals, sometimes a hissing, once more like whistling’. The origin of the noise begins to take shape in the mind of the listener. Soon the ‘mole’ is speaking of the ‘hisser’ and ‘digger’, of an unknown ‘great beast’ that is working furiously; an enemy who is closing in on the burrow, drawing ever narrowing circles. The noise seems to get louder. In the burrow, ‘every moment shakes the listener’. His own passages are indistinguishable from the possible passages of the Other. But has the hissing beast even heard the other one, the ‘mole’ who ‘drags his ear along the walls’? Does it have ‘any sort of intelligence’ about him? ‘If it had heard me, I would have noticed

\textsuperscript{25} Franz Kafka, \textit{Amtliche Schriften}, ed. Klaus Hermsdorf (Berlin, 1984), 402.
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something, it would have had to stop working and listen from time to time, but everything remained unchanged, that’—Kafka’s unfinished story breaks off in the middle of a sentence.

The similarities, first pointed out by the cultural scholar Wolf Kittler, between Kafka’s ‘Bau’ and Bernhard Kellermann’s reportage ‘Krieg unter der Erde’, quoted at the beginning, are astonishing.27 Both start by soberly describing technicalities, but switch to a dramatic event at the first mention of the noise or the enemy. Both are narratives about listening in silence, as the sapper in ‘Krieg unter der Erde’ also ‘listens with his sensitive ears’, and ‘hears the enemy scraping and scratching’. ‘His ears are part of it’, says Kellermann, who describes the listening training on the front lines that forms part of mine warfare and is also mentioned by the animal in the burrow when it is trying to localize the noise with its ‘ear sharpened by practice’.28 Kafka’s story ‘Besuch im Bergwerk’, dating from 1919, could also be mentioned in this context. In it, one of the engineers who, on the instructions of the directorate, are surveying a test tunnel ‘holds an apparatus to his ear and listens’.

By picking up on the perceptions that had become relevant in the war, developing them further and remodelling them; by placing the most diverse fields of discourse associated with acoustic perception in relation to each other, Kafka took part in the contemporary re-evaluation of the sense of hearing. Sitting at his desk, he wrote his text at the same time as acousticians, in their sound-proofed laboratories, were trying out ‘listening in silence’ and exploring a phenomenon that they called ‘subjective noise’. What they meant by this was ‘noises that originate in the body itself’. During the war and after it, this condition was treated in connection with ‘neurasthenia’ and ‘war neuroses’, that is, as a pathological phenomenon. In field hospitals, patients who had been close to exploding grenades complained of noises and ringing in the ears; their condition was known as ‘hysterical deafness’, and they often suffered less from hearing loss than insomnia and subjective noise.29 While examining these patients,

doctors noted down the onomatopoeic descriptions they provided, and classified them as: ‘droning, gurgling, growling, humming, whirring, roaring, hissing, rustling, murmuring, bubbling, thundering, rumbling, thumping, rolling, booming, clicking, creaking, squeaking, chirping, hissing, twittering, ticking.’\textsuperscript{30} Definable musical notes or sequences (the ringing of bells, music) were also described. Their intensity varied greatly. While the weaker sounds were overshadowed by noise from outside and could only be perceived in silence, others were so intense that they drowned out everyday noises.

But rustling, thumping, and buzzing in the ears are not necessarily pathological. They can also be attributed to natural vibrations in individual body parts, or to the beating of the heart that can be heard in silence. The acoustician Erich Waetzm ann from Breslau, inventor of the geophone, called these non-pathological, subjective manifestations ‘body noise’. He attempted to make it audible, and thus to objectify it, in the same way that he treated ‘earth noise’ when listening to enemy sounds during the war underground: ‘The problem of recording any noise from the ground or the human body is, in principle, the same’, he wrote in 1927 in an article summing up the geophone, and suggested that more attention should be paid to these connections.\textsuperscript{31} In 1914 Waetzm ann enlisted as a private and was soon employed as a chief engineer by the head of Field Telegraphy. In 1917 he was transferred to the Artillery Commission in Berlin and headed the military experimental station in Friedrichshagen. ‘In France and Russia’, we read in his obituary, commenting on the early years of the war, ‘Erich Waetzm ann checked the listening stations in front of the front lines himself, going out on night patrols, monitoring the installation and operation of his geophones on the sections of the front vulnerable to undermining.’\textsuperscript{32} Those areas of the front where sappers, in


\textsuperscript{31} Waetzm ann, ‘Zur Ausbreitung elastischer Wellen’, 33.

\textsuperscript{32} Paul Hahn, ‘Zum Andenken an Erich Waetzm ann’, \textit{Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht}, 53/3 (1940), 88–91, at 89.
their listening passages, could not distinguish between objective and subjective noise provided the laboratory in which Waetzmann developed his geophone. For him as for Kafka’s animal, the same questions arose. They were difficult because they could not easily be answered: was he hearing the enemy dig, or pretending to dig? Was he listening to his own steps echoing in the neighbouring tunnel? Could he hear an explosive charge being prepared to be set off? Or was it quiet? Was it just the blood pulsating in his own arteries and his pulse throbbing at regular intervals? Could the soldier and the animal hear the Other, or just themselves?

In the dangerous areas right at the front, listening to what was happening underground was frequently associated with the ‘over-excited imaginations’ and ‘hallucinations’ that were among the features of panic among soldiers.33 This can be attributed to the lack of detachment characteristic of auditory perception: what is heard always depends on the hearer.

IV.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the ear lost its innocence. Adapted to terrain where the eye could barely perceive the threat, it was no longer a passive receptor, but had become an organ with responsibility, one that actively listened rather than merely heard. In 1934 the acoustician Erich Waetzmann wrote a small book, *Schule des Horchens*, that was both manifesto and training manual. By training the hearing it aimed ‘to exercise and improve the skill of hearing to such an extent that we will be able to entrust ourselves entirely to the leadership (*Führung*) of the ear when the eye fails’.34 In future, he argued, there would be more and more cases ‘in which the ear will be the sole guardian over our security’. Thus the value of training an ability to hear and listen could not be overestimated. Waetzmann was exploring the technical possibilities of perceptions for helping us to survive at a time of new dangers. Where the eye could no longer guarantee safety, the traditional sovereignty of the seeing subject was over. This was the lesson to be learned from the battlefield situation

of trench warfare, where dangers were no longer visible. The dangers had changed. They were invisible. Waetzmann wanted to give perceiving individuals back the security they had lost. This could only be achieved by training the capacity to listen.

In *Schule des Horchens* he prescribed eight listening exercises, ranked in order of difficulty. The acoustic signals (ranging from simple hand-clapping and banging pencils together to the firing of a pop gun) were to be as loud as possible, and distracting background noise to be avoided. The trainee listener only gradually learned to pick out each individual noise from many different but simultaneous noises, and identify the direction from which it was coming. For Waetzmann, this ‘directional listening’ was the centrepiece of the training. In the first exercise, the trainer was to position himself about a metre behind the trainee and, fixing his gaze on the back of the trainee’s head, send acoustic signals. The listener was to keep his head motionless, while the trainer changed the position from which he sent the sounds, clapping or knocking behind the trainee, then moving to the right, even further right, then to the left, then going back to the centre, and so on. In each case the trainee had to indicate the direction from which he heard the sound coming.35 Trainees had achieved the highest stage of auditory training when they were capable of locating moving targets. This exercise, Waetzmann suggested, could be carried out in a darkened room with a mouse moving around it. Once the trainee had established the direction from which the sound came, he was to illuminate the spot with a torch. Experienced listeners became so good at this ‘that the mouse soon becomes nervous and anxious and either stays quite still or, it seems, prefers to leave the room’.36

Waetzmann had his trainees playing games such as ‘Blinde Kuh’ or ‘Mäuschen, sag mal piep’. But these children’s games were nothing less than war games. The skills they taught were aiming at, illuminating, and hitting targets and making people nervous. Where war was played, the world war was inevitably present. Although Waetzmann did not make this explicit, all his examples pointed to this conclusion. It is striking, however, that here he suddenly ignored all the uncertainties of auditory perception, all the difficulties of objectiviz-

---

35 Ibid. 39.
36 Ibid. 49.
ing subjective sounds, which he had put to the test years earlier in his experiments on ‘listening in silence’. In *Schule des Horchens* he advocated automatic listening, a skill to be acquired by training, that kicked in like a reflex action as soon as a noise was heard, obviating any reflection on hearing itself.

In his investigation of ‘listening in silence’, Waetzmann had assumed that listeners were involved in what they were hearing, that they perceived not only auditory sensations from outside but also subjective noises like their own pulses or breathing. By registering natural vibrations in his experiments with an oscillograph, he attempted to explore the boundary in a way that, in a different place, the animal in Kafka’s ‘Bau’ was incapable of doing. It could not say whether it was hearing itself or the threatening Other. This aspect of participation, which became a dilemma for Kafka and is peculiar to auditory perception, no longer had any part to play in *Schule des Horchens*. Rather, the assumption was that for the perceiving individual, there was an audible world which just had to be listened to.

In *Schule des Horchens*, Waetzmann wrote that the aim of his slender handbook was ‘to exercise and improve the skill of hearing to such an extent that we will be able to entrust ourselves entirely to the leadership of the ear (*Führung des Ohres*)’.\(^{37}\) In Germany in 1934, this had to be understood politically. Given the radio loudspeakers of the Third Reich, such words were ambiguous. Listeners not only entrusted themselves to the leadership of the ear, but allowed themselves to be led by the Führer. Where the dilemma of participation, which is implicit in hearing, is not allowed to come into play, and where there is no question about whether I am hearing the Other or myself, the ear is easily made subservient. It becomes deaf to reflection on hearing itself.

The First World War was a war that affected all the senses. At times, when approaching danger could only be perceived acoustically and the sense of hearing, which, unlike sight, knew neither distance nor protection, was challenged, the perception of danger became a dilemma: was the soldier hearing the Other or himself? At moments of panic he could not tell. How was he to train for this? But as the significance of the sense of hearing was increasingly understood, exercises were undertaken, like the ones prescribed by Waetz-
mann in his *Schule des Horchens*. Even if the sense of hearing cannot be ‘steeled’, Waetzmann wanted to make it serviceable to both military and civilian life, and to increase its efficiency so that those living under threat ‘can, calmly and confidently, place their trust in the leadership of the ear, when the eye fails’. In his drills he tried to eliminate the ambivalence inherent in auditory perception which he had analysed so precisely in past years. And in Germany in 1934 this was not good news.

JULIA ENCKE is editor of the feuilleton in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung* and from 2001 to 2005 was editor of the feuilleton in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. After studying literature in Freiburg, Toulouse, and Munich, she did her doctoral research on the sensory perception of the First World War. Her publications include *Augenblicke der Gefahr: Der Krieg und die Sinne, 1914–1934* (2006) and *Charisma und Politik: Warum unsere Demokratie mehr Leidenschaft braucht* (2014).
REFLECTIONS OF WAR SOUNDS IN GERMAN CONCERT HALLS

STEFAN HANHEIDE

The impact of the First World War was, in German public awareness, far more marked in literature and the visual arts than in music. In the sphere of literature Erich Maria Remarque’s *All Quiet on the Western Front* springs to mind, likewise Ernest Hemingway’s *A Farewell to Arms*, both of 1929, but also Henri Barbusse’s *Le Feu: journal d’une escouade*, published in 1916.¹ In the visual arts Käthe Kollwitz, Otto Dix, and Max Beckmann on the German side deserve mention.

Musical works with war references have been investigated much more in the English-speaking world than elsewhere. A conference held at the university of Osnabrück in October 2012 and its published proceedings represent an early contribution by German musicology, which deals with many of the belligerent countries.² In contrast to the perceptions of the German public today, research so far suggests that the First World War inspired a wealth of compositions in all combatant nations. They often have titles such as Anthem, Victory March, Battle Song, To my Fatherland, Pour la patrie, Lamentation, Elegy, Requiem, Berceuse, Memorial, Honneur à . . ., Sonata Eroica, and so on. The motives were twofold: composers wanted to participate in the war by giving musical expression to their own enthusiasm for it; and they also sensed the prospect of financial success. This applied to both composers and publishers. War noises were often given musical treatment. Thus semantic signs emerged that could make a recognizable statement.

Newly published pieces in the German-language area were listed in the monthly *Hofmeister-Verzeichnis*, which can be found online. Trans. Jane Rafferty (GHIL). This article is based on a paper delivered at the German Historical Institute London on 24 June 2014.

¹ The English version, *Under Fire: The Story of a Squad*, was published in 1917; the German version in 1918.
today. From September 1914 on it brought together a huge number of relevant compositions inspired, above all, by the ‘August experience’ and the following enthusiasm for the outbreak of war (see Figure 1). Most of these pieces are by composers who are totally unknown today and only a few of the titles are available in specialist libraries. Richard Strauss accused these composers of exploiting the boom and producing dilettante work in the guise of patriotism. Alongside such compositions, many simple songs were written for the people and soldiers, often without accompaniment, and published together in small booklets. Dietrich Helms has put together a list of songs relating solely to Hindenburg, containing 168 individual titles. Shortly after the outbreak of the First World War, therefore, ambitious German composers had already started to be creative and comment on the hostilities in their works.

It must be noted that we should, in fact, be referring to German-speaking rather than German composers, as Austrian music—almost exclusively Viennese—cannot be separated from German. At the time of the First World War Vienna was still the capital of German music. And most of the examples to be discussed here were composed by Austrian musicians. The following incident illustrates this integration of Germany’s and Austria’s musical cultures. In July 1921 the Austrian composer Arnold Schoenberg wrote to his pupil Josef Rufer: ‘I have discovered something that will ensure the superiority of German music for the next hundred years.’ The Austrian head of the Vienna School, who in 1925 took over the master class for composers at the Preußische Akademie der Künste in Berlin, wanted to play a part in the future predominance of German music with his twelve-tone technique. He saw himself as continuing the German tra-


7 Willi Reich, Schönberg oder Der konservative Revolutionär (Vienna, 1968), 173.
Figure 1: Excerpt from the Hofmeister-Verzeichnis.
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dition represented by Bach, Beethoven, Schumann, and Brahms, one to which Austrian composers such as Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, and Mahler had also contributed. For him, separating the Austrian was out of the question. A short time later the Jew and exponent of the New Music, Schoenberg, was denounced by the German side as an internationalist and musical bolshevik.

This article is divided into three sections. The first looks at how and why composers worked war noises into their pieces by examining selected examples, including some from beyond the German-language area. The Italian composer Alfredo Casella and the French composer Maurice Ravel represent the side of Germany’s wartime enemy. By drawing on a broader horizon of music history, the second section will demonstrate what opportunities musicians had in 1914 to incorporate further war noises into their compositions. The third section will discuss why these opportunities were not taken, and look at how the war influenced music history in a different way.

I. War Sounds in Music

The first sounds of the First World War that spring to mind are those of the battlefield—the thunder of canons, the firing of guns, bombs exploding, and so forth. These, however, were not the sounds adopted by composers. Rather, they turned to other acoustic signs sent by the war, mainly in the form of anthems, war songs, patriotic chorales, military music, and marches.

A number of works use national anthems, often drawing on the same melodies: La Marseillaise, the Austrian Gott erhalte, and the British national anthem. It is important to note in this context that allocating the national anthems in the First World War is not straightforward. The melody of the British national anthem was the same as that of the German Heil Dir im Siegerkranz and the non-official American My Country, ’Tis of Thee. This American patriotic song is quoted in Charles Ives’s In Flanders Fields, based on John McCrae’s famous war poem. America’s current national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner, was declared the national anthem by President Wilson in 1916, and confirmed by the US Congress in 1931. So the warring parties, Germany on one side, Britain and America on the
other, had national anthems with the same melody. In Germany there were discussions and attempts to create a new national anthem, but these came to nothing. Popular audiences often sang the Deutschlandlied, which used Joseph Haydn’s melody of 1797 to the words ‘Deutschland, Deutschland über alles’ by Hoffmann von Fallersleben (1836). After the First World War the Deutschlandlied became the official German national anthem. In the nineteenth century and during the First World War, however, this melody was used for the Austrian anthem. It was composed in 1797 by Joseph Haydn to the words ‘Gott erhalte Franz, den Kaiser’, which were later changed.

Other melodies of national importance were also used, in Germany, above all, Protestant chorales that came to represent the nation. Nun danket alle Gott, known as the Choral von Leuthen, is constantly cited in music history. In a political context, the chorale was used by Johannes Brahms, who quoted it in his Triumflied Op. 55, composed immediately after the victory over France in 1870–1 and dedicated to the German emperor. Max Reger used the chorale in his Vaterländische Ouvertüre of 1914, linking it with the Deutschlandlied, which, in this case, should be seen not as Austrian, but as the German national anthem, in order to distinguish it from the British one. In his piano piece En blanc et noir (1915), Claude Debussy used Luther’s chorale Ein feste Burg to characterize the Germans.

My first example is Felix von Weingartner’s overture Aus ernster Zeit. Weingartner is today better known as a conductor than a composer. In 1915 he expressed his political opinions of the world war as follows: ‘Lying, deceitful, swaggering, and haughty—that is how our enemies set up a wicked war. Honest, loyal, powerful, and modest—that is how we accept the challenge and respond to it. There will be no higher world order if we are not the victors.’

Weingartner’s programme, which he set to music, is illustrated in the drawing (see Figure 2). Aus ernster Zeit was composed right at the start of the war, in September and October 1914. Two critics reported on performances in the autumn of 1914. One wrote:

Vienna. On the 8th inst. [November 1914], under F. Weingartner’s proven and masterful leadership, our unsurpassed

---

8 Two other patriotic songs also occur in the composition: Ich hatt einen Kameraden, and Ich hab mich ergeben.

9 See Figure 2.
Gedanken.

Von Felix von Weingartner.

Verlogen, heimtückisch, prahlerisch und dunkelhaft, — so haben unsere Feinde einen frevelhaften Krieg gerüftet.

Ehrlich, treu, kraftvoll und bescheiden, — so haben wir die Herausforderung angenommen und erwidern sie.

Es gäbe keine höhere Weltordnung, wenn wir nicht die Sieger blieben.

The enemy’s bad soldier with a snake on the left is opposed to the winner, presented in the style of a Greek victor, adorned with oak greenery symbolizing Germany. Source: Kriegshilfsbüro des k.k. Ministerium des Inneren (ed.), Kriegsalmanach 1914–1916 (3rd edn. Vienna, 1916), 78.
Philharmonic opened its midday concerts. . . . We heard Weingartner’s new overture Aus ernster Zeit. The French seem to be characterized by La Marseillaise, the Russians by their imperial hymn; both melodies do battle with Heil Dir im Siegerkranz and Gott erhalte; of course these last two (joined at the end in skilful counterpoint) gloriously prevail. Weingartner introduces La Marseillaise ‘scornfully and cheekily’ like croaking birdsong. Soon afterwards, conceived in a guardistic-ironic way, the Russian national anthem appears, distorted in neo-French whole-tone harmony à la Debussy . . . Par nobile fratrum . . . At first hinted at very quietly by the cellos and basses, we then sense, as if from a long way off in gentle, full organ chords, Gott erhalte; this then sets the tone most powerfully, forcing the audience to stand up involuntarily, which is what happened at the Philharmonic concert. And when the two imperial anthems are combined at the end, it caused a storm of applause that did not want to end, in response to which Weingartner repeated the last part of his new piece—the apotheosis—as an encore.10

A performance in Darmstadt was reported as follows: ‘Here a new composition by Felix Weingartner, an overture Aus großer Zeit [sic] was performed for the first time. The composer works on La Marseillaise, the British, and the Russian national anthems in a dissonant way and at the end contrasts them with a victorious combination of the German and Austrian anthems.’11

The confusion over the national anthems becomes quite clear here. The first critic speaks only of Heil dir im Siegerkranz, the second also mentions the British anthem. To understand the meaning of the music it is useful to show the Russian imperial anthem, which is hardly known today (see Figure 3). The other anthems are well known. La Marseillaise, the Russian anthem, both distorted, and God save the King/Heil dir im Siegerkranz can be heard. The last anthem appears in both a deconstructed and a pure, dignified form. Then Gott erhalte is quietly played by the organ, in a quasi-sacral style. In a

later section another sacral rendition of Gott erhalte by brass instruments can be heard, followed by a combination of Gott erhalte/Heil dir im Siegerkranz as an apotheosis which closes the piece. A musical battle ends in musical chauvinism. Weingartner’s overture Aus ernster Zeit is a work laden with emotion and effects. During the war it was often performed in Germany, as the advertisement in Figure 4 shows. The composition was published by Universal Edition in Vienna as early as 1914, and a piano version for four hands was brought out in 1915 for playing at home.

Yet this use of national anthems in musical pieces directed at concert audiences was also explicitly criticized. Unlike Weingartner, the French composer Vincent d’Indy refused to use national anthems and songs when he composed his Third Symphony, De bello gallico (1916–18). He wrote: ‘J’ai évité avec soin toute Marseillaise, toute Wacht am Rhein.’

My second example is Franz Lehár’s lied Fieber from his cycle of five songs, published in 1915 as Aus eiserner Zeit. While the first four are simple songs with piano accompaniment, the fifth, entitled Fieber, is staged as a dramatic scene (see Figure 5). It depicts a wounded soldier’s time in a field hospital. He is in a feverish dream and imagines himself amongst his fighting comrades. To the words ‘den Kriegsmarsch, den wir alle sangen’ (‘the war march, that we all sang’), the

---

12 Letter to Paul Poujaud, 5 Aug. 1916. See Esteban Buch, ‘Vincent d’Indy et la Première Guerre mondiale: Sinfonia brevis de bello gallico’, in Manuela Schwarz (ed.), Vincent d’Indy et son temps (Sprimont, 2006), 22–3. Die Wacht am Rhein was the most popular German patriotic song of the time, directed against France. The composer commented (ibid.): ‘J’y ai mis presque inconsciemment, toutes mes impressions de la guerre; 1er Mouvt. = La Mobilisation—La Marne; Scherzo = La gaieté du front; Andante = L’art latin et l’art boche; Finale = La victoire, avec l’hymne de S. Michel comme préraison.’

13 The five songs in the collection are: Trutzlied (words by Fritz Löhner); Ich hab’ ein Hüglein in Polenland (words by Karl Dankwart Zwerger); Nur einer . . . (words by Fr. W. van Oestéren); Reiterlied 1914 (words by Hugo Zuckermann); and Fieber (words by Erwin Weill).
Figure 4: An Advertisement for Universal Edition.

This advertisement contains numerous references to performances. Source: Signale für die musikalische Welt, 73 (6 Jan. 1915).
Austrian Radetzky March sounds, in combination with the Hungarian Rákóczi March, in a minor key.

In the soldier’s hallucinating state, the sounds of the various marches mix together. Then, eerily and sombrely, Lehár depicts his approaching death, which brings the work to an uneasy end. This composition, written in April 1915, is generally seen as linked to the suffering of Lehár’s brother Anton, a colonel in the Austro-Hungarian army. He was wounded twice during the first weeks of the war and taken to a hospital in Vienna, where he suffered for months, but eventually recovered. ‘My visits to him are some of the saddest memories of my life’, Lehár remarked in his journal in November 1919.14 Lehár, the son of a military chaplain, presented the tragic side of the war in a complex composition. Along with the piano piece, he also wrote a version for orchestra, which was performed for the first time on 12 April 1916. Scholars of Lehár’s music generally have great dif-

Figure 5: Franz Lehár, Fieber.

Combination of the Austrian Radetzky March and the Hungarian Rákóczi March. Version for piano, with one of the marches appearing in small print.
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difficulty in knowing where to place this work amongst the composer’s successful operettas.15

Alban Berg’s March from Op. 6, is another instance of the most military of musical genres. The last section of his Drei Orchesterstücke, Op. 6, entitled Marsch, was written in the summer of 1914. Unlike in Lehár’s treatment, however, the march character can barely be heard in Berg’s work. Although traces of military music idioms can be heard in various places, these are distorted. A military march is usually in a major key, and its tempo and structure are clearly recognizable. Its positive and stimulating message must come across clearly, and any complexity is alien to it. Berg turns all this completely on its head. The atmosphere is dark and depressing. For most of this ten-minute movement, even the march tempo is unclear. All we hear is destruction. Characterized by virtuoso ‘careless counterpoint’,16 the structure is extremely complicated and various different canons overlie one another. The march as military idiom is destroyed and repeated hammer blows disrupt the events, turning it into a Marche macabre.17 In this piece, Berg explicitly refers to Mahler’s Sixth Symphony (1904), especially its last movement. Later, both Mahler and Berg were seen as anticipating the horrors of the First World War, as the war was just beginning when Berg finished the piece. He completed it in outline at the end of July, and as a full score on 8 September 1914. Despite the fact that the full scale of violence of the First World War had not yet unfolded, during the Balkan Wars of 1912–13 a war of unprecedented scale could be anticipated. Debates about war and peace were particularly intense in Vienna, which emerged as one of the most important centres of the European peace movement.

When Berg destroys the march as military idiom, it is useful to look at his attitude towards the war. Berg’s letters to Schoenberg before the end of 1914 reveal a certain ambivalence. On the one hand he expresses a compulsion to be part of it and regrets that he has been declared unfit to serve. As a contemporary with a moral sense he

expects the war to improve the world by ‘cleansing’ it. On the other hand, he speaks of the horrors and suffering of the time and longs to be able to live in peace far away from it all.\textsuperscript{18} He complains about the reports in the newspapers, which he calls ‘filthy rags’ and a ‘disgusting accompaniment’.\textsuperscript{19} Schoenberg had urged him to pledge a war loan. Berg refused, citing financial difficulties, but said that he had donated to war welfare, preferring to support the victims rather than the perpetrators. All in all, there is little enthusiasm for war to be found in these letters, especially to the nationalistic Schoenberg.

Having initially been declared unfit, Berg was called up in August 1915. At a school for reservist officers in Bruck an der Leitha he suffered a physical breakdown at the beginning of November 1915 and was admitted to the military hospital, where he stayed for two weeks. After that he was first reassigned to guard duty in Vienna and finally, in May 1916, to a position in the War Ministry, where he remained until the end of the war.

A final example from the German side is Paul Hindemith’s \textit{Repertorium für Militärochester Minimax}. Like Lehár and Berg, Hindemith also worked with marches. While the three works discussed so far were intended for the general public and were performed in large concert settings, Hindemith’s work was designed for a small circle only. Nonetheless, it can be regarded as a personal confession of faith, or as an outlet for dealing with the events of the war. It was performed at the Donaueschinger Musiktag in 1923 for a private audience. A contemporary photograph shows the well-known Amar Quartet, in which Hindemith himself played the viola, performing \textit{Minimax} on the grass in the park of Donaueschingen Schloss. The photograph shows a clear parody. The four musicians are executing a military salute while wearing home-made white paper hats and holding their bows like weapons.\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{20} The photograph, entitled ‘Die “Militärkapelle Minimax” beim Morgentraining (Amar-Quartett)’, is printed in Heinrich Strobel, \textit{Paul Hindemith}:
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The opening and closing movements of the six-part work parody the popular Prussian military marches which were among the standard repertoire of German military bands until the end of the First World War. During the war Hindemith himself was a regimental musician who played the big drum. The first movement parodies the Hohenfriedberger Marsch. Hindemith gives it the title Hohenfürstenberger, referring to the patron of the Donaueschinger Musiktage, Max Egon Fürst zu Fürstenberg. Hindemith calls the last movement, containing shades of the march Alte Kameraden, Alte Karbonaden. There is hardly a musical ensemble that is further removed from the military band than the string quartet. The military band plays loud, open-air concerts; the string quartet, by contrast, produces a particularly noble, almost philosophical sound. ‘The serious musical presentation of a string quartet, that reasoned conversation between four people, mercilessly exposes the pathetic veneer and sentimental kitsch of the military bands.’21 The facetiousness is also evident in a note on the cello score saying: ‘slur note. A valve is to be kept “frozen” at the Kaiserbaß.’ Everything that has been written here about Hindemith’s military music, the intimate audience, and the valve function, also applies to Schoenberg’s composition of 1916, Die kleine Brigade for string quartet and piano. It is worth noting that both composers defamiliarize the military music idiom by presenting it for string quartet.

If we look beyond the German-language area, Pagine di guerra by the Italian composer Alfredo Casella, strengthens the argument that composers hesitated to insert actual war sounds into their works. Its subtitle is Cinque Films musicali. A version for piano, four hands, Op. 25, was created in 1915–16; the version for orchestra with an added fifth movement was concluded in 1918. The five short individual movements are entitled: 1. In Belgium: Parade of German Heavy Artillery; 2. In France: In Front of the Ruins of Reims Cathedral; 3. In Russia: Charge of the Cossack Cavalry; 4. In Alsace: Wooden Crosses

More than in other compositions, the events of the war determine the titles. But they all refer to images. Nowhere is there any mention of sounds, such as bombardment or the beating of drums. And the music is constructed visually. It does not imitate noises; it is not onomatopoeic. This is confirmed by the subtitle’s reference to ‘films’. A certain drastic quality can be discerned, however, not so much in the more harmless second and fourth movements, but in the others.

Perhaps the most successful way of commenting on the First World War in music was found by Maurice Ravel, who worked especially with the symbol of the dance. One example is *Le Tombeau de Couperin*. Here he moulds six movements by the French Baroque composer into new works. The version for piano was written from 1914 to 1917 and was first performed on 1 April 1919 in Paris. It is composed of the following six movements: 1. Prélude (à la mémoire du lieutenant Jacques Charlot); 2. Fugue (à la mémoire du sous-lieutenant Jean Cruppi); 3. Forlane (à la mémoire du lieutenant Gabriel Delue); 4. Rigaudon (à la mémoire de Pierre et Pascal Gaudin); 5. Menuet (à la mémoire de Jean Dreyfus); 6. Toccata (à la mémoire du capitaine Joseph de Marliave). A version for orchestra in only four movements was completed in 1919 and was premiered on 28 February 1920 in Paris. But the typical French titles were retained: 1. Prélude; 2. Forlane; 3. Menuet; 4. Rigaudon. Thus Ravel declared himself part of the great French musical tradition and gave his country and compatriots, who had suffered so much violence in the war, the potential for identification. He dedicated each movement to an acquaintance or friend who died in the war.

The idea of destroying musically encoded material encountered in Berg’s *March of 1914* reoccurs in Maurice Ravel’s *La valse*, finished in 1919. This project was started in 1906 and, under the title *Wien*, was intended as an apotheosis of the Viennese waltz. Once the Habsburg Empire had become an enemy in the war, Ravel added his own de-

---

22 I. Nel Belgio: sfilata di artiglieria pesante tedesca; II. In Francia: davanti alle rovine della cattedrale di Reims; III. In Russia: carica di cavalleria cosacca; IV. In Alsazia: croci di legno . . . ; V. Nell’ Adriatico: corazzate italiane in crociera.

23 Printed version Paris 1918.

24 Printed version Paris 1919.
struction of the waltz, while he had started by celebrating the genre. With distorted rhythms and dissonant harmonies the piece ends in an eruption of chaos and violence. The idiom of the waltz, which symbolizes the Habsburg monarchy, has achieved its own destruction. In both works Ravel composed dances and placed himself in the tradition of the great ballet-loving nation France. In Le Tombeau de Couperin he created a memorial to his fallen friends in the French dances. In La valse he composed a Viennese waltz in which the enemy destroyed itself.

II. War Noises in Music?

In the examples given so far, the noises of the battlefield hardly appear in the compositions. One reason for this can be found in the musical aesthetics of the time. This was the last breath of musical romanticism, marked by a large distance between politics and music. Politics was regarded as a bad thing, a mundane business, from which high art should distance itself as far as possible. Any point of contact between the two different worlds was out of the question. This is why Gustav Mahler was so harshly criticized when he dared to use everyday music in his symphonies. The Frère Jacques canon in a minor key in the third movement of his First Symphony was an affront to the aesthetics of the time, but it paved the way for the New Music. Building on what he had done, musicians developed major musical departures around 1910. Unlike the composers encountered so far, the new avant-garde, however, was prepared to integrate war noises into musical compositions. This applies to Italian Futurism and its musical branch, Bruitismo, and to Expressionism, which in music took the the form of atonality.

Futurism

Futurism developed the idea that in a musical work most attention should be paid not to the traditionally dominant parameters of melody, harmony, and rhythm, but to noise. The new art was to be shaped by railway noises, ships’ sirens, and the sound of aeroplanes. The traditional range of instruments was considered inadequate for this, and in 1913 new instruments were developed, the intonarumori. The key representatives of musical Futurism, the brothers Luigi and
Antonio Russolo, divided their *intonarumori* into six groups producing the following sounds:

1. Rumbles, Roars, Explosions, Crashes, Splashes, Booms
2. Whistles, Hisses, Snorts
3. Whispers, Murmurs, Mumbles, Grumbles, Gurgles
4. Screeches, Creaks, Rustles, Buzzes, Crackles, Scrapes
5. Noises made by percussion on metal, wood, skin, stones, terracotta etc.
6. Voices of animals and men: Shouts, Screams, Groans, Shrieks, Howls, Laughs, Wheezes, Sobs.25

This range of instruments was ideally suited to reproducing the sounds of the battlefield. Part of the ideology connected with Futurism before the First World War was also the glorification of war, ‘this unique hygiene of the world’, as it was called in Marinetti’s *Futurist Manifesto* of 1909.26 This idea of hygiene was widespread among intellectuals, and music was part of it during the war. In the book version of Luigi Russolo’s central tract, *L’Arte dei Rumori* (1916), a six-page chapter is devoted solely to ‘The Noises of War’. Russolo reports with enthusiasm that when he was called up at Lake Garda, he could ‘study the immeasurable wealth of war noises in every detail’.27 He wrote that war and musical Futurism engage in a positively poetic symbiosis: ‘In the modern mechanized and metal war, visual elements are virtually irrelevant, but the sense, meaning, and expression of noise is unlimited. Since traditional poetry lacks the appropriate means for transposing the reality and value of these noises, modern war can only be given expression using the sound instrumentation of futuristically liberated words.’28 If the First World War had ended with a positive experience, its sounds would clearly have determined the art of Futurism.

Despite the negative experience, the word ‘war’ appears in the titles of works by Futurists more often than in those of other composers.29 After the war, however, it was only the movement’s leader,

---

26 *Le Figaro*, 20 Feb. 1909.
28 Ibid.
29 Examples of pieces by futurist composers with titles referring to war are Francesco Balilla Pratella, *La Guerra: Tre Danze per Orchestra*, Op. 32 (1913):
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Marinetti, who continued to be interested in war for his art. For the others, reality destroyed their war enthusiasm. Thrilled at having been called up, thirteen close adherents lost their lives, and another forty-one were wounded. Russolo himself suffered severe head wounds, from which it took him a long time to recover. Although he continued to pursue the idea of noise machines with his brother in the 1920s, they no longer worked with war noises. Two works of 1921 were called Corale and Serenata. These two pieces, each only about two minutes long, expose the shortcomings of their work and illustrate the huge gulf between theory and practice. Yet no other musical style went as far as Italian Futurism in using war noises in musical compositions.

Of the Futurists, Pratella was the actual musician, while Russolo was a painter. His piece La Guerra does not work with noise-makers, the intonarumori, but with traditional instruments. Written for orchestra, today all that remain are recordings of the piano version. Although we hear chaotic sounds primarily in the middle section, ‘La Battaglia’, there are no war sounds. The work is close to that of composers who, at this time, had decided to give noise in music greater status, but used traditional instruments, for instance, Igor Stravinsky in his ballet The Rite of Spring (1913) and Béla Bartók in his Allegro barbaro (1911). Here, too, the preconditions exist for treating war noises in music.

Expressionism
Expressionism opened up new possibilities for allowing pain and its human expression, the cry, to be heard in music. Atonality was used for this. In his two one-act pieces Erwartung (1909) and Die glückliche Hand (1913), Schoenberg used sounds ‘that offer more painful inten-
sity than anything that has gone before’. The cry of pain is a significant expression of war, whether produced on being wounded or on learning of a loved-one’s death. To this extent, Expressionism also laid the foundations for adopting the noises of the battlefield and war. Its central tenet, ‘Truth not Beauty’, fitted in with this.

The last great work of Expressionism, Alban Berg’s opera Wozzeck, composed between 1914 and 1922 and first performed on 14 December 1925, deals with the fate of a soldier. He has hallucinations that are already evident in the second scene of Act 1. As mentioned above, Berg himself had suffered a breakdown when he was a soldier. Now he had the chance to link the hallucinations of his soldier Wozzeck clearly with the war. Including some obvious war noises in this scene would have made the connection quite clear. But he did not do this. Georg Büchner’s text of 1836, which Berg adopted virtually unchanged, has characteristics of later literary Expressionism. Some of the concepts and images of the conclusion of the second scene derive from the biblical apocalypse:

Wozzeck:
Ein Feuer! Ein Feuer! Das fährt von der Erde in den Himmel
A fire! A fire there! It rises from earth into heaven

und ein Getös herunter wie Posaunen. Wie’s herankirrt!
And with a tumult falling, just like trombones. How it rattles!

Andres:
Die Sonn’ ist unter, drinnen trommeln sie.
The sun has set now, hear the drummers there.

Wozzeck:
Still, alles still, als wäre die Welt tot.
Quiet, all is quiet, as if the world were dead.

Berg’s soldier suffers from oppression by the captain and the doctor, from his lover’s interest in the drum major, and from the shame of having fathered an illegitimate child. Berg has resisted making any reference to the First World War. The only war sounds are in the
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form of sleep noises from the barracks in the fifth scene of Act 2. He confines himself to a generally valid depiction of the social fate of his Wozzeck, who murders Marie and then kills himself. Their child is left behind as an orphan. What is perhaps the most important opera of the twentieth century is thus one of social compassion. But it is not an anti-war opera— which it could have been. \(^{32}\)

III. Conclusion: The Impact of the War on Music History

Even though the musical means were available, composers during and after the First World War were not willing to use realistic war sounds in their compositions. Why not? The distance between music as art and the sphere of politics has already been mentioned. What should also be mentioned is that in the course of 1915 the reality of the war in all its horror and tragedy unfolded. The death announcements in the newspapers became ever longer and soon stopped being printed. Every small village and every family suffered losses. After the war, after all the devastation, there was a collective trauma. Composition using the noises that caused or depicted this tragedy became obsolete. No one wanted to put these sounds to music, and no one wanted to hear them.

Musical representation of more realistic war noises only emerged after the Second World War. Krzysztof Penderecki’s *Threnos*, depicting in sound the atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima, may be mentioned. Benjamin Britten’s more restrained *War Requiem* subliminally adopts the sounds of the battlefield. Both of these works were written around 1960. They were preceded by Dmitri Shostakovich’s *Leningrad Symphony* in 1941, where war noises can be heard in the middle section of the first movement. These are only a few really key works. As described above, Italian Futurism never really transformed war noise into music, although it developed the broadest theoretical guidelines. Today the best-known work that can be related to musical futurism in a broader sense is Arthur Honegger’s *Pacific 231* (1923). This depicts in sound a train starting and then coming to a stop. To this extent it corresponds to Futurism. What Honegger was really

interested in, however, was musical structures, namely, accelerating or decelerating movement simply by changing the rhythm and not the tempo. In other words, he dispensed with indications of tempo such as adagio, andante, or allegro and their modifications accelerando or ritardando, and only made the smallest rhythmical adjustments. This preoccupation with musical structures is symptomatic of the period. Rejecting romantic harmony, in fact, rejecting all expression as such, composers were looking for new musical structures.

The most prominent proponent of this process was the Vienna School around Schoenberg which, after the First World War, developed atonality further into the twelve-tone technique. The central principle of expression in atonality was to be drawn out of it by its structure. Besides the Vienna School, Stravinsky moved from writing music of extreme expression before the war, as in the *Rite of Spring*, for instance, to writing music of extreme structure, to neo-classicism, which seemingly lacks any expression. Another attempt to create new musical structures was Alois Hába’s quarter-tone system, which he applied, for instance, in his *Choral Suite*. For choral voices he did not use a text, but simply vocalized them. After the incomprehensibility of the war, any text, any content, was in danger of telling lies.

In exile, Hanns Eisler composed a choral cantata in 1936, *Gegen den Krieg*. His use of a strict twelve-tone technique barely allows for any emotion at all. On the German side the lack of language and expression must have been even greater than in other countries. The only thing any of them was interested in was musical structure, certainly not content, like Mahler and Strauss. A parallel development in visual arts was abstract painting, which began before the war. Order and structure in music were intended to neutralize any sort of expression. After the trauma of the war, the human soul, damaged forever, was given armour-plating to protect it from any feelings. ‘The First World War was followed by a disillusionment bordering on coldness.’33 This was how the war influenced music history.
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The First World War had a profound effect upon British music. Not surprisingly, the conflict brought a major interruption to the exponential creative invention that the nation had witnessed since the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Many of its most avid participants volunteered for the armed services, a responsibility which allowed little time for composition. Yet, in spite of the unexpected commitments that war brought, British composers across the spectrum of musical generations—which included late Victorians (such as Hubert Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford), well-established Edwardians such as Edward Elgar, and an abundant array of younger pupils from London’s musical conservatoires as well as from the provinces—found time and the need to express their impressions of the struggle. An understandable part of this creative response can be witnessed in the corpus of commemorative works such as elegies and funeral marches, expressions of heroism and courage, laments, and other outpourings of grief and loss. However, one of the most notable attributes of the range of musical utterances was a predisposition towards the enunciation of the war’s sights and sounds, a phenomenon which this article seeks to explore across a broad range of musical forms and genres. Moreover, in identifying these elements in music, some attempt is made to rationalize them in terms of individual and collective experience, both from the point of those who fought and took part in the military struggle, as well as those civilians at home who could only observe war from a distance.

One of the key preoccupations of First World War historians and commentators, and a principal focus of last year’s centenary of the outbreak of hostilities in 1914, has been the extraordinary speed with which Europe launched itself headlong into conflict in the months leading up to 4 August—the alliances, the misunderstandings, the mistrust, and the use of national propaganda. Tensions, of course,

This article is based on a paper delivered at the German Historical Institute London on 15 July 2014.
had existed for some time, notably in the arms race and the Dreadnought scare, and this did much to excite patriotic fervour at home. Sir Hubert Parry, Director of the Royal College of Music, former Heather Professor of Music at Oxford, a senior figure in the British musical establishment, and a man with strongly held liberal views, placed his faith in the power of democracy. His words about the role of a composer are enshrined in Ralph Vaughan Williams’ ‘An Autobiography’, where he declared to his former pupil: ‘Write choral music as befits an Englishman and a democrat.’¹ In that statement, his mission was to place the musician at the heart of society in which he or she had both a creative and moral duty to promulgate the values of music as an agency of self-improvement. On 4 February 1914 Parry had attended the Peace Centenary marking 100 years of peace between Britain and the United States. Writing in his diary that evening he noted: ‘In afternoon to the Peace Centenary meeting at the Mansion House. Asquith much off colour. Archbishop [of Canterbury, Randall Davidson] flowery. The best speech was [Viscount] Bryce’s, which was even amusing. He made some really good points, e.g. “War need never happen if people make up their minds they won’t have it.”’² And Parry held this firm belief until the outbreak of war.

Throughout his busy life, Parry had found time to provide music for five Greek plays for productions at Cambridge and Oxford. His last, for the Oxford University Dramatic Society, was written for Aristophanes’ The Acharnians, which was produced at Oxford in February 1914. The choice of this play, which talks of the folly and waste of war, was not lost on its audience, and it had many resonances for Parry, who refused to believe that Britain would go to war with Germany. It was the habit of the producers of these performances, ever since they were revived in the 1880s, to infuse Aristophanes’ text with contemporary political references and satirical jibes, almost in the manner of pantomime. For Parry, it was a welcome opportunity to voice his own opinions in musical terms, mostly through the medium of quotations, some of them subtle, others often rebarbative. As he detailed in the programme notes for the

² Diary of Sir Hubert Parry, 4 Feb. 1914, Shulbrede Priory, Sussex.
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Oxford performances, the ‘War Scares’ were typified by the tune ‘An orrible tale we have to tell’; ‘The Acharnians (the Old Fighters of Marathon and Salamis)’ by ‘the British Grenadiers’ and ‘Rule Britannia’; the ‘Pugnacious Athenians’ by ‘We don’t want to fight, but by jingo if we do!’ (sung in British pubs and music halls around the time of the Russo-Turkish War); ‘Athenian Alliances’ by ‘La Marseillaise’; the ‘Smooth-Tongued Cajoleries of Foreigners’ by the waltz tune from Richard Strauss’ Der Rosenkavalier; fear of the Spartans by ‘Die Wacht am Rhein’, the popular German anthem during the Franco-Prussian War; and the ‘Obvious Answer to the War Scare’ by the nursery rhyme ‘O dear, what can the matter be’. 3 Many of these citations appear in the orchestral overture, one of Parry’s most satirical effusions, which, as he explained to his friend and colleague, Hugh Allen, he wanted ‘to dedicate to the “Blue-Funkers”’. 4

It therefore came as a terrific shock to Parry that Britain went to war with the Central powers in August 1914. For him, by admission a pro-Teuton, Germany’s war machine seemed to embody the very fall of Lucifer. In addressing the students of the Royal College of Music in October 1914, he exhorted them to seek a heroism that was ‘chivalrous and frank, modest and unaggressive, cheerful in adversity and unboastful in success’. ‘True music’, he added, ‘can be inspired by such qualities, and when it really is so inspired it can convey a noble message to us.’ 5 Parry’s musical reaction to the war was, for the most part, one of regret and inner sadness. His own particular brand of heterodoxy found voice in his one and only symphonic poem, From Death to Life, written in the early months of the war, a bipartite piece consisting of a lament followed by a more buoyant slow march, signalling a form of reveille. Of more vivid character, however, was his last choral work, The Chivalry of the Sea.

After the news of the Battle of Jutland in June of that year, Allen organized a concert ‘to commemorate the officers and men of His Majesty’s Fleet and of the Mercantile Marine who [had] fallen in the war, and to celebrate the achievements of the Empire at sea’. 6 Using

---

4 Ibid. ii. 272.
5 Ibid. ii. 71.
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a poem specially written by the Poet Laureate, Robert Bridges, with whom Parry had collaborated on several earlier occasions, the work was composed in September 1916, three months after Jutland. In the work he was seized by the tragedy of the lonely, unrecorded graves of the mariners, especially that of Charles Fisher, a brilliant Oxford student who had died on HMS Invincible. In fact, Parry’s naval ode had an even more personal significance for him in that his godson and namesake, Hubert Dannreuther, son of his former mentor, Edward Dannreuther, had also been on board Invincible as she blew up, and miraculously had been one of only five men to survive. The opening of the work, broad and stately, must surely have been intended to represent the sights and sounds of the vast naval procession of dreadnought battleships and battlecruisers as they sailed to meet the German fleet. Parry, who was a regular visitor to see London’s popular cinematographs of the war, might well have seen footage of the great fleet as it passed through the Firth of Forth.

Parry ultimately believed that Britain’s war effort was a just cause, unlike his son-in-law, Arthur Ponsonby, whose Union of Democratic Control advocated non-involvement. The choral song ‘Jerusalem’, composed in March 1916 and written at the behest of Bridges and the Fight for Right movement, was designed for communal singing to bolster the morale of the population. Yet in 1917 Parry resigned his membership of Fight for Right, probably because he was uncomfortable with the notion of national propaganda. ‘Jerusalem’ today is very much associated with patriotic fervour and the sounds of the Last Night of the Proms, but its First World War origins are less well known.

Parry’s colleague at the Royal College of Music, the Irishman Charles Villiers Stanford, took a particularly active creative stance during and after the war. Works such as his Fifth Irish Rhapsody, dedicated to Lord Roberts and the Irish Guards, combined his own national support for the regiment (through the use of Irish folk songs associated with war and victory) with his own pugnacious belief in the Unionist cause for Ireland. Other works, such as the powerfully English tone poem, A Song of Agincourt, reveal his British fealty in its commemoration of those who fought and died through the agency of the ‘Agincourt Song’, a medieval melody written to celebrate the victory of Henry at Agincourt in 1415. Stanford’s Songs of the Fleet, arguably even more evocative of British naval resources than Parry’s
Naval Ode, were originally composed for the Jubilee Congress of Naval Architects in 1910, but when this was postponed owing to the death of the king, the work was premiered at the Leeds Festival in 1910. Designed as a sequel to the composer’s Songs of the Sea of 1904, Stanford drew on Henry Newbolt’s poetry, inspired by a visit to the Channel Fleet in 1908 during a nine-day manoeuvre. Spending time aboard HMS Hibernia, Newbolt learned to appreciate at first hand the ritual of life on a pre-dreadnought battleship. This was captured particularly vividly in Stanford’s opening song, ‘Sailing at Dawn’, which depicts the sounds of the fleet ‘stirring from their sleep, Cables all are rumbling, anchors all aweigh’.  

The Songs of the Fleet had a particular resonance during the war, not least the concluding song, ‘Farewell’, which became a contemporary funeral oration, sung at the concert of the ‘Seven Divisions’ who fought at Mons and Ypres at the Royal Albert Hall on 15 December 1917. It was later turned into a piano piece as a tribute to Lord Kitchener, who died during a diplomatic mission to Russia in 1916. The Songs of the Fleet was one of several works Stanford wrote in connection with the war. Though intended for the Boer War, his choral setting of Henley’s poem ‘The Last Post’ was taken up with alacrity during the First World War, particularly since the entire work is based on the music of the well-known bugle call, scored for a real bugle in Stanford’s score. Even more realistic in this depiction of army life was Stanford’s direction in the score that, in the last part of the work, ‘the bugle should play ad libitum in quick free time’ with no metrical correspondence with the orchestra; moreover, the player was ‘to be placed at a distance from or behind the platform’. 

A similar effect was created in Stanford’s orchestration of the last two movements of his Organ Sonata No. 2, subtitled Eroica, which he dedicated to the Principal of the Paris Conservatoire, Charles Marie Widor, and the French army at Verdun. After a first movement which attempted to capture the ruins of Rheims Cathedral, a powerful historical symbol of French defiance encapsulated in Stanford’s

7 Henry Newbolt, Poems New and Old (London, 1912).
8 Charles Villiers Stanford, The Last Post, vocal score (Boosey & Hawkes: London, 1900), 24.
9 This was recently broadcast for the first time on BBC Radio 3 with the Ulster Orchestra conducted by Howard Shelley.
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quotation of the old French tune O FILII ET FILIAE (‘O sons and daughters let us sing, Alleluia’), a solemn march includes nocturnal strains of ‘La Marseillaise’ on solo muted trumpets. This quotation subsequently acts as a prelude for the ‘Heroic Epilogue’, in which various strains of ‘La Marseillaise’ coalesce symphonically to form a full rendition of the French national anthem at the conclusion.

Other sounds and impressions of the war were evoked in further works by Stanford. As an Irishman he was notably supportive of the Irish Guards, and his Fifth Irish Rhapsody of 1917 was dedicated to the regiment, its symphonic structure made up of a range of Irish folk tunes closely associated with war, lament, and courage. One should also not forget Edward Elgar’s involvement in Britain’s musical war effort. His choral trilogy, The Spirit of England, is probably his best known work of the period, but less well known is his symphonic prelude Polonia, written in tribute to the many Polish refugees in London, and more unusual, a recitation for speaker, soprano, and orchestra, A Voice in the Desert, first produced at the Shaftesbury Theatre, London in January 1916. A setting of the Belgian poet Émile Cammaerts, the tableau attempts to draw a picture of the sights of a ravaged Belgium, the numbed air of a village close to the battlefront broken only by the redemptive strains of a girl’s song.

The aftermath of war was also a powerful stimulus for Stanford. Parry had died only four weeks before the Armistice, so the expression of the older generation’s loss was left primarily to him in works such as the orchestral tone poem A Song of Agincourt of 1919, dedicated to the students and staff of the Royal College of Music, based throughout symbolically on the medieval Agincourt song sung after Henry V’s victory in 1415. On 11 November 1920 the first ceremony of the Unknown Warrior took place at Westminster Abbey, the vivid impression of which moved Stanford to set C. J. Darling’s poem ‘At the Abbey Gate’, first published in The Times on 26 October 1920, as a memorial to the Unknown Warrior. Stanford’s work, a substantial slow march in the form of a choral scena, attempts in orchestral terms to portray the cortège to the Abbey, the firing of the guns, the files of silent people processing past by the tomb, while the central vocal paragraph enacts a dialogue between the Unknown Warrior and those left to grieve, embodying a cathartic process of collective mourning which Britain had not experienced hitherto. Lillian Elkington’s symphonic poem of 1921, Out of the Mist, also attempted
to evoke a picture of the warship that brought the body of the Unknown Warrior to Dover coming through the Channel in the mist.

Stanford, like Parry, had been a member of the teaching staff at the Royal College of Music since its inception in 1883, and he had witnessed several generations of composers and performers enrich the ranks of society with a new energy and attitude to music’s importance as a civilizing and democratic force. A consequence of this desire to see music as an indispensable part of life, with the role of the musician being considered as significant as any of the traditional professions, was also to see the same generations volunteer for active service. And many did join up, which meant that the production of music during the war from these younger generations was reduced to a minimal level. One of the most poignant products of the war was Frederick Kelly’s *Elegy, In Memoriam Rupert Brooke* for harp and strings. A member of the ‘Latin Club’, Kelly enjoyed the company of a group of young intellectuals, including the poet Rupert Brooke and composer Charles Denis Browne, who were caught up in the disastrous Dardanelles campaign in 1915. Brooke died of disease on a French hospital ship even before the fighting began; Kelly and Browne were among those who buried him on the island of Skyros. Browne was killed at Achi Baba on 4 June 1915 and Kelly was wounded and evacuated to Alexandria where, in June, he composed the *Elegy* to Brooke, who had been buried in an olive grove. The work, a tender tone poem, was intended to capture the scene and the sound of the rustling trees and the rich scent of thyme, as Kelly himself remembered: ‘The body lies looking down the valley towards the harbour, and, from behind an olive-tree bends itself over the grave as though sheltering it from the sun and rain. No more fitting resting-place for a poet could be found than this small grove, and it seems that the gods had jealously snatched him away to enrich this scented island.’

10 The ‘Latin Club’ was the soubriquet given to a group of scholar–soldiers who were part of the Hood Battalion on board ship on the way to the Dardanelles in 1915. The group included not only Brooke and Browne, but also Arthur Asquith (son of the prime minister) and Patrick Shaw-Stewart (the brilliant classicist, poet, and author of the war poem ‘Achilles in the Trench’).

Kelly was himself killed in the last battle of the Somme at Beauchamp-sur-Aube on 13 November 1916. George Butterworth, who seems to have found purpose in the war, was also killed earlier in the Battle of the Somme. He produced no music after the war began, but his settings of A. E. Housman, whose Shropshire Lad poetry was carried in many Tommies’ knapsacks, also acquired a strong association with the war. Housman’s eerily prophetic poetry talked of young men from Britain’s declining agrarian culture going to war and death. There were many settings of Housman before and, indeed, after the war—one thinks of Ivor Gurney, Vaughan Williams, Ernest John Moeran, C. W. Orr, and John Ireland, all of whom, save Ireland, fought in uniform—but it was Butterworth’s true understanding of Housman’s Heine-esque irony and artless handling of the poet’s folk-like scansion that gave his own Shropshire Lad settings a particularly eloquent post-war poignancy. One song, ‘On the idle hill of summer’, depicts a pastoral scene of the lad dreaming on the Shropshire slopes in the summer heat, yet, in this fevered sleep suggested by Butterworth’s manipulation of whole-tone movement and advanced harmonic aggregates, the sound of a distant drummer excites memories of the sounds of bugles and fifes in the heat of battle.

One of the more elegiac expressions of the First World War was Herbert Howells’s expression of loss at the death of Francis Purcell Warren during the Battle of the Somme. Howells, who was considered one of Stanford’s most brilliant students, had not been able to join the army in 1914 because of poor health. Instead he corresponded with many of his student colleagues at the front, notably his Gloucester confrère, Ivor Gurney. The loss of Warren, enshrined in Howells’s Elegy for Strings, remains an affecting reminder of youthful death and promise. Of more immediate experience, however, are the turbulent sounds and progressions of his Third Rhapsody in C sharp minor for organ, which was written during a Zeppelin raid in York in 1918. In this work Howells came closest to the expression of something more immediately physical.

One of the more onomatopoeic attempts to portray the sound, atmosphere, and chaos of battle, written towards the end of the war, was Josef Holbrooke’s Debussy-inspired prelude Barrage, which he dedicated to the Royal Regiment of Artillery. A brilliant pianist and prolific composer, Holbrooke had spent much of his life inveighing against the British public’s neglect of native musical talent and their
favouritism towards German music. When war broke out in 1914, this sense of chauvinism escalated in British Music Versus German Music, a series of five essays published in *The New Age*.\(^{12}\) Barrage, a virtuoso composition of considerable technical display, explores something of the relentless, percussive, yet co-ordinated volley fire of the many artillery guns, not least the screaming trajectories of shells, the explosions, and the sense of savage onslaught heightened by Holbrooke’s cadenza-like, quasi-improvisatory conception. The piece may also have expressed something more bellicose in his cause to promote the value of British music over that of Germany.

Though clearly an autonomous work, Holbrooke’s *Barrage* has a visual as well as an aural dimension not far removed from the silent film, though if the printed version of Haydon Augarde’s ‘Descriptive Fantasia’, *Battle in Mid-Air* of 1914 is anything to go by, then here we see a rapid medley of different musical genres, hymns, national anthems, popular tunes, rapid figurations, chromatic scales, and many other harmonic and gestural clichés gleaned from late Romantic musical vocabulary closely juxtaposed with replete prescriptive accounts of the unfolding drama of a dog-fight. Such techniques were common during the era of silent films, though this work is a rare example of improvised music marshalled into some semblance of episodic shape for the pianist to play at home, a medium that remained one of powerful domestic communication as well as commanding a strong commercial attraction.

In the decade after the war there was an immediate outpouring of national grief at the realization and scale of the casualties. Joining the ranks of Stanford’s *At the Abbey Gate* and unperformed mass ‘Via Victrix’ was John Fould’s *World Requiem*, a piece inspired by the Cenotaph commemorations on 11 November. Frank Bridge, a pacifist by conviction, commemorated his close friendship with Ernest Farrar as part of the ‘Beloved Vagabonds’ at the Royal College of Music through his gloomy, but highly progressive *Piano Sonata*, after Farrar was killed close to the end of the war at the Battle of Ephey Ronssoy on 18 September 1918. Gustav Holst remembered his close friend, Cecil Coles, who had been killed in the last major German offensive in March 1918, in his *Ode to Death*. It was Holst, too, who rescued Cole’s mud-stained manuscript suite, *Behind the Lines*, a set of pieces

\(^{12}\) The five essays by Holbrooke appeared between 5 Nov. and 3 Dec. 1914.
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depicting scenes of army life during the war, which remained unfinished at his death.

Perhaps most significantly, however, was the sense of watershed which the war seemed to define. A new generation now turned its back without compunction on the pro-Teuton values that had been those of Parry, Stanford, Elgar, and others, and looked towards a future inspired by post-tonal techniques, atonality, bitonality, poly-tonality, serialism, jazz, neo-classicism, and the new manipulation of national ‘raw’ materials such as folksong. Holst was one such composer whose modernist interests had begun to emerge just before the war, and with the composition of The Planets during the conflict, his ‘coming of age’ as a contemporary composer gained important momentum. The Planets as a complete work did not actually come before the public until 1920, after several semi-public hearings in 1918 and 1919, but when it did, it was an instant success and the reaction to the opening movement, ‘Mars’, subtitled ‘The Bringer of War’, was immediately a response to mechanized warfare. Though the composer denied this, the combination of violent dissonance, the relentless irregular ostinati, and bitonal argument make this impression irresistible.

Out of The Planets came the patriotic tune THAXTED, better known as ‘I vow to thee my country’, which became a regular fixture at Armistice services after 1921, to a poem by Stanford’s cousin, Cecil Spring-Rice. Another setting, this time of a highly popular poem by Kipling, ‘Danny Deever’, was published by Percy Grainger in 1922. Though the poem, from Barrack-Room Ballads, pertained to the Victorian British Army, its publication in 1922 must have awakened memories of one of the most tragic of events during the war, the execution of deserters. Kipling’s poem portrays the macabre execution ceremony of Danny Deever (who was convicted of shooting a soldier in his sleep), the marching out at dawn into hollow square of the entire regiment, and the impressions of a private soldier and his comrades. During the war, of course, men were shot rather than hanged, but the same horror existed. Grainger’s setting for solo baritone, male chorus, piano, and harmonium amplifies that sense of revulsion, and the grisly atmosphere is enhanced by the sounds of Kipling’s vernacular English, an unforgiving colour sergeant, the harrowing scene of Danny struggling on the rope, and the march-refrain of increasingly traumatized soldiers ‘[wanting] their beer today’. The melodrama of
Grainger’s almost Gothic setting stands in stark contrast to the heartbreaking setting of Kipling’s ‘Have you news of my boy Jack?’, set by Edward German in 1917.

Perhaps two of the most vivid retrospective representations of the First World War were written in the 1920s by men who had fought in it and survived, and for whom the composition of music was a process of gradual catharsis. Vaughan Williams, over military age at the outbreak of hostilities, nevertheless volunteered as a private soldier and served with the Royal Medical Corps. As in the case of his artistic confrère, Holst, the war appears to have acted as a catalyst towards a new modernism in his style and heightened a sense of nationalism that he had already begun to embrace in the years directly before it. His third symphony, bearing the title *A Pastoral Symphony*, encouraged a degree of criticism among some commentators who accused the composer of a pastoral escapism, unaware that the work evoked a landscape not of rural England, but of war-torn scenes in northern France. Indeed, Vaughan Williams’s haunting, restless canvas provides the very converse in its probing of ‘hard pastoral’ and its attempt to explore a range of disturbing personal emotions. Its distance from the traditional rhetoric of symphonic music, with its three slow movements avoiding the conventional movement types, makes it a problematic work to perform in the concert hall. In the second movement of the symphony Vaughan Williams creates a nocturne in which the tranquillity is disturbed only by a bugler, represented in the score by a natural trumpet. Adding to the realism of the representation are ‘fluffed’ notes created by the flattened overtone of the seventh, a feature which itself becomes an intrinsic part of the movement’s cadenza as it rises to the point of structural return.

Vaughan Williams was troubled by the war throughout the 1920s, and the menace of future conflict in the 1930s gave rise to a plea for peace in his choral work *Dona Nobis Pacem* in 1936. Arthur Bliss, who much admired Vaughan Williams’s work, was also deeply troubled by his own war experiences. As an officer he led attacks of the Royal Fusiliers at the Battle of the Somme and later, after 1917, fought with the Grenadier Guards. He was wounded twice and gassed once. But
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more affecting was the death at the Somme of his brilliant brother, Francis Kennard, in October 1916. After the war, Bliss found it difficult to shake off both his grief for his elder brother and the nightmares of his own memories. A recurring one, he recalled in his autobiography As I Remember, was that the war was still going on while he, his comrades, and the Germans in the trenches opposite had been forgotten.

The pain of these recollections continued throughout the 1920s until he resolved to exorcize them in a choral symphony about war and courage, Morning Heroes, in 1930. This was an experimental series of movements involving reciter, chorus, and orchestra using a variety of poems about war from across the millennia, from Li Tai Po, Homer, and Walt Whitman to two contemporary poets who had shared his experience, Wilfred Owen and Robert Nichols. In the finale to the work, ‘Spring Offensive’ and ‘Dawn on the Somme’, Bliss perhaps comes closest to that most chilling of events that haunts us all in our imaginings of those extraordinary hours before lines of soldiers, bayonets fixed, went over the top to their doom. His concept of Wilfred Owen’s stark poem portrays such a surreal scene, accompanied only by timpani, whose gentle rumbles at first evoke the sound of the distant guns but, at the same time, embody that restless energy and pent-up fear.

Halted against the shade of a last hill,
They fed, and, lying easy, were at ease
And, finding comfortable chests and knees
Carelessly slept. But many there stood still
To face the stark, blank sky beyond the ridge,
Knowing their feet had come to the end of the world.14

At the climax of the poem, as the soldiers pile over to face, as we know, a German army ready for them in spite of the most fearsome of Allied barrages, the timpani assume the role of the relentless machine gun and artillery fire until, by degrees, they return to their initial pianissimo dynamic as the attack peters out. Finally, as a form of musical balm, Bliss elides his musical recitation with an assuaging, elegiac siciliano for chorus and orchestra.

We can adduce from this wide and varied evidence that, for British composers at least, the sights and sounds of the First World War in music were a very real concern and one germane to expression. Reasons for this desire to capture them, often so vividly, is difficult to define, but most likely it was connected with an ongoing cultural change in musical reception and the perception of music’s role in society that had been taking place before the war. All the composers mentioned in this article were raised essentially on a diet of German precepts, of Brahmsian organicism in which the intellectual argument of the musical notes brought a sense of ‘unity’ to the work’s content. It was a principle to which Parry and Stanford cleaved and which they fervently promulgated, exhorting their students to consider intellect rather than colour as the highest goal. Their expressions of the war, though powerful in their own way, were tempered by this principle.

With the popularity and vividness of Elgar’s orchestral scores, however, a shift in critical perception was taking place in which the older Teutonic ideals were, in part, the subject of aesthetic rejection. The ultimate paradigm of cerebral content was lost to an audience hungry for the pictorial, the programme, and the colourful. This was accentuated by the immense interest in Richard Strauss during his visits to London at the turn of the century, but also by a new eclecticism which was ready to embrace the sensuality of French and Russian music. Combined with a wave of cultural nationalism, partly, but not wholly, enshrined in the folksong, this helped shape the musical generations that would go to war and their readiness to embrace a more programmatic and illustrative style of expression in their musical works.

Society’s musical voice was also changing. Composers and performers reflected the range of social classes and this was paralleled in uniform, from the simplest private soldier to the officer, all of whom died together indiscriminately in the conflagration. This, albeit unwittingly, spawned a shared, more democratic experience in which the trauma of the battlefield, the immense casualties, and sense of personal loss served only to intensify a new wave of expression in which sights and sounds, horrendous, even nightmarish, as they were, contributed to a realist form of artistic communication, and one that could readily be understood by a wider audience.
The Sounds of the First World War
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REVIEW ARTICLE

‘WHEN SATURDAY COMES’: NEW BOOKS ON GERMAN AND INTERNATIONAL SPORTS HISTORY

KAY SCHILLER


Sports history is a booming field of historical research. Major sports events are no longer just an occasion for the publication of gossipy autobiographies and glossy coffee table books for the consumption of fans, but also inspire serious scholarship. Sports history is a field in which the boundaries between popular history and academic scholarship are porous. Much of what is written for a mass market is pro-
ductively appropriated by serious historians, while their work, in turn, is read beyond the realm of sports scholars. The last FIFA World Cup in Brazil, for example, led, in Britain and the USA, to the publication of a number of eminently readable historical books on the host country and Brazilian football more generally. Football is also the subject of quality fanzines-cum-magazines, such as When Saturday Comes or its German equivalent 11 Freunde, which regularly publish historical articles. And football often features in magazines dedicated to popular history. A search of the History Today archives from 1980 onwards returns 328 articles dealing with football in one way or another. More recently, there has also been a marked growth in quality websites on sports history, such as Bruce Berglund’s New Books in Sports podcasts, The Allrounder, and the Football Scholars Forum.

Common to all these publications is a recognition that sports (not just football) history has arrived in the academic mainstream. It is now an accepted part of cultural history like the history of film, for example. Part of the attraction of sport for fans and professional historians alike is that in all known cultures and civilizations it has never been purely autotelic, that is, an activity pursued exclusively for its own sake or as an end in itself. In the words of Christiane Eisenberg, the doyenne of German sports history, sport inhabits a semi-autonomous sphere of society. It functions according to its own rules but, at the same time, is a sub-system of society, and, as such, both reflects and influences trends in society.

The first half of this review article deals with publications that focus on the political purposes realized through sport from the 1930s to the 1970s and until the end of the Cold War. This reflects sport’s
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main function for nation-states during the ‘age of extremes’. It is also the area of sports history from which ‘non-sports historians’ feel they can learn most. Many recent works on football history, a few of which will be discussed in the second half, have a different focus. It is not that national politics is absent from these works, and excellent national football histories continue to be written, as Brazil 2014 showed yet again. But football’s globalizing force and economic power, its internationalism and commercialism make it especially suitable for transnational perspectives and analyses. While politics is never far away in these works, other hitherto underexplored themes, especially the ever increasing role of money in the ‘people’s game’ over the past fifty years, take precedence.

Unsurprisingly, Berno Bahro’s book on sport in Hitler’s SS focuses on the abuse of sport by the Nazi regime. There is very little in this work to suggest that sport inhabited a sphere of its own and that it was also pursued for autotelic purposes (although, in reality, it probably was). The instrumentalization of sport by politics, especially fencing (ch. 4) and horse-riding (ch. 5) for future SS leaders (with Reinhard Heydrich and Eva Braun’s future brother-in-law, Hermann Fegelein, prominently representing both sports), as well as less exclusive physical pastimes for the lower ranks, could not be more obvious. The main argument of this Ph.D. thesis-turned-monograph, which was supervised by the eminent Potsdam sports historian Hans Joachim Teichler, is that sport was intended to foster the morale and esprit de corps of the SS, and to demonstrate the status of the ‘Black Corps’ as a racial elite in German society. Bahro also stresses that sport was one means by which the SS competed for influence with other groups in National Socialism’s competitive society (‘NS-Wettkampfgesellschaft’, p. 301) in ‘working towards the Führer’ (in the words of Ian Kershaw). Before his assassination in 1941, the ambitious Heydrich, for example, was aiming to rise to the top position in German sport and replace Hans von Tschammer und Osten as Reich Sports Leader.

It is well known that apart from Heydrich, most of the Nazi elite initially did not care much about sport unless it prepared German men for war. An equally well-known fact is that this changed when sport’s propaganda potential was recognized on the occasion of the 1936 Berlin Olympics. The SS also saw the Olympic Games as a not-to-be-missed chance to stamp its imprint on German sport. Unlike
Heydrich, Heinrich Himmler was not a gifted athlete, as his amateurish approach to the shot-put while training for the Reich Sports Badge, depicted on the cover of Bahro’s book, shows. He wanted the nucleus of the German Olympic team to be recruited from the SS, and for it to win a large number of medals in 1936. Both wishes turned out to be pipe dreams, and while sporting activities continued to be varied in the SS during peace time and the early years of the war, after 1943 the main function of sport was again reduced to ensuring military fitness.

Bahro provides a competent institutional and organizational history of SS sport, thereby filling a gap in our knowledge. This is a notable achievement, but the fact that the book does not go beyond this is lamentable. As Veronika Springmann has rightly pointed out, scholars looking for insights into the impact of sport on the mentality of the SS and wanting to get to the bottom of the relationship between Nazi sport, the body, and exterminatory violence will be disappointed.6 In contrast to Svenja Goltermann’s work on German Turnen (gymnastics), in which she explains how physical practices shape both bodies and minds and lead to the ‘in-corpo-ration’ of mental attitudes, Bahro’s book unfortunately displays no real engagement with the crucial question of sport’s influence on German mentalities.7 My other qualm is about Bahro’s wooden, often stilted prose.

While it is a truism that every topic presents its own challenges, it is tempting to compare Bahro’s work with Eva Maria Gajek’s decidedly more ambitious Ph.D. project on the parallel histories of the 1960 Rome and 1972 Munich Olympics, the first book of its kind to combine an analysis of two such sporting mega-events in different countries. This is a truly remarkable achievement, and not only because of the range and variety of primary source materials that inform Gajek’s study. I have to declare an interest here, as I am the co-author of a history of the Munich Games that appeared a few years before Gajek’s book.8 I am therefore more than aware of the
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8 Kay Schiller and Christopher Young, The Munich Olympics and the Making of Modern Germany (Berkeley, 2010).
The author’s main achievement, however, lies elsewhere. The book instructively compares two further attempts to politically instrumentalize sport. Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany, two post-fascist states, each used ‘their’ Olympics as an occasion for representing themselves to audiences abroad and at home, thus refashioning their national identities in relation to a problematic past. The book also reveals an acute awareness of the role played by the mass media, especially the press and television, in these processes. While Christopher Young and I also used media sources for our history of Munich 1972, unlike Gajek (p. 11), we did not assign them an elevated status as historical agents in their own right, which is perhaps a shortcoming of our book.9 Thus Gajek, like Christian Tagsold, whose study of the 1964 Tokyo Olympics operates in a similar fashion,10 adds an additional discursive dimension to the history of these mega-events.

Not surprisingly, this reader was especially interested in Gajek’s specific insights on the Rome Olympics of 1960. She shows convincingly, for example, how the poor Italian mezzogiorno was mostly written out of the Olympic story in 1960 by the organizers and the media. The Rome Games were first and foremost a ‘mise-en-scène of the rich, industrialized North’ (p. 93). The Games were also symbolic confirmation of Italy’s membership in NATO, the United Nations, and the European Communities (p. 111). As in Munich, staging the Rome Olympics was an elite project, though the involvement of party politicians, led by future multiple government minister and prime minister ‘Divo’ Giulio (after Julius Caesar’s epithet) Andreotti, was greater there. And the juxtaposing of Pier Luigi Nervi’s modernism (p. 229) and Mussolini’s Foro Italico (previously Foro Mussolini, p. 232) as Olympic venues suggests that the Italian organizers felt less

9 Christopher Young, incidentally, is currently working on a media history of German sport in the twentieth century.

10 Christian Tagsold, Die Inszenierung der kulturellen Identität in Japan: Das Beispiel der Olympischen Spiele Tokyo 1964 (Munich, 2002).
need than the Munich OC to make a clear rupture with the fascist past. As Gajek shows, their politics of the past was characterized by constant references to Roma Eterna and artificial claims to the heritage of classical Rome as a universal inspiration for the Olympic ideal (p. 218), regardless of the fact that Mussolini had equally laid claim to this part of the Italian past. To sum up, this is an excellent book, rich in interesting material and illuminating insights, although occasional long-winded passages mean that it is not always easy to read. This comparatively small problem might have been overcome by more stringent editing.

Gajek’s study does not deal in great detail with the German–German dimension of the Munich Games. Christopher Young and I covered the intra-German sports contest of 1972 and its ramifications quite extensively in our book, while the historical development of the rivalry between the sports establishments of the two German states has been thoroughly investigated by Andreas Höfer, Uta Balbier, and, most recently, Juliane Lanz. Both East and West Germany were keen to demonstrate the superiority of their political systems, and came third and fourth respectively in the 1972 medal table, behind the superpowers. The systematic use of banned substances as one of the key reasons for the GDR’s disproportionate athletic success at this and later Olympics and international championships continues to receive much scholarly attention, for example, in the excellent concise survey of GDR sport by Mike Dennis and Jonathan Grix. They also show, however, that the focus on the
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11 Schiller and Young, *The Munich Olympics*, 157–86.
13 Mike Dennis and Jonathan Grix, *Sport under Communism: Behind the East German ‘Miracle’* (Basingstoke, 2012), chs. 4 and 5; see Uta Balbier’s review of this title in *German Historical Institute London Bulletin*, 36/1 (2014), 125–8. The work by these two UK scholars builds on the pioneering efforts of Brigitte Berendonk (and Werner Franke) and Giselher Spitzer in the 1990s; see Brigitte Berendonk, *Doping-Dokumente: Von der Forschung zum Betrug* (Berlin,
'totalitarian' East German elite sports machine, in which the systematic use of performance-enhancing drugs was endemic, has somewhat unfairly overshadowed other features of sport in East German 'real socialism'.

Doping in West German elite sport, in turn, has only recently attracted more systematic attention from historians. Given that history is written by the victors who, after 1990, were faced with an over-abundance of sources left by a state and regime that perished, this is not surprising. And as Michael Krüger and Christian Becker have recently demonstrated, the prospect of creating unbeatable all-German teams in future by combining the GDR sports system with Western commercial incentives proved too tempting for politicians and sports functionaries alike to resist. This meant that the Treaty on German Unity preserved the heart of the GDR’s sports system, for example, the infamous Doping Control Laboratory in Kreischa, whose scientific expertise was used to prevent drugged East German athletes from being caught. Attitudes changed only when doping and anti-doping in the capitalist West attracted greater public interest internationally during the 1990s and 2000s. This led to political threats of public funding cuts for elite sports in Germany and a greater willingness to address the issue both as a problem in the present and as a legacy from the past. Nevertheless, significant parts of the (West) German sports establishment continue to be protective of their reputation, and are unwilling to admit that during the Cold War ‘doping and manipulation were practised [there] as well and particularly vigorously’. Because of the relative autonomy of German sport despite its dependence on money from public coffers, German sports organizations are not legally bound to grant researchers access to their materials.

While the use of EPO, blood doping, and performance-enhancing hormones by German athletes remain largely unexplored, the will-


14 Dennis and Grix, *Sport under Communism*, 198.


16 Ibid. 621.
ingness of some sports federations, such as the German athletics federation (DLV), to embrace transparency and open their files has allowed a promising start to be made. The authors of *Siegen um jeden Preis* acknowledge the limitations of their undertaking (p. 400), but theirs is nevertheless a truly ground-breaking book. It contains the results of the second part of the research project ‘Doping in Germany from 1950 to 1990’. Initiated by the German Olympic Sports Association (DOSB), Germany’s main sports organization, the project was led by the foremost German historian of doping, Giselher Spitzer. It was funded by the Bundesinstitut für Sportwissenschaft (BISp), which in this way attempted to come to terms with problematic aspects of its past. The project involved a number of collaborators, including Erik Eggers, a well-known sports writer and historian, and was officially completed in 2012, although the results of both project stages were not fully published until 2013.\(^{17}\) This delay made headlines at the time and raised suspicions that the project’s official sponsors were unhappy with some of its findings. This is not surprising, as its main result is that, despite declarations to the contrary by quite a few former athletes and functionaries, doping in West Germany was more widespread than originally believed and admitted.

On the basis of numerous documents and statements by informants, Spitzer et al. demonstrate that in order to guarantee ‘equal chances for international athletic success’ (‘internationale Chancengleichheit’, p. 354), the West German state used taxpayers’ money to sponsor research into performance-enhancing drugs, especially anabolic steroids. When steroids were banned by the IOC in 1974 with the DSB following suit in 1977, the focus of research and state funding shifted towards testosterone as a regeneration-enhancing drug for elite athletes (p. 156). This research, sponsored by the BISp, was mainly conducted under the leadership of prominent sports scientist Joseph Keul from Freiburg University’s medical school, which in 2007 became the centre of the Team Telekom doping scandal in German professional cycling. It has rarely been out of the news since then. The latest information that has come to light is that while setting up an independent inquiry headed by the Italian criminologist and Mafia expert Letizia Paoli into the activities of Keul and others, Freiburg University seems to be restricting the material it makes

\(^{17}\) The results of the first project stage were published as Giselher Spitzer (ed.), *Doping in Deutschland: Geschichte, Recht, Ethik 1950–1972* (Cologne, 2013).
available to the commission. In October 2014 Paoli threatened to resign from her post.\footnote{See <http://www.spiegel.de/sport/sonst/doping-letizia-paoli-droht-universitaet-freiburg-mit-ruecktritt-a-997807.html#ref=veeseoartikel>, accessed 25 Oct. 2014.} At the same time, the scholarship of Spitzer et al. seems to have helped to spur German politicians into action. At the time of writing in November 2014, the German interior and justice ministers introduced a long overdue legislative proposal, which, when passed by parliament in 2015, will make doping a criminal offence punishable by prison.

How did the West German doping system compare with that of the East? While the use of banned substances by athletes in the GDR was ‘Staatsdoping’,\footnote{See Klaus Latzel, Staatsdoping: Der VEB Jenapharm im Sportsystem der DDR (Cologne, 2009).} a state-run undertaking that followed a systematic plan involving the production of banned substances in factories such VEB Jenapharm, their use on elite athletes from an early age, and their concealment in places like Kreischa, it was no less a ‘systemic’ practice in West Germany. However, smaller networks ‘where athletes, coaches, doctors and managers worked together in a Trainingsgruppe’ to maximize performances with the help of banned substances were more typical of the West German scene.\footnote{Krüger and Becker, ‘Doping and Anti-Doping’, 629.} Dennis and Grix usefully sum up the difference: ‘Doping was widespread and structured in both [countries] but the differences lay in the higher degree of central-state control of research in the GDR, the minute regulation of the administration of substances to athletes and the almost blanket systematisation of doping in the socialist state.’\footnote{Dennis and Grix, Sport under Communism, 120.} In any event, Spitzer et al. show that based on frequency and seen in moral terms West Germany did not lag far behind East Germany in substance abuse. While doping happened in a semi-private, semi-public sphere, all actors operated with the financial support of the state and could rely on the tacit approval of the authorities.

One of the sports organizations that blocked research by Spitzer and his collaborators into the use of banned substances in its past was the German football association DFB. It did not allow the researchers access to its files (p. 400), regardless of whether such practices existed or whether it even held any records to this effect. To be clear, there...
are well-founded suspicions that players in the West German national teams in the 1954 and 1966 World Cups were given amphetamines, while the use of banned substances had been the order of the day for GDR teams competing in international competitions since the mid 1960s. Yet there is still no agreement on whether banned substances even have a performance-enhancing effect in football. The DFB, however, shows no interest in clarifying the issue. My own experience of researching the history of the 1974 FIFA World Cup, famously hosted and won by West Germany, confirms that unlike FIFA, which, perhaps surprisingly, allows researchers relatively open access to its archival holdings in Zurich, the German FA is not especially interested in historians inquiring into its past.

Despite such obstacles, and basing his research primarily on a multitude of other sources, including the archives of a number of important clubs, the Stuttgart historian Nils Havemann has succeeded in writing the first serious economic, social, and cultural history of professional football in West Germany. While the main focus of *Samstags um halb 4* is the DFB’s top league competition, the *Bundesliga*, the professional German league founded in 1963, Havemann’s book covers much more. It branches out into a variety of different areas which, while relevant to the league, also explain the fortunes of the game in the Federal Republic more widely. In essence, the book is a sequel to his equally rich and convincing study of German football under National Socialism. Given that, all too often, football scholars and historians limit themselves to reporting what the contemporary press wrote about a match, a club, a team, or a player, often leading to superficial results, it is refreshing to see that *Samstags um halb 4* is grounded in meticulous historical research.

If one were looking for a thread holding these extremely well-written 672 pages together, it would have to be Havemann’s emphasis on the close relationship between the processes of professionalization and commercialization in German elite football. While other scholars have concentrated primarily on the role of football in German


24 Nils Havemann, *Fußball unterm Hakenkreuz: Der DFB zwischen Sport, Politik und Kommerz* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005).
culture and identity, Havemann’s main focus here, as in his previous monograph, is on the economic interests connected with football as a product. He shows that from the 1960s on top-level professional football became part of the entertainment industry in Germany.

The main economic imperative to which this gave rise was that in order to be successful in the Bundesliga, clubs had to recruit the best players and keep them from moving elsewhere. This was only possible by paying them ever more inflated salaries. At least initially, this happened at a time when club incomes were still primarily based on gate receipts rather than on revenue from advertising, television, and merchandising. This often made them take on major debt and sail dangerously close to bankruptcy. As Havemann shows, in the 1960s and well into the 1970s, they often survived only by manipulating their balance sheets and through the generosity of local politicians and tax authorities (pp. 193–208). The first German world star of football, Franz Beckenbauer, who profited handsomely from the process and whose club salary alone increased more than fiftyfold in the decade from 1963, wrote in 1975 that the clubs ‘took financial risks, even the thought of which would lead a city treasurer to put a gun to his head’.

But Havemann’s study does not stop there. He follows the changing fortunes and increasing professionalization of the league throughout the entire fifty years. For example, he also analyses in illuminating detail how highly indebted clubs like Bayern Munich, VFB Stuttgart, and Werder Bremen undertook successful reforms from 1978 onwards, whereas other historical names in German club football, such as 1. FC Nürnberg and Schalke 04, missed the boat at crucial moments. When focusing on football’s cultural impact he shows how through the media, especially television, the sport increasingly lost the stigma attached to it in Germany as a pastime of and for the ‘uneducated’ working classes. What had been mainly a proletarian spectator sport from the Weimar Republic to the 1950s increasingly moved from the margins to the centre of modern mass culture.

culture, sustained by the success of the Bundesliga. As early as in the mid 1970s, Beckenbauer could state, with some justification, that ‘football is no longer a closed milieu. There is no special football “class”. Football has become a big deal, a sport that has both followers and opponents.’

Other topics on which Havemann has interesting things to say include violence and racism, and the renationalization of the German national team from the late 1980s on. And the list could be extended. *Samstags um halb 4* is a remarkable achievement in terms both of breadth of coverage and sharpness of analysis. It is no exaggeration to claim that it sets a new scholarly standard and that it is already a classic which no serious historian of German football can afford not to read.

Havemann shows that money continues to play an ever increasing role in modern football. The corrupting influence of the hyper-commodification of the game through television and marketing revenue is also at the core of Alan Tomlinson’s short survey *FIFA: The Men, the Myths and the Money*. This is the fifth book which the sociologist and football scholar from the University of Brighton has written about the game’s world governing body since the 1980s. Tomlinson therefore knows his subject matter very well, not only from studying historical and contemporary documents (to the extent that these are available to researchers), but also from interviews with members of the international football hierarchy and close observation of the FIFA elite at some of its gatherings. Tomlinson cares deeply about the sport and believes that football, like other sports, ‘should operate with some sense if not code of ethics and . . . that there are “interests of international sport” that may be in need of protection’ (p. 87).

While eschewing the sensationalism of investigative journalists like Andrew Jennings and David Yallop in favour of sober interpretation and understanding, Tomlinson unmasks the ease with which
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members of the FIFA elite have, in the last forty years, been able to abuse their positions of power. Through the massive influx of money since the 1970s, FIFA’s role has changed radically from that of a relatively small organization overseeing the rules of the game and the organization of international tournaments to that of a dynamic global sports enterprise. That said, much of the content of this book is already well known to football historians, not least from the earlier monographs in which the author collaborated. Tomlinson deals with FIFA’s origins (ch. 1), its structure and mechanisms (ch. 2), and then focuses on the influence its most important presidents, Jules Rimet, Sir Stanley Rous, and João Havelange (ch. 3), had on the development and running of football’s world governing body and international football. This part of the book culminates in an indictment of the role the current incumbent, Sepp Blatter, Havelange’s chosen successor, continues to have in world football and the international sporting landscape. Blatter was brought into FIFA by Havelange as early as 1975 and now, forty years later, is heading for a fifth term in office as FIFA president. In what is one of the weaker chapters (4) in an otherwise excellent volume, Tomlinson tries to get to grips with how Blatter managed to get the position of FIFA’s ‘supreme leader’ (p. 71) and how he has been able hold on to it since 1998. Given that most of the goings-on in the higher echelons of FIFA are sealed off from view and are likely to remain in the dark, despite recent internal investigations, Tomlinson often relies on conjecture and witness accounts without being able to prove their veracity. To be fair, however, he shares this problem with every outsider trying to understand the complex inner workings of this institution and its representatives. Tomlinson is on much firmer ground when explaining the role of the men’s World Cup as FIFA’s ‘cash cow’ (ch. 6) and how the organization acquired its by now immense wealth (ch. 5). Given the crisis of credibility and legitimacy which football’s world governing body has been suffering since late 2014, Tomlinson’s book must be recommended reading for anyone interested in the future of the ‘people’s game’ and how FIFA got itself and international football into such a compromised position.

Germany and the world’s favourite pastime is also the subject of Markwart Herzog’s edited volume, *Memoralkultur im Fußballsport*, 69

though in a rather different fashion. Herzog is a prominent and prolific German scholar of the ‘beautiful game’. He has published widely on football under the Nazi regime, including on the fortunes of 1. FC Kaiserslautern, the German ‘Red Devils’, during that period. More recently, he has also written a fascinating book on attempts to ‘Nazify’ German football tactics in the early years of the war. And he regularly organizes academic conferences on various aspects of football history, one of which resulted in this sizeable volume on memorial and sepulchral cultures in football. The book is a pioneering attempt to get to grips with an aspect of football culture which has hitherto been neglected by scholars, its relationship with memory and death. The volume comprises contributions by eighteen authors, some very lengthy and detailed and extending the themes of the book in various directions, which makes it impossible to do them all justice here.

In their introductory chapters, Herzog and Sven Gültenpfennig remind us that football, like all other areas of human endeavour, constantly generates its own memorial cultures, which are determined by the interplay of memory and forgetting. As is amply demonstrated in other parts of the book, this means that both concrete memorials (for example, the ‘Holy Trinity’ and Sir Alex Ferguson stands at Old Trafford, or the Shankly statue and stand at Anfield) and narrative memorials, that is, stories, myths, and legends about certain players, matches, locations, and so on are constructed. Other actors of football culture in turn fall victim to the damnation of memory. For political reasons this was the fate, as Insa Schlumbohm’s, Jutta Braun’s, and Michael Barsuhn’s contributions recall, of the persecuted Jewish members of Arminia Bielefeld in the Federal Republic and of East German players seen as ‘class enemies’ by the Stasi during the GDR dictatorship.

While readers familiar with the scholarly literature on memory will find much in this book that is well known to them from other spheres of culture, the volume is most innovative and original where

it deals with death and focuses on football’s ability to generate its own sepulchral culture. Herzog’s contribution on memorial bricks, engraved with the names of fans who have passed away, which are sold and used in commemorative walls forming part of the stadium architecture is particularly instructive. This sepulchral practice, which was invented at Glasgow Rangers and has spread to other clubs in Scotland and England, shows how commercialization and memory in football can enter into a fruitful partnership (p. 134). Were it not for the fact that, at forty pounds, the bricks cost less than the average ticket for a home game in the Scottish and English Premier Leagues and that even this minor income helps poor lower and non-league clubs to make ends meet, one could lament the commercialization of football and the willingness of the football business to exploit fans’ love for their clubs even beyond death. However, that football stadia are displacing churches and graveyards as places of worship is nothing new, of course. In England and Scotland, fans’ ashes have for decades been scattered on sections of the pitch, and two German clubs, Schalke 04 and Hamburger SV, now also possess dedicated fan cemeteries. Fans increasingly want to be buried in the kits of the ‘love of their lives’ and buried in coffins painted in club colours. As the moving funeral service for Robert Enke in Hanover’s former AWD (now HDI) Arena in 2009 demonstrated, football stadia can be an appropriate setting for farewelling footballers who die under tragic circumstances (pp. 255–9).

Of course, stadia themselves have occasionally been places where people have met a violent death. It is therefore more than fitting that Glasgow Rangers have built a memorial for the victims of the Ibrox disaster of 1971 (pp. 149–51) and that the Heysel and Hillsborough disasters in 1985 and 1989 are remembered with memorials at Sheffield Wednesday FC’s ground and at Anfield. Anne Eyre shows for the latter case that it was in large part due to the continued pressure exerted by the Hillsborough Family Support Group in conjunction with the memorialization of the disaster that in 2009, some twenty years after the event, the then Home Secretary appointed the Hillsborough Independent Panel which was tasked with establishing the full reasons why ninety-six people died in the most serious tragedy in UK sporting history (pp. 193–4).33

Review Article

Herzog’s book and the other publications discussed here show that sport is an extremely fruitful area for historical scholarship, whether one is interested in politics, commercialization, memory, or a multitude of other areas that have not been touched upon here. It is, indeed, difficult to imagine our culture without sport. And it is no exaggeration to claim that football provides scholars with important clues for understanding our culture.
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*Chartularium Sangallense*, i: 700–840, ed. Peter Erhart with Karl Heidecker and Bernhard Zeller (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2013), xxxvi + 375 pp. ISBN 978 3 7995 6067 2. €120.00

‘The charter material from St Gall is unique for the Carolingian period’: thus Rosamond McKitterick near the start of a path-breaking discussion of early medieval charters.¹ No other medieval monastic community managed to keep so many of its original charters in a way that lasted or, in the High Middle Ages, resisted the temptation to make copies instead of keeping the originals. Though a great many charters were lost during and after the Reformation period, and some were shamelessly filched, the oldest of them were printed in 1645. An edition of all surviving charters (including those filched) was published in two volumes in the 1860s by Hermann Wartmann (1835–1929).² These volumes, representing the finest scholarship of their day, have clearly stood the test of time: not only have they remained scholarly stand-bys until the publication of the work under review, but they were regarded as still sufficiently useful in 1983 for a modern re-edition to be postponed, and it was decided that the new edition of all the St Gallen charters would begin with volume three, from 900. Nevertheless, ‘Wartmann’ was showing its age. In 1985 the archivist of St Gallen wrote that a new edition was ‘an urgent necessity’.

Meanwhile, the profound researches of Michael Borgolte had made some flaws apparent, notably in the datings of charters, and offered at the same time a wealth of new findings about the people and places who made up Carolingian St Gall’s charter-world.³ Rosamond McKitterick’s work admirably set out the charters’ social and

² Hermann Wartmann, *Urkundenbuch der Abtei St Gallen*, i: (700–840) and ii: (840–920) (Zurich/St Gallen, 1863; St Gallen, 1866). Wartmann was a former student of Georg Waitz (1813–86), godfather of the project.
³ The relevant works by Michael Borgolte are the following: ‘Chronologische Studien an den alemannischen Urkunden des Stiftsarchivs St. Gallen’, *Archiv*
cultural context; and in the early twenty-first century the appearance of successive parts of the second series of *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* has provided excellent facsimiles. All this ground work is presented in pp. ix–xii of Peter Erhart’s introduction, where the guiding principles of the new edition are clearly stated at pp. xiii–xv. It must be said at once that this is a contribution to Carolingian scholarship of the very highest quality.

Particularly helpful, given the fundamental importance of dating in charter scholarship, is the ‘Kommentar zu den Datierungen (700–840)’ contributed by Karl Heidecker and Bernhard Zeller, pp. xvii–xxvi. Like the mythic dwarfs on giants’ shoulders, they give due acknowledgment to the work of both Wartmann and Borgolte. It is on their revisions to the giants’ datings that, as Erhart notes (p. xii) ‘attention falls above all’. Rules of thumb inferable from editorial practice are made clear (pp. xvii–xx): first and foremost, consult originals wherever possible; second, emend as little as possible; third, when the various dating-forms in a given charter do not agree, consider emending regnal dates in light of days and months; further, accept Borgolte’s corrections to Wartmann’s dates; then, assume that differentiating between monastic and non-monastic scribes can help determine whether to accept the date offered by an original or by a copy; then, do not make many assumptions based on the dates when particular scribes held monastic offices, for these are seldom precise; finally, when dating elements are missing or inadequate, give clear indications of *terminus ante quem* or *post quem*, and assign a ‘c.’ dating


5 Two mistakes in the Introduction are only very minor irritants: there is a marker for footnote 18 but no footnote, and footnote 20 appears but without a marker for it in the text.
only on the basis of information on persons named in the charter in question or in other related charters. These are working principles recognizably right for the tiro charter-scholar and expert alike.

In the rest of their ‘Kommentar’, Heidecker and Zeller consider difficulties encountered in the variety of regnal years used by the scribes of St Gall. These are difficulties that can be seen in a broader historical view to arise from the succession practices of the Carolingians. In 768, for instance, the division of the regnum Francorum between Pippin’s sons Charlemagne and Carloman put St Gall in Carloman’s kingdom. These editors convincingly reject the suggestion that some St Gall charters were dated by Charlemagne’s regnal years even before Carloman’s death on 4 December 771, basing their rejection not only on technical grounds but on an appraisal of Carolingian political thought and practice. Regnal-year datings were part and parcel of what Ildar Garipzanov has termed ‘the symbolic language of authority’, partly inherited, also much developed, by Carolingian rulers, and communicated to their people by, inter alios et inter alia, charter-scribes and charters.² It is because regnal dates were anything but ‘merely’ formulaic that, to echo Peter Erhart, they demand our attention as signs of legitimacy. Signs were not always read at St Gall in precisely the same way, however. Heidecker and Zeller, noting (p. xxiii) that from 775 onwards nearly all the monastery’s scribes used reign-years for Charlemagne that dated from 9 October 768, interpret this as a consequence of the take-over of the Lombard kingdom in 774 and ‘the expression of a new and, so to speak, more generalized understanding of Charlemagne’s rulership’.

Charlemagne’s Divisio regnorum of 806 was a project for the future, but at St Gall in Alamannia it was perceived as something more concrete and immediate. Heidecker and Zeller point out (p. xxii with n. 25) that several St Gall charters dating from 807–9 give the regnal years of not only Charlemagne but also Pippin of Italy, to whom the divisio assigned Alamannia.³ ‘Political datings’ recur in

² Ildar H. Garipzanov, The Symbolic Language of Authority in the Carolingian World (c.751–877) (Leiden, 2008).
³ Zeller, ‘“Politischer Datierungen” in St. Galler Urkunden 814–841?’, in M. Gravel and S. Kaschke (eds.), Politische Theologie und Geschichte unter Ludwig dem Frommen (forthcoming); and for the wider context see S. Kaschke, Tradition und Adaption: Die “Divisio regnorum” und die fränkische Herr-
subsequent Carolingian divisions. After the forced retirement of Louis the Pious in 833, and the *de facto* succession of three of his sons, the St Gall scribe Theothart seemed unsure of when Louis the German’s reign began, dating a charter of 26 July 834 ‘anno secundo incipiente iunioris Hludouici regis in Alamannia’ (p. xxvi). After Louis the Pious’s restoration in 834, and especially from 837 onwards, when Heidecker and Zeller detect a ‘consolidation and strengthening of the emperor’s position’ (p. xxv), St Gall scribes always give the regnal years of either the emperor alone or of both him and ‘junior’ Louis. Only charters written by scribes who did not belong to the St Gall community were dated by the years of ‘junior’ Louis alone. After the definitive breach between the emperor and his namesake in 839, all charters were dated by the emperor’s reign years alone: the clearest possible sign of legitimacy vindicated.

The last charter of volume one is dated 12 June 840, ‘anno XXVII Hludouici imperatoris’. Louis died just a fortnight later, on 26 June. And there ends the project-story so far. With this beautifully edited volume readers must be satisfied for the moment. The Table of Concordances between it and ‘Wartmann’ and the *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* volumes shows the very large number of reorderings of charters the new edition offers—further evidence of the crucial importance of datings. Volume two (promised by the publisher for 2016) will contain the indices of people, places, and things for all the St Gall charters down to 1000, thus making the contents of both volumes eminently usable. This reader for one can hardly wait to use them! But, having noted Wartmann’s regret in 1863 at having had to abandon planned maps for reasons of cost, she hopes that it is not too late to make a plea for maps in 2016.
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In this volume of essays Tom Scott, Reformation historian from the University of St Andrews, brings together seven of his essays published between 2001 and 2011, some in rather obscure places. These are supplemented by three previously unpublished essays (‘Why was there no Reformation in Freiburg im Breisgau?’; ‘The Problem of Heresy in the German Reformation’; ‘Johannes Agricola’s *Ein nützlicher Dialogus* as a Source for the Peasants’ War in Central Germany’) and an afterword, which he presents as ‘a personal memoir of my own visits to the GDR’ (p. 257). As an eyewitness to the transformations of GDR historiography and science policy from the early 1980s, Scott reminds us of a chapter of Reformation historiography that is in danger of being forgotten today, although it is of inestimable significance for the writing of early Reformation history in particular.

Scott here continues the trajectory of his life’s work which, starting with his 1986 study of Freiburg in the age of Reformation and Peasants’ War,¹ has brought not only the Reformation history of the Holy Roman Empire in the 1520s, but also the wider debates in German-language historiography to the attention of historians in Britain and the USA. This task has lost none of its relevance — on the contrary — as he rightly points out in his brief introduction to the present volume.

From the beginning of his academic career in the mid 1980s to the present volume, Scott has consistently studied topics and pursued approaches which, even in a field that has been as intensively studied as the early Reformation history of the Empire over the last twenty-five years, can still yield new insights. Arguing that the Reformation should be seen against the background of late medieval Imperial history, as in the first essay in this volume (‘The Early Reformation in Germany between Deconstruction and Reconstruction’), Scott emphasizes the fruitfulness of an approach that seems
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recently to have experienced a renaissance, while demonstrating how it can be profitably employed, and not only in this essay. Scott’s interest in the social and economic contexts of Reformation activity focusing on the Peasants’ War of 1524–6, something that has not been widely studied recently, can make his works seem ‘outdated’. But they call to mind that while the cultural turn has stimulated Reformation history in important ways (and vice versa), the epistemological potential of the ‘old’ questions and approaches has certainly not been exhausted.

The volume is divided into two almost equal parts, ‘Social and Political Aspects of the Early Reformation’ and ‘Radicals in the Reformation’, but the main thread running through it is an interest in the events of the Peasants’ War. The only essay that does not fit into this framework is Scott’s study of accusations of heresy which, as he shows, form a complex strand of early Reformation discourse that was used by old and new believers to discredit each other. Scott’s substantive approaches to ‘the largest popular uprising in European history before the French Revolution’ (p. 2), by contrast, are diverse. He examines the central protagonists of the Peasants’ War under many different aspects: he looks at Gaismaier’s economic thinking (‘The Reformation and Modern Political Economy: Luther and Gaismaier Compared’) and the intellectual worlds of Balthasar Hubmaier, Christoph Schappeler, and Hans Hergot (‘Hubmaier, Schappeler, and Hergot on Social Revolution’). Two essays are devoted to the events of 1524–5 in Allstedt, focusing on Thomas Müntzer (‘Johannes Agricola’s Ein nutzlicher Dialogus . . .’; ‘Müntzer and the Mustard-Seed: A Parable as Paradox?’). Three further essays take a systematic approach to the subject. ‘The German Peasants’ War and the “Crisis of Feudalism”: Reflections on a Neglected Theme’ reassesses historiographical debates that have fallen into oblivion; ‘The German Peasants’ War of 1525 and the English Peasants’ Revolt of 1381: A Comparison of Peasant and Urban Participation’ takes a comparative look at one of the basic themes of Scott’s oeuvre, the relationship between town and country; and ‘The Collective Response of Women to Early Reforming Preaching: Four Small Communities and

their Preachers Compared’ takes an innovative approach to gender history.

Completed by an exemplary index of names and places, and one of subjects, Scott’s collection of essays demonstrates the correctness of his conviction that, far from being a worked-out seam, early Reformation history ‘still contains new adits and shafts of exploration into unresolved questions’ (p. 1).

GABRIELE HAUG-MORITZ is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Graz. She has published extensively on the Reformation in Germany, the constitutional and judicial history of the Holy Roman Empire, and media history. She is the author of, among others, Der Schmalkaldische Bund (1530–1541/42): Eine Studie zu den genossenschaftlichen Strukturelementen der politischen Ordnung des Heiligen Römischen Reiches Deutscher Nation (2002) and Die württembergische Ehrbarkeit (1648–1805): Annäherungen an eine bürgerliche Machtelite der Frühen Neuzeit (2009). Currently she is writing a comparative study of religious conflict and the media in France and the German lands in the middle of the sixteenth century.

Britain’s political and cultural insularity during the early modern period has long been accepted, more or less uncritically. Recently, however, thanks to the work of J. C. D. Clark, Timothy Blanning, Andrew Thompson, Tony Claydon, and others, this view has begun to give way to a broader European perspective. Comparative investigations as well as studies of transfer and cultural processes of translation and reception have shown—and not just in the context of the anniversary of the Hanoverian succession in 2014—how closely Britain was involved with what was happening in continental Europe, especially central Europe, and how much the Continent contributed to shaping (early) modern Britain. They have made clear that political, religious, and cultural processes on both sides of the Channel were not irreconcilable Sonderwege, but parts of a common European ancien régime.

This is the context for these two new studies by David Scott Gehring and David Worthington, which deal with special areas of contact and mechanisms of exchange between Britain and the Continent. Gehring examines a hitherto neglected dimension of Elizabethan foreign policy, studies of which have traditionally concentrated more on relations with France and Spain. Building on the work of Erkki Kouri in particular, Gehring looks at England’s relations with the Protestant imperial Estates from the start of Queen Elizabeth I’s reign to the 1590s. The book fits into the research on the Protestant cause or Protestant interest as an integrative force in English foreign policy, stretching from Simon Adams’s unpublished Ph.D. thesis of 1972 to Andrew Thompson (2006). Gehring analyses diplomatic contacts between English envoys and the courts of what he calls, terminologically not entirely convincingly, ‘greater Germania’
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Specifically, in addition to England, he focuses largely on the imperial Estates of Electoral Palatinate, the Electorate of Saxony, and Denmark. The Danish monarchy was closely connected with the Holy Roman Empire not only by its territorial holdings, but also through dynastic and denominational ties with, among others, Electoral Saxony.

The starting point for Gehrings’s study is the observation that Lutheranism influenced Elizabethan ecclesiastical policy. This strand, like other continental denominational transfers to Britain, is not pursued further in the study. Instead, Gehring concentrates on various attempts by English politicians to conclude alliances with the more important Protestant imperial Estates. In the tradition of classical diplomatic history, he describes individual missions and their often rather hopeless attempts to persuade the princes, who were mostly theologically and politically totally at odds, to sign treaties of alliance, to support troops, or contribute money in the service of a wider, common Protestant interest. Despite external threats to the interests of Protestant polities, such as the French Wars of Religion, the revolt of the Netherlands, and the expansion of Spanish Habsburg power, the theological and denominational divisions within the Holy Roman Empire proved to be an insurmountable obstacle to forging political alliances, and the atmosphere surrounding the Formula of Concord and the 1580 Book of Concord further exacerbated this situation. Attempts at cooperation naturally had the greatest chance of success where, as in Electoral Palatinate or the Electorate of Saxony under the short reign of Christian I, they aimed to bring together Lutheran opponents of the Formula of Concord into a Protestant alliance.

Developments in the Empire and central Europe were, of course, closely monitored by Britain. It is not surprising, therefore, that when crises such as the French Wars of Religion or the Cologne War of 1584 threatened European Protestantism, feelers were quickly extended and attempts made to persuade potentially friendly princes to enter a wider alliance. The Danish king Frederick II’s support for English plans played a special part here. The English–Danish axis seemed to weaken after the execution of Elizabeth’s rival, Mary Queen of Scots, and Frederick II’s death, which followed soon thereafter. This was because Scotland now intervened more actively in Europe’s concert of Protestant powers, until the potential for conflict between Den-
mark and Scotland (for example, about the Orkney Islands) was contained when James VI married Anne of Denmark. A more significant break in England’s policy towards the Empire did not occur until the 1590s. It was caused by deaths and generational changes on both sides, the failure of the anti-French alliance army under the leadership of Anhalt followed by Henry IV’s conversion to Catholicism, and the consolidation of the situation in the Protestant Netherlands. This put an end to the ‘era of Anglo-German involvement in the wars of religion’ (p. 147) and, according to Gehring, the closest phase of Anglo-German cooperation until the eighteenth century.

This strictly chronological study convincingly presents the significance and, above all, the coherence of Elizabethan foreign policy towards the Protestant imperial Estates, based on rich manuscript material from British and German archives: ‘the Queen’s German policy exhibited a fundamentally consistent pan-Protestant ideology’ (p. 111). Although many diplomatic missions had no concrete results, the book’s achievement is to have demonstrated the integrative power of a Protestant cause between Britain and continental Europe, despite the fact that the most convincing military cooperation of 1591 after the union of Torgau took place in the context of English policy for France. This meant that Protestant policy towards the Empire was often simultaneously a policy towards France (pp. 140–3). Whether the numerous appeals to an international Protestantism should always be seen as instructions for specific political action or whether they were sometimes intended to promote a rhetorical integration (also internally), however, remains a moot point. Further studies, for example, on the theological background of Protestant appeals to the community, on the role of print, or on the imperial Estates’ political and cultural interests in cooperating with England could provide more insights. The way in which this study is structured and its rather one-dimensional perspective, looking from England to Europe, mean that potential interlocutors and cooperation partners in the Empire and their political chances and ambitions appear relatively pale and passive.

Gehring’s argument is detailed and factual, but does not adopt the newer methodological insights of a cultural history of early modern diplomacy. A number of exciting questions would repay further consideration. What impact did internal denominational policy between the two poles of reformed Puritanism and state church
Erastianism have on Elizabethan foreign policy and diplomacy? To what extent were both really ‘partners in the Protestant cause’ (p. 150)? Was Lutheranism a ‘third force’ during the late English Reformation period, or were there significant fractures, despite the postulated continuity?

David Worthington’s study of the experience of British travellers and migrants in continental Europe is located beyond the politics of political alliances and set against an even larger geographical horizon. It has grown out of the context of a number of studies and research projects conducted at the University of Aberdeen, dealing with the early modern Scottish diaspora on the Continent of Europe. Worthington himself is the author of a study, published in 2003, of Scots in Habsburg military service in the seventeenth century. These interests explain the geographical scope of his investigation, which includes the eastern part of central Europe, in particular, the Prussian–Polish Baltic region, and the Habsburg sphere of influence going beyond the borders of the Old Reich.

The timeframe Worthington suggests, 1560 to 1688, that is, from the establishment of a Scottish national church to the Glorious Revolution, is to be understood loosely. The Introduction refers back to the Middle Ages, while the Conclusion looks forward well into the eighteenth century. Between them lie five large chapters which look at links between British travellers to Europe and the formation of expatriate networks (chapter one); diplomats and spies, especially around the Habsburg court (chapter two); soldiers in the service of continental armies (chapter three); Protestant scholars and traders (chapter four); and Catholic colleges, orders, and clergy from Britain on the Continent (chapter five). The Conclusion offers more than a mere summary, including references to connections with the later Jacobite diaspora and the place of Anglo-Irish migrants in the collective memory of individual central European regions. Particular attention is paid throughout to the Leslie family of Scottish descent, one of whose members, Walter, gained a certain notoriety as an imperial field marshal and assassin of Wallenstein.

The study offers a great deal of detailed information about the careers and contacts of the mostly Scottish expatriates it discusses. Fully in the spirit of the book’s ‘transnational perspective’ (p. 2), some of them ended up in North Africa or the Netherlands in the service of Spain. Some we find in Poland, or fighting for the Habs-
burgs against the Ottomans in Hungary. Networks of mercenaries and diplomats were formed on an ad hoc basis, or based on family relations (pp. 93–4). The comparison between Protestant and Catholic migrants is appealing. For Catholics, their educational infrastructure helped in group-formation, as is demonstrated by taking the example of the Jesuit academy in Braunsberg/Branievo in the Duchy of Prussia (pp. 158–9).

It is a problem, however, that the book does not have an overarching argument, but consists primarily of a collection of rather scattered individual stories. Often these are not clearly contextualized in terms of the origin of the source, or their specific political and cultural setting. In particular, the way in which travel reports are used is methodologically unsatisfying. Ignoring the findings of recent research, travel reports are here treated (and extensively quoted) as sources of seemingly objective factual information, without a closer look being taken at their authors or intended readership (pp. 26–8).

Based on sources from numerous European archives (Britain, Belgium, Spain, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria), contemporary prints, and (sometimes obscure) research literature from a number of national historiographies, this book is valuable as a treasure trove of personal history and a pioneering cross-genre work. It paints a picture of a ‘largely male, disproportionately Scottish if transnational, mixed Protestant and Roman Catholic grouping with a “multiplicity of involvements” in both home and host societies’ (p. 189). Further archival research on both sides of the Channel may possibly reveal an even greater diversity among the British expatriates in early modern continental Europe.

The two studies under review here both show, in different ways, how fruitful the investigation of Anglo-continental relations and networks in the early modern period can be. They also point to the many research questions that have not yet been adequately answered, and document a fundamental change in some areas of British research on the early modern period over the last twenty years. A corresponding change in central European research is now required in order to temper the traditional dominance of Franco-German transfers by looking at the significance of early modern exchange relations between Britain and Germany. But both studies underline the difficulty of adequately reflecting the multipolarity of entanglements in a transnational perspective and presenting them in a narrative that does justice to the
transcultural realities, complex communication structures, and mobility of the early modern population. There is always the danger of preferring to look in one direction rather than the other. In conjunction with the selection of sources and approaches, this can result in rather traditional histories of transfer and reception whose unilinearity does not do full justice to the actual complexity of the exchange across the Channel. Yet if, as in the books discussed here, this opens new horizons, then this represents a major asset for research.
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This edited volume on caricature and visual satire is based on a symposium to celebrate the tercentenary of the accession of the House of Hanover to the British throne in 1714. Comprising nine chapters, it aims to demonstrate, as the editors write in their introduction, that the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century dynastic link between the United Kingdom and the German electorate represented ‘a determining factor’ for the emergence and development of caricature in England. In what follows the reader encounters something very different, namely, a number of excellent essays on various aspects of caricature: visual print’s artistic origin, its production and markets, and exchange with other media. The Personal Union is left unexplored and is hardly referred to in any of the contributions. This observation is not meant as pedantic criticism. Rather, it aims to point out that students and scholars of art history, history, and cultural studies will discover more in the book than the title implies, or, at least, something different from what it suggests.

The nine essays are divided into four sections. The first deals with the king as a central figure for the artistic genre. It explores the importance of monarchy both as an attractive topic for caricaturists and a major reason for the rising popularity of loyalist and opposition caricature. Werner Busch points to the Catholic origin of caricatures. The first representations of caricatured heads appeared at the papal court in Rome. While late sixteenth-century Italian caricature showed individual portraits, however, it was in England that such ‘heads’ were placed in satirical images and narratives. The emergence of English caricature around the middle of the eighteenth century coincided with the end of George II’s reign and the accession of George III. The late Hanoverian monarchs lived during an age of caricature. Sheila O’Connell, Christina Oberstebrink, and James Baker demonstrate in their contributions that the monarchy was central to the success of the genre. While O’Connell’s essay provides a concise history of caricature of members of the royal family, Oberstebrink places the British caricaturist James Gillray into the contemporary discourse on art. Gillray’s Shakespeare references can be understood as a response
to art theory. Similarly, the caricaturists’ approach of making fun of authority, not least the monarchy, has an equivalent in Shakespeare’s use of the comic in drama. While caricatures can be understood as something new to a mid eighteenth-century audience, there were strong links with other artistic genres.

James Baker points to the strong nexus between caricature and commerce. Artists, engravers, and printers experimented with royal images, not least in the hope of better sales. However, as the strategies of the stationer, printer, and entrepreneur Samuel Fores show, appealing to the loyalism of potential buyers while also exploiting the broader appeal of caricaturing the royal family proved to be a delicate business. It was because of the controversies surrounding the royal princes such as George Augustus Frederick that monarchy took centre stage in caricatures. In other words, politics needs to be included in an interpretation of caricature as art.

The second section discusses the evolution of topics and the subversive content of images. Karl Janke argues that the English Republic encountered difficulties in visual self-representation. While caricaturists benefited from the aggravated ideological confrontations of the late seventeenth century it was the conservative ‘counter-offensive’ that won the ‘civil war of images’ and the ‘battle for state symbols’. Republican political ideas were successful in poetry and prose while it proved much more difficult to develop a Republican iconography.

Temitope Odumosu’s contribution can be placed somewhere between sections one and two. Her analysis of royal caricature deals with the discourse on anti-slavery. While caricatures played with the frugal image of George III and his family, they also referred to Wilberforce’s anti-slavery movement that had advocated abstaining from colonial products such as sugar since 1791. At the other end of the political spectrum we find references to black African women in caricature that highlight the distance between royalty and reality. While Prince William publicly defended slavery on economic grounds, he was known to have an African mistress, something caricaturists hastened to exploit. However, ‘representing the prince with a “black” woman was certainly a daring intervention’ (p. 133).

The more practical aspects of caricature production and sale are at the heart of the third section. Timothy Clayton points to the differences between France and Britain. While French representations of
monarchy were often state funded, the emergence of a consumer society provided an important prerequisite for British caricature. However, commercial success also led to piracy of ideas and to the question of copyright. As early as 1735, unauthorized copies became illegal. Efforts by caricaturists to sell themselves as artistic personalities was both an attempt to defend their genre against other artistic traditions and a device to tackle the thriving market in cheaper versions of art.

The final section deals with caricature’s interaction with other media. Brian Maidment explains the visual image’s path from individual large-scale artefact to illustration in printed periodicals and other forms of serial publication. He describes the fold-out, engraved frontispiece as a mechanism for providing small-sized volumes with a large and glamorous form of illustration. Publishers embarked on this strategy around 1820. This can be placed somewhere between the wish of publishers to preserve the tradition of political caricature and the changed market for comic visual culture. As Maidment shows, the *Glasgow Looking Glass* can be interpreted as a prime example of this sort of development. More importantly, he also demonstrates that visual artists in their ‘frantic energy, endless inventiveness and low success rate’ (p. 180) experienced comic art as a form of intense experimentation that was symptomatic of the transformation of the 1820s and 1830s.

Finally, Sune Erik Schlitte points to the many layers of caricaturist biography and art. John Wolcot’s success (under the pseudonym Peter Pindar) as a critic of society must be placed against his ambition to exploit career opportunities, address popular topics, and benefit from political argument. In conclusion, caricaturists must be understood in their artistic, social, economic, and political context. As Wolcot’s caricature *Lousiad* of 1787 (referring to a louse George III found in a dish) shows, it was because of the British upper class’s interest in opposition caricature and the Prince Regent’s support of Pindar that the caricature became so successful.

As in Schlitte’s essay, the reader finds strong thematic overlap in most contributions to the volume. (Hence the editors refer to the four sections only very briefly in the introduction. The categories find no place in the table of contents.) Caricature, cartoons, and other forms of visual satire need to be placed between art and commodity. Thus while some of the elaborate, large-scale, and coloured examples can
be seen as high (and expensive) art, cheaper copies with a large print run appealed to a much wider audience. While caricaturists placed themselves in an artistic tradition, the potential price of their art, or the income it could generate, proved just as important an inspiration.

While this volume’s description of the multi-layered world of caricature is strong, a small critical reservation needs to be made. The historiography on the Personal Union is entirely neglected. John Harald Plump’s *The First Four Georges* (1975) is described as the best account of the Hanoverians. While we find references to Ernst Brandes and his links with Britain, and to the Hanoverian artist Heinrich Ramberg’s contribution to caricature, none of the more recent books on cultural transfer between Britain and Hanover is mentioned. The original and innovative aspects of the book are to be found elsewhere. Despite this reservation, the volume is recommended as a highly readable, concise, and inspiring state-of-the-art account of English political caricature during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

TORSTEN RIOTTE is a Lecturer at the Goethe University Frankfurt. His publications include a monograph on composite statehood during the reign of George III, *Hannover in der britischen Politik* (2005) and several articles on the Dynastic Union between the two states. He is co-editor of *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714–1837* (2010) and of volumes 3 and 4 of the edition *British Envoys to Germany* (2006 and 2010). His most recent study of European monarchs in exile will be published at the end of 2015.

Focusing on cultural exchange between Britain and Germany from 1770 to 1840, this volume represents the published outcome of a conference of early-career researchers at the Institute for European History in Mainz in 2009. An introduction by the editors sets the analytical pace. It refers to the historical backdrop, differing starting points in Britain and Germany, and general patterns of Anglo-German intercourse. It also exercises analytical concepts of intercultural exchange and doffs a cap at important historiographical predecessors, in particular, the volume edited by Rudolf Muhs, Johannes Paulmann, and Willibald Steinmetz (1998).1 The editors argue the case for extending the focus of this study backwards in time to this earlier period and outwards in subject to areas not traditionally identified as cultural. They also emphasize the plurality of the subject and the need to distinguish between reception and impact.

Jennifer Willenberg takes up the analytical baton with an article explaining how foreignness was constructed and perceived in Anglo-German discourse. Cultural goods are identified as belonging to one’s own culture or as foreign by means of stereotypes, models, and fashions. In such ways, information is selected for adoption or rejection, and the self is defined simultaneously with the foreign. Willenberg then sets out to illustrate her argument by pointing to the formative influence of French ideas about Britain on eighteenth-century Germany, in particular, the work of Voltaire and Montesquieu. In so doing, she introduces a recurring theme of the volume: the European dimension of the subject. She also proceeds to explore how patterns of thought about Britain developed through and beyond the revolutionary period and in reaction to changing power-political relations.

The significance of Göttingen as a sort of cultural camera obscura transposing British themes onto a German screen is taken up by Sünne Juterczenka. The lens is widened from Europe to empire, as Juterczenka analyses how Göttingen academics received and presented information about British exploration of the Pacific. Published discussions of Captain James Cook’s exploits, it is argued, testify to the increasing focus on Britain as opposed to France or Portugal, but also to an emerging sense of self-worth on the part of Göttingen’s academics. Their absorption of notions of British empiricism at first encouraged a sense of themselves as *Stubengelehrte*. This, in turn, formed a foundation for arguments regarding German analytical strengths and the necessity of subjecting empirical if not superficial British findings to German science. Both Willenberg and Juterczenka demonstrate the European context and the more problematic phase post-1789.

Evelyn Gottschlich turns to the reception of the Earl of Chesterfield’s letters in Germany and, in particular, to the way in which his arguments about politeness were received. In a consideration which rests upon comparison of moral philosophical traditions in Britain and Germany, Gottschlich reveals how politeness constituted a particularly British phenomenon rooted in the specific social context of public life. This made it difficult for German philosophers to understand or recognize Chesterfield, who they rejected as having no moral principles and simply advocating good deeds for self-serving ends. Chesterfield’s treatment is contrasted with that of Shaftesbury, whose ‘moral sense’ movement was understood and became popular in Germany. Politeness, therefore, was not treated as a major theme by German writers. As the eighteenth century ended, German moral philosophy was presented as strengthening its interest in moral sense theories, while British counterparts became more evangelical, leaving Chesterfield’s politeness a thing of the past.

Michael Bies likewise considers the limitations of German Anglophilia. On the one hand, his introduction of Charles Gore both recalls contemporary British fascination with Weimar and focuses attention on a man whose presence in the town brought about personal encounters with leading figures in German cultural life, including Goethe. On the other hand, Bies deftly explores how Goethe drew upon Gore as the basis for his English Lord in *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*, but also how Goethe’s depiction, while grounded in reality,
can be seen as a rejection of English traits. For example, the camera obscura makes a reappearance, this time as the English Lord’s—and Gore’s—preferred method of producing artwork. Goethe, however, presents this utilization of intentionally empirical methods as leading to imitative and pedantic results. Art, by implication, is about something unseen, more spiritual. In this case study, Bies masterfully illustrates the strengthening aspirations of German culture, its increasing emphasis on artistic idealism, and the simultaneous rejection of British cultural approaches. His account is a useful extension of Jutrczenka’s account of growing academic confidence.

Uwe Ziegler, recalling initial points made regarding the definition of culture, considers discussion of the British constitution in Prussia from 1790 to 1823. His account traces pre-revolutionary interest and how this was transformed after 1789. Prior to the revolution, anti-absolutist interest predominated, despite conservative concerns in the wake of American independence. After the revolution, a Burkean interest in constitutional liberalization in order to avoid revolution developed in Prussia. Ziegler also explains how enlightened interest in the British constitution was spread across a network of reformers from the 1760s on, not just in Göttingen but also in Königsberg, Berlin, and elsewhere. Thus by the turn of the century a visit to Britain had become an established part of the education of the aspiring and reflective civil servant. Despite the small number of those concerned, Ziegler argues that the impact of British influence was enhanced, given the positions of the individuals and the political situation. Once direct contact with Britain became difficult after 1803, the information and arguments regarding Britain would continue to have influence. However, this provides a useful distillation of the phenomenon that discourse regarding foreign themes and subjects can exist in a vacuum and for domestic purposes. Drawing on previous essays, Ziegler again underlines how Montesquieu’s arguments regarding the Germanic characteristics of the British constitutional system were utilized by reformers for their own ends.

Later, however, the reformist discourse foundered on resistance constituted by an alliance between Hardenberg’s administrative precedence, the provincialism of the Estates, and the conservatism of the aristocracy. Ziegler’s constitutional exploration demonstrates clearly the tensions, evolution, and limitations of Prussian discussion of Britain. Out of this discussion a home-grown constitutional posi-
tion emerged, emphasizing representation rather than democracy, and culminating in, for example, Hegel’s critique of the Reform Bill. The theme of continuity between Hegel’s position and that of the late-Enlightenment political publicists is explored in greater depth by Iwan-Michelangelo D’Aprile. D’Aprile’s focus on Friedrich Buchholz expands the critical position of conservatives to social and economic questions.

Oliver Werner explores the way in which preconceptions about foreign states led to a particular focus and the selection of information, and the ramifications of this in political decision-making. In this case, however, the object of study is Henry Addington. Addington’s experience during the Napoleonic Wars as British envoy to Prussia, it is argued, shaped his approach to German politics when appointed as Britain’s representative to the Confederation in Frankfurt in 1828–9. Werner shows how this led to a particular position on intra-German politics. He also adds a fresh area of investigation by considering the measures taken by European states during this period to ensure the appointment of diplomats with an understanding of the culture of their host states. Governments, it is implied, were themselves becoming aware of the importance of freeing themselves from their own preconceptions for the sake of better information-gathering.

In the volume’s final contribution, Niall Busse studies the remarkable network of chemists built up by Justus von Liebig, now seen as a classic example. Busse focuses his attention on the carriers, rationale, locations, media, and objects of transfer at work. The essay becomes a contemplation of the concept of culture. There are differing academic cultures. Liebig was intent on spreading his own approach via his pupils in Britain. Scientific literature is considered as a cultural medium. Liebig’s enthusiasm for empiricism fuelled his support for the translation of John Stuart Mill’s *System of Logic*. Busse also highlights how chemistry provided a dense network of contacts facilitating cultural transfer in more mundane senses. The deficiencies of chemistry in Britain required the transfer there of German glass implements and raw materials. Liebig wrote on English-style notepaper, constructed an English garden, and introduced tea at 5 o’clock in Giessen.

This volume is not without weaknesses. More explicit cross-referencing reinforcing the contributions and an analytical conclusion.
drawing the whole together would have been helpful. The relevance of some of the contributions to the whole is not made obvious enough. The perennial problem of England versus Britain is left unaddressed and at times becomes excruciating. There are similar concerns when discussing Prussia versus Germany. The question of representativeness is never far from the reader’s mind: how far can a small group of academics at Göttingen or reformers in Berlin constitute a German reception at all? Indeed, are terms such as Britain and Germany suitable when considering intercultural transfer in this period? There is an imbalance, with most of the contributions focusing on German reception and leading one to question the title’s reference to *Austausch*. Despite fleeting mention, there is little consideration of economic themes. Nevertheless, together and separately, the contributions in this volume constitute important and welcome additions to research on cultural transfer and Anglo-German relations, both chronologically and thematically.
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LEIGHTON S. JAMES, Witnessing the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in German Central Europe, War, Culture and Society, 1750–1850 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), xiii + 281 pp. ISBN 978 0 230 24917 2. £55.00

Leighton S. James draws on the full range of German-language ego documents that survive from the turbulent decades around 1800: letters, diaries, and memoirs. On this broad source basis, he reconstructs contemporary perceptions of the wars of the time. This applies to the entire period from the outbreak of the revolutionary wars to the end of the wars of liberation; to all locations with German-speaking actors, from Spain to Russia; and to testimonies of soldiers on campaign as well as to records left by civilians who experienced the war at home. James manages to compress this huge programme into just 200 pages of text.

And there is still space for a chapter outlining the constitutional and political framework for the disintegration of the Holy Roman Empire, thus making the book accessible to those who are not familiar with these complicated, very German structures. And there is also room for a concise chapter discussing the specific features of the various text genres and the older and more recent literary traditions that might have influenced the individual authors.

The book’s specific nature is defined by the wealth and breadth of its coverage on the one hand, and compression on the other. It is designed as a handbook that systematically covers the whole of its subject area in order to reflect the state of research. But it is intended to be much more than that. By arguing so closely from the sources, it claims to make an independent and continuing contribution to research in its own right. Its systematic coverage, however, militates against transparency and unity of epistemological approach.

To start with, the author explains his main epistemological interests, but here, too, he poses several very different questions. He asks to what extent experiences of the war were shaped by social status, gender, denomination, and literary interpretations; to what extent eye-witness testimonies reflect a changed culture of war; and to what extent the war encouraged the development of German nationalism. All three are justified and complex questions which, under the cir-
circumstances, can only be addressed sporadically, unsystematically, and in an unbalanced way. And it remains unclear whether the overwhelmingly broad range of sources presented is based on a methodological selection and evaluation of the texts. The treatment of the sources also varies. Sometimes they are themselves the subject of an analytical reception history, when the author is investigating the reflection of ethnic stereotypes, for instance; at others, they are a medium which is used to illustrate events, for example, to tell the story of how resistance to the French occupation fell apart.

We do the book more justice, therefore, if we read it as a handbook with a pragmatically designed methodology that allows the reader to follow the voices of contemporaries through the period, while also reporting on current research and discussing it in the light of the author’s own reading of the sources. His knowledge of these allows him to bridge gaps in the debate. Given the constraints outlined above, it does this in a highly concentrated form, and in what, from a German perspective, seems like a typically English fashion, with quotations from the sources used as examples to prop up wide-ranging theses and arguments that quickly follow on from each other.

Two chapters take a military perspective, and another two a predominantly civilian one. The military chapters deal with the conditions of military service, with emphasis on the problems of patriotism. They also look at perceptions of the Other during extensive campaigns. The following chapters, conceived more from the civilian perspective, examine reactions to the French occupation and perceptions of liberation, with a stress on the participation of women. Thus they allow a rough chronological juxtaposition.

Read as a handbook, the volume spreads out before the reader a wealth of stimulating observations and references to current research which, in the end, merge together to create a remarkable panorama of the period. To this extent, therefore, the author has produced an unprecedented synthesis. At the end, he pares the fruits of his own reading down to two essential theses which will serve to stimulate further discussion. First, James wants to free his sources from appropriation by nationalist interpretations of the nineteenth century. These are, in any case, no longer taken seriously as reference texts. In this context, James points out that his ego documents reveal little patriotic inspiration, and expose highly differentiated and inconsistent perceptions of France in particular.
This also affects the author’s second main concern. Going against the grain of recent research, which emphasizes the particularity of this era, James claims to find hardly any specific features in the ego documents he examined. Rather, he mentions similarities with eighteenth-century testimonies, and even with those of the First World War. Thus the texts suggest that from the point of view of the individual, the burdens of war changed little—‘unsurprisingly’ is a word that recurs often in this context. The values and perspectives of social orders prove to be long-lived, while the undeniable political and military upheavals of the time are barely reflected in these contemporary accounts. This finding must, of course, itself be related to the status, genre, and perspective of the documents. But it is also a reason to consider the basic implications both for the range of these sources and, conversely, for the implementation of changes. Eventually, however, even these 200 pages are exhausted.

MICHAEL SIKORA is Adjunct Professor at the University of Münster. His publications include Disziplin und Desertion: Strukturprobleme militärischer Organisation im 18. Jahrhundert (1997); Der Adel in der frühen Neuzeit (2009); Zelebrieren und Verhandeln: Zur Praxis ständischer Institutionen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa (2009); Kulturgeschichte der Schlacht (2014); and, as co-editor, Gerhard von Scharnhorst: Private und dienstliche Schriften, 7 vols. (2003–14).

Sven Oliver Müller’s monograph, which has grown out of the *Habilitationsschrift* he submitted to the University of Bielefeld, focuses on the role of the audience in opera houses and concert venues during the nineteenth century. In Berlin, London, and Vienna he is looking at three distinct and well-chosen cities. This is an ambitious and fascinating project and, to anticipate, Müller pulls it off beautifully.

In his introduction Müller usefully points to the power of audiences and their influence on performances. His study focuses on patterns of behaviour that were often seen as annoying and disruptive by composers and musicians, such as talking through performances, applauding in the middle of a scene, walking in and out of auditoria in the middle of a performance, and so on. Disappointingly, Müller’s focus is entirely on middle- and upper-class audiences at concert and opera performances. Although this is perhaps understandable given the enormity of the project and the comparative approach, the focus on elite audiences and the canonical high-art repertoire they patronized is also limiting. It sidelines the vast audiences attracted by a more popular musical programmes, for example, in the music halls and variety theatres of Britain, and the body of work on popular entertainment.

Müller usefully sets out the ideas for his book in a number of theses. He argues that musical performances made and extended social and political groups; that audience behaviour was not static but changed throughout the nineteenth century; that the pleasure of attending concerts cannot be separated from their social function; that the years from 1820 to 1850 were a distinct turning point in the reception of music and the process of creating mass audiences for concerts and operas; that we can detect changing mechanisms of exclusion in practices of musical communication; that audiences were multifaceted and interconnected; and, finally, that audiences were co-creators of musical performances. In working through these theses, Müller looks for common ground in Europe’s musical life by taking a comparative approach. One area of common ground, he argues, was the middle-class appreciation of music that decisively influenced its reception. Patterns of behaviour, Müller argues, were,
in fact, very similar across Europe, with similarities decidedly out-
weighing the differences (p. 28).

In terms of balance, Vienna, perhaps surprisingly, gets the short-
est treatment. Müller’s expertise lies elsewhere, as illustrated by his
previous publications, and he clearly feels much more at home dis-
scussing the situation in London. At times he could have explored the
fundamental differences between Germany and Austria on the one
hand and Britain on the other in more detail, in particular, relating to
state funding. On page 44, when discussing musical venues in
Europe, he could have mentioned that there was no equivalent to a
Hoftheater (court theatre) in Britain (although he briefly notes this on
p. 59). He could also have stressed that the performance ‘pot-pourri’
on offer at London theatres did not actually cease to exist with the
emergence of the symphony as an art form (p. 49), but continued well
into the twentieth century at many venues. Otherwise this second
chapter’s focus on audiences, social structures, inequalities and status,
and distinctions is highly convincing. Müller shows how concert and
opera venues in growing cities acted as spaces for meeting and nego-
tiating social distinctions. Elite bourgeois and aristocratic audiences
consciously linked aesthetic beauty with economic power (p. 67).

In chapter 3 Müller turns to programmes and repertoires. He
addresses the issue of ‘cultural transfers’ and the development of
common repertoires, aesthetics, and tastes. The nineteenth century
saw the development of a standard opera repertoire consisting of
Mozart, Bellini, Donizetti, Meyerbeer, Verdi, and Wagner. The same
applied to orchestral music, with symphonies by Beethoven, Brahms,
and Dvorak topping the bill across Europe. These similarities, Müller
argues, were down not only to the qualities of the musical composi-
tions themselves, but also to the discourses surrounding them (p.
106). Europe, on the whole, was fascinated by the idea of the ‘musi-
cal genius’, for example, especially Beethoven and Wagner, who
almost created his own myth. Strauss and Mahler, on the other hand,
divided opinion (p. 134). The cult of the virtuoso, too, was a
European phenomenon with Liszt, Jenny Lind, and Paganini the
most obvious examples. Another pan-European development was a
longing for oriental dreams and illusion on stage, with increasingly
elaborate productions being staged from the 1830s on (one minor
point of criticism here is that Gilbert and Sullivan’s enormously suc-
cessful Savoy operas warrant a broader discussion here, or at least a
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bit more space than just a footnote on p. 191). From the 1850s on, however, a more conservative taste in musical programming took hold all over Europe, with calls for ‘true art’ and ‘absolute music’ (p. 175).

Chapter 4 deals with the changing musical experience during the nineteenth century and the ‘invention of silence’ (p. 217). Between 1820 and 1860 a fundamental shift occurred across Europe, as audiences at concert and opera performances grew increasingly quiet. Müller convincingly discusses this phenomenon as a change in patterns of behaviour through self-control. Quiet audiences first appeared in northern Germany around 1820 in a development which reached Britain around 1850, although as late as 1877 there were still complaints about London audiences applauding during a performance instead of at the end of it. Müller’s particular interest in elite forms of performance, however, perhaps narrows the focus too much here as this kind of expression of the audience’s appreciation could still be found in the 1940s and 1950s, especially at regional repertory theatres. Applause would break out as soon as the local favourite actor appeared on stage, regardless of whether this was appropriate to that particular moment in the play or not. In the context of high art, on the other hand, European concert and opera audiences had grown quiet by the last third of the nineteenth century, thanks to pan-European cultural transfers, as Müller argues (pp. 257–8). They had developed into quiet and avid listeners, and their behaviour consciously exemplified their elevated social and cultural status. Music was now considered art to be marvelling at, and not something to be enjoyed as background entertainment.

Müller rightly points out that this development is all the more remarkable when contrasted with the early nineteenth century, when riots had regularly broken out and audiences had taken a much more active role, almost playing out their own performances. Müller discusses a fascinating example from the Berliner Hofoper in 1818, when the audience decided to put on its own show in response to a vain soloist, Josef Fischer, who had criticized them previously for not showing sufficient appreciation of his performance (p. 264). At London’s Her Majesty’s Theatre in 1840 aristocratic audiences almost caused a riot in order to stake their claim to how operatic performances were run (pp. 265–6), and to reaffirm their place in society at large. Müller usefully puts this unrest into a larger political context,
including London’s Promenade concerts and other, similar, popular concert series elsewhere.

In chapter 5 Müller discusses the political dimension of operatic performances as events where power, control, and influence were negotiated, celebrated, and reaffirmed. Performances themselves were very similar across the Continent, irrespective of whether they were put on in celebration of a monarchy or a republic (p. 296). During official gala performances and through the active participation of audiences, an imagined nation came together. Interestingly, and again linking to Müller’s claim that practices were similar across Europe, the nationalistic rituals played out in Vienna, Berlin, and London were almost identical (pp. 327–8). Müller also makes clear, however, that musical performances were used not only to affirm existing political structures, but also to question them. In the 1830s and 1840s, in particular, performances became political demonstrations and concerts were turned into ‘battle grounds’ (p. 337) in the run up to revolutions on the Continent, or to mock the behaviour and outdated taste of aristocratic audiences in London. In contrast to Berlin and Vienna, however, middle-class audiences in London enjoyed significantly more freedom of expression (at least after 1850) than their continental peers.

Overall, Müller has written a detailed, well-researched, and well-argued book. He is always in command of his vast material, and the study’s comparative nature is exemplary. Müller is also able to place his research into current theoretical debates, although the tentative claim for a ‘musical turn’ may be a bit far fetched (pp. 19 ff.). As Müller’s book does not only speak to a German-language readership, I would highly recommend that it is translated into English.
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The German term in the title of this book opens up a wide field. While an English translation exists, it is not a direct equivalent. ‘Völkerpsychologie’ is a hybrid in German, both a technical term and a part of everyday language. Neither variant corresponds exactly to ‘folk psychology’ or ‘psychology of the people’, which come across in English as distorted neologisms. Nor do paraphrases such as ‘folklore’ or ‘ethnic anthropology’ convey the meaning of the German term. The author’s decision, therefore, to leave the German term in the title (although not consistently throughout the text) is a good one. It seems that both the term and what it refers to are specific to the German-language discourse of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and this in itself is an important statement about the subject. But what does the term mean in German? Is the difficulty in translating it merely a matter of terminology, or does it also point to substantive peculiarities? Does it refer to a scientific method or to an academic subject? Or perhaps to a specific style of thinking?

As Egbert Klautke’s concise book makes clear, all of this applies at the same time to Völkerpsychologie. His decision not to present his subject as a defined field, but as a contradictory and mutable concept that served different purposes at different times, is illuminating. The reader is thus confronted with a conglomerate of ideas, drawn from intellectual history and the history of ideology, of very different provenances: a bundle of themes from Wesensschau and Seelenschau, ethics and morality, and elements of social and cultural history. This mixture aspired to become a theory of civilization and a philosophy of history. At the same time, however, the changing Zeitgeist meant that the term was used to refer to quite different things. This is what makes up the peculiarity of the subject, and it would have been a pity if the author had limited his account to one aspect of the confusingly varied writings. Nonetheless, Klautke had to make a selection, and here a third decision on his part is to be praised. It reveals the common sense of an experienced historian. Almost typologically, Klautke describes how the concept was invented and consolidat-
ed by Moritz Lazarus and Heymann Steinthal from the middle of the
nineteenth century (ch. 1); how Wilhelm Wundt, a medical doctor
and philosopher from Leizpig, made the approach academically re-
spectable and worthy of inclusion in encyclopaedias (ch. 2); and then
how it was popularized in the journalism of the 1930s and 1940s, cit-
ing the psychologist Willy Hellpach from Karlsruhe (later Heidel-
berg), a student of Wundt, as a representative figure (ch. 3).

In the first chapter, Klautke introduces Moritz Lazarus (1824–
1903) and Heymann Steinthal (1823–99), and presents an intellectual
history of the liberal science of early Völkerpsychologie. This mental
construct was liberal because it resulted from reflection on the rela-
tionship between religion and modernity, and defined emancipation,
equality (of chances and before the law), and freedom (of the indi-
vidual) as the central problem nexus of the time. Early Völker-
psychologie was connected with the journal Zeitschrift für Völkerpsycho-
logie und Sprachwissenschaf which the two founded in 1860, and thus
itself generated publicity; it was liberal because it put up its terms for
discussion, above all, ‘Verdichtung’ (condensation or thickening), the
title of an essay by Lazarus, but also the interpretative figure of ‘Zir-
kulation’ (circulation), as well as ‘Mannigfaltigkeit’ (multiplicity) and
‘Verflechtung’ (entanglement). In this journal, the term ‘Völker-
psychologie’, which had been in use since 1851, became the key con-
cept for a universal meta-science of modernity, which today we
would probably call social psychology or sociology. What was spe-
cial about this project, however, was that it chose language as the
material and method for its own interpretative attempts. By 1890,
twenty volumes of this journal, which also printed work by
Windelband, Dilthey, Goldziher, Bastian, and Simmel, had been pub-
lished. The main authors, however, were the editors, both of whom
had been shaped by the experience of Jewish emancipation in nine-
teenth-century Germany. They came from a traditional religious
milieu, left the provinces behind, and headed for the metropolis,
Berlin. Once there, both gave up their original intention of studying
theology and becoming rabbis, and turned instead to philosophy
and linguistics. Both were more impressed by Johann Friedrich
Herbart, the founder of an empirical cultural psychology, than by
Herder’s theory of the Volksgeist. They were students of Friedrich
Eduard Beneke, and enthused about the writings of Wilhelm von
Humboldt.
Drawing on the work of Ivan Kalmar and Gerhard von Graevenitz, Klautke gives a precise account of the eminently modern concept of culture developed by the Jewish founders of this journal. Despite elements of romanticism in their language and thinking, their concept did not, as a whole, aim to define states or nations in terms of collective ontologies and set them off against each other. Rather, the journal presented a comprehensive sociology of the relationship between individual and society. The editors understood the nation as a community of consent (Zustimmungsgemeinschaft), as a collective to which one belonged not on the basis of birth and property alone, but also through communication and a ‘daily plebiscite’ in Ernest Renan’s sense. Their most famous student was Georg Simmel, who took Steinthal’s and Lazarus’s terms, approaches, and arguments and developed them further. Unlike Wundt, however, Simmel did not use the key concept itself. Wundt, who did, and considered the coinage ‘Völkerpsychologie’ a ‘masterpiece of the art of language’, spelled out one of the aspects of its early history in his own work. In some ways logically, however, he referred to his two predecessors much less frequently than Simmel did.

The second chapter consists of the best scholarly introduction we have so far to the voluminous work of the doctor, psychologist, and polymath Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920). To the present day, his name, rather than those of Lazarus and Steinthal, is associated with Völkerpsychologie. From the 1890s, Wundt, an established university professor, gave lectures that were well received not only in Germany (Martin Buber and the doctor and psychiatrist Emil Kraepelin, for instance, could be named) but also in the USA (for example, by George Herbert Mead and Franz Boas). Between 1900 and 1920, he published ten volumes on the subject, in which he presented his approach, preserving the liberal approaches of the nineteenth century in the subtitle, Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythus und Sitt. Wundt wanted to put psychological methods onto an academic basis, and pursued experimental, almost scientific methods. His best-known

work was Die Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie (1837). As in the case of Lazarus and Steinthal, a number of attempts have been made to make Wundt relevant and see him as a ‘misunderstood scholar of the humanities’. But much of what he simply assumed in his writings has become completely foreign to us today. Even contemporaries of his, such as the historian Gerhard Masur, noted about the theory of stages in world history presented in Wundt’s Elemente der Völkerpsychologie that it conveyed the impression of ‘free historical life being violated by a regular course of development imposed on it and declared as the norm’. The hypostatization of the notions of ‘Volk’, ‘Volkstum’, and ‘Volksgeschichte’, which increased shortly thereafter, in the 1930s and 1940s, made this unease even greater, not least because Völkerpsychologie was now associated with the racism of the period. Even if this did not connect directly with Wundt, let alone his Jewish predecessors, but merely drew on them and borrowed their concepts, the tradition of Völkerpsychologie, which had still been rich and diverse in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was overlaid and finally destroyed by völkisch essentialism (for example, in Werner Sombart) and the racism of the Nazi years.

While the third chapter does not give an account of Nazi Völkerpsychologie, it provides the portrait of a scholar working on the intellectual and political margins of the age. Although he engaged with a number of Nazi ideological beliefs, he did this in a different spirit from most Nazi supporters. Willy Hellpach was a student of Wundt, and his Einführung in die Völkerpsychologie (1938) was the first attempt since Wundt’s death to popularize his ideas. In his writings, Hellpach did not subscribe to the racism of someone like Hans F. K. Günther (whom he criticized for his materialism), but he supported the ideological values of landscape psychology and ethnic physiognomy in the tradition of Friedrich Ratzel. Hellpach, therefore, did not simply assume the legacy of his academic supervisor. Rather, his works represented a synthesis of the ‘synergetic dynamic’ of the scientific milieu of Leipzig, which was home not only to Wundt but also to Karl Lamprecht and Hans Freyer.

2 Gerd Jüttemann (ed.), Wilhelm Wunds anderes Erbe: Ein Missverständnis löst sich auf (Göttingen, 2006).
3 Gerhard Masur, Rankes Begriff der Weltgeschichte (Munich, 1926), 4.
4 Elfried Üner, ‘Der Einbruch des Lebens in die Geschichte: Kultur- und Sozialtheorie der “Leipziger Schule” zwischen 1900 und 1945’, in Hartmut
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In this chapter, Klautke demonstrates the range of topics covered by Hellpach, and makes it clear that his writings were always addressed to two audiences. Hellpach wrote about the social question, human emotions, colour perception, environmental psychology, big city nervousness, hysteria, group behaviour, and education for a broad public, continuing the journalism he wrote as a student under a pseudonym. Nonetheless, he was also proud of his research achievements; in his memoirs, he later pointed out that he was the first to introduce the psychology of business and work to the university. He described his world view as a ‘socialism of reason’, which allowed him to switch between left-wing and right-wing political positions. For a time he was close to the Pan-German League, but admired Britain for its international standing. For him, the war was an opportunity to balance out the distorted mutual perceptions of the opponents by means of a ‘living Volk psychology’. During the Weimar Republic Hellpach represented Liberal ideas and was politically active for the German Democratic Party, among other things serving as Baden’s minister of education. In 1933 he remained in office, and his work could be published. His Völkerpsychologie enjoyed great success as essential reading for anything to do with the topics of Volk and Volksstum. In Klautke’s account, Hellpach appears less as the representative of an academic discipline than as the beneficiary of a particular style of thinking that he used—half opportunistically, half pragmatically—for his own purposes. In this way, he created a characteristic mixture of support for and opposition to National Socialism: on the one hand he criticized the Nazi Party’s anti-Semitism; on the other, he agreed with the Nazis’ social policies of exclusion based on völkisch criteria, which he still saw through the eyes of Friedrich Naumann and the early twentieth century.

On the whole, Klautke’s study benefits from the fact that instead of attempting to recapitulate all attempts to play fast and loose with Völkerpsychologie, he concentrates on the origins of the concept, which are underestimated or even forgotten today. Yet in the conclusion he explains why, although Völkerpsychologie from time to time achieved a high intellectual level, it had no future. The differences, some subtle and some more fundamental, between Völkerpsychologie and the
many variants of past and present collective characterology can hardly be intellectually or terminologically maintained. Even supporters always felt that they had to start from the beginning and clear up misunderstandings. Hellpach, who had not only worked in the field himself for decades but, as Wundt’s student, knew his writings well, attempted to make a comeback by publishing a book entitled Der deutsche Charakter in 1954. The reason he gave was that the topic was ‘a branch of research that had not got beyond its early stages’. He was wrong; this thinking had been discredited and was therefore finished.

Although the representatives of Völkerpsychologie selected by Klautke fit into a series, his book makes it clear that their writings were not connected. On the contrary, they fell apart into entirely different islands of knowledge, each of which was wholly committed to the logic of its time and the hopes of its representatives. In doing so, Klautke charts the historical and systematic differences between the concepts of Völkerpsychologie over a century in a book of fewer than 200 pages. Readers will consult with profit this short, but important history of ideas, science, and culture, which deals with the arguments and topics relating to Völkerpsychologie.

NICOLAS BERG heads the section ‘Text, Literatur, Gedächtnis’ at the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at the University of Leipzig. His current research project is entitled ‘Das Rätsel Produktivität: Völkerpsychologie, Kulturtheorie und jüdische Geschichte in der deutschsprachigen Nationalökonomie des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts’. His many publications include The Holocaust and the West German Historians: Historical Interpretation and Autobiographical Memory (2015); Luftmenschen: Zur Geschichte einer Metapher (2nd rev. edn. 2014); and Textgelehrte: Literaturwissenschaft und literarisch-sches Wissen im Umkreis der Kritischen Theorie, ed. with Dieter Burdorf (2014).
The year 2014 brought us a bumper harvest, some would even say a glut, of publications on the cataclysmic conflict that engulfed Europe a century ago. While the sheer volume of scholarship came close to what Germans call a Materialschlacht, relatively few newly unearthed contemporary voices have rung out. Amid the din of the historians’ disagreements, the BBC’s decision to re-issue as podcasts a dozen re-stored in-depth interviews with eye witnesses first recorded in the early 1960s thus offered a refreshing change of tone. One of the faces and voices brought back to life from the material archived for the landmark ‘Great War’ series (1964) belongs to Stephan Kurt Westmann.

When the war broke out in 1914, this 21-year-old German medical student was about complete his first stint as an Einjährig-Freiwilliger conscript with the 5th Badenese Infantry Regiment (Nr 113). Instead of returning to his studies Westmann now served, first as a medical NCO and then as an officer, for the whole duration of the conflict, on both Western and Eastern fronts, at Verdun and on the Somme, bayonetting enemies in hand-to-hand combat and patching up the wounded in filthy dressing stations. He not only appears to have been good at soldiering, winning a brace of Iron Crosses and surviving years of slaughter with only minor injuries, but seems also to have developed a liking for the military which outlasted the war itself. Within days of being demobbed in 1918, he volunteered to join the 8th Hussars to help provide a ‘security police force’ that would prevent ‘civil disorder’ (p. 151). Westmann would remain involved with the newly formed Reichswehr until at least 1920 (as a member of no less notorious a unit than the Reichswehrbrigade 15, formerly known as the Freikorps Reinhard).

Watching the 1963 interview,1 viewers may not find it easy, though, to recognize in the dapper and slightly fragile gentleman carefully detailing the events of these frantic years the tough young warrior who lived through them. The man describing these harrowing experiences in fluent, but heavily accented English, is a septua-

---

Serger with the Kaiser’s Army

genarian, a naturalized Englishman, and a Harley Street consultant with a house in leafy Chorleywood. And it was also this man who authored the wartime memoirs Surgeon with the Kaiser’s Army, penned at the same time, which have just been published in an updated version edited by his grandson. This lively, opinionated, and often wry narrative provides a wealth of graphic detail about the rough end of warfare and especially about the medical care (or lack thereof) received by the wounded. The book brims with memorable stories about bordellos and pet dogs, outings in biplanes and horse-drawn panje carts, hospital trains and boils on the behinds of senior officers—all of it sustained by endless servings of the bland noodle soup that was the German army’s standard fare. Westmann’s memoirs were first written in German, but the translation is smooth enough to make the text readable while retaining a flavour of the German original.

Westmann’s book is thus of obvious interest to those keen to learn more about the combat experience of front-line soldiers during the Great War, even though his retrospective account has, naturally, been filtered and re-shaped by the intervening decades. It could be argued, though, that the real originality and poignancy of these recollections lie in the testimony they give of a German–British–Jewish life in the twentieth century—that the voice truly worth listening to here is that of the elderly man speaking in the 1960s and not that of the youthful soldier whose war he recalls. Although one would hardly know it from his narrative, which mentions his ‘descent’ only once and then to describe it as irrelevant (p. 4), Westmann was a Jew. After the war he completed his medical training, married Marianna Goldschmidt, another Jewish physician, and embarked upon a successful career which involved not only a lucrative private practice and an appointment at the Charité, Berlin’s University Hospital, but also, as the editor informs us in a colourful ‘epilogue’, a large home on the Kurfürstendamm and an expensive car. As a prominent Jewish doctor and outspoken critic of the Nazi Party Westmann was about to receive a visit from the Gestapo in April 1933. Tipped off in the nick of time he hastily made it across the border to France, apparently behind the wheel of his flashy car. He would eventually settle in the UK, where he and his family were naturalized in 1940 and where Westmann eventually turned into the bow-tie-wearing gentleman interviewed in 1963.
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Read against this background, Surgeon with the Kaiser’s Army offers a number of intriguing insights into the memory, world view, and identities of its author at the time of writing. It is fascinating to speculate to what extent some of the more salient features in the landscape of Westmann’s memory are specific to him or form part of a wider pattern amongst Jewish refugees from Germany. For one, Westmann’s attitude to the Kaiserreich, to its politics and culture, to its role during the run-up to the Great War, even to its last monarch, appears to have remained remarkably unchanged from what one would expect from a patriotic German soldier in 1914: the Wilhelmine Reich was ‘a hive of activity’, prosperity ‘pervaded all classes’, and the ‘workers seemed content, protected against exploitation by powerful trades unions, a raft of social reforms and legislation passed by the Reichstag’ (p. 3). Even humble dwellings were ‘spotlessly clean and well-furnished’, unemployment and illiteracy did not exist, arts and sciences flourished, and ‘anti-Semitism was not an issue’ (pp. 3–4). Known as the ‘Prince of Peace’, Kaiser Wilhelm II was ‘no fool and neither was he suffering from paranoia’ (pp. 5, 7). Rather, he led a country surrounded by strong and revengeful neighbours and, like a farmer with rich grazing lands, took sensible steps to secure his property. Similar paeans of praise for Imperial Germany, its army, culture, and institutions are liberally sprinkled across the text, and there is a clear determination to isolate and protect this idyllic recollection of German history from what was to follow: ‘What a difference to the demonic machinations of Hitler twenty-five years later!’ (p. 19).

Just as Westmann’s Kaiserreich appears to have lost none of its pre-1914 lustre, his verdict on the French has not changed much either. For a start, the author is at pains to confirm where the national allegiance of the Alsatian population lay. His men, Westmann recalls, who were almost all from Alsace, ‘were highly indignant at the slightest suggestion that they were anything other than fully German’ (p. 84). Given what the reader learns about the French throughout these memoirs, this is hardly surprising: they are consistently described as slovenly, cowardly, untrustworthy, and uncivilized. The peasants Westmann encountered on the Eastern Front, were ‘completely devoid of any sense of hygiene’ (p. 89). This immediately reminded him ‘of rural France, where the response to the question as to where one could answer a call of nature was, “Tout le
jardin, monsieur, tout le jardin’’ (p. 89). Moreover, the French would treat German soldiers who had fallen into their hands appallingly: ‘they beat them up and French women spat in their faces or scratched them. When they tried to defend themselves they were punished severely and brutally’ (p. 115).

The deeply unflattering portrayal of the French contrasts, perhaps rather unsurprisingly, with Westmann’s recollection of the noble British, whose stretcher-bearers ventured out into no-man’s land to deliver wounded German soldiers to the German trenches (p. 46). Generally, when a Red Cross flag appeared to allow for wounded soldiers to be retrieved, the Germans would cease their fire and the ‘British would do the same for us’ (p. 73). But at Verdun this humanitarian practice could not be used since ‘there seemed to be a difference between British gentlemen and French Cavaliers’ (p. 73). The problem appears to have boiled down to an issue of national character, the man from Chorleywood explains: ‘The British kept their promises as gentlemen, but the French did not’ (p. 115).

Westmann’s memoirs contain few direct references to the concerns that are contemporary to the time of writing, but both the Cold War and race relations are interestingly interwoven with his recollections of the First World War. The author refers only very briefly to his post-1918 service with military units such as the Reichswehrbrigade 15, whose founder, Colonel Wilhelm Reinhard, eventually rose to the rank of SS-Obergruppenführer, but he still regards their actions as ultimately successful. After all, ‘without them, the red flag with its hammer and sickle would now be flying on the shores of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans’ (p. 151). It was only many years later, Westmann observes in a different place, that he understood why white British prisoners of war had been so desperate not to be kept together with ‘Indian or black troops’. Having lived in England for some time it dawned on him that this ‘might have had something to do with what we now call the colour bar’ (p. 63). There are similarly intriguing asides about the ‘vice’ of homosexuality amongst the soldiers (pp. 86–7) and the unrestrained sexual behaviour of the ‘Congolese French troops whom Poincaré sent into the Ruhr five years after the war to squeeze millions of marks for reparation from an already exsanguinated Germany’ (p. 122).

Surgeon with the Kaiser’s Army can thus be read with profit, and occasionally with raised eyebrows, on a number of different levels. It
is a multi-layered ego-document composed by a man whose eventful life must have left him with multiple, partially imbricated identities—German patriot, soldier, medic, bourgeois, Jew, refugee, immigrant, acculturated Englishman. That Stephen Westman, as he had then become, decided to write this text half a century after 1914 reminds us how, for some, the war continued in one form or another for a very long time indeed. ‘Nearly all my pals lay buried in foreign soil, together with nine million soldiers who had lost their lives in the Great War’, he ends his recollections—‘and for what?’ (p. 151).

FRANK LORENZ MÜLLER teaches modern history at the University of St Andrews. He works on the political and cultural history of nineteenth-century Europe with a particular interest in the history of monarchy. His most recent book is Our Fritz: Emperor Frederick III and the Political Culture of Imperial Germany (2011). He leads the AHRC-funded project ‘Heirs to the Throne in the Constitutional Monarchies of Nineteenth-Century Europe’.

Germany was the first nation in Europe to lose its colonies. As such, Britta Schilling so cogently reminds us in her book Postcolonial Germany, it has an exceptionally ‘long-lived and relatively dynamic’ colonial memory (p. 2). Recovering and tracing that memorial culture over most of the twentieth century, Schilling’s study shows that, despite a widely held belief, Germany at no point suffered from colonial ‘amnesia’ (p. 10). On the contrary, her main argument is that German colonial memory, conceived as an ‘entangled memory’ (p. 9) of both private and public narratives, was especially adaptable and resilient despite gaps, disruptions, re-evaluation, and partial forgetting. Schilling takes a refreshingly new approach to the question of collective memory, focusing on its material culture, or as she puts it, on ‘how things make us think about the past’ (p. 9). Creatively organized chronologically and thematically at the same time, the book takes the reader through five chapters, each representing a different time period and a different category of artefact.

Chapter 1 addresses the immediate postcolonial era (1915 to 1925) when Germany was stripped of its colonies after the First World War. Through her reading of several ‘Africa-books’ — a cross between travel account, adventure story, and memoir — Schilling demonstrates how a small group of former settlers who had been forced to move back to the metropole left their mark on important national issues, such as the question of war guilt and the notion of Heimat, by weaving these themes into stories of ‘good colonialists’, loss, and victimhood. In the end, these books, which had a considerable market, functioned as ‘politically charged treatises’ (p. 40) with the aim of gaining a larger audience for the colonial cause.

Chapter 2, moving further into the Weimar Republic (1925 to 1935), analyses commercial and cultural products from the former colonies displayed at colonial balls. Here Schilling engages thought-provokingly with Sigmund Freud’s dream theory and his concept of wish fulfilment to argue that colonial balls served to create the illusion of a colonial paradise that had been lost and thus ‘fulfilled a certain set of desires held by the German colonial elite in the interwar years’ (p. 42). She shows how in these balls a number of different ele-
ments—colonial products, ‘black’ performers (both blacks and ‘blacked up’ whites), and jazz—came together in a condensed, overdetermined scene that helped to fashion fantasies of economic recovery, racial hierarchy, and exoticism.

These elite aspirations became an object of mass distribution only during the Nazi period, by way of schoolbooks, as chapter 3 (1935 to 1945) shows. In the Third Reich ‘the colonial story stayed much the same’ (p. 89). Colonialism was still remembered exclusively positively, albeit with some significant variations. National Socialist ideology reinterpreted the colonial project, and, in particular, colonial violence, within the logic of ‘race war’ and heroic sacrifice. Violence was no longer passed over but celebrated. Thus colonial memory served as a tool for the formation of a collective will (Willensbildung) and the Volksgemeinschaft so crucial to the Nazi regime.

After the Second World War, in the face of devastating mass destruction and murder, colonial memory temporarily disappeared from public discourse. But interestingly, Schilling observes that Germany’s colonial past resurfaced rather quickly. She argues that continuity not rupture dominated the public narratives, notably regarding both East and West German foreign aid policies for the Third World. Chapter 4, in my opinion the most compelling and intriguing, examines the practice of gift-giving by German states to their former colonies in the era of decolonization (1949 to 1968). Based on previously unexplored archival sources and Mauss’s anthropological theory of the gift, this chapter notes that German gift-giving was deeply symbolic and ritualized in nature, and that this process was ‘motivated by prestige even more than by economics’ (p. 129). In pursuing these practices, the two Germanys could not avoid references to the colonial past. In the context of the Cold War, colonial memory was reinterpreted yet again with the aim of producing images of themselves as benevolent former colonizers, outdoing the other state and inducing the need to reciprocate on the side of the gift-receiving party. And African agency finally becomes evident in this chapter (an aspect that is unfortunately almost entirely absent in the other parts of the book). Schilling demonstrates how African state leaders consciously deployed certain tropes of colonial memory in order to secure their interests.

Chapter 5, entitled ‘The Empty Plinth’, addresses the most recent past (1968 to 1990) in which Germany’s colonial past ‘receded from
the nation’s (or, rather, both nations’) collective memory’ (p. 134). This chapter deviates the most from Schilling’s initial intention to trace colonial memory through different kinds of objects. It tries to make do with a period of colonial memory characterized by a void. According to the author, there was ‘no tome, no statue, no product of consumption’ (p. 153) that could meaningfully build collective colonial memory. Empty plinths (and more obviously those few colonial monuments that remained erect but were rededicated), however, could have been interpreted as physical objects, even if they were not visible or palpable. Instead, the chapter mostly discusses non-material phenomena: debates among historians about the nature of German colonialism and discussions around the anti-apartheid struggle and how it related to the ‘Namibian question’. It would have been more convincing to remain within the realm of the material, however peripheral it may have been to colonial memory — ethnographic collections on display in German museums, or fair trade products sold in the flourishing *Drittweilläden*, for example.

Partly to fill the gap in public memory mentioned above, the book closes with a final, sixth chapter which revisits the entire period under investigation, but revolves around family memories. Based on a large pool of interviews conducted by Schilling herself, the chapter traces the fate and function of family heirlooms that were passed down through generations to construct private colonial memories. This chapter also harks back to the public memories discussed in earlier chapters and shows how the public and the private were intertwined. She argues that if private memories are taken into account, ‘the realities of colonial memory formation are far more intricate’ (p. 195) than a look at the official memory discourse would suggest.

Overall, *Postcolonial Germany* is an important and timely study. The long time span Schilling covers and the contextual knowledge she provides are impressive and delivered in straightforward prose. Great effort has obviously been put into collecting such a wide range of different sources, which have been carefully analysed. Schilling’s use of approaches from neighbouring disciplines such as anthropology, archaeology, and cultural studies is also laudable. Yet the question of material culture in particular could have been examined more closely, especially with all the interpretative tools these disciplines offer. Thus Schilling’s theoretical aim to understand ‘the link between memory and material culture’ (p. 7) appears to remain unful-
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Filled. At least, there is no explicit explanation of exactly what it is that things do to memory, or how memory gets inscribed into things in return. This might be because the artefacts Schilling chooses are highly diverse and therefore hardly comparable. It might also be related to her rather cursory analysis of the quotidian uses of the chosen artefacts. A more extensive, thicker description of the materiality of memory objects, of their sensual and physical impact on those who consumed, owned, used, and appropriated them would have been helpful in order to make the connection between material culture and memory formation more transparent. More careful editing might also have helped to bring the different strands of interpretation from the individual chapters together in an overall thesis regarding the role of material culture in collective memory. But this should not deter anyone from reading *Postcolonial Germany*. It has the great merit of reminding many readers, or perhaps even informing them for the first time, that Germany *had* a colonial past and that its legacy lives on in many different forms and material shapes, even if contemporary decision-makers would often like to ignore this fact.

This session brought together historians from Britain, the partner country of this year’s *Historikertag*, the German Historical Institute London, and the Transnational Research Group on Poverty and Education in Modern India. The presentations, however, covered many more countries, providing a truly international perspective on how education was planned and experimented with, and how it shaped people’s lives in colonial and post-colonial times. The session engaged with educational methods and transformative aspects of education, ranging from Indian monitoryal schools to female education in Sierra Leone and Nigeria, new experiments in mass education on an international scale, and the importance of education for children from working-class households in Mumbai.

As Andreas Gestrich (GHIL) emphasized in his introduction, education is not only a mechanism for transforming individuals, but has itself always been subject to transformation. This happens through the introduction of new educational concepts and as the result of experiments, but also by the processes of transferring these concepts globally and adapting them (sometimes unintentionally) to new contexts. In addition to tracing these processes of transformation, this session revolved around the central question of the purpose of education. Beyond the old Enlightenment idea of making better individuals through education, it has always been a tool for certain interests, whether in favour of transforming society or maintaining its order.

In the first presentation Jana Tschurenev (TRG, Göttingen) looked at the monitoryal system and its introduction in early nineteenth-century British India. This new form of schooling for the poor was
marked by an inherent tension: while schools were organized in a highly competitive meritocratic system, the missionaries’ intention was to maintain the hierarchical social order and keep people in their places. Their teaching method was based on the concepts of Joseph Lancaster and Andrew Bell. Advanced students were asked to teach the less advanced, and lessons followed an extremely rigid plan. The main objective of these schools was to produce rational subjects with Christian moral values who would be able to make themselves useful to society. Among the challenges which this educational method faced, Tschurenev highlighted that the meritocratic system was seen as containing the danger of raising expectations among students, possibly leading to social mobility; hence education had to be kept within certain limits. This demonstrates that education was seen primarily not as a medium for individual development, but as a tool for maintaining a certain order in society.

Silke Strickrodt (GHIL), too, assessed educational experiments by missionaries in the British Empire, shifting the focus from India to Sierra Leone. She analysed the transformation of the missionaries’ educational ideals when they set up the Church Missionary Society’s (CMS) Female Institution in 1849 and were confronted with local ideas and demands. Unlike the schools in the monitory system, this was an example of exclusive, elite education based on a highly selective system. It intended to transform the girls morally and spiritually into Christians, housewives, and mothers. In contrast to this missionary objective, Strickrodt emphasized, the parents did not want their girls to be transformed in this way, but made their own demands, which were largely oriented by British values. This example clearly demonstrates that information about ways of life and educational patterns circulated in various ways and were not solely transferred by missionaries. This story also underlines that it is not always easy to identify the ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ of educational experiments. Rather, we are confronted with complex entanglements, and the outcomes of education are rarely limited to what was intended.

The regional focus shifted back to India in the following presentation, with education among the elites in colonial times remaining the main theme. Georgina Brewis (London) gave an insight into the Indian students’ social service leagues in the first two decades of the twentieth century. Brewis found that the focus was on the transfor-
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domination of moral values in those who participated in the service, with
the aim of making them future leaders of the country, rather than on
the outcome of the service. Brewis drew attention to a kind of educa-
tion that was, paradoxically, closely intertwined with the British sys-
tem on one hand, but became part of the Indian nation-building
movement on the other. In both previous presentations, there was no
doubt that the concepts were developed by British missionaries and
changed only as a result of encountering the different contexts in
which they were applied. In the case of the Indian social service,
there were conflicting claims about whether these concepts had
indigenous roots or had been introduced by British missionaries.
Brewis emphasized that the student social service in India was a
hybrid model, including a set of Christian as well as Hindu influ-
ences, and can therefore be seen as reflecting the constant interplay
of ideas and practices between European and Indian educationalists
in India.

Charlotte Hastings (Manchester) provided another example of
female education in colonial Africa. She traced the struggle to set up
a regular secondary school for girls in Nigeria, highlighting the igno-
rance with which the government responded to the demand that
girls should receive an education beyond being taught how to be
good housewives and mothers according to Christian values. Only
with the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Native Educa-
tion in British Tropical Africa (later renamed Advisory Committee on
Education in the Colonies) and the first female appointments to it,
did education for girls slowly gain more attention. Queen’s College
was finally opened ten years after the campaign began. The way in
which the school was run by the colonial administration revealed dis-
crimination on the basis of race. There was a clear preference for ap-
pointing British teachers, and women were paid less than men. The
example of Faith Wordsworth, an English teacher who was the main
figure during Queen’s College’s initial phase, reveals a wide gap
between her ideals and those of the colonial administrators. Highly
praised for her achievements in girls’ education, she herself was
deeply disappointed by the meagre support she received. This
demonstrates not only how educational concepts and ideas in colo-
nial times changed under the influence of the local population, but
also that conflicting ideas and visions existed in parallel and were
negotiated among different colonial actors.
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From the regional examples of the session Valeska Huber (GHIL) turned to an educational experiment that was introduced on a global scale. In the late colonial period, when programmes of mass education and informal education became more widespread, the American missionary Frank C. Laubach invented one of the more successful methods for educating the ‘masses’. Laubach’s method was based on simplifying the alphabet and making everyone teach others the lessons that they themselves had learned (a technique he took from Lancaster and Bell). Laubach was guided by his vision that everyone should be able to read and write so that the ‘masses’ would be transformed into a population able to take part in political life. As Huber emphasized, he was convinced that literacy could solve problems of poverty, overpopulation, and ill health. As well as suggesting that such a simplified approach to solving all other problems by tackling just one aspect seems problematic, Huber also pointed to other shortcomings of Laubach’s method, including the question of how sustainable it really was. Laubach’s method was, however, adopted in many countries to which he travelled and by UNESCO. It proved to be a popular attempt to transfer a specific educational method to various regional contexts.

Completing the trajectory from early colonial to post-colonial times, Sumeet Mhaskar (Göttingen) returned to a micro perspective and looked at the educational attainments of ex-mill workers’ children in Mumbai, asking what factors influenced the educational attainment of working-class young people. Overall, he found that the children’s education was only slightly more advanced than that of their parents. The factors he identified as important (beyond, of course, the financial status of their families) were: parental education, neighbourhood and school peer effect, career guidance, part-time employment, private tuition, and language of schooling. According to Mhaskar, these factors had the potential to enable children to achieve social and economic upward mobility. They were, therefore, decisive for whether the children of ex-mill workers could take charge of their individual futures, or were left behind. Receiving solid career guidance seemed to have played an especially important role for the educational achievements of the children. This shows that the aim with which education was pursued was extremely relevant. In this context, education was seen primarily seen as a path to a certain career, rather than as a way of achieving personal fulfilment.
The same question—education to what end?—was also addressed in the discussion, which recognized that the session had shed light on several ‘ends’ of education as a transformative mechanism on the individual level and far beyond. The session clearly demonstrated that the transformative power of education can be used for very different purposes. The fact that education has itself always been subject to various transformations, intended or not, makes this field such a fascinating one for both historical and contemporary research. It was pointed out that there has always been a great deal of exchange of educational ideas and concepts between countries and continents, and although London can be seen as the centre for the parts of the British Empire presented here, information flows were highly decentralized and not limited to the Empire’s borders. Another aspect discussed was the interconnection between education and respectability, most powerfully demonstrated in the case of girls’ education among the elites in Sierra Leone, where a certain type of education seems to have been very important for achieving the English respectability envisaged. In general, education’s inherent potential to make people ‘winners’ was agreed upon, even though it became clear that it was not always easy to tell who they were. Another central aspect discussed was the tension between education as a tool for individual achievement, and for maintaining the social order and keeping people in their places. The session showed that analysing this tension between education as a tool for liberation and for social control should be on the research agenda in many different geographical and political settings.

ALVA BONAKER (Transnational Research Group on Poverty and Education in Modern India)
All At Sea: The Prize Papers as a Source for a Global Microhistory.

Conference organized by Dagmar Freist (Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg), Caroline Kimbell (National Archives, Kew), Lex Heerma van Voss (Huygens Institute, The Hague), the German Historical Institute London, and the Friends of the National Archives, Kew, and held at the National Archives, Kew, 6–8 Oct. 2014.

In maritime law a ‘prize’ is an enemy ship captured in war. Until the later nineteenth century and even, in some countries, the early twentieth, officers and crews who participated in a prize ship’s capture collected a share of the proceeds of its sale or the sale of its cargo, but only if it could be demonstrated that the ship truly was an enemy ship and not the ship of a neutral power. In England that all-important judgement fell to the Admiralty Prize Courts. The archival materials that ensued from these sometimes very long-drawn out struggles in court are familiarly known as the ‘Prize Papers’, and they have of late been generating considerable interest among historians. When a ship was captured it was customary to confiscate all the documents on board. If the ship was an enemy navy ship, there was some hope of intercepting useful intelligence by this means. But more often, and especially in the case of merchant ships, the overriding purpose was to provide evidence of the nationality of the ship’s owners, officers, and crew, or the ownership of its cargo, to make it easier to prove in court that the ship really was a legitimate prize. Because early modern ships were, in effect, floating post-offices, seizing all the documents on a ship frequently yielded an astonishing range of materials, and that is what has got historians and others quite excited about them.

The Prize Papers are now kept by the British National Archives in Kew and catalogued among the HCA (High Court of Admiralty) records, chiefly in HCA 30, 32, and 65. The papers were never technically lost, but few people knew about them until quite recently and they have been woefully underutilized, in good part because the majority of the papers are in languages other than English. This situation is now changing and this conference is a testimony to the buzz the Prize Papers have created, the new research they have begun to

The full conference programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL’s website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.
generate, and the theoretical developments they have helped to encourage.

The opening session began with a description by Caroline Kimbell from the National Archives (NA) of the peripatetic life of the Prize Papers since they began to be fairly systematically collected in the sixteenth century (one of their earliest resting places was in an allegedly rat-infested chamber in the Tower of London). Catt Baum, also from the NA, discussed the challenges of conserving the papers, and Amanda Bevan and Randolph Cock spoke about cataloguing—past, present, and future. Dutch researchers were among the first to see the potential of the papers and this has borne fruit in some important print and online projects which were described in the last presentation in this session. Els van Eijck van Heslinga, director of the Royal Library of the Netherlands, described and demonstrated an online index of seven hundred of the boxes.¹ One of the digital projects inspired by the Prize Papers is an open access project sponsored by the Meerkens Institute, which has digitized approximately 3,500 of the letters, focusing primarily on Dutch business correspondence.² Another open-access collection, sponsored by the Schatkamer van de Nederlandse Taal, has digitized about a thousand of the Dutch letters, focusing especially on personal correspondence.³ A series co-edited by Perry Moree and called Sailing Letters Journaal has come out with Walburg Press. It is based on Dutch materials from the Prize Papers, including, among others De smeekbede van een oude slavin en andere verhalen uit de West (The plea of an old slave-woman and other tales out of the West), a powerful example of the unexpected sources that can be found among the Prize Papers. Moree, who has recently moved to Brill, concluded his presentation by describing an ongoing Brill project to digitize many more of the papers.⁴

The Prize Papers are, above all, a product of wartime, and they testify powerfully to the challenges and opportunities that war and political uncertainty presented to states, to shipping, and to individ-

1 See <http://www.gahetna.nl/collectie/index/nt00424>, accessed 23 Jan. 2015.
2 This can be found at <www.gekaaptebrieven.nl>, accessed 23 Jan. 2015.
3 This can be found at <www.brievenalsbuit.inl.nl>, accessed 23 Jan. 2015.
4 For information on this proprietary database see <http://www.brill.com/products/online-resources/prize-papers-online>, accessed 23 Jan. 2015.
The panel on ‘Politics and Economy’ showed very effectively how peculiarities and arcane features of the theory and practice of neutral shipping, ancient practices of credit, and sheer opportunism came together to permit merchants to survive the long stretches of time during which the major European states were at war. Leos Müller (Centre for Maritime Studies, Stockholm) and Steve Murdoch (St Andrews) used a series of Admiralty cases relating to Swedish ships to illustrate how prize law worked in both England and Scotland. Neutrality, of nations and of ships, turns out to have been a contested status that depended, among other things, on the proportion of the ship’s owners hailing from an enemy nation, whether there were enough crew members from an enemy nation to make it conceivable that they could overpower the ship, and whether a ship carried ‘warlike’ cargo. Xabier Lamikiz (University of the Basque Country) focused on social networks, information flow, and credit in the colonial trade between Spain and its American colonies. Lamikiz sees the cultural relations of credit—with their focus on trust, reciprocity, and real or fictive kinship—as holding special promise for understanding business culture in the early modern period. In the past the complex social arrangements surrounding merchant credit have usually eluded us. However, they come to life in the large body of business correspondence to be found in the Prize Papers. Renaud Morieux (Cambridge) examined the world of prisoners of war in the Caribbean. As he pointed out, the story of eighteenth-century prisoners of war was one both of circulation and incarceration. Prisoners moved about (or found themselves being moved about) a great deal, often as a result of bilateral agreements between islands that wished to continue to trade with each other, even though they were at war. This had more to do with opportunism than humanitarianism, however. Ships voyaging to exchange prisoners were temporarily neutral, and so could engage in trade with islands with whom they were, in fact, at war. In effect then, prisoners of war were used as ‘passports’, with some colonials even going so far as to rent out prisoners to ships’ captains along with blank flags of truce. This paper represents a striking new departure in the study of coerced labour in the Caribbean.

The first keynote lecture, delivered by Dagmar Freist (Oldenburg), focused on how the Prize Papers can be used to develop a more nuanced sense of the relationship between local social practices
and global historical change. Freist argued that as long as microhistory is misunderstood to mean single case studies, a friction will remain between micro- and macro-analysis, and old questions about the degree of generalization and representativeness will persist. The problem of size, however, is not the question at stake. Instead, microhistorical analysis offers an analytical perspective on the contingencies of the past by reducing the scale of observation. The Prize Papers show us, in a so far unprecedented way, the entanglement of the early modern world within and across continents, and they do so from a bottom up perspective. First, we come face to face with the connectedness and contingencies of the past. Second, we are confronted with many instances of clashing difference as well as improvisatory adjustments. And third, we gain access to sources in which individual micro-strategies, sometimes the strategies of quite humble people, are on display. All are valuable for obtaining a better understanding of processes of change. Furthermore, Freist showed that a microhistorical analysis of global phenomena asks for a critical reappraisal of macrohistorical concepts such as ‘national identities’. The Prize Papers, including the interrogations, bring to the fore the tension between official attempts at constructing ‘national’ identities and people’s display of ‘multiple belongings’ to places and identities, depending on the specific situation and social site they were relating to. In the second part of her paper Freist proposed a way to make these observations and macrohistorical patterns of change intersect by drawing on practice theory and the concept of ‘social site’ (Theodor Schatzki). The question posed and partly answered by this keynote is one that recurred at several points in the conference, that is, how do we understand and model the links between small changes made by individuals and small groups in local settings—the sorts of changes we glimpse fleetingly in the Prize Papers—and larger ‘global’ shifts and trends?

The third session, on ‘Seafaring’, developed some similar themes to the second session, among them neutrality and ways of keeping trade flowing even in wartime. All the papers were powerful demonstrations of the fine-grained detail that the Prize Papers are able to give of processes we have known about in the past only in broad outline. This panel also focused usefully on change and (in the case of the papers by Starkey and Brand) on the relatively understudied fourth Anglo-Dutch War. Lucas Haasis’s (Oldenburg) paper looked
at the case of a merchant named Nicolaus Gottlieb Luetkens, based in Bordeaux and Brest, who tricked the British Admiralty Court officials into thinking that a French ship called L’Esperance was actually a German-owned ship called the Hoffnung, and persuaded them that the eighty barrels of sugar from French Martinique sitting in her cargo hold were not French-owned but the property of his relatives in Hamburg. He also managed to transfer ownership of five of his ships to his 20-year-old brother, a Hamburg apprentice, who was, handily enough (and unlike Nicolaus Luetkens himself), in possession of Hamburg citizenship. This fascinating case shows clearly how neutrality (here combined with a certain lack of scruples), family ties, and written correspondence helped to grease the wheels of trade.

David J. Starkey (Hull) offered a fascinating discussion of prize-taking during the fourth Anglo-Dutch War (1780–4). Based on a count of letters of marque issued by the Admiralty just before and during the war, Starkey was able to show a truly extraordinary increase in the number of privateers, up to a total of 8,831 ships in 1781, with 19,000 men shipped aboard them in January of 1781 alone. Starkey argued that this was a triumph of predatory entrepreneurialism, and he used the Prize Papers to show the kinds of ships that rushed into this enterprise, their gun and manning complements, and some of their methods, especially for dealing with neutrals. This elegant essay showed that the history of privateering responds well to being seen in the context of markets and shipping entrepreneurship more generally. Hanno Brand’s (Fryske Akademij Leeuwarden) paper examined what the Prize Papers contribute to the study of Frisian shipping through the Sound. Because of the famed Sound Toll Registers we know a good deal about the movements of individual ships and what commodities they carried. However, little is known about the organization of shipping and trade or, for that matter, what ships did once they passed out of the Sound. At the outbreak of the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War hundreds of Dutch and Frisian ships were seized and their papers, including journals, logbooks, and accounts, eventually ended up in the Prize Papers. These papers, coupled with interrogations of crew-members of captured ships allow us to glimpse the social networks that kept both people and businesses afloat.

The fourth session, on ‘Language and Literacy’, was opened by Stephan Elspaß (Salzburg) and Doris Stolberg (IDS Mannheim), who argued that the Prize Papers are especially valuable for linguists
because they are a rare window into the language of common people. The early modern period poses serious methodological problems because only about 5 per cent of the linguistic community created most of the records, and we have almost no sources that hint at the speech of the remaining 95 per cent. In contrast, the Prize Papers, because they include a great many letters and the like from more ordinary people, allow a kind of linguistic history from below and can therefore be of great importance for understanding the evolution of language. Gijsbert Rutten (Leiden) explored the question of what happens when people who do not write very much find themselves forced to express themselves in that form. Lower-class people, whose efforts are often on display in the Prize Papers, tended to inhabit the border between orality and literacy, so the techniques they utilized, such as formulaic language, clause chaining, and oral elements in written speech, are important clues to the evolution and decline of regional dialects. Esther-Miriam Wagner’s (Cambridge) paper was one of only two at the conference explicitly based on a source other than the Prize Papers. The Cairo Genizah was a storeroom in a synagogue in Old Cairo where, for a thousand years, Jews deposited everything they wrote. What the Cairo Genizah collection has in common with the Prize Papers is the grab-bag character of the collection. It constitutes a vast reservoir of items that ordinarily would have been thrown away and that, in most cases, have no surviving equivalents anywhere else. Wagner’s paper focused on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century business correspondence as a linguistic source. In a rich and fascinating paper she discussed such topics as occupational code words, the sharp differences between spoken and written languages, and the distinctive ways that merchants wrote when compared with scribes. She also examined whether or not social and occupational identities can be linked to particular mixtures of vernacular and non-normative speech. This paper provided much food for thought about the subtle ways non-official sources can be analysed and interpreted, and it is to be hoped that it will influence future work on the Prize Papers.

The exceptionally focused fifth panel, ‘Family, Friends and Private Lives’, dealt with the Prize Papers as a source for understanding the intimate lives of humbler people. The paper by Andrew Ross Little (a freelance researcher) was a discussion of Dutch manning issues in the seventeenth century that concentrated especially
on the navy, though it touched on all branches of Dutch shipping. A significant proportion of the men in Dutch crews had been born in France, Britain, or the southern Netherlands, but the low survival rate of administrative records for four of the five Dutch admiralties (Zeeland is the notable exception) has made it difficult to say much about them. The Prize Papers provide materials that partially compensate for what is lost; they also include private correspondence that sheds light on the family lives of navy sailors, including some of the difficulties particular to women married to foreigners. Christina Beckers (Oldenburg) mined personal letters from the Prize Papers for what they show about divided families, or families where one member had gone to the colonies or some other distant place. This data often suggests a different view of family life from the normative one where families co-reside. A particularly interesting section of the presentation focused on what Beckers calls ‘practices of belonging’ within the letters, which included rhetorics of remembrance; ‘imagined communion’, which aimed to ‘translate’ the sights, practices, and material objects of a foreign place for the benefit of the letter’s recipient; and attempts to integrate the memory of distant loved ones into one’s daily routine (or at least to assert that one had done so). Beckers concluded that the family correspondence in the Prize Papers yields numerous insights into ‘practices [designed] to negotiate hierarchy, possession, ideals and affection’. Judith Brouwer (Groningen) analysed the large number of Dutch letters captured during the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672–4), most of them intended for Batavia and Curacao. A very large proportion of these were written or dictated by lower-class women, and they therefore partially ‘[fill] the gap in our knowledge when it comes to the inner world of the functionally illiterate’. These letters illuminate issues to do with the upbringing and care of adolescent children, death, and financial survival, among others, and the overwhelming emotion is anxiety and uncertainty about the welfare of their relatives abroad or on board a ship. As Sünne Juterczenka (Berlin) remarked in her comment, these papers show that ‘globalization did not happen exclusively on the level of the state, geopolitics, or economics, but in the private lives of ordinary people and in the web of their personal relationships too’. According to her, the paper also revealed some of the challenges of using the Prize Papers as a source for global microhistory, especially the problems posed by their disjointed and scatter-
shot character and the fact that they tend to be isolated snapshots in time. Juterczenka posed the question: are the Prize Paper materials dense enough to allow us to go beyond the case study and address larger issues and trends, including more ‘global’ ones? Can we connect the little and the big beneath the same conceptual rubric?

In the second keynote lecture, Lex Heermans van Voss (Huygens Institute) focused on the valuable new information the Prize Papers offer that cannot be found elsewhere, such as certain types of ships’ logs and large caches of personal letters by ordinary people. The rest of the talk focused on two main themes, the question of nationality or allegiance, and what the Papers reveal about emotion. On the first issue the interrogations of crew members that accompany each case show extremely diverse principles of identification. Some people clearly identified themselves much more powerfully with a particular town than with a nation. Length of residence played a role, as did personal connections, such as having a wife and children in Flanders. This evidence demonstrates the still malleable and imprecise contours of nationality and the nation-state in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (and, indeed, both terms are of recent vintage). The second part of the talk was a meditation on the shifting character of emotion in the Prize Papers and in similar caches of personal letters. Here the main theme was the greater frequency of expression of deep emotion, especially love, in the letters in the later eighteenth century than had been true in the seventeenth. This keynote lecture therefore highlighted two of the ways in which the Prize Papers can be used to trace change over time, first with respect to identification with a particular place or country, and second with respect to deep emotions like love. Of the two, the issue of identification with place, which had already been addressed in the first keynote lecture, seems especially valuable, since there is not much written about it; conversely, claims about the rise of emotion similar to those Heermans van Voss mentioned here have an established, if not uncontested, place in the historiography of the early modern period. On the other hand, if these sort of shifts can be demonstrated in relation to letters by lower-class people, that would be a significant contribution.

The sixth session, on ‘Colonial Cross-Overs and Confrontations’, opened with Jessica Cronshagen’s (Oldenburg) examination of the Surinam Moravian community’s attitude to slavery as it was lived out in daily life. The Moravians sought to convert slaves, but had to
ally with plantation owners in order to do so. They tried to secure better living conditions for slaves, but they themselves owned slaves from at least the mid eighteenth century on. In the past, most historians studied Moravians in the Caribbean primarily with reference to official correspondence sent directly to the Moravian leadership. This essay used private letters, seized from prize ships, and was therefore able to examine the local and household dimensions of the problem. Cronshagen found hints that ordinary Moravians believed that they treated slaves more humanely than non-Moravians did. However, there was also rhetorical confusion in relation to terms such as ‘freedom’: was the ‘freedom of the Christian’ merely spiritual and never bodily? What happened (as was the case in one of the letters Cronshagen cites) when a master refused to allow his slaves to attend church services and made it essentially impossible for one slave to mother her own children? Could one be spiritually free and yet be a slave? Erik van der Doe (The Hague) presented information about a joint project of the Koninklijke Bibliotheek and the Nationaal Archieff in The Hague, which aims to preserve and display records pertaining to the Dutch slave trade. Part of this project is based on records drawn from the Prize Papers in HCA, which include records confiscated from individual slave ships. One of these captures has yielded the only known journal of a Dutch private slave trader, one kept by a Flushing captain between 1794 and 1795. Also in the Prize Papers, amazingly, is the complete financial archive of the Dutch slave forts on the African Gold Coast from 1793 to 1803. These had been put on board a slave ship called the Jacobina, bound first for Surinam with a cargo of slaves and then for Amsterdam. The Jacobina was captured on the way, and the entire archive joined the Prize Papers. It includes muster rolls both of free and slave men, payrolls, inventories, and wills that cast light on daily life in Elmina, the main fort, and outlying forts. It is clear that the study of the Dutch slave trade and of slavery has much to gain from the Prize Papers.

The papers on the seventh panel, ‘Practices, Artefacts, Spaces and Body’, were unified around the theme of sickness and the body, and all three could be said to be about early modern ‘crises of the self’, especially those derived in some way from a conflict between masculine ideals of strength and self-possession and the bodily weakness that often accompanies illness. All the papers also took up themes to do with humorally-based medical theory and practice as they
addressed the challenge of travel and new and terrifying tropical and subtropical diseases. Annika Raapke’s (Oldenburg) paper was a fine example of how close analysis of a few letters can recreate a whole world. Raapke’s paper was based on a series of descriptions by a young French military officer, one Lelong, of his near-fatal encounter with yellow fever while stationed in French Martinique. Raapke read these letters as being centrally about masculinity and identity, and she argued that they were part of a larger set of claims that yellow fever especially targeted young European men. This particular military officer was also clearly in touch with enlightened discourses of masculine rationality and used them to think through his own illness as well as to try out different ways of representing his ordeal to friends and relatives. Rebecca Earle (Warwick) examined a range of early modern writings about the physical and psychic dangers of straying far from one’s native land, and especially the health risks of eating unfamiliar foods. As Earle showed, anxiety about the health effects of novel foods and drinks had all kinds of implications for social arrangements, economic planning and trade policy outside Europe, as colonists sought to ensure a supply of the commodities with which they had grown up back home. This nicely conceived paper is an excellent corrective to the tendency to overemphasize the ease of adoption of crops from the New World, like potatoes and maize. Peter van den Hooff (Utrecht) first discussed some of the methodological problems posed by online searches of the Prize Papers, then examined the single case of a Dutchman named Wernard Van Vloten, from a family of wine merchants, who circulated around several of the Dutch New World colonies in the 1780s. Van Vloten wrote a number of letters home that contained quite explicit descriptions of his medical ailments, from jaundice to an injured knee that later became badly infected. Van den Hooff argued that the Prize Papers permit a kind of patient-centred ‘medical history from below’ that is harder to achieve with other sorts of sources.

What do the Prize Papers offer to researchers that they did not have before? Four major areas emerged from this conference. First, the Prize Papers offer new sources related to trade and commerce, including large caches of business letters, account books, and the like. These do more than just supplement more quantitative sources; they offer a window into the culture, the social networks, and legal and political manipulations (especially of the laws of neutrality) that con-
stituted trade. Second, the Prize Papers supply new information about slavery and the slave trade, especially in the Dutch colonies and in some of the Dutch slave forts on the west coast of Africa. Third, the Prize Papers give us a wide range of information specifically about seafaring, from ships’ logs and information about ships’ crews (such as the fascinating and largely unique information gleaned from the interrogations) to rare personal letters from seamen’s wives. And fourth, the Papers often preserve correspondence to and from quite humble participants in the great diaspora that was European global trade and settlement in the early modern period. This sort of correspondence occasionally turns up in other kinds of sources, but only by chance and hardly ever in significant amounts before the mid to late nineteenth century. These sources promise new insights into a wide range of issues, from the history of emotions to the study of gender; from notions of identity to the evolution of language; from the study of coercive labour practices to the history of the body—and a good deal else.

In theoretical terms the impact of the Prize Papers remains uncertain, though it could be significant. Clearly some people see them, with their tantalizing but rich insights into the lives of the sorts of people who seldom left private papers, as a key source for rethinking notions of historical change and personal or collective agency. The challenge here is to figure out ways actually to demonstrate the relationship of micro-situations to middle-sized and large global trends, to figure out, as it were, the architecture and mechanics of ‘global microhistory’. One of the great advantages of the Prize Papers is that, while they were confiscated in the context of legal cases (that is, in anticipation of having to prove in court that a given ship was an enemy ship) they are far more diverse than the usual exhibits in court cases. The custom of confiscating all the documents on a particular ship is different from submitting a few love letters in a betrothal dispute, or issuing a subpoena for a firm’s account books in a conflict over a contract—two other instances that generate material of this kind. It is different primarily because there is a greater diversity in terms of types of documents saved (including many that would have had no discernible use in a standard court case) and because there is, typically, a good deal more of it. It remains to be seen whether this kind of source really will lead to enduring changes in our understanding of those internal mechanisms of change, and that will part-
ly depend upon what else turns up in the archive boxes. What is clear
is that this conference illuminated the personal and networking
dimensions of maritime life and global expansion in the early mod-
ern period in a really unprecedented way.

For various reasons, including some last-minute cancellations,
there were some lacunae in the conference. There was, for example,
relatively little coverage of French- or Spanish-language material
(only one paper each) and far less on the Mediterranean or Indian
Ocean trade and settlement than on Northern European powers and
the Atlantic. The absence of any East India material, even in the
Dutch papers, was especially striking. Though the Prize Papers clear-
ly do illuminate the lives, and even, at times, the feelings of non-
elites, including non-elite women and even a few slaves, it is not
clear, at least not yet, how much they have to contribute in terms of
our understanding of non-Europeans, though the sources on Dutch
slave forts in African sound promising. There is obviously much
more to do in the Prize Papers, which will be occupying researchers
for years to come.

MARGARET R. HUNT (Uppsala University, Sweden)
‘Only doing my duty’: Defining Perpetrators in Relation to State-Sanctioned Violence. Conference organized by the UCL research group ‘Reverberations of the Second World War in Germany and Europe’ (Mary Fulbrook, Stephanie Bird, Julia Wagner, and Christiane Wienand) in co-operation with the German Historical Institute London. Held at the GHIL, 9–10 Oct. 2014.

This interdisciplinary workshop set out to investigate what is meant by the term ‘perpetrator’ in the context of state-sanctioned violence. Mainly drawing on examples taken from the period of the Third Reich and the Holocaust, but moving away from studies primarily concerned with circumstances and motives, the workshop examined the issue of perpetration and its legacies with particular regard to questions of ethics and morality, individual agency and social mobilization, strategies and patterns of self-representation, and intergenerational transmission. The contributions thereby problematized the conceptions of guilt and responsibility of historical actors themselves over time as well as of those (historians, writers, and members of later generations) who are led to engage with evidence of the violence later on.

Providing a short and provocative introduction, Mary Fulbrook (London) drew attention to the risks and attractions of particular understandings of the phenomenon of perpetration. These included the fallacy of motives which simplifies the mechanisms of mass murder by assimilating them to those at work in individually motivated acts (that is, a particular brand of anti-Semitism), selective demonization which allows for the rehabilitation of large numbers, and the temptation of blanket guilt. Instead, Fulbrook advocated a focus on ‘the prosaic significance of the system’ to help explain both the degree of mobilization at the time and the possibility of later ‘defractions of guilt’.

The first session, entitled ‘What is a Perpetrator? Interpretations and Self-Understanding’, began with a short presentation of film clips by the UK-based documentary filmmaker Luke Holland (Ditchling). He was followed by literary scholar Tim Beasley-Murray (London) who, referring to two French novels, Emmanuel Carrère’s L’Adversaire and Jonathan Littell’s The Kindly Ones, raised the issue of
empathic identification with the perpetrator. Beasley-Murray argued that by exploring violence and evil we are, in fact, led to face our own proximity to it. This challenges the widely held assumption that what is disturbing about evil is its inhumanity; rather, he argued, it is its humanity that bothers us. Returning to the specific case of state-sanctioned violence, he then stressed the role of the law and emphasized the significance of the difference between subjective and objective violence as put forward by Slavoj Žižek.

The third speaker in this session, the sociologist Iris Wachsmuth (Berlin), explored female participation in the crimes of the Third Reich. She offered a definition of female perpetrators as individuals who ‘arbitrarily damaged and impaired the dignity of others in various ways’. On this basis, Wachsmuth has worked with the biographies of a wide range of women in terms of age, status, and occupation, including wives and partners of high-ranking Nazis as well as direct offenders, and analysed how they legitimized their actions retrospectively. Drawing on selected excerpts, Wachsmuth pointed to the diverse and contingent nature of these narratives and shifts in their discourse over time.

The final speaker in this session, the historian Imke Hansen (Uppsala), presented extracts from interviews with survivors of forced labour and concentration camps from Ukraine and Belarus dealing with the issue of local collaboration with the violence sanctioned by the occupational regime. While in some instances members of the local police were described as helpless and vulnerable individuals, in others they appeared to be benefiting from considerable room for manoeuvre, which could be used for either malevolent or benevolent ends. Hansen concluded that taking the perspective of the victims offers a complex picture and raises the question as to whether or not to regard collaboration as perpetration.

The second session, entitled ‘Representations and Transmissions’, opened with a presentation by the historian Felix Römer (GHIL). Drawing on extracts from the secretly recorded conversations of German prisoners of war in American captivity at Fort Hunt from 1943 to 1945, Römer showed that despite a general absence of remorse and widespread acceptance of the rationale for the crimes committed, there was a notion of ‘too much violence’ and even a degree of revulsion regarding the methods applied in the Holocaust. This was expressed in the language of shame and morality or silenced
altogether. In conclusion, Römer argued that a conception of perpetration did exist under the Nazis, and that both the ‘myth of the clean Wehrmacht’ and the silence regarding the Holocaust can be shown to have emerged before 1945. These can be understood as ways of coming to terms with the violence.

The literary scholar Stephanie Bird (London) focused on Jonathan Littell’s novel The Kindly Ones and its main character, Max Aue, a Nazi official involved in mass murder during the war. Bird drew attention to specific aspects of the narrative, such as Aue’s incestuous relationship with his sister and his somatic disturbance, as well as formal aspects of the text, such as the tragic structures running through it. She thereby highlighted the moral complexity of a narrative in which genocide is presented as ‘a necessary duty’ and National Socialism as ‘living law’, and yet Aue is at once clearly traumatized and primarily guided by his desire. In conclusion, then, Bird argued that though the novel may be read as a fictional attempt to call a mass murderer to justice, by challenging the ethically privileged status of trauma, the novel also disrupts our comfort as readers and abolishes any fantasy of justice we might have.

Based on her research into the fates of former members of the NSB (the National Socialist Movement in the Netherlands) and their families, the historian Ismee Tames (Amsterdam) challenged the widespread assumption that in the Netherlands after the Second World War, society was clearly split between those who were ‘right’ and those who were ‘wrong’, and Dutch collaborators and their children were treated like second-class citizens. She pointed out that the issue of collaboration attracted, at times, significant public attention and, in some cases, lasting respect. Some former members of the NSB did not distance themselves from their past, feeling they had done nothing wrong. Many others, in turn, underwent actual conversions (religious or other) and developed stories of integration linked to a new set of moral values. Finally, although members of the second generation do, indeed, convey stories of victimhood and exclusion, in practice, they constitute one of the most respected groups in the Netherlands today.

For the last paper in this session, the scholar of religious studies Katharina von Kellebach (Maryland) drew on her exploration of selected exchanges between prison chaplains and former Nazi perpetrators in captivity after the war. Kellenbach identified the religious parable of the prodigal, obedient, and lost sons and the trope
of the ‘father’s house’ as a model of redemption and conversion for former perpetrators. Although many of those whose letters she examined did not confess, remained in denial of their guilt, and continued to feel they had only done their duty, for Kellenbach, these sources nevertheless give insight into the religious rituals thought to provide purification for society. In conclusion, she put forward her own preference for a ‘composting’ rather than a ‘cleansing’ model for dealing with a poisonous and contaminated past.

The final session, ‘Family Histories’, brought together Jens-Jürgen Ventzki (Zell am See), the son of the National Socialist wartime mayor of Litzmannstadt, and Naomi Tadmor (Lancaster), the child of survivors from the same city of Łódź in Poland, whose family survived by leaving for Mandate Palestine during the war. Each of the speakers presented an account of their family’s history and reflected on their own engagement with this past. In relation to their memorialization activities over the last two decades, both emphasized the importance of seeking knowledge rather than reconciliation, which only serves the perpetrators, and welcomed the open attitude of the younger generation in Poland today to this difficult history.

Over the course of the day, the appropriateness of the use of the term perpetrator—rather than, for instance, persecutor or collaborator—under different circumstances and in different settings was repeatedly questioned, raising awareness of the need for a careful, critical, and nuanced use of terminology. The contentious issue of the possible overlap of victimhood and perpetration was also mentioned. In their different ways, the various contributions and the discussions that ensued exposed the importance of combining a focus on individual acts and motives with a consideration of wider practices, processes, and the results of violence perpetrated. Therein lies the key to understanding the complexity and diversity of the legacies but also to the possibility for comparison across cases. Indeed, as the Argentinian film shown on the eve of the workshop and the frequent references made to it in the discussion the following day showed, it may be worth thinking about what a wider perspective across time and space could bring to bear on the topic of perpetrators and the issue of perpetration.

As the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War approached in 2014, interest in the war predictably increased and research about the war developed in new directions. The workshop ‘Inside World War One?’ aimed to combine two of these new directions: the increased interest in ego documents from the Great War, and the increased interest in the First World War beyond the Western front, which for so long has dominated both academic debate and public commemoration. While British and French perceptions of the war have understandably focused largely on the Western front and German perceptions, too, have drawn largely on the war in the west, more attention has recently been paid to both the Eastern front and the non-European battlefields. In fact, the war on the Eastern front involved as many soldiers, left behind as many dead, and had consequences as significant as those stemming from the war in western Europe; at the same time, the label World War One is now finally being taken seriously, with recognition of the global nature of the conflict, which involved parties from every continent and soldiers of numerous ethnic backgrounds.

The workshop aimed to discuss the value of ego documents emerging from the First World War, both against the background of a broad belief in the ‘authentic’ access to historical events they seem to promise and through their use to professional historians trying better to understand the war and how it was experienced and communicated. At the same time, it aimed to extend our understanding of the war both geographically and culturally, bringing East and

This conference was organized as part of the Gerda Henkel Visiting Professorship jointly established at the German Historical Institute London and the Department of International History at the London School of Economics and Political Science, and held in 2013/14 by Dorothee Wierling. The full conference programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL’s website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.
West into the frame, comparing the nature of ego documents from different cultures, and analysing the subjective interpretations of those who had been there. The discussions drew on eighteen pre-circulated papers covering a wide range of regions, genres, individuals, and social groups as well as experiences and perspectives.

Offering a non-European perspective, Mustafa Aksakal’s (Georgetown) paper drew on personal documents written by elite soldiers in the Ottoman army as well as by Europeans living in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. In her paper Anna Maguire (Imperial War Museum London) analysed perceptions and reactions of British officers encountering colonial troops from India, South Africa, and New Zealand.

An important focus was on occupation regimes. A number of papers focused on Warsaw. Robert Blobaum (West Virginia University) critically assessed the potential of ego documents for the study of everyday experiences in occupied Warsaw, while Marta Polsakiewicz (Frankfurt/Oder) looked at the personal papers of the German Governor General to analyse his perspective on the city’s population and his understanding of what constituted a satisfactory occupation regime. This also surfaced in Stephan Lehnstaedt’s (GHI Warsaw) paper on the same Governor General and his perceptions of Polish Jews, who at the time accounted for 15 per cent of the population in occupied Poland, comparing his views to those of the Austrian envoy in Warsaw. Belgium offered another example of occupation experiences, explored by Sophie de Schaepdrijver (Penn State), who based her analysis on both Flemish and Francophone diaries. In his paper, Alexander Watson (Goldsmiths, University of London), used police records dealing with civilians’ reports on atrocities committed by Russian soldiers during their invasion of East Prussia as ego sources for experiences with, and perceptions of, the invaders.

Experiences on the Austro-Hungarian/Italian front provided another focus of the papers. Pavlina Bobic (Birmingham) analysed letters from Slovenian soldiers serving in the Austro-Hungarian army, and was able to demonstrate how religion, in particular, Catholicism, compensated for the lack of national coherence to create a sense of belonging and unity. John Paul Newman (Maynooth) examined one Serb activist’s writings in post-war Yugoslavia and showed the extent to which the First World War was perceived in the
region as a continuation of the earlier Balkan Wars as well as being inseparable from the civil war that followed in its wake. Marco Mondini (Italian–German Historical Institute, Trento) based his paper on letters and memoirs of Italian reserve junior officers, all volunteers, and interpreted them in terms of generation and class. Roberta Pergher (University of Indiana, Bloomington) compared letters and memoirs of Austrians on the Alpine front and showed how the nationalist interpretation of the war experience is largely absent in the former and seems to be a product of post-war discourses and adaptations. Christa Hämmerle (Vienna) looked at (mostly unpublished) memoirs of nurses in the Austro-Hungarian army and asked how and why they did not fit into the post-war Austrian discourse on the war experience.

Christa Hämmerle’s paper also fitted into another group of contributions, which dealt with members of the medical profession and their perspectives on the war. Andrea von Hohenthal (Freiburg) analysed medical reports by psychiatrists as ego documents of an expert group which was crucial to the war in the attempt to understand and deal with new phenomena, such as shell shock and other psychological reactions. Sönke Neitzel (LSE) focused on the diary of a German physician who not only served on various fronts, but also regularly returned to his hometown to continue his practice there. His diary is complemented by his letters to his wife and the memoirs he wrote in 1947. The texts provide evidence not only of a typical bourgeois existence and world view of the time, but also of significant shifts in attitude through the extreme confrontation with violent war experiences.

A last group of papers was devoted explicitly to the process of representing the Great War in writing. Thus Gerd Krumeich (emeritus, Düsseldorf) discussed the value, both for propaganda and historical research, of letter collections published during and after the First World War in Germany, focusing on the influential Witkop collection of students’ letters. Joshua Sanborn (Lafayette College) took up the social figure of the World War One ‘peasant soldier’ as constructed on the basis of the writings of Russian officers. Leonard Smith (Oberlin College, Ohio) explored the peculiar place of the First World War in the diaries of two French intellectuals, Henri Barbusse and Marc Bloch, focusing on the representation of time. Finally, Piotr Szlanta (Warsaw) presented the case of a Polish painter (based on his
letters and a memoir) who tried to avoid if not ignore the war while living and travelling in Poland under occupation.

The format chosen for the workshop was unusual. The papers were pre-circulated and had been read by the participants beforehand. In order to devote maximum time to discussion, there were no presentations of the individual papers. Instead, the papers provided material for thematic discussions: the workshop was structured around general themes so that all papers would be discussed under various headings. In this way the conveners hoped to tap the full potential of the papers, which were too rich and complex to be limited to just one aspect. This placed great demands on the chairs of the workshop sessions—John Horne (Trinity College, Dublin), Heather Jones (LSE), Richard Bessel (York), Hew Strachan (Oxford), Robert Gerwarth (University College, Dublin), and Adrian Gregory (Oxford)—whose thorough introductions and thoughtful moderation were instrumental to the success of the discussions.

After a short introduction by Richard Bessel and Dorothee Wierling, the first group of sessions was dedicated to discussion of the general perspectives of the ego documents presented in the papers. The first session in this group referred to the perception of contemporaries as well as historians that the First World War meant something fundamentally different on the Western and on the Eastern front. How was this assumption reflected in our sources? What was the broader discursive context in conceptualizing East and West so differently? How was the notion of different wars further cemented through the politics of history in western and eastern Europe? Other topics discussed in this session were military and civilian perspectives on the war, and the role of elites and experts vis-à-vis the broader population (both at the front and on the home front). Clearly, ego documents as a source privilege the perspective of elites and educated classes in general. Are there ways, however, to find out something about other social groups by learning to read their indirect presence in the ego documents available to us? Finally, women’s and men’s perspectives were discussed. The militarization of all societies involved in the war certainly privileged military and male perspectives on the war. Nevertheless, many women supported the fighting, were active as nurses at the front, and managed the home front, being indirectly involved in occupation regimes. It was therefore not because their role during the war was minor, but
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because it was an outcome of memory politics that women’s war experiences were marginalized.

The next two sessions were grouped under the heading of ‘theatres’: the battlefield and life ‘behind the lines’, namely, under occupation. The papers were discussed with regard to concrete experiences at the front and home front, social relations and cultural clashes between soldiers and doctors, commanders and ‘ordinary’ soldiers, men and women, occupiers and occupied, Europeans and non-Europeans, and silences when it came to violence and death.

The third session was devoted to questions about memory and representation which concerned all the papers. How were the ego documents as texts socially and culturally formed and how was the experience of the authors mediated by literary conventions, emotional regimes, and dominant public narratives? What were the consequences for historians of working with these texts? How could we think of the potential of these sources not just as limitations, but also as paths to a subjective history of the First World War?

Finally, a roundtable of experts including historians and archivists discussed the practice of ego-document collections and the use made of them by a wider public. Gerhard Hirschfeld (former director of the Library of Contemporary History in Stuttgart), William Spencer (National Archives, Kew), and Marlene Kayen (Tagebucharchiv Emmendingen) described collections and talked about the limitations and opportunities of working with ego documents, while Joshua Sanborn discussed the archival situation in Central and Eastern Europe. The workshop ended with some closing remarks by Dorothee Wierling, summarizing the methodological issues dealt with in the discussions.

The papers brought to light the enormous richness of ego documents, with regard both to genres and the experiences dealt with. This concerns firstly the sheer abundance of sources, which come, however, with a striking imbalance: the male bourgeois author dominates the narratives, be it as the military leader or the young volunteer leader. In addition, much depends on the memory politics of post-war societies. On the one hand, where the war experience was superimposed on historical changes more central to the national narrative—regained statehood in Poland, the Bolshevik revolution in what became the Soviet Union, or the creation of a new multinational state in Yugoslavia—the war became a mere step towards the new
development. On the other, how it was publicly remembered became a function of the new national need for positive meaning and national unity. Therefore the direct comparison of unpublished and published texts by the same authors turned out to be especially fruitful; and the fact that in some Central and East European post-war countries ego documents of the war (with the exception of those by military elites) obviously were neither systematically collected nor published leads to a most unfortunate imbalance today.

The transnational comparison of ego documents revealed both variety and surprising commonalities. An obvious one is the generational and social make-up of the young volunteers, who shared not only age and status, but the same enthusiasm for the nation, a willingness for sacrifice, and world views built on reading the same authors, listening to the same music, and cherishing the same artists—in other words, sharing a canon of European culture that they sought to defend against each other.

Many of the questions raised during the workshop remained open, or could be answered only tentatively. The enthusiasm of some participants for the specifics of ego documents in understanding the First World War as experience was met with scepticism by others. The discussion is ongoing, and the conveners are most grateful for the commitment made by contributors, chairs, and discussants to keep it going.

DOROTHEE WIERLING (Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte in Hamburg)
RICHARD BESSEL (University of York)
Society, Rule, and their Representation in Medieval Britain. Conference held at the German Historical Institute London, 13–14 November 2014. Organizers: Julia Crispin (University of Münster) and Cornelia Linde (GHIL). Conveners: Katherine Harvey (Birkbeck, University of London), Alexandra Sapoznik (King’s, University of London), Alixe Bovey (University of Kent), and Ian Forrest (University of Oxford).

On 13–14 November 2014, thirteen young medievalists from German universities, most of them doctoral students working on British and Irish medieval history, were invited to present and discuss their current research at the GHIL. They included historians as well as art historians and their papers represented a wide range of different disciplinary and methodological approaches. After a welcome address by Andreas Gestrich, director of the GHIL, the first panel was opened by Thorben Gebhardt (Münster) with a paper on the self-categorization of medieval rulers from 1016 to 1138 in England and the Holy Roman Empire. Based on the concept that social identity comprised group affiliation, Gebhardt argued that the Norman kings incorporated the laws of their Anglo-Saxon predecessors into their own authoritative legal codes in order to present themselves as ‘English’ rulers. This could best be observed through an examination of the legislation of Henry I, who adopted laws of Edward the Confessor.

The second paper, by Isabelle Chwalka (Mainz), presented some of the results of her research on the conception and perception of England and the Empire in the twelfth century. A thorough study and statistical analysis of thirty-one chronicles of both countries showed that the writers on both sides of the Channel were aware of at least important topics and events such as the papal schism and sometimes even of internal political developments. Most important for Chwalka’s project was the question of where the authors obtained their information about the other country. In the case of the capture of Richard Lionheart, the evidence strongly suggests that rumours were the source.

Stephan Bruhn (Kiel) analysed the discursive formation of elites in the biographical and hagiographical writings of the Anglo-Saxon and early Norman period. Tracing the origins of early medieval
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forms of noble conduct, a close study of the lives of saints showed how ecclesiastical writers conceived the lay elite of their time. One example was the role of eloquence, which the author of the *Vita Dunstani* restricted as a virtue to a social group of elites. It was incorporated into the ideal role models that emerged during this period. Further examination of these role models would contribute to a better understanding of normative self-perception and perception by others of lay and ecclesiastical elites in early medieval England.

The second panel began with Grischa Vercamer’s (Berlin) study of descriptions of power and rulers through close reading and statistical analysis of selected chronicles from Germany, Poland, and England in the High Middle Ages. Lordship, for example, was depicted very differently in these three countries. An English ruler, for instance, was described mainly in terms of his administrative tasks, whereas Polish chronicles focused heavily on the king’s qualities as a warrior. Vercamer stressed that these different conceptions of lordship were to a large extent shaped by different structures within these countries, which led him to question whether a common conception of lordship existed in medieval Europe.

A comparative approach was also taken by Bastian Walter-Bogedain (Wuppertal) in his research on kings in captivity in western Europe in the later Middle Ages. The famous case of the capture and imprisonment of Richard Lionheart was by no means unique. The act of capturing and the conditions of captivity, however, seem to have depended on the actual circumstances and, by comparing cases, only a few similarities could be observed. Examining the consequences of captivity had on a ruler’s kingship, Walter-Bogedain stated that it was not clear whether released kings could return to their thrones, merely facing more difficulties than before.

Ulla Kypta (Frankfurt) presented an overview of her completed dissertation on the emergence of the English exchequer during the twelfth century. Through a close reading and analysis of the technical language in the pipe rolls, she showed that the clerks unintentionally invented a specialized accounting language. Kypta argued that it was this successive development of a professional language, rather than royal reforms, that created the framework for the emergence of the courts of the exchequer. This gradual transformation of their employer into an institution gave the clerks of the exchequer a sense of identity and legitimacy.
In his paper on rank in the English baronage in the fourteenth century, Martin Stier (Heidelberg) analysed the process of stratification and definition within the English higher nobility in the later Middle Ages. The emergence of new titles during the first half of the fourteenth century for those personally summoned to parliament corresponded closely to developments in heraldry, especially the practice of quartering of arms. Apart from in rolls of arms, these developments can best be studied in baronial seals. Stier argued that these new forms of social distinction were used by barons to signal their rank, which marked them off from the group of knights.

Veronika Decker (Vienna) launched the third panel with her paper on the patronage of William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, in fourteenth-century England. Combining an examination of the iconography of the stained glass in the chapel of Wykeham’s foundation of New College Oxford with a close reading of the college statutes, Decker argued that the architecture served as a medium for promoting educational ideas. The imagery of a flourishing vineyard and a *virgo lactans*, which closely relates to the metaphorical language in the college foundation documents, can also be observed in the chapel of Winchester College, another of Wykeham’s foundations.

The collections of French illuminated books in the possession of John of Bedford, regent of the English-occupied parts of France, were the topic of the paper delivered by Julia Crispin (Münster). As well as providing an opportunity for self-display on the part of their commissioner, the books could also serve as devotional aids and pedagogical tools, which was demonstrated here on the basis of two case studies. Crispin looked at a collection of books from the Louvre and at the Bedford Hours, a manuscript which included genealogies and a French coronation order and was presented to the young English king Henry VI before his coronation as king of France.

In her paper on cultural networks and artistic exchanges in fifteenth-century England and Germany, Antje Fehrmann (Berlin) focused first on the tombs of English kings and their relatives, and secondly on two major events of this period: the council in Constance with the participation of an impressive English delegation, and King Sigismund’s journey to England in 1416. The exchange of gifts during Sigismund’s stay in London, in particular, played a major part in the negotiations between the two monarchs.
The fourth and final panel was opened by Franziska Klein (Duisburg-Essen) with a paper on the house of converts in medieval London. Arguing against older research, Klein suggested that the foundation of this institution by Henry III should not be interpreted as a centre of Christian mission to the Jews, but as a royal attempt to control the borders between Christianity and Judaism. As converts with their often ambiguous religious and social identities presented a challenge to the orders of medieval society, it was in the crown’s vital interests to keep them under control. A range of mechanisms, such as registration and physical isolation, were introduced for this purpose.

In her paper on children, liturgy, and festive culture in medieval London, Tanja Skambraks (Mannheim) focused on the feast of the boy bishop in London. Drawing on a broad basis of available source material and her analysis of the ritual character of the feast, she revised earlier views that saw it as a carnivalesque festival. Skambraks argued that this was a genuine liturgical feast performed by children in commemoration of their patron, St Nicholas.

The last paper of the conference, delivered by Ute Kühlmann (Mannheim), was an overview of her recently completed dissertation on Celtic fosterage. Sending children away from home at a relatively young age to be educated by another family was not an insular Celtic phenomenon. As well as broadly discussing the different practices of this form of education and socialization, Kühlmann stressed the importance of fosterage for building and strengthening alliances, friendships, and communities between families through these emotional bonds. This institution was also used by families for the consolidation of power and lordship.

After two days of presentations and lively discussions the conference ended with closing remarks by Cornelia Linde, who emphasized that despite the impressive diversity of topics, the papers also presented considerable overlaps regarding general themes and approaches. Overall, the German Historical Institute London, as the host of this conference, plays a vital role in bringing together an academic community of young German scholars working in the field of British and Irish medieval history.

MARTIN STIER (University of Heidelberg)
Scholarships Awarded by the GHIL

Each year the GHIL awards a number of research scholarships to post-graduate students, Habilitanden, and post-docs at German universities to enable them to carry out research in Britain, and in some cases to post-graduates at British universities for research visits to Germany. The scholarships are generally awarded for a period of up to six months (only full months), depending on the requirements of the research project. Applicants from British universities will normally be expected to have completed one year's post-graduate research, and be studying German history or Anglo-German relations. Deadlines for applications are 31 March (for the period from July) and 30 September (for the period from January) each year. Applications should include a CV, educational background, list of publications (where appropriate), and an outline of the project, along with a supervisor’s reference confirming the relevance of the proposed archival research. During their stay in Britain, German scholars present their projects and the first results of their research at the Institute’s Colloquium, and British scholars do the same on their return from Germany. For further information visit: <http://www.ghil.ac.uk/scholarships.html>.

In the first allocation for 2015 the following scholarships were awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo-German relations.

Benjamin Auberer (Heidelberg) Subaltern Diplomats and the League of Nations
Felix Eickelbeck (Heidelberg) Gewalt gegen Tiere in Indien: Ein transkultureller Diskurs zwischen Imperialismus, Rassismus und Tier- schutz
Jan Freytag (Bochum) Der katholische Klerus und die nordirischen Gefängnisproteste 1976–81
Lucas Haasis (Oldenburg) Das Geheimnis des Erfolgs: Kaufmännische Briefschaften zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts
Bastian Herbst (Freiburg) Vom Kommunikationsempire zur Kommunikationskrise: Britische und französische Kommunikations- und Medienpolitik in Ägypten, 1856–1956
Stefan Hynek (Münster) Das ‘akademische Jahr’ als Ausdruck zeitbezogener Identitätsbildung an den Universitäten des Mittelalters
Alina Khatib (Birkbeck College) ‘Imperial Vision’: Stereoscopic Mass Culture in Wilhelmine Germany
Lukas Keller (Berlin) Das Kaiserreich im Ausnahmezustand: Deutschland und seine ‘inneren Feinde’, 1914–18
Franziska Klein (Düsseldorf) Die Konvertiten des Königs: Caritas und Kontrole im spätmittelalterlichen England
Sarah Kunkel (Berlin) From Forced to ‘Free’ Labour in the Gold Coast/Ghana: The Institutionalization of the Labour Market in the Aftermath of International Labour Conventions from 1930 to 1966
Birte Meinschien (Frankfurt) ‘A Tale of Two Cultures’: Deutschsprachige Historiker in der britischen Emigration nach 1933
Tim Neu (Göttingen) Imperiale Geldströme: Zur Praxis der politischen Ökonomie im British Empire (1688–1834)
Christoph Nübel (Berlin) Der lange Schatten der Revolutionen: Politische Sicherheit in England und Preußen 1815–67
Anna Paulina Orlowska (Kiel) Die englische Handelsniederlassung in Danzig
Ulrich Päßler (Berlin) Preußen: Deutsch-englische Beobachtungen eines Staates 1830–1918
Katharina Schmitten (Berlin) Riot Policing without Riot Police? Eine interaktionistische Perspektive auf Straßenunruhen in deutschen und britischen Industriestädten, 1900–33
Nikolas K. Schröder (Halle) Außenbeziehungen eines Waisenhauses: Die Bedeutung Londons im Korrespondenznetzwerk der Glauchaschen Anstalten
Klaus Seidl (Munich) Weltbürger wider Willen: Eine Biographie Veit Valentins
Carolin Viktorin (Cologne) Branding Spain: Die Kultur- und Tourismoopolitik des Franco-Regimes in der Bundesrepublik Deutschlands und in Großbritannien 1945–75
Barbara Wünneberg (Berlin) British Writers and the Weimar Republic
Noticeboard

Postgraduate Students Conference

The German Historical Institute London held its nineteenth postgraduate students conference on 8–9 January 2015. 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 or a similar field. The conference opened with words of welcome by Andreas Gestrich (Director, GHIL) and Michael Schaich (Deputy Director, GHIL). Over the next one and a half days, seventeen speakers introduced their projects to an interested and engaged audience. Participants gave a short summary of their work containing general ideas, leading questions, sources, and initial findings, followed by discussion. Information was also exchanged about institutions that give grants for research in Germany. The GHIL 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 conference was preceded by a palaeography course tutored by Dorothea McEwan. The GHIL is planning to hold the next postgraduate students conference from Thursday 7 to Friday 8 January 2016. For further information, including how to apply, please contact the Secretary, Anita Bellamy, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ.

Natalie Anderson (Leeds) Following the Footsteps of Emperor Maximilian I: A Chronology of Tournaments
Katy Bond (Cambridge) Costume Books in Early Modern Germany
Alex Burkhardt (St Andrews) Anti-Marxism and the Nationalist Milieu in Hof-an-der-Saale, 1906–23
Joe Cronin (Queen Mary) What does a Ghetto Mean after Auschwitz?
The Case of the Börneplatz Excavation 1987
Austin Glatthorn (Southampton) ‘Our Great National Drama’: The Music of Leopold II’s Imperial Coronation (1790)
Jonathan Green (Cambridge) Friedrich von Gentz, the Congress of Vienna, and the Problem of ‘Perpetual Peace’
Perica Hadzi-Jovancic (Cambridge) The Economy as a Tool of German Foreign Policy in the 1930s: The Case Study of Yugoslavia
Charlie Hall (Kent) The Politics of Plunder: British Exploitation in Post-War Germany, 1944–60
Jan Hillgaertner (St Andrews) Reporting Regicide: Continental Reactions to the Execution of Charles I
Saskia Limbach (St Andrews) Government Use of Print in the Holy Roman Empire in the Sixteenth Century
Antonio Mileo (Ulster) The Brief Session of the Austrian Viceroyalty (1707–14): The Role of Naples in the Empire of Charles VI
Frank Sterkenburgh (Warwick) Monarchical Rule and Political Culture in Imperial Germany: The Reign of Emperor William I
Adam Storrer (Cambridge) War and Political Thought in the Writings of King Frederick II of Prussia
Marcel Thomas (Bristol) Placing the Self in a Changing World: Villagers, Spatial Perceptions and Everyday Life in Divided Germany
Itzel Toledo Garcia (Essex) The Encounter of Two Countries in Reconstruction: Mexico and Germany, 1920–28
Markus Wahl (Kent) Medical Memories and Experiences in Post-War East Germany, 1945–61
Dagmar Zadrazilova (Cambridge) Tempelhof Airport: Memory, Heritage, and Cultural Politics in Twentieth-Century Berlin

Prize of the German Historical Institute London

The Prize of the German Historical Institute London is awarded annually for an outstanding Ph.D. thesis on German history (submitted to a British or Irish university), British history (submitted to a German university), Anglo-German relations, or an Anglo-German comparative topic. The Prize is 1,000 Euros. Former Prize winners include Chris Knowles, Helen Whatmore, David Motadel, and Britta Schilling. To be eligible a thesis must have been submitted to a British, Irish, or German university after 30 June 2014. To apply, send one copy of the thesis with
• a one-page abstract
• examiners’ reports on the thesis
• a brief CV
• a declaration that the author will allow it to be considered for publication in the Institute’s German-language series,
and that the work will not be published before the judges have reached a final decision

- a supervisor’s reference
to reach the Director of the German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, by 31 July 2015. The Prize will be presented on the occasion of the Institute’s Annual Lecture on 13 November 2015.

For further information visit: <www.ghil.ac.uk>
Email: ghil@ghil.ac.uk Tel: 020 7309 2050

Forthcoming Conferences

*Negotiating the Nazi Model: The Internationalization of Nazi Labour and Social Policy and the Role of the Reichsarbeitsministerium, 1933–1945. Internal Workshop and Public Panel Discussion to be held at the German Historical Institute London, 4–5 June 2015. Conveners: Kiran Klaus Patel (GHIL/LSE) and Sandrine Kott (Geneva).*

From the late nineteenth century, German officials and experts heralded their models of labour and social policies internationally. During the Weimar Republic, the newly established Reichsarbeitsministerium became the guardian and international promoter of German social policies and expertise. The year 1933 was no turning point in this respect: German actors remained part of international expert discourses, and while the Nazis assessed new schemes in fascist Italy and elsewhere, they were also eager to promote their own programmes abroad. Nor did this come to an end with the advent of the Second World War. Instead, the war provided new opportunities and rationales to experiment with policies elsewhere, and to project Nazi labour and social policy ideas on to other societies. Which of their ideas and schemes did the Nazis promote internationally? To what extent did such policies continue earlier practices from the Weimar Republic or even the Kaiserreich? What was the role of racism and violence in this context? How did non-Germans react, and what was their room for manoeuvre? The internal workshop addresses these and related questions. It is complemented by a public panel discussion with the following participants: Jane Caplan

For the last few years the German Historical Institute London has organized an annual, week-long summer school on British history in co-operation with the History Department of the Ludwig Maximi- lians University Munich. The summer schools are aimed at advanced BA and MA students from German universities and are meant to encourage and foster the study of British history in Germany. The topic of this year’s summer school is ‘Natural History, Politics, and Religion in the Victorian Age’. It will be taught by Professor Jim Secord (Cambridge), Professor Peter Bowler (Belfast), and Dr James Enderby (Sussex). Students registered at a German university who would like to take part in this year’s summer school should send their applications to Michael Schaich (schaich@ghil.ac.uk) by 15 May 2015. For further information visit: <http://www.ghil.ac.uk/events_and_conferences/conferences_and_workshops/2015/summer_school_2015.html>.


In the early 1970s, intellectuals and journalists became aware of a new and worrying phenomenon: nostalgia. Only a decade before, dictionaries had still defined nostalgia as a medical term for an extreme form of homesickness. Now it described the sentimental yearning for an irretrievable past. And this yearning seemed to be everywhere: in popular culture, in the rising number of museums and the expansion...
History is as popular as never before, popular culture is still obsessed with its own past, fashion designers continue to look back to earlier decades for inspiration, and the current upsurge of heritage television is again being discussed in terms of nostalgia.

Much harder to pin down are the origins of nostalgia and the changes it has undergone during the twentieth century. While a number of studies on nostalgia have appeared in various disciplines, historians have taken surprisingly little interest in the phenomenon. If they use the term at all, it is often with condescension, variously describing nostalgia as a sickness, kitsch, or even a sin. What we still know very little about, however, is the history of nostalgia. How can we historicize nostalgia? How did it change over time? Does nostalgia, distort the past, as many historians believe, or does it perhaps foster an interest in history? These are some of the questions the conference wants to address. It is interested both in theoretical contributions to the history of nostalgia and in case studies of nostalgia in various times, places, groups, and contexts.

Medieval History Seminar. Seminar to be held at the German Historical Institute Washington, 15–17 Oct. 2015. Conveners: Paul Freedman (Yale), Ruth Mazo Karras (Minnesota), Stuart Airlie (Glasgow), Miri Rubin (Queen Mary), Bernhard Jussen (Frankfurt), and Frank Rexroth (Göttingen).

The German Historical Institutes in London and Washington are pleased to announce the ninth Medieval History Seminar. The seminar is designed to bring together Ph.D. candidates and recent Ph.D. recipients (2013–14) in medieval history from American, British, and German universities for three days of scholarly discussion and collaboration. They will have the opportunity to present their work to their peers as well as to distinguished scholars from both sides of the Atlantic. The Medieval History Seminar, which takes place every two years, covers all areas of medieval history.
Nineteenth-Century Anti-Semitism in International Perspective. Conference to be held at the German Historical Institute Paris, 21–23 Oct. 2015, in collaboration with the German Historical Institutes in London, Moscow, Paris, Rome, Warsaw, and Washington; the Deutsches Forum für Kunstgeschichte Paris; the Orient Institute Istanbul; and the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, TU Berlin.

Research on the history of anti-Semitism still attracts a great deal of interest, not only because of the Nazi regime, the Holocaust, and the radicalization of traditional anti-Semitic ideas and practices in the Third Reich. Recent developments, too, have given rise to a deeper engagement with the history, roots, and manifestations of anti-Judaism. Anti-Semitic attitudes still exist in Western European societies, often dressed up as leftist anti-capitalism or critiques of Israeli policies, while in Eastern Europe traditional resentments, sometimes based on religious foundations, have re-emerged since the fall of communism. In contemporary Muslim societies anti-Semitic ideas are spread by drawing on European traditions, which attract growing interest in the context of the Middle East conflict.

To understand both current and National Socialist varieties of anti-Semitism, it is necessary to understand the emergence of new forms of anti-Judaism in the nineteenth century, culminating in the coining of the term ‘anti-Semitism’ (Antisemitismus) in Berlin in 1879, one which shortly afterwards entered all European languages. An investigation of the phenomenon in comparative and transnational perspective, which has only rarely been attempted, promises to provide new insights. This will be the approach of the conference to be held at the German Historical Institute Paris and organized in cooperation with the other institutes of the Max Weber Foundation (the German Historical Institutes in London, Moscow, Paris, Rome, Warsaw, and Washington; the Deutsches Forum für Kunstgeschichte in Paris; and the Orient Institute Istanbul), the Centre for Research on Anti-Semitism (Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung) at the Technical University Berlin, and other partners. The aim of the conference is to study, in an international perspective, the various levels, milieux, actors, and forms of anti-Semitism in the nineteenth century, some of which, in different contexts, have survived or been revived in the twenty-first century.
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Recent forms of mass protest and debates around open, censored, or intercepted flows of information have triggered debates about the power and limits of the global public. Yet many preconditions for such a global public had their origin in the last decades of the nineteenth century, when global travel became more standardized and new media such as telegraphy, mass print, and, later, film entered the scene. During the two world wars, the global public was mobilized and manipulated in an unprecedented manner. Communication theorists and internationalists of the inter-war period, such as John Dewey, Harold Lasswell, and H. G. Wells, saw it as a rising political force that would change future decision-making. In war or crisis, peace activists and humanitarians evoked it as a moral tribunal and normative entity. The organizers of cultural and sporting events hoped for new worldwide audiences, which businessmen and advertisers associated with opportunities for profit-making on a new scale. Politicians recognized the global public as a force for prestige and image-cultivation, for instance, during the Cold War, turning it into an arena of intense competition. At the same time, the related technologies, especially print media and film, and their penetration of different world regions and layers of society, provided a field of experimentation, and the limits of the global public, on a geographical and social but also normative scale, remained visible. The conference will explore such theories and practices of a global public and its limits in the long twentieth century in a comparative and interdisciplinary perspective.
LIBRARY NEWS

Recent Acquisitions

Appelbaum, Peter C., Loyalty Betrayed: Jewish Chaplains in the German Army during the First World War (London: Mitchell, 2014)
Arblaster, Paul, From Ghent to Aix: How They Brought the News in the Habsburg Netherlands, 1550–1700 (Leiden: Brill, 2014)
Assmann, Aleida, Ist die Zeit aus den Fugen? Aufstieg und Fall des Zeitt-regimes der Moderne (Munich: Hanser, 2013)
Bamji, Alexandra, Geert H. Janssen, et al. (eds.), The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)
Baumgartner, Ingrid (ed.), Fürstliche Koordinaten: Landesvermessung und Herrschaftsvisualisierung um 1600, Schriften zur sächsischen Geschichte und Volkskunde, 46 (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitäts Verlag, 2014)
Beiser, Frederick C., Late German Idealism: Trendelenburg and Lotze (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)
Bienert, Maren, Protestantische Selbstverortung: Die Rezensionen Ernst Troeltschs, Troeltsch-Studien, NS, 5 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014)
Recent Acquisitions

Bischoff, Doerte et al. (eds.), *Sprache(n) im Exil*, Exilforschung, 32 (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2014)


Bley, Helmut and Anorthe Kremers (eds.), *The World during the First World War* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2014)


Bohm-Duchen, Monica, *Art and the Second World War* (Farnham: Lund Humphries, 2013)


Library News


Burschel, Peter and Christine Vogel (eds.), *Die Audienz: Ritualisierter Kulturkontakt in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2014)


ChauSSY, Ulrich and Gerd R. Ueberschär, ’Es lebe die Freiheit!’ Die Geschichte der Weißen Rose und ihrer Mitglieder in Dokumenten und Berichten (2nd edn. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2013)


Clark, James G., *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014)


Duchhardt, Heinz, Der Westfälische Friede im Fokus der Nachwelt (Münster: Aschendorff, 2014)

Duindam, Jeroen Frans Jozef and Sabine Dabringhaus (ed.), The Dynastic Centre and the Provinces: Agents and Interactions, Rulers and Elites, 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2014)


Eckart, Wolfgang Uwe, Medizin und Krieg: Deutschland 1914–1924 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2014)

Ellis, Heather and Ulrike Kirchberger (eds.), Anglo-German Scholarly Networks in the Long Nineteenth Century, Knowledge Infrastructure and Knowledge Economy, 43; History of Science and Medicine Library, 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2014)


Ernst, Wolfgang, Signale aus der Vergangenheit: Eine kleine Geschichtskritik (Munich: Fink, 2013)


Fritsche, Christiane and Johannes Paulmann (eds.), *‘Arisierung’ und ‘Wiedergutmachung’ in deutschen Städten* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2014)

Füssel, Marian and Michael Sikora (eds.), *Kulturgeschichte der Schlacht, Krieg in der Geschichte*, 78 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2014)

Gailus, Manfred and Clemens Vollnhals (eds.), *Mit Herz und Verstand: Protestantische Frauen im Widerstand gegen die NS-Rassenpolitik*, Berichte und Studien/Hannah-Arendt-Institut für Totalitarismusforschung, 65 (Göttingen: V & R Unipress, 2013)


Gjuricová, Adéla and Andreas Schulz (eds.), *Lebenswelten von Abgeordneten in Europa 1860–1990*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 165; Parlamente in Europa, 3 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2014)


Haid, Elisabeth, Stephanie Weismann, and Burkhard Wöller (eds.), *Galizien: Peripherie der Moderne – Moderne der Peripherie?*, Tagungen zur Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung, 31 (Marburg: Herder-Institut, 2013)
Hartmann, Heinrich and Corinna R. Unger (eds.), *A World of Populations: Transnational Perspectives on Demography in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Berghahn, 2014)
Herwig, Malte, *Die Flakhelfer: Wie aus Hitlers jüngsten Parteimitgliedern Deutschlands führende Demokraten wurden* (Munich: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 2013)
Recent Acquisitions

Herzfeld, Wolfgang D., Rosenzweig, ‘Mitteleuropa’ und der Erste Weltkrieg: Rosenzweigs politische Ideen im zeitgeschichtlichen Kontext, Rosenzweigiana, 8 (Freiburg: Alber, 2013)
Hettlage, Robert and Karl Lenz, Projekt Deutschland: Zwischenbilanz nach zwei Jahrzehnten (Munich: Fink, 2013)
Hilmes, Oliver, Ludwig II.: Der unzeitgemäße König (Munich: Siedler, 2013)
Hoffmann, Richard Charles, An Environmental History of Medieval Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
Holborn, Mark (ed.), The Great War (London: Cape, 2013)
Hordt, Arne, Von Scargill zu Blair? Der britische Bergarbeiterstreik 1984–85 als Problem einer europäischen Zeitgeschichtsschreibung, Modeme Geschichte und Politik, 26 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2013)
Horkheimer, Max, Eclipse of Reason (Mansfield, Conn.: Martino Publishers, 2013)
Hübner, Christoph, Die Rechtskatholiken, die Zentrumspartei und die katholische Kirche in Deutschland bis zum Reichskonkordat von 1933: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Scheiterns der Weimarer Republik, Beiträge zu Theologie, Kirche und Gesellschaft im 20. Jahrhundert, 24 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2014)
Isenmann, Moritz (ed.), Merkantilismus: Wiederaufnahme einer Debatte, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 228 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2014)
Jancke, Gabriele, Gastfreundschaft in der frühneuzeitlichen Gesellschaft: Praktiken, Normen und Perspektiven von Gelehrten, Berliner Mittelalter- und Frühneuzeitforschung, 15 (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2013)
Joskowicz, Ari, The Modernity of Others: Jewish Anti-Catholicism in Germany and France (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2014)
Jütte, Robert, Krankheit und Gesundheit in der Frühen Neuzeit (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013)
Julien, Elise, Der Erste Weltkrieg (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2014)
Recent Acquisitions


Kiechle, Oliver, Fritz Selbmann als Kommunist und SED-Funktionär: Individuelle Handlungsspielräume im System. Eine politische Biographie, Düsseldorfer historische Studien, 1 (Düsseldorf: DUP, 2013)


King, Steven and Anne Winter (eds.), Migration, Settlement and Belonging in Europe 1500 to 1930s: Comparative Perspectives, International Studies in Social History, 23 (New York: Berghahn, 2013)

Kirchner, Klaus, Flugblattpropaganda im Zweiten Weltkrieg, vol. xix: Antisemitische Flugblätter aus Deutschland 1939–1945 (Erlangen: Verlag D + C, 2014)

Klein, Annika, Korruption und Korruptionsskandale in der Weimarer Republik, Schriften zur politischen Kommunikation, 16 (Göttingen: V & R Unipress, 2014)

Kleinschmidt, Harald, Geschichte des Völkerrechts in Krieg und Frieden (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2013)

Koch, Jörg, Von Helden und Opfern: Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kriegsgedenkens (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2013)

Köhler, Helmut and Peter Lundgreen, Allgemein bildende Schulen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949–2010, Datenhandbuch zur deutschen Bildungsgeschichte, 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014)

Kornelius, Stefan, Angela Merkel: Die Kanzlerin und ihre Welt (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 2013)

Library News


Krämer, Jenny and Benedikt Vallendar, Leben hinter Mauern: Arbeitsalltag und Privatleben hauptamtlicher Mitarbeiter des Ministeriums für Staatssicherheit der DDR (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2014)


Kucher, Katharina, Gregor Thum, et al. (eds.), Stille Revolutionen: Die Neuformierung der Welt seit 1989 (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2013)

Landwehr, Achim, Geburt der Gegenwart: Eine Geschichte der Zeit im 17. Jahrhundert (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2014)


Leidig, Ludwig, Bombshell (Houston, Tex.: Strategic Book Publishing and Rights Company, 2013)
Leo, Per, Der Wille zum Wesen: Weltanschauungskultur, charakterologisches Denken und Judenfeindschaft in Deutschland, 1890–1940 (Berlin: Matthes & Seitz, 2013)
Libero, Loretana de, Rache und Triumph: Krieg, Gefühle und Gedenken in der Moderne, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, 73 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2014)
Lindenlaub, Dieter, Carsten Burhop, et al. (eds.), Schlüssereignisse der deutschen Bankengeschichte (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013)
Mandler, Peter, Return from the Natives: How Margaret Mead Won the Second World War and Lost the Cold War (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013)
Mangold-Will, Sabine, Begrenzte Freundschaft: Deutschland und die Türkei 1918–1933, Moderne Europäische Geschichte, 5 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2013)
Martel, Gordon, The Month that Changed the World: July 1914 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)
Maurer, Trude (ed.), *Der Weg an die Universität: Höhere Frauenstudien vom Mittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2010)


Meder, Stephan, *Familienrecht: Von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2013)


Meyen, Michael, *Wir haben freier gelebt*: Die DDR im kollektiven Gedächtnis der Deutschen (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2013)


Möllers, Heiner and Rudolf J. Schlaffer (eds.), *Sonderfall Bundeswehr? Streitkräfte in nationalen Perspektiven und im internationalen Vergleich, Sicherheitspolitik und Streitkräfte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, 12 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2014)


Müller, Yves and Reiner Zilkenat (eds.), *Bürgerkriegsarmee: Forschungen zur nationalsozialistischen Sturmbteilung* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2013)
Müller-Doohm, Stefan, *Jürgen Habermas: Eine Biographie* (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2014)

Mulsow, Martin (ed.), *Kriminelle, Freidenker, Alchemisten: Räume des Untergrund in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2014)

Myers, Perry, *German Visions of India, 1871–1918: Commandeering the Holy Ganges during the Kaiserreich* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)


Patel, Kiran Klaus and Kenneth Weisbrode (eds.), *European Integration and the Atlantic Community in the 1980s* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Pettegree, Andrew, *The Invention of News: How the World Came to Know about Itself* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014)


Pohl, Mareike, *Fliehen, Kämpfen, Kapitulieren: Rationales Handeln im Zeitalter Friedrich Barbarossas* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014)


Poska, Allyson M., Jane Couchman, and Katherine McIver (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)


Pyta, Wolfram (ed.), *Geschichte des Fußballs in Deutschland und Europa seit 1954* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013)

Recent Acquisitions

Rehmann, Jan, Max Weber: Modernisierung als passive Revolution. Kon-tekststudien zu Politik, Philosophie und Religion im Übergang zum Fordismus, Argument, Sonderband 253; Berliner Beiträge zur kritischen Theorie, 8 (Hamburg: Argument Verlag, 2013)

Reichardt, Sven, Authentizität und Gemeinschaft: Linksalternatives Leben in den siebzigern und frühen achtziger Jahren (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2014)


Reinkowski, Maurus and Gregor Thum (eds.), Helpless Imperialists: Imperial Failure, Fear and Radicalization, Schriftenreihe der Frias School of History, 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013)


Rogg, Matthias, Kompass Militärgeschichte: Ein historischer Überblick für Einsteiger (Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 2013)

Rogger, Philippe and Benjamin Hitz (eds.), Söldnerlandschaften: frühneuzeitliche Gewalthärte im Vergleich, Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, Beiheft 49 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2014)


Rüsen, Jörn, Historik: Theorie der Geschichtswissenschaft (Cologne: Böhlau, 2013)


Samerski, Stefan, Panкратиус Пфейффер: Der verlängerte Arm von Pius XII. Der Salvatorianergeneral und die deutsche Besetzung Rom 1943/44 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2013)

Schenk, Dietmar, ‘Aufheben, was nicht vergessen werden darf’: Archive vom alten Europa bis zur digitalen Welt (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013)

Schlögel, Karl, Grenzland Europa: Unterwegs auf einem neuen Kontinent (Munich: Hanser, 2013)
Library News


Schmiedel, Michael, ‘Sous cette pluie de fer’: Luftkrieg und Gesellschaft in Frankreich 1940–1944, Schriftenreihe des Deutsch-Französischen Historikerkomitees, 9 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013)

Schminck-Gustavus, Christoph U., Feuerrauch: Die Vernichtung des griechischen Dorfes Lyngiádes am 3. Oktober 1943 (Bonn: Dietz, 2013)

Schneider, Ulrich Johannes, Die Erfindung des allgemeinen Wissens: Enzyklopädisches Schreiben im Zeitalter der Aufklärung (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013)


Schraut, Sylvia, Bürgerinnen im Kaiserreich: Biografie eines Lebensstils (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013)


Schulte, Jan Erik and Michael Wala (eds.), Widerstand und Auswärtiges Amt: Diplomaten gegen Hitler (Munich: Siedler, 2013)


Shepard, Todd, Voices of Decolonization: A Brief History with Documents (Boston, Mass.: Bedford/St Martin’s, 2015)
Signori, Gabriela (ed.), Das Schuldbuch des Basler Kaufmanns Ludwig Kilchmann (gest. 1518), Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beih. 231 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2014)

Smart, Sara and Mara R. Wade (eds.), The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protest Alliance and Court Festival, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung, 29 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013)


Spilker, Annika, Geschlecht, Religion und völkischer Nationalismus: Die Ärztin und Antisemitin Mathilde von Kemnitz-Ludendorff (1877–1966), Geschichte und Geschlechter, 64 (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2013)

Stangel, Matthias, Die Neue Linke und die nationale Frage: Deutschlandpolitische Konzeptionen und Tendenzen in der Außerparlamentarischen Opposition (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013)


Stickler, Matthias (ed.), Jenseits von Aufrechnung und Verdrängung: Neue Forschungen zu Flucht, Vertreibung und Vertriebenenintegration, Historische Mitteilungen, Beiheft 86 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2014)


Strohmeyer, Arno and Norbert Spannenberger (eds.), Frieden und Konfliktmanagement in interkulturellen Räumen: Das osmanische Reich und die Habsburgermonarchie in der Frühen Neuzeit, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen Mitteleuropa, 45 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013)
Taylor, Frederick, *The Downfall of Money: Germany’s Hyperinflation and the Destruction of the Middle Class* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013)
Ungerson, Clare, *Four Thousand Lives: The Rescue of German Jewish Men to Britain*, 1939 (Stroud: The History Press, 2014)
Wiel, Jérôme aan de, *East German Intelligence and Ireland, 1949–90: Espionage, Terrorism and Diplomacy* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014)


Withington, Phil and Angela McShane (eds.), *Cultures of Intoxication, Past and Present, Supplements*, NS, 9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)


Zehender, Kathrin, *Christine Teusch: Eine politische Biografie*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 166 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2014)

Ziegler, Uwe and Horst Carl (eds.), *‘In unserer Liebe nicht glücklich’: Kultureller Austausch zwischen Großbritannien und Deutschland 1770–1840*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, Beiheft 102 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014)


Zimmerer, Jürgen (ed.), *Kein Platz an der Sonne: Erinnerungsorte der deutschen Kolonialgeschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verlag, 2013)
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. 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 in der Nachkriegszeit: Großbritannien und die Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Vergleich (Munich: Oldenbourg, 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)


Matthias Reiss (ed.), *The Street as Stage: Protest Marches and Public Rallies since the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 2007)


Willibald Steinmetz (ed.), *Political Languages in the Age of Extremes* (Oxford, 2011; paperback 2012)

**STUDIES IN BRITISH AND IMPERIAL HISTORY**


**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: Saur Verlag, 1993)

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


**BRITISH ENVOYS TO GERMANY**


HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON


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


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


*Research on British History*


Annual Lectures of the German Historical Institute London


1990 *Not available*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>David Blackbourn</td>
<td>A Sense of Place: New Directions in German History</td>
<td>London, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Werner Paravicini</td>
<td>Fact and Fiction: St Patrick’s Purgatory and the European Chivalry in the Later Middle Ages</td>
<td>London, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jürgen Osterhammel</td>
<td>Europe, the ‘West’, and the Civilizing Mission</td>
<td>London, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 *Not available*


2012 Jane Caplan, ‘*Jetzt Judenfrei*: Writing Tourism in Nazi-Occupied Poland’ (London, 2013)


*German Historical Institute London Bulletin, Issue 1* (Spring, 1979)–


*German Historical Institute London Bulletin Supplements*


No. 2 Andreas Gestrich and Margrit Schulte Beerbühl (eds.), *Cosmopolitan Networks in Commerce and Society 1660–1914* (London, 2011)