German Historical Institute London

Bulletin

CONTENTS

Contents

Conference Reports

Noticeboard

Library News

SEMINARS AT THE GHIL
SUMMER 2005

24 May **DR NICHOLAS STARGARDT (Oxford)**
War Children in Nazi Germany

Nicholas Stargardt is Lecturer in Modern History at Magdalen College, Oxford University. His interests lie in the social history of Nazi Germany, including the Holocaust and the history of child-hood. Among his most important publications are *The German Idea of Militarism: Radical and Socialist Critics, 1866–1914* (1994) and *Witnesses of War: Children's Lives Under the Nazis* (2005)

31 May **DR KARIN FRIEDRICH (Aberdeen)**
The Vassal's Subjects: Prince and Estates in Sixteenth-Century Ducal Prussia and the Polish Crown

Karin Friedrich is Lecturer in the Department of History at the University of Aberdeen. Her main research interests focus on Prussia and its territories, the history of Poland–Lithuania, political thought and ideas in early modern Europe, and the urban history of early modern central Europe. She is currently working on *History of the Prussian Lands* and *The Cultivation of Monarchy in Brandenburg–Prussia and the Rise of Berlin 1700–1701*, in co-authorship with Sara Smart. Among her most recent publications is *The Other Prussia: Royal Prussia, Poland and Liberty* (2000).

14 June **PROFESSOR ECKART CONZE (Marburg)**
Security as a Culture: Reflections on a 'Modern Political History' of the Federal Republic of Germany

Eckart Conze has been Professor of Modern History at the University of Marburg since 2003. His main research interests are German and European history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the history of international relations, and the history of the aristocracy. His recent publications include *Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen: Erneuerung und Erweiterung einer historischen Disziplin* (2004) and *Kleines Lexikon des deutschen Adels* (2005).

Seminars

21 June **PROFESSOR CHRISTOPH CORNELISSEN (Kiel)**
Public Remembrance of the Second World War in Germany
Christoph Cornelißen has been Professor of Modern History at the University of Kiel since 2003. His research interests include nineteenth- and twentieth-century British history, the history of historiography, European migration, and comparative research on cultures of remembrance. His numerous publications include *Gerhard Ritter: Geschichtswissenschaft und Politik im 20. Jahrhundert* (2001) and *Diktatur – Krieg – Vertreibung: Erinnerungskulturen in Tschechien, der Slowakei und Deutschland seit 1945* (2005).

Seminars are held at 5 p.m. in the Seminar Room of the GHIL.
Tea is served from 4.30 p.m. in the Common Room, and wine is available after the seminars.

ARTICLE

*FROM KING TO FÜHRER: THE GERMAN ARISTOCRACY AND THE NAZI MOVEMENT**[*]

by Stephan Malinowski

A summary execution in the courtyard of the German High Command on the night of 21 July 1944 has entered the history books in a number of versions. The story encountered most often in the literature reads as follows: in order to execute Count Claus von Stauffenberg, the firing squad had to shoot twice. At the moment of the first order to fire, Stauffenberg's adjutant, Werner von Haeften, dramatically hurled himself in front of Stauffenberg and took the bullets with his own body. Before Stauffenberg was killed by the second volley, he stood up straight and called out: 'Long live Secret Germany!' The bodies were buried in a cemetery in Berlin-Schöneberg, only to be dug up again shortly afterwards on Himmler's orders. They were burned and the ashes cast to the winds.

This scene, so rich in symbolism, typifies the alleged incompatibility between aristocracy and National Socialism. In this version of events, for example, the Nazi death machine was shown as being under the command of a bourgeois general, Fritz Fromm, who acted in a manner which was spineless and cowardly. His noble victims, by contrast, represented the peak of perfection of the aristocratic ideal of *Haltung* ('bearing' or 'a stiff upper lip'). Then there is the lily-livered hatred with which the petty bourgeois and neo-aristocratic prophet, Heinrich Himmler, persecuted these victims beyond the grave. And, finally, the impressive contribution of the aristocracy to the events of 20 July—about 45 per cent of the conspirators were members of the aristocracy[1]—and the long list of aristocratic names among the vic-

[1] According to figures in Romedio Galeazzo Graf von Thun-Hohenstein,

5

tims of the ensuing retribution, reinforced the image of noble stead-fastness. The aristocracy made up about a third of the victims of retaliation—men of the resistance who had led the most promising attempt to get rid of the Nazi regime, freely sacrificing their lives in the process. Their names are known not only to historians. Since the 1950s, a long tradition of historiography, journalism, and commemorative speeches has counted these men among 'the noblest and greatest that human history has ever seen'.[2]

This image is tempered somewhat by the second association which always arises in discussions of the influence of the aristocracy after 1918, when we once again encounter von Papen and his followers, those five to ten figures, 'unforeseen by the Constitution', who negotiated the transfer of power from the aged Field Marshal von Hindenburg to the Nazi regime in January 1933.

As far as the aristocracy is concerned, it is no exaggeration to say that both between and beyond these two extremes there lies an area which historians have generally glossed over and rarely examined in depth. Every account of January 1933 mentions the conservative élites. However, so far much has been claimed, but little substantiated, about the aristocracy after 1918.[3] While this situation has clearly

'Wehrmacht und Widerstand', in D. H. Poppel *et al.* (eds.), *Die Soldaten der Wehrmacht* (Munich, 1998), pp. 62–123, at p. 113.

[2] Chancellor Helmut Kohl, making a (historically incorrect) reference to Winston Churchill, 'Justitia fundamentum regnorum', speech given on 20 July 1994 in Berlin, published in Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand (ed.), *Der 20. Juli 1944: Reden zu einem Tag der deutschen Geschichte* (Berlin, 1984), quotation at p. 215. On the history of the reception of 20 July see Jürgen Danyel, 'Der 20. Juli', in Etienne François and Hagen Schulze (eds.), *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*, 3 vols. (Munich, 2001), ii. pp. 220–37 and Peter Steinbach, *Widerstand im Widerstreit: Der Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus in der Erinnerung der Deutschen* (Paderborn, 1994). See also the bibliographical essay by Ulrich Heinemann, 'Arbeit am Mythos: Neuere Literatur zum bürgerlich-aristokratischen Widerstand gegen Hitler und zum 20. Juli 1944 (Teil I)', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 21 (1995), pp. 111–39, and id. and Michael Krüger-Charlé, 'Arbeit am Mythos: Der 20. Juli 1944 in Publizistik und wissenschaftlicher Literatur des Jubiläumsjahres 1994 (Teil II)', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 23 (1997), pp. 475–501.

[3] Among the older literature, the following titles deserve mention: Walter Görlitz, *Die Junker: Adel und Bauer im deutschen Osten* (Limburg a. d. Lahn, 4th edn. 1981; first published 1956), esp. pp. 326–410; the pioneering essays by

begun to change over the last ten years,[4] it is interesting to note that when writing about the Weimar Republic, historians seldom depict the aristocracy as an analytical category in its own right, even though it is omnipresent in theories concerning the Republic's destruction. Although the aristocracy's inner dynamics after 1918 have not been examined deeply, in light of 1933 most scholars would agree that it is impossible to discuss the seizure of power without mentioning the Junkers. No one from the 'old power élite', Heinrich August Winkler has said, 'worked as early, contributed as actively, and as successfully, toward the destruction of Weimar democracy, as the East Elbian Junkers'.[5] The terminology chosen here illustrates that scholars have focused on a small and, even after 1918, immensely influential aris-

George Kleine, 'Adelsgenossenschaft und Nationalsozialismus', *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte,* 26 (1978), pp. 100–43, and Karl-Otmar Freiherr von Aretin, 'Der bayerische Adel: Von der Monarchie zum Dritten Reich', in Martin Broszat, Elke Fröhlich, *et al.* (eds.), *Bayern in der NS-Zeit*, 6 vols. (Munich, 1977–83), iii. pp. 513–67.

[4] Of the more recent literature see esp. Iris Freifrau von Hoyningen-Huene, *Adel in der Weimarer Republik* (Limburg, 1992); Shelly Baranowski, *The Sanctity of Rural Life: Nobility, Protestantism and Nazism in Weimar Prussia* (New York, 1995); Rainer Pomp, 'Brandenburgischer Landadel und die Weimarer Republik: Konflikte um Oppositionsstrategien und Elitenkonzepte', in Kurt Adamy and Kristina Hübinger (eds.), *Adel und Staatsverwaltung in Brandenburg im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Ein historischer Vergleich* (Berlin, 1996), pp. 185–216; Larry Eugene Jones, 'Catholic Conservatives in the Weimar Republic: The Politics of the Rhenish–Westphalian Aristocracy, 1918–1933', *German History*, 18 (2000), pp. 60–85; Eckart Conze, *Von deutschem Adel: Die Grafen von Bernstorff im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2000); Heinz Reif (ed.), *Adel und Bürgertum in Deutschland*, vol. 2: *Entwicklungslinien und Wendepunkte im 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2001); Eckart Conze and Monika Wienfort (eds.), *Adel und Moderne: Deutschland im europäischen Vergleich im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 2004); Marcus Funck, *Feudales Kriegertum und militärische Professionalität: Der Adel im preußisch-deutschen Offizierkorps 1860–1933/34* (Berlin, 2005); and the book on which this article is based, Stephan Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer: Deutscher Adel und Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004; first published 2003).

[5] Heinrich August Winkler, 'Requiem für eine Republik: Zum Problem der Verantwortung für das Scheitern der ersten deutschen Demokratie', in Peter Steinbach and Johannes Tuchel (eds.), *Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus* (Bonn, 1994), pp. 54–67, at p. 57.

tocratic faction called 'the Junkers', the 'pre-industrial power élite', or the 'agrarians'. However, these categories do not describe 'the aristocracy' as such. The Hindenburg camarilla, which is always mentioned in this context, refers to a group of ten to twelve men,[6] a circle which grows to a few hundred if aristocrats who played important roles in the *Reichslandbund*, the German National People's Party (DNVP), the *Stahlhelm*, and similar organizations, are included.[7] The early and fateful alliance between these groups and the Nazi movement is known and undisputed.

This article, therefore, will not deal with this minority and its relatively well-researched organizations. Instead, I will examine the aristocracy and its associations as a whole, and, in particular, the rapidly growing group of the 'aristocratic proletariat' (I). I shall then outline the main similarities and differences between the old aristocracy and the Nazi movement (II), and go on to make a few comments on the scope of aristocratic convergence with National Socialism, and on how this has been interpreted (III), before concluding briefly (IV).

This essay is limited to the period up to 1934, when the Nazi state, newly consolidated by means of the 'long knives', brought the 'second revolution' to a halt and silenced the Conservative Revolution. Apart from individual aristocrats who took part in the Conservative Revolution, there was, in my opinion, no movement of opposition to Nazism to which the aristocracy as a whole contributed after this date. The major aristocratic associations and the new aristocratic–bourgeois foundations of the Weimar period had completed their voluntary alignment with National Socialism (*Selbstgleichschaltung*) by 1933–4, and any organizational remnants and personal networks

[6] The smallest details of the political equivocations of this circle are well known. See esp. Heinrich August Winkler, *Weimar 1918–1933: Die Geschichte der ersten deutschen Demokratie* (Munich, 1993), pp. 477–594 and, taking a strongly personalized view, Henry Ashby Turner, *Hitler's Thirty Days to Power: January 1933* (London, 1996).

[7] First, Hans-Jürgen Puhle, *Agrarische Interessenpolitik und preußischer Konservatismus im Wilhelminischen Reich (1893–1914): Ein Beitrag zur Analyse des Nationalismus in Deutschland am Beispiel des Bundes der Landwirte und der Deutsch-Konservativen Partei* (Hanover, 1966). And most recently, Stephanie Merkenich, *Grüne Front gegen Weimar: Reichs-Landbund und agrarischer Lobbyismus 1918–1933* (Düsseldorf, 1998).

of élitist opposition in which the aristocracy played a prominent part were violently destroyed on 30 June 1934.[8]

I *On the Heterogeneity of the German Aristocracy*

During the Weimar period the aristocracy was no longer limited to a small circle of influential large landowners, Reichswehr officers, and district administrative officials. In the 1920s the aristocracy as a whole numbered some 90,000 people, representing between 0.1 and 0.2 per cent of the German population. It was a highly complex group, heterogeneous in terms of region, denomination, and legal and, especially, social status.

Historians so far have, understandably, concentrated on the successful sections of this group. However, this perspective tends to distort our understanding of a phenomenon which should, in fact, be the starting point for any study of the aristocracy after the First World War. For the aristocracy as a whole, 1918 brought decline more dramatic than for any other social group. Of the 10,000 noble officers of the Imperial Army, no more than 900 found a position in the Reichswehr.[9] There was no professional replacement for the ruined old-boy networks of the aristocracy in state service, or for the vanished princely courts and cadet schools—at least none which the aristocracy was prepared to accept. After 1918 the notorious East Elbian landed aristocracy's estates were still large enough to serve as weapons depots for demobilized Freikorps units and meeting places for anti-democratic discussion circles, and to provide modest homes for unmarried women in the 'spinster wing'.[10] But the majority of these estates were no longer profitable enough to provide disorientated younger sons and daughters with a living.

[8] Larry E. Jones, 'The Limits of Collaboration: Edgar Jung, Herbert von Bose and the Origins of the Conservative Resistance to Hitler, 1933–34', in id. and James Retallack (eds.), *Between Reform, Reaction and Resistance: Studies in the History of German Conservatism from 1789 to 1945* (Providence, 1993), pp. 465–502.

[9] Funck, *Feudales Kriegertum und militärische Professionalität,* now provides a detailed analysis of the aristocracy and the military.

[10] Aristocratic designation for the rooms in which unmarried female members of the family who were not gainfully employed were accommodated.

Article

This group of impoverished and socially degraded petty nobles which, in the 1920s, expanded to number several thousands, shook up the class consciousness of the entire aristocracy.[11] After 1918 the social dynamics of this group troubled noble families, family associations, and the large aristocratic associations at various levels. This is why any political and social history of the aristocracy after 1918 which concentrates on the diverse functional élites (especially in the Reichswehr, the higher civil service, and among large landholders) which managed to preserve their status at this period misses the point entirely. Instead, evidence shows that the process of the aristocracy's political radicalization can be adequately described only if the dynamic loser groups are included as well. Even within the high aristocracy, which generally continued to concentrate great wealth in the hands of its (male) patriarchs,[12] the social trajectories of individual younger sons plummeted. The young princes who, after the war, ended up earning their bread in auto repair shops and insurance offices, and, finally, serving in the SA and becoming members of the Nazi Party in the 1920s and 1930s, were not anomalies, but represented a distinct social type in their own right.[13]

A closer look at aristocratic organizations reveals an astonishing degree of social degradation which the aid organizations could only symbolically assuage with pitiful support funds and donations of

[11] Erwein Freiherr von Aretin, 'Adel und Krone', in id. (ed.), *Erster Rundbrief an den jungen Adel Bayerns* (1923), Archiv der Fürsten Öttingen-Wallerstein, VIII, 19c 1, no. 117.

[12] In the 1920s the *Deutsche Adelsgenossenschaft* (DAG, German League of Aristocrats) had members who were unable to pay their annual subscriptions of 6 Marks, while during the same period, the annual apanages of the hereditary prince Franz Joseph von Thurn und Taxis amounted to about 80,000 Marks. Archiv der Fürsten Thurn und Taxis (Regensburg), HMA, nos. 3596 and 3597. On poverty among the petty aristocracy see Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 260–82.

[13] For this see the curricula vitae in the personal records of Karl Fürst von Wrede, (b. 5 Sept. 1876), Marie Adelheit Prinzessin Reuss zur Lippe (b. 30 Aug. 1895), Ernst Erbprinz von Lippe-Biesterfeld (b. 12 June 1902), and Christoph Prinz von Hessen (b. 14 May 1901), all in Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, Ref. 2 R (NSDAP-Personalakten). Summarized in Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 562–7.

potatoes and linen.[14] The history of the *Deutsche Adelsgenossenschaft* (DAG, German League of Aristocrats) shows that after 1918 it was mainly the rapidly expanding 'aristocratic proletariat' which was responsible for the early radicalization of the largest German aristocratic association. Elements of the northern German, Protestant, petty nobility were particularly successful in steering the association on to a distinctly anti-Semitic course as early as the 1880s.[15] As a result, in 1920 the DAG, which soon represented some 30 per cent of the adult aristocracy, introduced an 'Aryan clause' which excluded all aristocrats whose family trees included any Jewish ancestors later than 1800.[16] In parallel, the DAG established the *Eisernes Buch des Deutschen Adels Deutscher Art* (Iron Book of the German Nobility of German Origin), known as *Edda*. This represented a German aristocratic stamp of approval which excluded 'racially impure' peers, thus sweeping aside the traditional definition of aristocracy.[17] Although the metaphor of 'blood' was central to the traditional definition in all European aristocracies, for many centuries it had meant aristocratic birth and descent, traditions specific to the aristocracy, and cultural peculiarities. The practice now introduced, by contrast, represented nothing less than the self-destruction of this tradition with the tools

[14] Stephan Malinowski, ' "Wer schenkt uns wieder Kartoffeln?" Deutscher Adel nach 1918—eine Elite?', in Marcus A. Denzel and Günther Schulz (eds.), *Deutscher Adel im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (St Katharinen, 2004), pp. 503–37.

[15] This can be demonstrated from the very first volumes of the *Deutsches Adelsblatt* (1883–1944). Graphic examples of the types of arguments used by this movement and its style can be found in a series of essays by Oldwig von Uechtritz, 'Semitismus und Adel', *Deutsches Adelsblatt* (1885), pp. 169–235.

[16] An account of the debate at the *Adelstag* can be found in *Deutsches Adelsblatt*, 31 July 1920, pp. 241–3. On this see Kleine, 'Adelsgenossenschaft und Nationalsozialismus', and Stephan Malinowski, 'Vom blauen zum reinen Blut: Antisemitische Adelskritik und adliger Antisemitismus 1871–1944', *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung,* 12 (2003), pp. 147–68.

[17] According to § 8 of the *Edda* constitution, 'one Semite or a coloured person' was the maximum permitted in the demonstrations of noble descent. See *Deutsches Adelsblatt*, 15 Apr. 1921, p. 98. On the debate and the constitutent assembly, see the following issues of the *Deutsches Adelsblatt*: 38 (1920), pp. 259 f.; 39 (1921), pp. 82, 97–9, 115–17. By 1942, 4 vols. of the *Edda* had been published. By 1936, more than 6,000 applications for an entry in the *Edda* had been made.

of a biologically-defined racism. According to the logic applied here, a single Jewish ancestor could invalidate a seven-hundred-year-old pedigree.

From the very beginning the DAG, which had been created by East Elbian estate owners in Berlin in 1874, brought together members of the old aristocracy who perceived the upheavals of the modern era from the vantage point of losers. The hard-line anti-Semitism, the association's affinity with the Stöcker movement, and its demand that the petty nobility 'seize the banner of leadership' within the anti-Semitic movement were all aimed at Wilhelm II and the high aristocracy. The DAG successfully resisted any trend towards a synthesis of élites encompassing rich, educated sections of the aristocracy and the upper middle class. Aggression towards the liberal bourgeoisie, which was accused of adopting Jewish values, and its allegedly Byzantine lifestyle had already characterized the association before 1918, and anti-Semitic campaigns served as one of its most important channels of communication with National Socialism.

The association's racial anti-Semitism implied the successive self-destruction of the aristocratic idea itself. In 1924, when Baron Börries von Münchhausen, an author widely read in aristocratic circles, defined the 'meaning and purpose' of the aristocracy as 'human breeding', thus making a direct comparison with the breeding of 'full-blooded horses', 'dachshunds', and 'pug dogs', this represented an intellectual low point, permanently damaging the traditional concept of the aristocracy. Münchhausen's line about mongrelized 'dachs-pugs' which were justifiably drowned by breeders—a clear reference to aristocratic families with Jewish relations—shows where the journey was heading.[18] The more strongly 'pure-bloodedness' was declared the primary qualification for a modern 'leader class', the more did the aristocracy in effect undermine itself. After all, other groups were as 'pure-blooded' as the aristocracy, if not more so, as an influential section of the Nazi movement would soon argue.

[18] Börries Freiherr von Münchhausen, 'Adel und Rasse', *Deutsches Adelsblatt,* 42 (1924), pp. 63–5.

II *Similarities and Differences between the German Aristocracy and National Socialism*

Since the German aristocracy was not socially, culturally, or politically homogeneous, it is extremely difficult to make general statements about the attitude of the German aristocracy towards National Socialism. However, it is possible to identify a number of fundamental structures which can then be applied to the aristocracy as a whole. I shall here outline the most important similarities and differences between the aristocracy and the Nazi movement. First, the similarities:

(1) An uncompromising and aggressive rejection of democracy, the parliamentary system, liberalism, and the party state provided the foundation upon which the old aristocracy and National Socialism identified a common enemy. By 1932 at the latest, the Nazi movement represented the most promising instrument with which to crush the political Left, something which the aristocracy first regarded as a challenge, but later as a welcome opportunity. In a letter from Count Friedrich von der Schulenburg to the last president of the Prussian Upper House, Count Dietlof von Arnim, the retired general abandoned his previous doubts in 1933: 'Hitler's success in the Reichstag was remarkable and it was a pleasure to watch him crushing the Social Democrats as if in passing. In any case, whoever persuaded old Hindenburg to hire Hitler as chancellor has performed a historic service.'[19]

(2) The blood-and-soil ideology with its negative references to large cities and 'asphalt culture', linked with praise of the 'soil'. In contrast to the English aristocracy, for example, which largely retained a lifestyle divided between town house and country seat, around 1900 the Prussian petty aristocracy developed a strong aversion to large cities, and Berlin in particular. By beating an ideologically motivated retreat from the metropolis, the Prussian aristocracy missed out on one of the most important routes of access to modernity. At the same time, the aristocracy's contempt for the capital,

[19] Letters from Friedrich Graf von der Schulenburg to Dietlof Graf von Arnim, 23 Nov. 1932 and 8 Apr. 1933, in Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv (Potsdam), Rep. 37 Boitzenburg.

which it regarded as a *Parvenüpolis* and New Jerusalem, offered an important link with the Nazi movement's anti-urban rhetoric.[20]

(3) Relentless invectives against 'materialism' and 'worship of Mammon' plus sharp anti-capitalist rhetoric and an implicit recognition of bourgeois (non-Jewish) property relations. The culture of scarcity stylized by the petty nobility is reminiscent of the ideas and rhetorical conventions of the Conservative Revolution, with which the German aristocracy maintained many personal, intellectual, and organizational links.[21] The great anti-capitalist longing which Gregor Strasser would evoke in a sensational Reichstag speech in 1932 offered many points of contact with the aristocratic culture of scarcity.

(4) The aggressive style of the Nazi movement with its masculine and militaristic symbolism, particularly in the SA, which Sven Reichardt has recently described as anti-bourgeois.[22] All variants of anti-bourgeois sentiment as cultivated by the entire New Right conjured up the ideal of a charismatic leader figure as the antithesis of the sickly, democratic 'philistine'. This quest was eventually bound to discover the aristocracy.

(5) Closely linked with this was contempt for the occupational core of the bourgeois élites, such as commerce, banking, the stock exchange, industry, and the university sector. In 1945, no more than 10 per cent of the aristocracy worked in these areas.[23] Much more strongly than in England, France, and Italy, the German aristocracy considered that it was incompatible with their social position

---

[20] Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 55–73; Heinz Reif, 'Hauptstadtentwicklung und Elitenbildung: "Tout Berlin" 1871 bis 1918', in Michael Grüttner et al. (eds.), *Geschichte und Emanzipation: Festschrift für Reinhard Rürup* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999) pp. 679–99.

[21] On this see Stefan Breuer, *Ordnungen der Ungleichheit: Die deutsche Rechte im Widerstreit ihrer Ideen 1871–1945* (Darmstadt, 2001), and Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 90–104, 293–320, and 422–76.

[22] Sven Reichardt, *Faschistische Kampfbünde: Gewalt und Gemeinschaft im italienischen Squadrismus und in der deutschen SA* (Cologne, 2002).

[23] See figures in von Hoyningen-Huene, *Adel in der Weimarer Republik*, pp. 378–405 and Karl August Graf von Drechsel, *Der bayerische Adel 1921–1951*, offprint from vol. 4 of *Genealogisches Handbuch des in Bayern immatrikulierten Adels*, in Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv (Munich), Bestand Genossenschaft katholischer Edelleute in Bayern, no. 3.

(*unstandesgem*äß) even for the younger sons of the German aristocracy to pursue careers in trade, finance, and industry.

(6) The significance of the category of 'blood', which enjoyed a centuries-old tradition in the aristocracy and was freely linked with the category of 'race' as early as the Wilhelmine era. This was closely associated with a highly aggressive anti-Semitism in all branches of the aristocracy, including the Catholic nobility.

(7) Finally, aristocrats had a clear view of the opportunities which the rapidly expanding officer corps,[24] and the foreseeable 'ride eastwards', would provide for their caste. Ewald von Kleist-Schmenzin, known in the literature as an unyielding opponent of the Nazis, expressed this in 1926: 'The fountain of youth that the colonial land acquired east of our borders, with unlimited settlement opportunities, represents, requires no discussion.'[25] By the beginning of the war at the latest, what Kleist formulated here as a vague hope had evolved into a scramble to share in the spoils. As early as 1939, members of the upper and lower, the rich and the poor, aristocracy were turning to the SS in search of vast estates in the looted territories.[26] For many aristocratic families, even for those who had lost any connection with the land, the prospect of being able to acquire property and settle in the East was obviously highly attractive.

Nevertheless, the aristocracy's relationship with the Nazi movement was considerably more complex than, for example, the ortho-

---

[24] During the Weimar Republic, the aristocracy was not permitted to provide more than 900 permanent officers in the Reichswehr. For purposes of comparison, in September 1937 the Reichsheer had 2,280 aristocratic officers, and by 1937 this number had almost trebled. More precise figures in Funck, *Feudales Kriegertum und militärische Professionalität*.

[25] Ewald von Kleist, 'Adel und Preußentum', *Süddeutsche Monatshefte,* 23 (1926), p. 383.

[26] Examples of enquiries concerning the possibility of acquiring land in the conquered territories: Nikolaus Erbgroßherzog von Oldenburg to Heinrich Himmler, 2 Jun. 1941; Erasmus Freiherr von Malsen-Ponickau to the *Reichstatthalter* in Posnan, 16 Jun. 1941; Adolf Fürst von Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda, letter dated 1939. (Applications are in the Party files of these three aristocrats in Bundesarchiv, Berlin-Lichterfelde.)

dox Marxist analysis of fascism would have us believe.[27] I shall now discuss some important distinctions between National Socialism and the aristocracy, whether real or perceived:

(1) Only at first glance does the leader–follower ideal of Nazi ideology appear to dovetail with the aristocracy's intellectual world view. In a group which had exercised power for a thousand years, unconditional subordination to a mere party leader (one recalls Hindenburg's celebrated contempt towards the 'Bohemian corporal') was harder to achieve than in other groups.

(2) Concern that the second part in the name of the National Socialist movement might be meant seriously caused considerable scepticism towards the NSDAP long after 1933, particularly among the landed aristocracy. Even after the elimination of the party's Straßer wing, doubts about the Nazis' vaguely defined position on property questions, nationalization, and agrarian programmes probably remained the most important barrier between the propertied aristocracy and the Nazi movement. Many nobles warned against the 'Bolshevist experiments' contained in the Nazi programme.[28] However, discussions were held in castles and ancestral homes, to which Hitler and important Nazi leaders were invited. Thereupon these doubts gave way to a general hope that lost entailed estates would be restored.[29]

(3) Both before and after 1933, another branch of the Nazi movement, both influential and vociferous, pursued a sharply anti-aristocratic line. It was mainly represented in public by Walther Darré, one

[27] GDR literature typically simply lumps the aristocracy, or the *Junker*, in with the 'fascists'. A characteristic example is the commentary on the important collections of sources edited by Kurt Gossweiler and Alfred Schlicht, 'Junker und NSDAP 1931/1932', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 4 (1967), pp. 644–62. The 'Junkertum', it is claimed here, was part of the 'Monopolbourgeoisie' (p. 651).

[28] Manfred von Binzer, 'Politische Bewegungen in Deutschland' (speech given to the DAG's aristocracy section, 6 Dec. 1930, in Berlin). Manuscript of the speech in Deutsches Adelsarchiv (Marburg), Bestand DAG (Bayern), vol. 6, issue: 'Adel und NS', esp. pp. 17–19. For southern Germany see Ludwig Pesl, 'Zur politischen Einstellung des Jungadels', *Gelbe Hefte*, 6 (1930), pp. 665–80, esp. pp. 671 ff.

[29] Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 516–20.

of the leading Nazi ideologists. In 1930 Darré had demanded a 'new aristocracy of blood and soil', maintaining that the old aristocracy had so little 'pure blood' in its veins that it was no longer a match for a 'racially Nordic' peasant boy.[30] The primitive anti-aristocratic prejudice which moved the *Gauleiter* of the Eastern March to refer to aristocratic large landholders as 'a heap of swine contaminated with Jewish blood',[31] was widespread in the SA. This conflict intensified after 1933 when aristocratic 'fancy boys' and *Märzgefallene* (March recruits) proved to be more successful in exploiting new career opportunities than many of the petty bourgeois *alte Kämpfer* (old fighters).[32]

(4) The aristocracy quite clearly perceived the struggle for dominance among the newly created élite organizations, and especially the SS, as a challenge. In its claim to leadership and élite status, the SS took recourse to aristocratic insignia and traditions in many areas. In general, the organization was conceived as a form of 'new aristocracy'.[33] While Darré's 'new aristocracy of blood and soil' represented a new 'leadership class' which was unmistakably directed against the old aristocracy, the leadership ideals of the SS were viewed as a race in which the aristocracy had to participate. In 1935 Count Kuno von Dürckheim called upon the aristocracy to pick up the 'noble gauntlet' and to compete with the SS in the construction of a future élite. 'As with livestock breeding', he wrote, wives were to be 'tested', while 'pure-blooded' men had to prove themselves in demanding

[30] Richard Walther Darré, *Neuadel aus Blut und Boden* (Munich, 1930), quotations at p. 163. Cf. Hans F. K. Günther, *Adel und Rasse* (Munich, 1926).

[31] *Gauleiter* Kube to Gregor Straßer, 9 Oct. 1931, quoted from Wolfram Pyta, *Dorfgemeinschaft und Parteipolitik 1918–1933: Die Verschränkung von Milieu und Parteien in den protestantischen Landgebieten Deutschlands in der Weimarer Republik* (Düsseldorf, 1996), p. 469.

[32] *Märzgefallene* was the derogatory designation for the many members of the Nazi Party who opportunistically joined the Party between January 1933 when Hitler became Chancellor, and the halt on new memberships imposed in May 1933. *Alter Kämpfer* was an honorary title conferred on Nazis who had joined the movement especially early.

[33] Eckart Conze, 'Adel unter dem Totenkopf: Die Idee eines Neuadels in den Gesellschaftsvorstellungen der SS', in Conze and Wienfort (eds.), *Adel und Moderne*, pp. 151–80.

professions.[34] With reference to the SS, which, as an exclusively male society, could form a leadership class but not reproduce itself, the DAG in 1938 described the task of the aristocracy as to 'join with the hereditarily healthy and valuable non-aristocratic families to form a sacred source from which the state and the party can draw their finest recruits'.[35]

(5) Although dissent was rare in Prussia,[36] the Catholic aristocracy of southern Germany frequently objected to the anti-Christian aspects of National Socialism. The Catholic associations repeatedly spoke out against *völkisch* and anti-Christian articles in the *Adelsblatt*, provoking bitter controversies. In Prussia, young aristocratic men joined the National Socialist Party in large numbers, while, to take an impressive and characteristic example, the *Katholische Tatgemeinschaft*, dominated by young aristocrats, clearly rejected the Nazi movement and its hostility to the Church. 'Dear Friend!', we read in an appeal of May 1932, 'your place is always by the Holy Cross, not with those ... who have bent its arms.' In the Catholic south, this division continued until 1945.[37]

(6) Resentments arising from monarchist loyalties are widely exaggerated in the literature on Prussia, and were only really relevant among the Bavarian aristocracy. Even within the Kaiser's inner circle, the fact that, by fleeing to Holland, Wilhelm II avoided the heroic death on the front which should have been his destiny was viewed as a disgraceful act of treason,[38] and the Crown Prince was

---

[34] Memorandum by Kuno Graf von Dürckheim, 'Nationalsozialismus und Adel' (autumn 1935), in Deutsches Adelsarchiv (Marburg), Bestand DAG (Bayern), vol. 2, no. 35/36.

[35] 'Warum ist der Zusammenschluss des reinblütigen deutschen Adels notwendig?' (circular letter, 20 May 1938, DAG), held in Mecklenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv (Schwerin), GHK III, no. 2647.

[36] The best-known example is Ewald von Kleist-Schmenzin, *Der Nationalsozialismus: Eine Gefahr* (Berlin, 2nd edn., 1932).

[37] Lectures given by Hans Georg von Mallinckrodt and Anton Ernst Graf von Neipperg, mid-1932, at a conference of the *Katholische Tatgemeinschaft*, held in Deutsches Adelsarchiv (Marburg), Bestand DAG (Bayern), vol. 7, issue: 'Genossenschaft'. On this see Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 504–16.

[38] On the Kaiser's flight and how it was interpreted by the aristocracy see Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 228–58, and now also Martin Kohl-

widely viewed as an incompetent 'sissy'.[39] By 1932 at the latest, the ex-Kaiser's chief political advisers began putting their money on the NSDAP.[40] Drawing on vague statements by Hitler, a notion spread within the circle of advisers around the exiled Kaiser and the Crown Prince that they could use the Nazi movement as a Trojan horse in order to bring about a restoration. 'There is no doubt that Hitler wants it to culminate in the monarchy', Friedrich Graf von der Schulenburg, retired general, landowner, and Nazi Party member, mistakenly wrote in April 1933, in the letter cited above.[41] In 1933–4 Hitler, at a number of meetings with aristocrats from Wilhelm II's staff of advisers and the German League of Aristocrats, had made at least vague promises about reintroducing the monarchy. 'Adolf Hitler himself, so far as is known, is a monarchist.'[42] This assessment and the idea that the *Führergedanke* (leadership idea) would necessarily lead to 'undying leadership, that is, the hereditary monarchy', demonstrated resoundingly that the old guard of Prussian monarchism had understood nothing of what the signs of the new times indicated.[43] Even in 1934, members of the old imperial entourage drafted memos touting the grotesque notion that Hitler could be per-

rausch, *Der Monarch im Skandal: Die Logik der Massenmedien und die Transformation der wilhelminischen Monarchie* (Berlin, 2005).

[39] Letter from Friedrich Graf von der Schulenburg to Louis Müldner von Mülnheim (adjutant to the Prussian Crown Prince), November 1920, held in Bundesarchiv Berlin, 90 Mu 1, vol. 3, fos. 75 f.

[40] On this see Gerhard Granier, *Magnus von Levetzow: Seeoffizier, Monarchist und Wegbereiter Hitlers* (Boppard am Rhein, 1982) and Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 504–16.

[41] Friedrich Graf von der Schulenburg to Dietlof Graf von Arnim, 8 Apr. 1933, held in Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv (Potsdam), Rep. 37 Boitzenburg.

[42] See the notes made by Wilhelm von Dommes (Wilhelm II's 'Hausminister') on Hitler's attitude toward the monarchy, 15 May, 10 Sept., and 24 Oct. 1933, printed in Willibald Gutsche and Joachim Petzold, 'Das Verhältnis der Hohenzollern zum Faschismus', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 10 (1981), pp. 917–39, at pp. 934–9.

[43] Bundesarchiv, Militärarchiv Freiburg, N 266, no. 46, fols. 1–4 (memorandum from August von Cramons to Hindenburg: 'Argumente für eine Rückkehr Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs in Seine Rechte anlässlich des 75. Geburtstages').

suaded to arrange for the reinstallation of the Kaiser on Wilhelm II's seventy-fifth birthday in January 1934. When, shortly afterwards, the ceremonies marking the imperial birthday were stormed by marauding SA units, aristocrats sent enraged reports to Hindenburg. 'With a loud bang', the 'intruding rabble' set off fireworks 'which ruined the ladies' dresses', and they 'played football with the steel helmets of elderly gentlemen'.[44] However, the horror of the assembled aristocrats did not illustrate real political disagreements. Rather, it demonstrated the drastic misconceptions of this ossified caste of nobles who failed to grasp either National Socialist goals or the brutality of the fascist style.

In this respect too, the Bavarian aristocracy followed a separate path. In Bavaria the aristocracy controlled the strongest monarchist movement of the Weimar era, and had its own recognized pretender to the throne. Baron Erwein von Aretin, one of the most important heads of the Bavarian aristocracy, never faltered in warning his king about the dangers of a latter-day reign of terror. In a letter to Crown Prince Rupprecht in December of 1930 he wrote: '[We would] vanish like chaff before the wind; what would remain would be a fanatical proletariat which shoots generals when they suffer defeats and [terrorizes] every property owner for being a "Jew".'[45]

(7) Finally, an arrogant reaction to Adolf Hitler, who was derided as someone who could merely drum up support was significant.[46] In post-1945 autobiographies, Hitler repeatedly appears as a badly dressed, soup-slurping parvenu without manners, who may well have seduced the passive masses but, we are continually reminded, had no effect whatsoever on the incorruptible nobles. While it is rel-

---

[44] Confidential letter from retired major general Rüdiger Graf von der Goltz, chair of the Reichsverband deutscher Offiziere, to von Leers, 27 Jan. 1934, held in Bundesarchiv, Militärarchiv Freiburg, N 266, no. 42, fos. 1–12.

[45] Erwein von Aretin to Crown Prince Rupprecht, 23 Dec. 1930, held in Archiv der Freiherren von Aretin, Haidenburg (private ownership). On the Bavarian nobility see also von Drechsel, *Der bayerische Adel* and Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 367–85.

[46] In the early stages of his political career, Hitler defined himself not as a leader, but as someone who would merely drum up support among the masses for the coming *Führer*. On this see Albrecht Tyrell, *Vom Trommler zum Führer: Zum Wandel von Hitlers Selbstverständnis zwischen 1919 und 1924 und die Entwicklung der NSDAP* (Munich, 1975).

atively easy to unmask these accounts as so many acts of *ex post facto* denial,[47] it is nevertheless likely that a centuries-old élitist attitude was indeed an important source of a specifically aristocratic dissent. Until Stauffenberg's revised oath in July 1944, rejection of the *Gleichheitslüge* (equality lie) and faith in their call to *Führertum* (leadership) represented the indestructible core of the aristocrats' sense of self.[48] Aristocratic attempts to construct a new type of 'leadership' in the radical right-wing associations produced situations within the Stahlhelm and the SA in which aristocrats ended up marching alongside—and sometimes even behind—their estate managers or agricultural workers.[49] The Nazi demand for traditional aristocratic notions to be utterly abandoned remained a constant source of conflict. The habits of authority, the product of a thousand years of domination, were virtually impossible to carry over into the structure of the *Volksgemeinschaft*. The aristocracy remained a constant liability within the Nazi system.

III *The Extent and Significance of Aristocratic Convergence with National Socialism*

The extent of aristocratic convergence with National Socialism is difficult to measure precisely. It is likely that it was more pronounced among the Prussian nobility than among the Catholic nobility of southern Germany. A systematic evaluation of the NSDAP's mem-

[47] On the production of aristocratic self-images and the creation of aristocratic legends in autobiographies, see Marcus Funck and Stephan Malinowski, 'Geschichte von oben: Autobiographien als Quelle einer Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Adels in Kaiserreich und Weimarer Republik', *Historische Anthropologie*, 7 (1999), pp. 236–70; Marcus Funck and Stephan Malinowski, 'Masters of Memory: The Strategic Use of Memory in Autobiographies of the German Nobility', in Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche (eds.), *Memory Work in Germany* (Urbana, Ill., 2002), pp. 86–103.
[48] Stauffenberg's oath (early July 1944) reproduced in Peter Hoffmann, *Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg und seine Brüder* (Stuttgart, 1992), pp. 396 f.
[49] On this source of conflict within the SA see Stephan Malinowski and Sven Reichardt, 'Die Reihen fest geschlossen? Adlige im Führerkorps der SA bis 1934', in Conze and Wienfort (eds.), *Adel und Moderne,* pp. 119–50.

bership lists has revealed sensational findings. It was already known, for example, that Count Fritz-Dietlof von der Schulenburg joined the NSDAP early in 1932. However, few people know that his famous father, the Kronprinz Army Group's last Chief-of-Staff, and two of his brothers, had joined the party earlier. The literature has also ignored the fact that of the Schulenburg family, 24 had joined the party by 1933, and 41 by 1945. The Schulenburg family was not an exception. Rather, it reflected the political orientation of the East Elbian aristocracy: the NSDAP membership lists in the former Berlin Document Centre contain 17 Tresckows, 52 Schwerins, 10 Gersdorffs, 67 Arnims, 23 Dohnas, 37 Goltzes, 13 Stülpnagels, 43 Kleists, 20 Bernstorffs, 34 Bismarcks, 43 Bredows, 40 Bülows, 78 Wedels, 48 Winterfelds, and 34 Zitzewitzes.[50]

The sixtieth anniversary of 20 July 1944 has recently seen the reputation of the plotters reach an all-time high in the Federal Republic of Germany. As there probably would not have been a 20 July plot without the aristocracy, and as a majority of the conspirators were aristocrats, a part of this glory falls on the entire aristocracy. Yet while the contribution of the aristocracy to 20 July cannot be denied, it is important to remember the chronology of events and relations. It should be noted that the aristocratic contribution to the transfer of power in January 1933, to the officer corps of the Wehrmacht and the SS, and to the consolidation of the Third Reich, was much more significant than its later contribution to the attempted *coup d'état*. Undoubtedly, a large part of the aristocracy was an integral part of the National Socialist system of domination and its war of aggression and annihilation — *coûte que coûte*, as the resistance fighter Henning von Tresckow famously put it.

It is here, among the membership records of the Nazi Party, and not among the hand-picked luminaries who are constantly drawn to the attention of the collective memory by journalists nostalgic for Prussia, that we find the *Namen die keiner mehr nennt* (names which no one mentions today), to quote the title of a bestseller by Marion

[50] These figures are taken from a sample comprising about 350 families. They are based on a systematic analysis of Nazi Party membership records in the former Berlin Document Centre in the Bundesarchiv Berlin Lichterfelde. On this see Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 569–78.

Gräfin Dönhoff.[51] The fact that in our collective memory one 'good' Schulenburg can eclipse forty 'bad' Schulenburgs may be ascribed to an old aristocratic technique which Georg Simmel once perceptively described as the nobility's astonishingly successful demand to be judged by its best rather than its average performance.[52] But even among the richest, smallest, and most distinguished branch of the German aristocracy, that is, the high nobility, a total of 80 princes and counts had found their way to the party by 1933, and more than 270 by the end of the war. The Kaiser's fourth son, Prince August Wilhelm, who joined the party and the SA in 1931 and served the Nazi propaganda apparatus as 'Prince Auwi' for years, is no more of an exception than Princess Hermine von Reuss, the second wife of the exiled Kaiser, who, with her sons from her first marriage, began intensively campaigning for the Nazi movement in the mid-1920s.

In her study of the Dreyfus affair, Hannah Arendt describes the 'alliance of resentment and despair' as a 'mob', and this is extremely helpful when attempting to explain the convergence of the petty aristocracy, in particular, with the Nazi movement. Arendt's model of a new kind of coalition of the '*declassés* of all classes'[53] might well be a better explanation than the paradigm of an 'alliance of élites' which has informed our interpretation of the anti-democratic alliance since

---

[51] This book by an influential journalist can be read as a valuable prototype of the sort of stylization by which German aristocrats, after 1945, sanitized the role of the aristocracy as a whole during the Nazi period. Marion Gräfin Dönhoff, *Namen, die keiner mehr nennt* (Berlin, 1977). On this work of selective memory see Eckart Conze, 'Aufstand des preußischen Adels: Marion Gräfin Dönhoff und das Bild des Widerstands gegen den Nationalsozialismus in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland', *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 51 (2003), pp. 483–508.

[52] Georg Simmel, 'Exkurs über den Adel', in id., *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*, vol. 11 of *Gesamtausgabe*, ed. by Otthein Rammstedt (Frankfurt am Main, 1992), pp. 824 f.

[53] Hannah Arendt, *Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft* (Munich, 1986), p. 195. Arendt's perspicacious observations here on the role of the old aristocracy in *fin-de-siècle* Parisian society are unsurpassed. On this situation in France which, in many respects, anticipated that in post-war Germany, see William D. Irvine, *The Boulanger Affair Reconsidered: Royalism, Boulangism and the Origins of the Radical Right in France* (New York, 1989).

the days of Hans Rosenberg and Fritz Fischer.[54] This still prevails in the Marxist and the Bielefeld school interpretations, for example, in the third and fourth volumes of Hans-Ulrich Wehler's *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*.[55]

To be sure, the convergence of large sections of the aristocracy with the Nazi movement goes far beyond this model. The real mystery is why even socially unchanged, established aristocratic groups supported the *völkisch* rampage of the petty nobility, or else accepted it with a shrug of the shoulders. Any explanation of this phenomenon must examine the cultural peculiarities of the aristocracy, its traditions, and its notion of the family. In a narrow world in which everyone knew everyone else, the solidarity of the entire aristocratic 'family', which had grown up over the centuries, and its inherent tendency toward ideological homogeneity was of the utmost importance. From the early nineteenth century to the end of the Second World War, the petty nobility which dominated Prussia steadfastly resisted all attempts at reform which would exclude their ruined 'peers' and create new coalitions with the rich, educated bourgeoisie.[56] Within the atmosphere of aristocratic solidarity which this resistance cemented, the aristocracy sealed itself off from the central demands of bourgeois civil society. The *grand seigneurs* followed a similar pattern of solidarity in their social and political dealings with their ruined and radicalized peers.

Furthermore, the history of the convergence between the aristocracy and Nazism can also be described as the history of a twofold

[54] Hans Rosenberg, 'Die Pseudodemokratisierung der Rittergutsbesitzerklasse', in id., *Machteliten und Wirtschaftskonjunkturen* (Göttingen, 1978), pp. 83-101; Fritz Fischer, *Bündnis der Eliten: Zur Kontinuität der Machtstrukturen in Deutschland 1871–1945* (Düsseldorf, 1979).

[55] Hans Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 3 (Munich, 1995), pp. 805–25; vol. 4 (Munich, 2003), pp. 323–31, 985–94. See also id., review of Dominic Lieven, *The Aristocracy in Europe 1815–1914* (1992), in *Die Zeit*, 3 Nov. 1995, p. 15.

[56] On this see Hugo Preuß, *Die Junkerfrage* (Berlin, 1897); Heinz Reif, 'Friedrich Wilhelm IV. und der Adel: Zum Versuch einer Adelsreform nach englischem Vorbild in Preußen 1840–1847', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 43 (1995), pp. 1,097–111; Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer*, pp. 118–97.

misunderstanding. The most significant legacy of the *völkisch* move-
ment was that National Socialism did not abandon the aristocracy.
However, what remained was merely the concept and individual ele-
ments of an aristocratic tradition which could be distorted and ex-
ploited. 'Aristocracy' remained an institution which the Nazis ad-
mired and needed, but only in the form of the mutations which
Hitler, Günther, Darré, the SA and, ultimately, the SS leadership
desired and created in their quest for an 'aristocracy' of their own.
Conversely, a large section of the aristocracy recognized a modern
version of its own traditions in the guiding concepts and aims of the
Nazi movement. Yet the apparent affinity they identified in the
mutual language of 'blood', 'soil', and 'race' turned out to be a fatal
misinterpretation. The absurd perception of the Nazi movement as a
modern extension of the 'best' aristocratic traditions was widespread
among the aristocracy. It was based on the common use of key terms
which were phonetically—but not semantically—identical. Thus the
term 'conservative élites' is misleading. If terms from politics and
social science are to continue to mean anything at all, then, at least
after 1918, the majority of the aristocracy can be described as neither
conservative nor as an élite.

It is well known that in January 1933 there was no 'conservative'
alternative worthy of this name. This was partly because a large sec-
tion of the aristocracy—one of the potentially most significant
providers of such an alternative—had decisively broken with the
'conservative' tradition. Many of the close historical ties between
aristocracy and conservatism[57] were not destroyed by the Nazi
movement, as an influential interpretation claims, but had already
collapsed of their own accord. All attempts on the part of the aristoc-
racy to present itself as the genuine avant-garde of the Nazi move-
ment (as described above) demonstrate a centuries-old tradition
which had both forgotten and betrayed itself. Nowhere is this made
clearer than in an after-dinner speech given by Friedrich von Bülow,
chairman of the largest German family association, at the Bülow fam-
ily meeting in 1935:

[57] On this see Panajotis Kondylis's impressive account, *Konservativismus:
Geschichtlicher Gehalt und Untergang* (Stuttgart, 1986), esp. pp. 469–93.

> Upon blood and soil the Führer is building his Reich. We have understood blood selection for seven centuries and have built our bloodstream upon an age-old race and culture. … All the great ideals which the Führer has established for the German people originate not least from the deepest treasure chambers of the German aristocracy. Thus in its very foundations the German aristocracy is akin both in nature and origin to National Socialism. … This much we know: our old family is not a foreign body in the Third Reich, rotting and decaying, but rather it is a supporting beam in the structure, hardened over centuries. … Sieg Heil! Sieg Heil! Sieg Heil!'[58]

This speech shows how the aristocrats, like so many other discontented people at this time, confused National Socialism with their own unarticulated ideas and longings, as Martin Broszat once aptly put it.

The groups which asserted themselves within the aristocracy after 1918 and rejected every olive branch offered by the Republic were among the nobility's weakest groups. The social core of these groups was the military clan which had developed over the centuries. This was an aristocratic faction with many members in Prussia, whose sons were practically born in full uniform. This petty nobility—penniless, aggressive, and obsessed with its leadership claims—had a fateful influence both on the aristocracy itself and on the political culture of Germany as a whole. Among the diverse aristocratic traditions and types, it was not the rare, worldly, *grand seigneur* whose power was unbroken who was problematic. The aristocratic contribution to Nazi destruction at home and abroad involved a different type. It would therefore be useful for future research to concentrate less on the richest, most cultivated, and most elegant aristocratic families, and to look more closely instead at the proverbial Pommeranian lieutenant colonel (*Oberstleutnant*), the son of a Pommeranian lieutenant colonel who, having grown up in a circle of Pommeranian lieutenant colonels' sons, married the daughter of a lieutenant

[58] After-dinner speech given by the head of the family, Friedrich von Bülow-Omechau, at the Bülow family gathering, 8 July 1935. Quoted from the *Bülowschens Familienblatt* (January 1936), held in Landeshauptarchiv Magdeburg (Außenstelle Wernigerode), Rep. E von Bülow, no. 52, fo. 66.

colonel from the Brandenburg Mark, a marriage which produced at least two more Pommeranian lieutenant colonel's sons. It was not only after 1918, when jobs for lieutenant colonels became scarce, that membership of this group, which was highly influential among the East Elbian aristocracy, proved to be a heavy burden. Far removed from the lifestyle and culture of the bourgeoisie, committed to a world dominated by simple ideas, and neither able nor willing to integrate into a democratic civil society, this group possessed an old, deeply rooted cultural code which stylized military killing and being killed into its own *raison d'être*.[59] The capacity of this particular aristocratic culture to adapt to the ideals and realities of the Third Reich is obvious.

IV *Conclusion*

In the twilight of its political history, the German aristocracy was essentially taking cues from groups which had practically nothing to do with the aristocratic way of life. Alongside the nobles' remaining bastions in agriculture, the bureaucracy, and the military, the aristocratic idea maintained its aura as the ultimate resource of power. The aristocracy was, and remained, a master of self-promotion, memory, and the production of images which were eagerly consumed by others. The version of Stauffenberg's execution which was mentioned at the beginning of this article is a classic example of this. This apocryphal account which, typically enough, was penned by an aristocratic secretary at the High Command, has been taken out of the narrative circle of the post-war aristocracy and transplanted by conservative historians and journalists into scholarly literature, where it has found a home ever since.[60] A statement by another, non-aristocratic

[59] On the social and cultural history of the Prussian 'military clans', see the comprehensive analyses by Marcus Funck, 'The Meaning of Dying: East Elbian Noble Families as Warrior-Tribes in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries', in Greg Eghigian and Matthew Paul Berg (eds.), *Sacrifice and National Belonging in Twentieth-Century Germany* (Arlington, 2002), pp. 26–63 and id., *Feudales Kriegertum und militärische Professionalität.*

[60] See Hoffmann, *Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg,* pp. 442 f. and Joachim Fest, *Staatsstreich: Der lange Weg zum 20. Juli* (Berlin, 1994), p. 280. Fest opts for an undocumented, but especially dramatic version of the story.

eyewitness conveys a more prosaic version: no one hurled himself in front of anyone, and we will never know exactly what Stauffenberg called out before he fell.[61]

The bourgeois dream, Ernst Jünger wrote in 1929 in his book *Das Abenteuerliche Herz*, is the most boring to which mankind has ever succumbed.[62] Because this is not without some truth, the educated middle classes, in their search for new ideals, continually return to the treasure chest of aristocratic myths. Today, this quest may yield questionable results and anecdotes, but it does no harm. However, in the period between the wars, with the establishment of a bourgeois civil society at stake, it exacted a high price.

[61] On the source situation see Hoffmann, *Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg*, pp. 598 f. and id. *Widerstand, Staatsstreich, Attentat: Der Kampf der Opposition gegen Hitler* (Munich, 3rd edn., 1979), pp. 862 f.

[62] Ernst Jünger, *Das Abenteuerliche Herz* (Stuttgart, 1987; first published 1929), p. 131.

STEPHAN MALINOWSKI has been *Wissenschaftlicher Assistent* at the Friedrich Meinecke Institute of the Free University of Berlin since April 2003. His field of research is the political and cultural history of Western Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He is the author of *Vom König zum Führer: Deutscher Adel und National-sozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004; first published 2003). At present he is working on a research project entitled 'The Empire Comes Home: The Persistence of Empire and the Return of the "Colonial Experience" to Western Europe in the 1950s and 1960s'.

REVIEW ARTICLES

GERMANS AND BLACKS — BLACK GERMANS

by Matthias Reiss

MICHAEL SCHUBERT, *Der schwarze Fremde: Das Bild des Schwarz-afrikaners in der parlamentarischen und publizistischen Kolonialdiskussion in Deutschland von den 1870er bis in die 1930er Jahren,* Beitäge zur Kolonial- und Überseegeschichte, 86 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003), 446 pp. ISBN 3 515 08267 0. EUR 79.00
TINA M. CAMPT, *Other Germans: Black Germans and the Politics of Race, Gender, and Memory in the Third Reich*, Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), x + 283 pp. ISBN 0 472 11360 7. $ 29.95
MARIANNE BECHHAUS-GERST and REINHARD KLEIN-ARENDT (eds.), *AfrikanerInnen in Deutschland und schwarze Deutsche: Geschichte und Gegenwart,* Encounters. History and Present of the African–European Encounter/Begegnungen. Geschichte und Gegenwart der afrikanisch-eruopäischen Begegnung, 3 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004), 261 pp. ISBN 3 8258 6824 9. EUR 20.90

In June 1972, the Allensbach *Institut für Demoskopie* conducted a poll on what the Germans thought about 'the Negroes' (*die Neger*). Asked how they would describe 'Negroes' in general, 55 per cent answered 'kind' (*gutherzig, freundlich*), 49 per cent 'polite' (*höflich*), and 48 per cent 'ready to help' (*hilfsbereit*). In fourth place came the ideas that Blacks 'have a strong sexuality' and were 'intelligent' (both 36 per cent), while associations with drunkenness, dishonesty, laziness, crime, and deficiencies in personal hygiene were quite rare. One of the interesting aspects of this poll is that almost half of the people asked had never had any contact with a Black person. In fact, the question itself showed that 'the Negroes' were seen as a group different from 'the Germans'. The existence of Black Germans or Afro-Germans had entered neither the public nor the academic consciousness. Even ten years after the Allensbach poll, Sander Gilman could

publish a book entitled *On Blackness without Blacks: Essays on the Image of the Black in Germany* (Boston, 1982).

A few years later, the seminal study *Farbe bekennen: Afro-deutsche Frauen auf den Spuren ihrer Geschichte* changed this,[1] and interest in the history of Blacks in Germany has grown steadily ever since. Since the mid-1990s in particular, the number of publications on the relationship between people of African descent and 'white' Germans has increased sharply, perhaps as a result of the wave of racist violence, often directed against Blacks, after the unification of Germany in 1990. The great success of Hans J. Massaquoi's autobiography, *Destined to Witness: Growing up Black in Nazi Germany*,[2] shows that the experience of Afro-Germans has, in the meantime, also found interest among a wider audience outside the academic ivory tower. Publications on the image and reality of Blacks in Germany and under German rule continue to appear in substantial numbers. This also includes studies from abroad, where the diaspora paradigm has fostered interest in the history of Black communities outside the USA. The books under review here represent a cross-section of this growing field of Afro-German studies.

Michael Schubert's dissertation is a detailed study of the image of Black Africans in Germany from the advent of German colonialism in the 1870s to the end of the Weimar Republic. Written under the guidance of Klaus Bade at the University of Osnabrück, the study centres on the concept of the Black stranger (*der schwarze Fremde*) and its use in the German colonial discourse. Schubert traces the origin, development, variations in, and main propagators of the image of the Black African in Germany chronologically over the space of six decades in almost encyclopaedic detail. His aim is to reconstruct contemporary interpretations of German colonial expansion as mirrored in parliamentary debates and various publications. According to Schubert, this discussion was rooted in two different traditions: the idea of cultural mission (*Kulturmission*), which went back to the

---

[1] May Opitz, Katharian Oguntoye, and Dagmar Schultz (eds.), *Farbe bekennen: Afro-deutsche Frauen auf den Spuren ihrer Geschichte* (Berlin, 1986). English-language edition: *Showing Our Colors: Afro-German Women Speak Out* (Amhurst, 1991).

[2] Hans J. Massaquoi, *Destined to Witness: Growing up Black in Nazi Germany* (New York, 1999). Published in German as *'Neger, Neger, Schornsteinfeger!' Meine Kindheit in Deutschland* (Berne, 1999).

Enlightenment and saw colonial expansion as a humanitarian task, and Social Darwinism, which saw colonialism as the right of the stronger and biologically superior race. While the concept of a cultural mission acknowledged, at least in principal, the Africans' capacity to catch up with Europeans on the ladder of civilization, Social Darwinists considered this impossible. They regarded Africans as inherently inferior, and stressed the need for separate development of the races. As Schubert rightly points out, both positions were racist and marked the semantic boundaries of a discourse that was deeply intertwined with national, economic, and social justifications for colonial expansion. The construction of a counter-image in the form of the 'Black stranger', he argues, was a crucial condition for justifying Germany's imperialism.

The two concepts of cultural mission and Social Darwinism provide a unifying thread going through the three parts of the book, which deal respectively with the period from the end of the 1870s to the second half of the 1880s, 1888 to the end of German colonial rule in Africa, and the colonial discourse in the Weimar Republic. Each part is again subdivided into chapters and sub-chapters dedicated to particular images, organizations, or problems and phases of German colonialism. The final chapter offers a summary and brief outline of the further development of the image of Black Africans in the Third Reich and the post-war period up to the present.

One of the findings of *Der schwarze Fremde* is that the overwhelming majority of supporters of colonialism, critics of colonialism, and missionaries employed the discourse of cultural mission. Only a minority, consisting mainly of German settlers and planters and their allies in the motherland, attempted to justify colonial rule on the basis of Social Darwinism. Consequently, the image of the Black African was relatively stable between the 1870s and 1930s, and centred on the notion that Africans had no culture of their own and were in need of a paternalistic helping hand. Constructing the Africans as their own counter-image, the Germans perceived them as 'lazy' and uncivilized. Teaching them to work was seen as the main way to change this. Uprisings in the colonies in 1904 and 1906 promoted Social Darwinist rhetoric, but advocates of the idea of cultural mission quickly regained the upper hand. They continued to dominate the discourse on Africa even after the First World War, when colonial revisionists attacked what they regarded as the 'koloniale Schuld-

lüge'. Allied accusations that Germany had failed in its civilizing mission created a hitherto unknown consensus within Germany about the country's colonial experience, and centred on the image of the faithful African longing for the return of his former German master.

Critics of colonialism and missionaries (with the exception of the Catholic mission until the second half of the 1880s) likewise used the discourse of cultural mission, even when criticizing German colonial rule. They thus operated within the same racist preconceptions, even if these were softened by paternalistic and humanitarian notions. Radical dissenting voices were few and could not challenge the dominant view of Africa as an uncivilized and wild place, which was used to justify colonialism. Notions of a cultural mission also masked Germany's economic interest behind altruistic rhetorics and served as a rallying point for national integration in Imperial Germany.

After the First World War, however, the colonial movement contributed to the destabilization of the Weimar Republic. By the end of the 1920s, both Protestant and Catholic mission societies had withdrawn from the colonial discussion in Germany, which had partly adapted to the political realities. In the 1930s, the idea of cultural mission lost out to National Socialist notions of 'living space' in Eastern Europe, but it enjoyed a revival after the Second World War. Schubert's short but convincing treatment of how old ideas of Africa as an under-developed place waiting for the civilizing West, and as a barbaric place beyond hope of redemption, still figure in Germany today makes uncomfortable reading. Today, the supposed barbarism of the Africans is explained in cultural and biological, that is, genetic, terms, and is still used to legitimize government policy towards Africa. This observation alone makes *Der schwarze Fremde* worth reading, although the stability of the image of Black Africans also results in a certain repetitiveness. The stereotype of the uncultured African is extensively documented, and the book would have benefited from more rigorous editing and condensation. *Der schwarze Fremde* is still very much a German dissertation in style, organization, and length, which, together with the high price, might deny this impressive work the wide readership it deserves.

The formation of identity through the creation of a racial dichotomy of black/white is also the topic of Tina M. Campt's book, *Other Germans*. Campt, Associate Professor of Women's Studies at Duke University, is interested in how 'German Blacks were constituted as

particular kinds of raced and gendered subjects in Germany under the Nazi regime' (p. 1). Her main thesis is that people of African descent were identified as Black Germans during the Nazi period by the state's incoherent and unsystematic attempt to purify German society. The Nazis, in other words, significantly helped to produce the very group they were trying to get rid of. While Campt shows how the mechanics of this paradox worked, she also aims to 'push the limits of contemporary uses and interpretations of oral history narratives by engaging the dynamic interaction of memory, speech, and articulation in the writing of history' (p. 10). *Other Germans* is, indeed, mostly about the memories of two Afro-Germans interviewed by the author in 1992. Campt frankly acknowledges that their accounts 'are in many ways the most complex of the larger corpus of oral histories' she collected (p. 85), but argues that they are 'exemplary ... of the dynamics of race and gender in the Third Reich' (p. 89). And both of her interviewees have remarkable stories to tell.

Hans (Johann) Hauck was born in 1920 as the son of a German mother and Algerian father, who served with the French army of occupation in the Rhineland. Hauck grew up in the Saarland, where he joined the Hitler Youth in 1933. As one of the 'Rhineland bastards' (children of Afro-German descent who became enmeshed in the machinery of Nazi eugenics), he was sterilized between the age of fifteen and sixteen. Conscripted in 1939 and rejected as unworthy for military service, Hauck was nevertheless inducted into the German Wehrmacht in 1942 at his own request—a step which he believed saved him from being deported to a camp. As Campt points out, 'military settings were sites where Hauck enjoyed unquestioned status as a legitimate German subject' (p. 123) Three years later, Hauck became a prisoner of war on the Eastern Front. Refusing the chance for early repatriation by claiming his status as Saarlander, he returned from the Soviet Union in 1949.

Fasia Jansen was born in 1929 in Hamburg as daughter of a Liberian consul-general. Her parents did not marry and she never met her father. In 1936 her mother married a Communist who was later interned by the Nazis. Jansen began studying at a dance academy in Hamburg in 1940, but was forced to quit two years later. As a German, Jansen was drafted for mandatory labour service, working in the kitchen of a branch camp of the concentration camp Neuengamme. After the war, she unsuccessfully applied for compensation

for having to leave the dance academy. However, she later received the *Bundesverdienstkreuz* for her work in the German peace movement between 1960 and 1980.

Other Germans can be highly recommended to those interested in the theory and practice of oral history, memory, and identity formation. Although it is not always an easy read, it is a highly stimulating and challenging volume which makes a considerable contribution to the study of Afro-German history. The postscript, in which Campt reflects on the diaspora paradigm in the light of her experience as an African-American woman studying and interviewing Afro-Germans in Germany, deserves special mention in this context.

Historians interested in more traditional questions, however, might at times be frustrated by the author's focus on memory and identity. She could have provided more information, for example, about how Hauck was able to enter the German army after being refused once, where he served, and in what capacity. Campt mentions only that he 'spent several years working on building and reconstruction projects in various European countries' (p. 125). If Hauck's Hitler Youth uniform 'mitigated' the visibility of his 'skin color' (p. 108), it would be interesting to have more information about this point. Did Hauck pass as 'white', or was what he called 'his heritage' instantly recognizable? Campt mentions Hauck's 'visible markings of race' (p. 108), but the text suggests that these were easily overlooked by his contemporaries.

However, Campt deals with the historical background of Blacks in Germany, giving due attention to the importance of French colonial troops during the occupation of the Rhineland after the First World War, and the 600 to 800 children they left behind. What little systematic policy the Nazi state had towards Black Germans was, in her view, formulated with these children in mind, and the sterilization of some 385 'Rhineland bastards' was the only campaign consistently directed against people of African descent in the Third Reich. Nevertheless, the powerful image of the 'Rhineland bastard' did, as Campt points out, fuel random persecution of, and discrimination against, Black Germans by local Nazi authorities. Victimization in this 'gray zone' was 'neither systematic nor necessarily coherent but rather ambivalent and contradictory' (p. 166). Fear of persecution was ever-present, but balanced by ties within local communities, where the meaning of race was often contested, and protection offer-

ed. The lack of a coherent anti-Black policy on the part of the state meant that the local politics of race to a large extent determined the life of Black Germans in the Third Reich. With the help of her interviewees, Campt demonstrates this convincingly. An appendix containing excerpts from the transcripts of the original German interviews, a bibliography, and an index complete the volume and the positive picture.

The contributions to the book edited by Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst and Reinhard Klein-Arendt, *AfrikanerInnen in Deutschland und schwarze Deutsche* were all, with one exception (Wolbert Smidt), presented at a conference of the same name held in Cologne in June 2003. Written by scholars from various disciplines as well as Afro-German activists, the anthology provides an excellent and highly accessible overview of the diverse research done in the field of Afro-German history. Firla Monika opens the book with a paper on people of African descent in Germany before the *Kaiserreich* became a colonial power in 1884. Combining a spirited attack on Peter Martin's *Schwarze Teufel, edle Mohren*[3] with suggestions on how to do it better, Firla argues convincingly for the need also to present the achievements and successful integration of Blacks in Germany, instead of constantly seeing them just as victims of racism.

Despite this appeal, racism and exclusion are the main focus for the remainder of the book. The majority of authors deal with the outsider status of Africans and Afro-Germans in Germany from the nineteenth century on. Germans were willing to pay money to see Africans in a supposedly authentic setting. According to Hilke Thode-Arora, Africa *Völkerschauen* were highly popular in Germany from the 1870s on. Some organizers strove for authenticity and co-operated closely with the scientific community, but others simply tried to maximize their profits. Probably up to 3,000 Black people were employed in these shows from 1875 to 1933, often to their own considerable economic advantage. After the First World War, as Tobias Nagl shows, the film industry also offered employment for Black Germans and African migrants. Although sometimes forced into these jobs by economic necessity, the movie business offered a relatively high income as well as bargaining power, for Black actors

[3] Peter Martin, *Schwarze Teufel, edle Mohren: Afrikaner in Geschichte und Bewußtsein der Deutschen* (Hamburg, 1993; new edn., 2001).

were few and in demand. Their roles, however, almost always denied them identity or autonomy. They mainly played themselves as 'Blacks' and often served only to provide authenticity for exotic settings.

Wolbert Smidt highlights the important role of Black missionaries for the cultural exchange between Africa and Europe, and Germany in particular. Their work could start religious movements and foster reforms in their home countries, while they also influenced a generation of Black intellectuals and politicians through their schools in Africa. Lothar Pützstück, Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst, and Joachim Zeller then examine colonial connections and legacies in the cities of Düsseldorf, Cologne, and Berlin respectively, highlighting the presence and activities of Black people in these cities as well as the commemoration of Africa in the form of monuments, buildings, and street names. Particularly intriguing is the example of a company in Cologne which produced and exported African-style masks to Kenya, where they were sold to European tourists as genuine African art.

Andreas E. Eckl examines the situation of German farmers in the colony of South West Africa, using the story of Ludwig Cramer as a case study. In 1911–12 Cramer was sentenced in court for severely mistreating nine African farm workers who he thought were killing his cattle and trying to poison him and his wife. Rejecting the assessment that conditions in the colony were 'pre-fascist', Eckl traces the origins of the conflicts between farmers and African workers to the scarcity of labour and the farmers' dependence on the African workforce as well as the colonists' isolation within the landscape of South West Africa. Farmers had no effective way of coercing workers, who could easily run away, and constantly felt under threat from them. According to Eckl, the majority of farmers saw these conflicts as an extension of colonial warfare by other means and as an expression of race hatred which made peaceful co-existence impossible.

Fatima El-Tayeb's contribution traces the long connection between 'blood' and 'nationality' in Germany. In Germany, membership of the nation was inherited, not acquired. When German men in the colonies passed their citizenship on to the children they had with African women, however, a debate started. Long before the Nazi period, the exclusion of 'racial strangers' was discussed as an option and finally enshrined in law in 1913. Even after 1945, blood remained

the most important criterion for German citizenship for the rest of the twentieth century, dividing society into two groups. After the First World War, children of African–European relationships again acquired symbolic significance in Germany. When the French army occupied the German Rhineland, a campaign of race hatred against French colonial troops was deliberately incited. As Christian Koller's paper shows, this campaign was backed by the whole German political élite, with the exception of the far left. While the official government campaign was directed abroad, private activities primarily had a domestic focus. Most Black African troops were withdrawn in 1920, but the remaining Moroccan and Algerian troops were uniformly referred to as 'Blacks', accused of sexual violence, and used as a smoke screen for radical interpretations of the crisis Germany found itself in. For Nazi propaganda, the French troops were also instruments of a Jewish conspiracy, and the 'Rhineland bastards' were secretly sterilized in 1937. When confronted with French colonial troops in 1940 and African-American soldiers in 1945, German propaganda once again played on the image of 'Black humiliation' (*Schwarze Schmach*). According to Koller, this image might still exist under a different name, and resurface at times of crisis.

As Stefanie Michels demonstrates, Germany's own colonial troops, known as 'Askaris', enjoyed a much better press. Michels traces the origin of the word as well as the genesis of this military unit in the colony of German East Africa. After the First World War, the Askaris and their supposedly loyal service played a prominent role in the effort to counter Allied accusations that Germany had failed in its colonial mission. According to Michels, the still popular 'myth of loyalty' (*Treue-Mythos*) makes a critical discussion of Germany's colonial past very difficult right up to the present day. The positive image of the loyal Askari with Germany's continuing colonial ambitions, however, offered limited protection to Blacks after 1933, as Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst shows. Those who kept a low profile, as most Afro-Germans did, had a chance of surviving the Nazi regime. However, the lack of a coherent official policy and authorities eager to remove Afro-Germans from public life meant constant terror and insecurity, while relationships with German women could mean death. After the beginning of the Second World War, and especially after the turn of the tide on the Eastern Front, Germany's colonial ambitions became meaningless. As they disap-

peared, so too did any reason to protect Africans still within the German sphere of power. Blacks were increasingly terrorized, and a number were sterilized and deported to concentration camps, although the exact number is unknown.

The final part of the book deals with the presence of Blacks in post-war Germany. Nicola Lauré al-Samarai examines three autobiographies of Afro-Germans living in the former GDR and the Federal Republic, drawing on the works of Tina Campt among others. Like other Black Germans before them, these three were confronted with the notion that being Black and German was mutually exclusive. Carmen Humboldt, on the other hand, examines the heterogeneous African diaspora in Cologne, which, as she emphasizes, consists of many different communities with strong loyalties to their respective homelands and a high degree of internal cohesion. Contact between the communities is often eclectic, despite a widespread wish for a stronger and more comprehensive African network, while relations with the resident German population are highly formalized. Sascha Zinflou gives an overview of the history and activities of the Initiative Black Germans (*Initiative Schwarze Deutsche*, ISD; now *Initiative Schwarze Menschen in Deutschland*), which came into existence in 1985–6. According to Zinflou, who has headed the group since 1999, ISD confronts two central founding lies of the Federal Republic: first that Germany is not a country of immigration; and secondly, that there is no racism in Germany. Black Germans are automatically treated as strangers and in the context of migration, while racist incidents are blamed on misguided individuals instead of on racist structures. Since the 1990s, both founding lies have been challenged from within the political discourse, but Zinflou sees this merely as a sign that racism in Germany is modernizing.

The book concludes with two essays by Venant Adoville Saague. The first is on Black African migrants and refugees, which, as a mobile, heterogeneous, and relatively small group (numbering about 400,000 people), has attracted little scholarly attention so far. The vast majority of Germans incorrectly assumes that Africans are asylum seekers or illegal immigrants. Nevertheless, most African migrants have only low-paid jobs and struggle with German bureaucracy. African women also face the additional problem that only political persecution entitles them to claim asylum, while many flee from gender-specific violence in their home countries. In the final essay in the

book, Venant Adoville Saague deals with the most important organizations for support and protection founded by African refugees in Germany: the Voice, the Africa Refugee Association, and the Refugee Initiative Brandenburg (*Brandenburger Flüchtlingsinitiative*).

People of African descent in Germany is a difficult topic to write about. The first problem is the terminology: while 'Black Germans' or 'Afro-Germans' have become the accepted terms, both leave out African migrants in Germany who do not identify with their host country's culture. In addition, both terms also suggest a group consciousness that was at best weak until very recently. Another difficulty is the question of numbers: Afro-Germans have always been a very small minority in Germany, but it is extremely difficult to make an educated guess about how many there were—or, indeed, how many there are today. Statistics about German citizens are colourblind. This lack of figures has ramifications. When interest in Afro-German history began in the mid-1980s, the goal was to show that people of African descent had always been a part of German society. The close connection between retrieving the ignored or forgotten history of Blacks in Germany, the formation of an Afro-German group identity, and the struggle against racism and discrimination in contemporary Germany is exemplified by the fact that the book *Farbe bekennen* triggered the founding of the ISD and ADEFRA, a forum for black women and women of colour, as well as newspapers and Black History Month in Berlin. Black emancipation in Germany is to a significant degree based on the project of writing people of African descent back into German history. All the books under review here have the long chronological focus which this task requires. The unifying framework, from Germany's occupation of African territories in the nineteenth century to the campaign against French African troops in the Rhineland and the fate of Blacks under Nazi rule and to the present day, is racism.

As a result, a dominant interpretation emerges in which people of African descent figure primarily as the perpetual victims of white Germans. This, however, is only part of the story, and such a limited perspective does little to put an end to the automatic outsider-status of Blacks in Germany which Zinflou and other authors justly complain about. In addition, it is not very fruitful. As Monika Firla points out in her article, anyone trying to present a balanced view of Black life in Germany instead of focusing solely on the negative aspects

must fear accusations of whitewashing the past. However, one can only agree with her statement that to refer to the examples of self-determination and integration that do exist is not to deny the history of racism.

There are many indications that the reality was more complex than the victimization paradigm allows for. W. E. B. Du Bois, for example, the African American sociologist, writer, and civil rights leader, who certainly did not ignore racism when he saw it, reported in 1936, after returning to the United States from a five-months' stay in Germany, that he was 'treated with uniform courtesy and consideration'. He added: 'It would have been impossible for me to have spent a similarly long time in any part of the United States, without some, if not frequent cases of personal insult or discrimination. I cannot record a single instance here.'[4] Hans J. Massaquoi's autobiography shows in even greater detail that the lives of Afro-Germans, while often difficult and sometimes dangerous, cannot just be reduced to victimization in a hostile, racist environment. Tina Campt's book suggests the same, although her focus does not allow for too many details about her interviewees' lives. The victimization paradigm, however, offers little room for these more mixed experiences. In addition, those who try to overcome its simplistic dichotomy make themselves vulnerable to the charge of denying the history and presence of racism in Germany. Afro-German history may have experienced an upsurge in the last decade, but talking and writing about race is still not easy in Germany.

[4] Quoted from Werner Sollors, 'W. E. B. Du Bois in Nazi Germany, 1936', *Amerikastudien*, 44/2 (1999), pp. 207–22, at p. 221.

MATTHIAS REISS has been a Fellow of the GHIL since 2002. He is the author of *Die Schwarzen waren unsere Freunde: Deutsche Kriegs-gefangene in der amerikanischen Gesellschaft 1942–1946* (2002) and is, at present, working on the image of the unemployed in England and Germany from the end of the nineteenth century to the 1980s.

'MORALISCHE SCHIZOPHRENIE'
GERMANISTS AND THE THIRD REICH

by Michael Butler

CHRISTOPH KÖNIG (ed.), *Internationales Germanistenlexikon 1800–1950* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 3 vols., lxxxv + 2,200 pp. ISBN 3 11 015485 4. EUR 428.00

HOLGER DAINAT and LUTZ DANNENBERG (eds.), *Literaturwissenschaft und Nationalsozialismus*, Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur, 99 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2003), viii + 452 pp. ISBN 3 484 35099 7. EUR 76.00

In his *Tagebuch 1946–1949*, Max Frisch records his first visit to Hamburg in November 1948. From his vantage point of Swiss neutrality and confronted with the ruined city, he muses on one of the fundamental moral problems thrown up by the recent horrors of the Third Reich:

> Zu den entscheidenden Erfahrungen, die unsere Generation, geboren in diesem Jahrhundert, aber erzogen noch im Geiste des vorigen, besonders während des zweiten Weltkrieges hat machen können, gehört wohl die, daß Menschen, die voll sind von jener Kultur, Kenner, die sich mit Geist und Inbrunst unterhalten können über Bach, Händel, Mozart, Beethoven, Bruckner, ohne weiteres auch als Schlächter auftreten können; beides in gleicher Person. Nennen wir es, was diese Menschenart auszeichnet, eine ästhetische Kultur.[1]

---

[1] 'One of the most decisive experiences—especially during the Second World War—of our generation, born in this century but still educated in the spirit of the last, has probably been the fact that individuals who are imbued with that culture, connoisseurs who can discuss Bach, Handel, Mozart, Beethoven, Bruckner with intelligence and fervour, can emerge without further ado as butchers, the very same people. Let us call what characterizes this type of human being an aesthetic culture.' Trans. by Michael Butler.

Review Articles

By 'aesthetic culture' Frisch means culture divorced from morality and politics, that is to say, a culture which operates in a hermetically sealed 'higher' sphere with little or no contact with the exigencies of day-to-day existence. Frisch dubs this fatal disjunction 'Kultur als moralische Schizophrenie'; he goes on:

> Wie oft, wenn wir einmal mehr von Deutschland sprechen, kommt einer mit Goethe, Stifter, Hölderlin und allen andern, die Deutschland hervorgebracht hat, und zwar in diesem Sinn: Genie als Alibi — .[2]

A year later, the Nazi nightmare seemingly forgotten, university Germanists throughout Germany celebrated the bicentenary of Goethe's birth in speeches and lectures that illustrated precisely the 'moralische Schizophrenie' that Frisch had noted. Their praise of Goethe's work as the embodiment of timeless values dismayed at least one returning émigré, Richard Alewyn. Dismissed from his Heidelberg chair in 1933, Alewyn had been one of the first victims of the 'Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des deutschen Berufsbeamtentums', passed in April of that year. This law, the first act of discrimination in what was rapidly to become an infamous series, had excluded him on account of his Jewish grandmother. Not surprisingly, the blithe celebration of Goethe's genius, perpetrated by many of the same Germanists who had actively collaborated or at least found an accommodation with the Nazi regime, struck Alewyn as deeply and dangerously dishonest. In a lecture entitled memorably, 'Zwischen uns und Weimar liegt Buchenwald', he echoed Frisch's insight, rejecting any attempt to divorce aesthetic concerns from their contemporary context: 'There is only Goethe and Hitler, humanity and bestiality. There cannot, at least for the generations alive today, be two Germanys.'[3]

[2] 'How often, when the conversation turns once again to Germany, does someone trot out Goethe, Stifter, Hölderlin, and all the others Germany has produced, precisely in the sense of "genius as alibi".' Trans. by Michael Butler. Both quotations from Max Frisch, *Tagebuch 1946–1949* (Frankfurt am Main, 1950), p. 326.

[3] Quoted in Jens Malte Fischer, ' "Zwischen uns und Weimar liegt Buchenwald": Germanisten im Dritten Reich', *Merkur* 41/1 (January 1987), pp. 12–25, at p. 25. See also Alewyn's essay 'Goethe als Alibi', *Hamburger Akademische Rundschau*, 1948/49, pp. 685–7.

Such warnings were not heeded. Given the urgent need to maintain the university system, it was inevitable that a high degree of personal continuity occurred. The established professoriate and the younger generation who had launched their professorial careers in the Third Reich by and large kept their posts or were restored to them after a brief process of denazification. Not surprisingly, very few of these individuals were interested in an honest reckoning with their own immediate pasts. A telling example of how unpleasant facts were swept under the carpet can be seen in the obituary for Hans Pyritz, published in 1958 in *Euphorion*, the literary–historical periodical he had helped to re-establish after the war. Readers are told how Pyritz never got over the blow of being 'unexpectedly' removed from his Berlin chair by the 'sentence arbitrarily imposed by the authorities in the Eastern zone who, although he had duly gone through a rehabilitation process, excluded him from the university for eighteen months'.[4] Perhaps influenced by the Cold War, the writer presumably deemed Pyritz's membership of the SA from 1933 to 1937, of the NSDAP from 1941 to 1944, and his work for the 'Amt Rosenberg' too insignificant to mention.[5] The obituary records without any sense of irony that Pyritz died embittered that 'the high calling of the intellectual is not fully recognized in the present'; he had gloomily believed 'that unless the form of culture that he [Pyritz] represented continued to exist, the earthly kingdom of our whole culture and thus our life must wither, and that the decline of the humanities presaged downfall and destruction (Untergang)'.[6] How this threatened 'Untergang' differed from the actual Nazi version is not discussed.

In such an atmosphere of moral myopia isolated attempts to question the Germanists' complicity with the Third Reich, such as Rudolf Walter Leonhardt's *Der Sündenfall der deutschen Germanistik* (1959), found little echo. The long overdue reckoning had to wait until the famous 1966 *Germanistentag* in Munich at which the younger generation — not without some risk to their own careers — at last tried to per-

---

[4] Ulrich Pretzel, 'Zum Andenken an Hans Pyritz', *Euphorion,* 52 (1958), pp. 440–54, at p. 441.

[5] The full title of Rosenberg's organization was 'Amt für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP'.

[6] Pretzel, 'Zum Andenken an Hans Pyritz', p. 454.

suade the older generation to examine critically their discipline and its involvement with National Socialism. This tardy and—for those Germanists who had been prominent in the Third Reich—highly reluctant process of self-reflection was hardly unprecedented in the early years of the Federal Republic. The widespread conspiracy of silence among the participants in Hitler's regime, whether they were enthusiasts, opportunists, or merely timid fellow-travellers, goes a long way to explain the belligerence of the generational conflict unleashed by the Student Movement in 1968, one of whose principal targets was precisely the autocratic power of the traditional *Ordinarienuniversität*. The Eichmann Trial in Jerusalem, the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trials of 1963/65, and the election of the ex-Nazi Party member Kurt Georg Kiesinger as Chancellor in 1966 ensured that the long suppressed past would erupt into the present with even greater force.

Over the last two decades, however, a mass of research has examined every facet of the Third Reich, not excluding the role of the universities in general and the role of *Germanistik* in particular.[7] In the latter field systematic work began in 1972 with the setting up of the 'Arbeitsstelle für die Erforschung der Geschichte der Germanistik' in the *Deutsches Literaturarchiv* in Marbach, and intensified under the directorship of Christoph König after his arrival in 1986. The *Internationales Germanistenlexikon 1800–1950* is the product of seven years' work by König and his team, who have drawn on the expertise of a large number of advisers and correspondents across the world. The result is an exemplary compendium, listing 'Biogramme' of 1,400 Germanists from 44 countries (a further 114 are included in the CD-ROM version). The start date of 1800 was determined by the first signs of the discipline's institutionalization, the cut-off point by the loss of a central focus as German studies began to fragment, with the FRG, GDR, and Austria going their own way, and the international dimension of the subject rapidly expanding. Some 12,000 Germanists—defined as individuals dedicated to the study of the German language and literature—were considered. These were whittled down

[7] See, in particular, Jost Hermand's indispensable *Geschichte der Germanistik* (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1994), and the Marbach Arbeitsstelle's publication *Zeitenwechsel: Germanistische Literaturwissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, ed. by Wilfried Barner and Christoph König (Frankfurt am Main, 1996).

by applying criteria based on the significance of their publications and of the institutions within which they worked, checked against the latest research on the history of the discipline. Special care was taken to include scholars independent of the universities, as well as disadvantaged or suppressed 'outsiders', such as women and Jewish intellectuals. Not surprisingly, given the development of the discipline, one third of the *Lexikon* is devoted to the twentieth century. Germany naturally provides the bulk of the entries with 691 listings, followed by the USA with 188, and the United Kingdom with 38.

The British representatives are a richly varied group. One interesting entry is that of Adolphus Bernays. Born in 1794 of Jewish parents—though he himself converted to Christianity—Bernays emigrated in 1816 from Mainz, took English citizenship, and in 1831 was appointed to the first chair of German Language and Literature at King's College London (KCL), a post he held for thirty-two years. He was succeeded by Karl Adolf Buchheim who had taken part in the 1848 revolution in Vienna. Hunted by the police, he led a refugee existence in Leipzig, Zurich, Brussels, and Paris before immigrating to England in 1852. He held the KCL chair from 1863 until his death in 1900. Such men remind us of the contribution made by native Germans to the early development of British German studies. Indeed, Buchheim can be seen as an honourable precursor of those refugees from Nazism—among them, Erich Heller, Charlotte Jolles, Hans Reiss, Karl Heinz Spalt (alias Keith Spalding), Peter Stern, and Siegbert Prawer—who helped to shape the discipline after the Second World War.[8] Of the formidably gifted pre-war generation, the redoubtable Eliza Butler stands out if only for the distinction of having her controversial study of German classicism, *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany* (1935), promptly banned by the Nazis.

The pre-publication furore over the *Lexikon* in the late autumn of 2003—which unhappily obscured the impressive historical range of the work—was not due to arguments about who was in and who was out, but concentrated on the biographical data assembled on Germanists active in the Third Reich. During a routine check for party affiliations, including a search of the membership records of the

---

[8] Unhappily, Keith Spalding is omitted from the *Lexikon.* Siegbert Prawer just missed inclusion presumably because his first major publication, *German Lyric Poetry*, dates from 1952.

45

NSDAP, lodged in the *Bundesarchiv* in Berlin, four-fifths of which are still extant, König and his colleagues were astonished to discover that the vast majority had much closer contacts with the regime than previously thought. Some cases, of course, were already well known. The most notorious example was Hans Schwerte, who assumed a false identity after the war and rose to be vice-chancellor of Aachen University in the 1970s. Until his exposure in 1995 by a Dutch journalist as *SS-Hauptsturmführer* Hans Schneider—supposed killed in action in 1945—his astonishing mendacity had successfully expunged all traces of his prominent role in Nazi cultural politics. In 1947 he had even remarried his wife and adopted his own children. More recently, the general public had been sensitized to similar scandals, not only by the constant unmasking of Stasi collaborators, but also by the revelation in September 2003 that Martin Broszat, the distinguished Director of the Munich *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* until his death in 1989, had been a member of the NSDAP. Thus it was a simple matter for the German media to fabricate a controversy. Johannes Saltzwedel's article in *Der Spiegel*, 'Von Goethe zu Hitler',[9] revealed the fact that a number of highly respected scholars and intellectuals were listed in the *Lexikon* as former members of the NSDAP. Three of them, in particular, had played eminent roles in the development of West German democracy and in the re-establishment of the study of German social, political, and literary culture as a humane discipline: Walter Höllerer, Walter Jens, and Peter Wapneski, the founding director of the Institute of Advanced Study (*Wissenschaftskolleg*) in Berlin.

The *Lexikon* documents the fact that all three joined the NSDAP at the age of eighteen or nineteen (Höllerer in 1941, Jens in 1942, Wapneski in 1940). The dates are important, for they indicate the synthetic quality of the media storm. Moral outrage may be a suitable reaction when confronted with the Goethe specialist, Karl Justus Obenauer, who gave his Inaugural Lecture in 1935 in Bonn in SS uniform, especially when we recall that it was Obenauer, as Dean of the Arts Faculty, who wrote the infamous letter to Thomas Mann in 1936, stripping him of his honorary doctorate.[10] Moreover, Obenauer was

[9] Johannes Saltzwedel, 'Von Goethe zu Hitler', *Der Spiegel*, 24 November 2003, pp. 174–7.

[10] Obenauer was eventually denazified in 1949 and, astonishingly, placed in Category IV ('nur als nominelles Parteimitglied zu werten'). However, he

born in 1888 and thus forty-five years old when he decided to cast his lot in with the Nazis. His fanaticism cannot be compared with the misguided enthusiasm of young men who were still children when Hitler came to power.

The controversy was fuelled, however, by the unfortunate reaction of Höllerer and Jens who both flatly denied they had been members of the NSDAP. Wapnewski claimed he could not remember, but merely asked König to acknowledge that he had been accused of demoralizing the armed forces (*Wehrkraftzersetzung*) in 1944. A note to that effect duly appears in his entry. Jens tried bluster—he called the whole matter 'absurd and senseless'.[11] For a man who had spent over half a century courageously fighting against the expedient amnesia of the older generation, this was an ill-judged response. It is true that in all three cases the Marbach team found no trace of either a signed application form nor any record of the *Parteibuch* being issued, receipt of which alone confirmed constitutive membership. However, before publication Christoph König sought legal advice on the matter from Michael Buddrus, a Research Fellow at the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte*. Buddrus's opinion was unequivocal: it was not possible for a name to end up in the Party's membership files if the individual concerned had not personally submitted an application form.

Although the fuss said more about the nature of the German media than it did about the suppression of unwelcome memories, the fact remains that nobody was forced to join the NSDAP. That so many did so, and with such alacrity, was due to a multiplicity of factors, impinging in different ways and to varying degrees on each individual. The central question that puzzled Max Frisch, as it still puzzles us today, is how educated people could have welcomed the infamous burning of the books (*Bücherverbrennung*) of 10 May 1933 and accepted the escalating violence towards their fellow Jewish citizens—no matter how seductive the initial nationalistic fervour was when Hitler seized power, and however anti-democratic and *deutschnational* their sympathies had undoubtedly been before and during the Weimar Republic. Instead, to their lasting shame, many leading Germanists were prominent in support of their students'

---

was not granted the title of 'Emeritus', but retired on full pension, backdated to 1945.

[11] Quoted by Saltzwedel, 'Von Goethe zu Hitler', p. 175.

'Aktion wider den undeutschen Geist'. For example, Hans Naumann in Bonn and Gerhard Fricke in Göttingen, both recent recruits to the NSDAP, gave appalling addresses at their respective events. Fricke was particularly virulent in his rejection of Enlightenment values and in his brutal attack on those writers to be consigned to the flames.[12] The task of a truly 'Deutschwissenschaft', he declared in an essay of 1933, was clear: 'Unfruitful, decaying, parasitical superficial layers will be irresistibly ploughed under and melted down in the core of the *völkisch* primal reality which was believed to have been extinguished, but which has broken out in a youthful glow. It is from this reality, which was before us, is above us, and will be after us, that we all draw our existence.'[13]

As is well known, the situation varied throughout the Reich, marked as it was by competing and often mutually hostile authorities. Attitudes that attracted no consequences in Cologne might not have been tolerated in the more rabid Nazi atmosphere of, say, Danzig. Indeed, we have evidence from Heinrich Böll that Nazi control in his home town of Cologne was certainly not total. In his brief autobiographical memoir covering the years 1933 to 1937, *Was soll aus dem Jungen bloß werden?*, he records that he was one of three out of 200 pupils at this school who were never forced to participate in Baldur von Schirach's *Staatsjugendtage* nor to join the Hitler Youth. His headmaster's disapproval was restricted to making the three tidy the school library on the Saturdays when their peers were training for their future

---

[12] See Hans Reiss's informative essay, '*Geisteswissenschaften* in the Third Reich: Some Reflections', *German History*, 21/1 (2003), pp. 86–103, at 91. Reiss is sceptical about the genuineness of Fricke's belated public apology for his conduct during the Third Reich, delivered before students in 1965, the year before he retired from his Cologne chair (ibid.). As an interesting example of moral confusion, the *Lexikon* records that Naumann objected to the removal of Thomas Mann's honorary doctorate, three years after consigning his works to the flames.

[13] 'Unfruchtbare, verwesende, schmarotzende Oberflächenschichten werden unwiderstehlich hinuntergepflügt und eingeschmolzen in den erloschen geglaubten, aber jugendlich glühend hervorgebrochenen Kern jener völkischen Urwirklichkeit, aus der wir alle leben, die vor uns war, über uns ist und nach uns sein wird.' Quoted in Werner Helden, 'Zwischen "Gleichschaltung" und Kriegseinsatz: Positionen der Germanistik in der Zeit des Faschismus', *Weimarer Beiträge*, 33/11 (1987), pp. 1,865–81, at p. 1,867.

role as cannon fodder. Nevertheless, since their family joinery firm was reliant on state commissions, even the anti-Nazi Böll family deemed it commercially advisable in 1936 to select one of their members to join the SA, if only nominally. The unfortunate victim, Böll's older brother, never forgave the family for this imposed indignity.[14]

Such personal anecdotes are instructive. They sketch out the pressures to which ordinary people were subjected; at the same time they indicate the small, but real spaces where integrity could be maintained. In the case of the universities, the pressure was perhaps greater, but the spaces were still there. One distinguished professor who stood his ground was Günther Müller at Münster. Although he joined the National Socialist *Lehrerbund* in 1935, he was in constant conflict with the authorities, both for his Catholic views (he was an ardent convert from Lutheranism) and his refusal to adapt to the NSDAP's anti-Semitic policies. Attempts by local Nazis to have him removed failed. In 1937 the Nazi opportunist, Heinz Kindermann, was appointed to a chair at Münster, ignoring the customary rigorous *Berufungsverfahren*, in an attempt to neutralize Müller's influence, especially with his students. That also failed until Müller himself gave up and accepted early retirement in 1943. Müller's steadfastly humane record led to an immediate appointment in 1945 to a chair at Bonn and, significantly, in 1949 to the award of an honorary Litt.D. by Cambridge University, the first German scholar to be so honoured after the Second World War.

Kindermann, on the other hand, is a case history of the dismal skill with which a careerist, untroubled by conscience, could reconstruct a new scholarly identity in the post-war period. Enormously

---

[14] 'Er nahm uns das bis zum Ende seiner Tage übel—und er hatte recht: Wir hätten wenigstens knobeln sollen.' ('To the end of his days he bore a grudge against us for this, and he was right: we should at least have drawn lots.') Heinrich Böll, *Was soll aus dem Jungen bloß werden? Oder: Irgendwas mit Büchern* (Bornheim, 1981), pp. 45 f. Böll also notes that, following the advice of a keen *Blockwart*, they obtained a swastika flag for their balcony, 'wenn auch eine kleine; man konnte ja an Tagen, an denen flaggen Pflicht war, an der Größe der Fahnen *auch* Gesinnung ablesen' (p. 45, emphasis in text) ('albeit a small one; on days when displaying the flag was compulsory, sentiments could *also* be deduced from the size of the flags.') English versions from *What's to Become of the Boy? or Something to Do with Books*, trans. Leila Vennewitz (London, 1985), p. 37.

ambitious, he had joined the NSDAP in 1933. His work during the Third Reich was frequently disfigured by the irrational biological claptrap of Nazi racial theory. Promptly dismissed by the Allied authorities in 1945, he soon managed to claw his way back to respectability, and in 1954 he was appointed to the Chair for Theatre Studies at Vienna—despite vigorous protests from the student body. So successfully did he manage to suppress his embarrassing past that in 1974 he was awarded the *Österreichisches Ehrenzeichen für Wissenschaft und Kunst erster Klasse* and a year later the *Großes Bundesverdienstkreuz* of the Federal Republic of Germany.[15]

As so often in the Third Reich, individual fates were shaped by arbitrariness rather than the concerted intentions of the regime. The authoritarian, *deutschnational,* arch-conservative Friedrich von der Leyen, for example, was forced into early retirement from his chair in Cologne in 1936 after being denounced by a student for alleged critical comments on the Third Reich. The Goethe scholar, H. A. Korff, on the other hand, joined no Nazi organization, but simply got on with his monumental work, *Geist der Goethezeit*, the first volume of which he had already published in 1927. The fifth and final volume appeared in 1957 by which time Korff was an emeritus professor of Leipzig University.[16] Despite the momentous years during which the work was written, the only post-war amendment that had to be made was in the second edition of volume 3 (1949): the original date in the Preface, 'Leipzig, am Tag der Einnahme von Paris' (Leipzig, on the day Paris was taken), was deleted, as was the dedication, 'Den Helden unseres Freiheitskampfes' (To the heroes of our fight for liberty), which was replaced with one to his wife, 'der Unvergeßlichen' (the unforgettable). Korff is the prime example of 'innere Emigration' in the university context. His career confirms the point that no one was forced to contribute to the Nazification of the system. There were always moral choices to be made. If leaving the university life was

---

[15] For a succinct account of Kindermann's chequered career, see Mechthild Kirsch, 'Heinz Kindermann—ein Wiener Germanist und Theaterwissenschaftler', in Barner and König (eds.), *Zeitenwechsel*, pp. 47–59.

[16] Korff stayed in his Leipzig Chair from 1924 until retirement in 1954. He did not support the GDR regime and refused to accept the country's *Nationalpreis*. On the other hand, there is no record of any oppositional activity in either dictatorship.

unthinkable, withdrawal into a purely scholarly world was one option; resistance was another, but a heroic and foolhardy one as the brave Munich students of the *Weiße Rose* demonstrated—to the shame of their supine professors. For far too many, ruthless careerism seemed the obvious course.

In the latter category come such major figures of post-war *Germanistik* as Benno von Wiese and Wilhelm Emrich. The latter joined the NSDAP in 1935, worked in Goebbels' Propaganda Ministry, and after the war succeeded in suppressing his anti-Semitic record,[17] and establishing himself as a major figure in Berlin's Free University. Benno von Wiese, already a professor at Erlangen in 1932, became an active member of the NSDAP in 1933, worked for the 'Amt Rosenberg', and rose to even greater prominence and influence in the Federal Republic. Other Germanists, of course, had no choice. For example, the Jewish scholar, Max Herrmann, founder of the *Theaterwissenschaftliches Institut* at Berlin University, was driven from his chair in 1933 and died in Theresienstadt. His wife, Helene, a Germanist in her own right, was murdered in Auschwitz. Walter Benjamin was driven to suicide. Luckier colleagues were merely dismissed, for example Walther Brecht, a friend of Hofmannsthal and Kindermann's Ph.D. supervisor. He lost his post in 1937 because his wife was non-Aryan. Others, mainly younger colleagues, emigrated to the United States and England where in many cases they went on to enrich German studies in their adopted countries.

The biographical data touched on here are neatly tabulated in the *Lexikon*. Clearly, however, even such diligently researched information needs careful interpretation. To take an obvious point: membership of the NSDAP in itself does not prove the individual concerned was a convinced Nazi, as Böll's memoir indicates. The distinguished medievalist Eckhard Catholy, for example, claims he joined the SS in 1933 (at the age of nineteen) and the NSDAP in 1937 in order to protect his physically handicapped brother. On the other hand, Elisabeth

---

[17] See Renate von Heydebrand's discussion of Emrich's 'militanter Antisemitismus' in her revealing essay, 'Zur Analyse von Wertsprachen in der Zeitschrift *Euphorion/Dichtung und Volkstum* vor und nach 1945: Am Beispiel von Hans Pyritz und Wilhelm Emrich', in Barner and König (eds.), *Zeitenwechsel*, pp. 205–30, at p. 220. The fact, listed in the *Lexikon*, that Emrich was a 'Blockleiter' in 1934 and from 1941 a 'Zellenleiter' points to more than merely nominal commitment to the regime.

Frenzel who, with her husband Herbert, produced the enormously successful handbook, *Daten deutscher Dichtung*,[18] after the war, was never a member of the Party. Yet she worked hard for the Nazi cause, above all in the 'Amt Rosenberg', and produced a stream of crudely anti-Semitic publications—despite studying in Max Herrmann's Institute from 1933 to 1940. In 1997 Frenzel was awarded the *Bundes-verdienstkreuz*.[19]

Though NSDAP membership taken in isolation says little about an individual, it is depressing to trace in the *Lexikon* the numbers of excellent scholars who felt able to continue their work in a deeply corrupt context without too much interference from their conscience or, it would seem, too much awareness of what was happening outside their studies. If 'moralische Schizophrenie' does not apply to the disreputable propaganda work produced by the Obenauers, Kindermanns, and Frenzels, it is a worrying phenomenon exhibited by many others, particularly in areas such as philology and textual editing which did not require even lip-service to Nazi ideology. Indeed, Hans Reiss claims that 'genuine Nazi writings accounted for no more than 10 per cent to 15 per cent of the output in the subject'.[20] To withdraw into the ivory tower also serves to maintain and legitimize the *status quo*. Perhaps the more worrying questions are, firstly, how even those who fell for the vapid irrationalism of Nazi ideology could still at times produce scholarly work of an impressive standard, and secondly, how such individuals were able to discard an evil ideology so smoothly after the war in order to pursue careers of considerable distinction, as if the Nazi regime had never occurred.

Christoph König's *Lexikon* presents us with a unique and invaluable tool to approach these conundrums. The wider picture, however, can only be understood by detailed and well-focused case studies.

[18] H. A. and E. Frenzel, *Daten deutscher Dichtung: Chronologischer Abriß der deutschen Literaturgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Cologne, 1953). The two-volume dtv paperback version (Munich, 1962) has long been an international bestseller with over thirty reprints.

[19] For a devastating assessment of Elisabeth Frenzel's record, see Florian Radvan, ' "… Mit der Verjudung des Deutschen Theaters ist es nicht so schlimm!": Ein kritischer Rückblick auf die Karriere der Literaturwissenschaftlerin Elisabeth Frenzel', *German Life and Letters,* 54/1 (2001), 25–44.

[20] Reiss, '*Geisteswissenschaften* in the Third Reich', p. 98.

Over the last fifteen years these have begun to appear in increasing numbers, and the volume of sixteen essays edited by Holger Dainat and Lutz Danneberg is an excellent example. In his Foreword, Dainat discusses the concept of memory developed by Jan and Aleida Assmann. Generational change, they argue, causes a shift from 'communicative memory', conveyed by contemporary witnesses directly to the next generation, to 'cultural memory' where historical objectivity grows at the cost of immediacy. Dainat's starting point is that in the case of *Germanistik* and its role in the Third Reich, there was precious little communication of memory at all from those personally involved. Instead, an all-pervasive silence characterized the discipline until the generational revolt of the late 1960s. The persistent difficulty for those wishing to reflect on their own praxis and its history is to see beyond the personalization of scandal and the distortions this can produce—of which the media controversy surrounding the *Lexikon* is a good example—to the structures within which individuals operate. Despite widened perspectives over the last decade, research still operates within a framework determined by the belief that *Germanistik*, as *the* 'Nationalwissenschaft', was peculiarly susceptible to Nazi ideology. This conventional view requires modification, and the essays in *Literaturwissenschaft und Nationalsozialismus* are contributions to this process.

The volume is shaped around six themes: the academic and political context in which university teachers in general had to function; institutional history and policy within *Germanistik*; the mediation of German literature in schools and among the educated public; the effect of new methodologies; comparisons with *Auslandsgermanistik*; and, finally, the transition from Third Reich to post-war German studies in both German states.

In his wide-ranging essay on the fate of the *Geisteswissenschaften*, Michael Grüttner traces the Nazis' attempt to control these disciplines. Although a fifth of all staff were dismissed and some two thirds of the rest joined the NSDAP—as Christoph König discovered, a much higher figure than was once thought—Grüttner's careful analysis shows how, in fact, only a minority fully embraced the racial doctrines of the regime and none were forced to do so. Due in part to the hostile rivalries between the various State and Party institutions involved in cultural policy, academics, and especially established professors, had more freedom of manœuvre than official pronounce-

ments might lead one to suspect. Nevertheless, the fact is that even covert opposition to the regime was practically non-existent. Conformity and inertia were the dominant characteristics, the fate of Jewish and other persecuted colleagues a matter of indifference.

One of the most fascinating contributions to this invaluable compendium is Holger Dainat's own examination of *Berufungspolitik* between 1933 and 1945, in which he shows how and why the Nazis failed to get a firm grip on the German departments. In over a third of universities there were no professorial changes at all, and in the crucial period 1933 to 1936, only eight chairs fell vacant. Such stability gave the Nazis little opportunity for manipulation, even if they could have agreed a clear policy among themselves. From 1936 university academics largely regained control of their internal affairs. Such an apparent return of autonomy, however, was only conceivable because of the quiescent stance of the universities themselves. Dainat shows how appointments made between 1938 and 1944 determined the direction of post-war *Germanistik* in the Federal Republic far into the 1950s. The depoliticization of West German universities that was apparent after 1945 actually proceeded on foundations already established in the Third Reich, and this despite the fact that practically all the leading professors were members of the NSDAP.

Wolfgang Höppner (on the history of the Berlin German department between 1933 and 1945) and Andreas Pilger (on the confrontation between Günther Müller and Heinz Kindermann in Münster) offer excellent micro-analyses to add sharp detail to Dainat's broad canvas. Kindermann's appointment, as has already been noted, was a prime example of scholarly standards subjugated to ideological concerns. His failure to counter Müller's influence was not only due to his lack of charisma, but it also illustrated the difficulty the Nazis could encounter when they attempted to remove an established professor of Müller's distinction. The machinations in Berlin reveal even more vividly the prejudice and vicious small-mindedness that can engulf intelligent men once they have lost their moral footing. The fate of Max Herrmann, who had bravely protested against the *Bücherverbrennung*, has already been mentioned, but gifted young Jewish colleagues like Richard Samuel were also sacked.[21] The ferociously anti-Semitic Franz

[21] He emigrated in 1934 to England, took British citizenship, and in 1947 resettled in Australia, where he became a major force in the development of Australian German Studies.

Koch, appointed to a chair in 1935, was in permanent conflict as joint Head of Department with Julius Petersen, who, until he was personally threatened, managed for a while to protect younger Jewish colleagues working on major projects under his direction. Despite such internal conflicts, Höppner nevertheless demonstrates that it was possible, if only at the edges, to temper the *Gleichschaltung* of *Germanistik* in Berlin. The Berlin case also shows that the Nazis did not, in fact, succeed in their aim of totally restructuring the universities nor in abolishing the traditional powers of the *Ordinarien*.

The contributions by Burkhard Stenzel, Bettina Goldberg, and Bettina Hey'l examine the phenomenon of the *Mitläufer*. Stenzel's perceptive essay throws light on the delicate, at times dubious, tactics undertaken by the editors of the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* to steer their prestigious journal through the menacing thickets of the Third Reich. Goldberg concentrates on a case study of three Berlin secondary schools to demonstrate that the dominant type of teacher was not the ardent Nazi, but the conformist, albeit one of a deeply national-conservative temperament. The latter outlook, rather than any fervent commitment to National Socialism, argues Bettina Hey'l, was shared by one of the leading authors of the Third Reich, Hans Friedrich Blunck. The first President of the *Reichsschriftumskammer*, Blunck cuts a sorry figure: a cynical opportunist characterized by naïve stupidity.

Four essays are concerned with methodological questions. Ralf Klausnitzer examines lucidly the attempt in the Third Reich to appropriate (and distort) the ideals and theories of German Romanticism, while Petra Boden discusses the complex reasons why sociological approaches to literature and history found no purchase in the study of literature. Rainer Rosenberg and Klaus Weimar both trace the fundamental change from an approach dominated by the history of ideas to the radically more inward methodology of *Werkimmanenz*. Rosenberg contrasts the monumental, *Von deutscher Art in Sprache und Dichtung*, edited by Gerhard Fricke, Franz Koch, and Klemens Lugowski in five volumes (1941)—the discipline's main contribution to the so-called 'Kriegseinsatz der Geisteswissenschaften', initiated by the *Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung*—with Heinz Otto Burger's edited volume, *Gedicht und Gedanke: Auslegungen deutscher Gedichte* (1942). He argues that what was truly scandalous about the former project was how the majority of leading Germanists supinely delivered essays that together appeared to con-

struct a history of German literature that developed teleologically to a climax in Nazi racial ideology. The contributors to Burger's enterprise, on the other hand, concentrated on close analytical interpretation — the first sign of a turning away from ideology. Despite the different methodologies employed, however, the two publications reveal the same restricted canon and the same reverential tone that militates against proper critical scrutiny.

Three essays offer comparative studies from the viewpoint of Switzerland and France. Klaus Weimar draws a differentiated picture of the two Swiss Germanists, Emil Ermatinger and Emil Staiger. He contrasts Staiger's intellectual fastidiousness, which soon caused him to abandon his initial flirtation with the Swiss fascist National Front and to reject any connection between literature and politics, with Ermatinger's more ambivalent stance. The contributions on French *Germanistik* by Gilbert Merlio and Elisabeth Décultot reveal the tension amongst French scholars after 1933 between the objective demands of their discipline and the emotional tug of patriotism. The latter points to the singular contrast with the situation in the Third Reich, that is, the continued presence in French universities of both conservative and left-wing Germanists which led to very different responses to the Nazi revolution across the border. Merlio gives a succinct account of how, after 1940 and the *Gleichschaltung* of French universities, attitudes of French Germanists swung between opposition, sullen conformity, and collaboration. The best joined the Resistance; the second-rate tended to collaborate.

The final two essays cover the transition from the Third Reich to post-war Germany. Johannes Volmert analyses two speeches addressed to students by the distinguished philologist, Jost Trier, dating from 1938 and 1947. Although he joined the NSDAP in 1933, Trier had no record of active Nazi sympathies. Though the earlier speech is in part ambiguous enough to be interpreted as both conformist and oppositional, underlying the two texts is a deeply conservative and idealistic vision of the university as an élite institution that must be kept uncontaminated by political manipulation. It was precisely this continuity of belief that enabled Trier to be one of the few Germanists to emerge from the Third Reich with his reputation intact. Indeed, he became one of the most influential philologists in the Federal Republic and co-founder of the Mannheim *Institut für Deutsche Sprache*.

Gunter Schundera's comparison of the two dictatorships of the Third Reich and the GDR produces interesting results. Schandera makes a good case for the assertion that the Nazi attempt to instrumentalize scholarship failed and therefore no such thing as 'Nazi *Germanistik*' existed. The comparison with the GDR is instructive. Here the system was more tightly controlled and thus more unified. All professorial appointments were influenced by the cultural policy of the SED. Nevertheless, despite the greater political interference and the ubiquitous activities of the Stasi, GDR *Germanistik*, too, retained a strong measure of scholarly independence, though one, of course, that eschewed the methodological pluralism of the West.

Finally, the volume is enhanced by two excellent bibliographies on 'Literaturwissenschaftliche Selbstthematisierungen 1915–1950' and 'Geschichte der Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften in der NS-Zeit'. Anyone who wishes to understand how *Germanistik* functioned within its institutional framework during the Third Reich could do no better than to start with this thought-provoking book.

The overall picture painted by *Literaturwissenschaft und Nationalsozialismus* is a dispiriting one. In the face of the most obvious challenge to the humane pursuit of teaching and research, opportunism and lack of moral courage led to the betrayal of the very principles of a university. In the face of discrimination and radically escalating violence towards Jewish colleagues and students, and other marginalized minorities, the majority of university teachers either threw in their lot with the new dispensation with little thought for the consequences, or kept their heads below the parapet and got on with their careers. Either way, Frisch's metaphor of 'moralische Schizophrenie' can be applied to them. The frightening ease with which the values of the Enlightenment could be traduced and abandoned by individuals of high intellectual achievement constitutes a warning that future generations would be well advised to heed.

MICHAEL BUTLER is Professor of Modern German Literature at the University of Birmingham. He has wide research interests in the twentieth century, especially German Expressionism, post-1945

German literature and society (including the former German Democratic Republic), and contemporary German-Swiss society, culture, and literature. Among his many publications are several studies of Max Frisch's plays and novels. Most recently he has edited (with Malcolm Pender and Joy Charnley) *The Making of Modern Switzerland 1848–1998* (2000) and (with Robert Evans) *The Challenge of German Culture* (2000).

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN LACKNER, *Hof und Herrschaft: Rat, Kanzlei und Regierung der österreichischen Herzöge (1365–1406)*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 41 (Vienna: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2002), ISBN 3 7029 0456 5. (Munich: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag), ISBN 3 486 64847 0. 472 pp. EUR 64.80

It has long been generally accepted by German-speaking medievalists that the medieval court cannot be seen purely as a phenomenon of cultural history. Rather, only a comprehensive approach which does justice to what Werner Paravicini has called the 'polyvalence of the court' between organizing everyday life, managing power, and providing administration can give a full view of its significance for society, politics, and the economy. This more or less constitutes a system of co-ordinates which allows recent research on the court to be slotted into a framework, and provides methodological and substantive orientation for future research contributions.

Christian Lackner's *Habilitation* thesis, which has appeared in print just one year after being submitted, focuses on the Austrian Habsburg ducal court at the end of the fourteenth century as a political and social construct, as a decision-making centre, and an instrument of government and administration. In the course of a comprehensive structural analysis, Lackner looks at offices, functions, and the practices of government, and at the phenomenon of the 'court' as the sum of the people who formed the duke's immediate environment. In relation to the latter, Lackner is particularly interested in the problem of the court's integrative function. The vast extent and heterogeneity of the Habsburgs' complex of territory and rule placed Albrecht III, Leopold III, Wilhelm, and Albrecht IV in the position of having to bind individual lands and their respective local power élites to the court. Questions concerning such issues as material supplies to the court, the court economy and household, and the cultural dimension of court life are, by contrast, deliberately relegated to the background.

In essence, the study is driven by two main interests: one concerning the diplomatics of the sources, and the other relating to

administrative and constitutional history. In his introduction Lackner outlines the profile of, and conditions governing, Habsburg policies in the time period under consideration. Thereafter, he sets himself the praiseworthy goal of bringing together for the first time the three approaches which he regards as having shaped research on the late medieval court for the last twenty years. These are, first, research on residences and itineraries, which Lackner regards as particularly significant; secondly, the history of chancery as developed in the dissertations written in Munich under Hans Rall's supervision; and thirdly, the prosopographical approach to the court in the tradition of Peter Moraw's Giessen school.

Each of these analytical concepts is used in the work which follows. The detailed second part consists of prosopographical chapters on court office bearers and the Court Council (*Hofrat*). In the second half of the fourteenth century, the office of the Lord Steward (*Hofmeister*) became the most influential, and its incumbents early gained special political influence. After the middle of the century, the second most important official was no longer the Marshall of the Household (*Hofmarschall*), whose sphere of activity was restricted to the court, but the Treasurer of the Household (*Kammermeister*), an office that was, developmentally speaking, less venerable. In addition there was the Treasury Clerk (*Kammerschreiber*). Formally subordinate to the Treasurer, he *de facto* had greater power in financial matters. From the sparse sources available, Lackner derives the insight that the office of the Treasury Clerk represented the real operational centre for income and outgoings. A lengthy section is devoted to the ducal council. In Austria, a 'sworn council' (*geschworener Rat*) is attested since the time of Albrecht I (1282–1308) at the latest. While it would be mistaken to see this as an authority in the modern sense, with clearly defined powers, a set number of members, and regular meetings, its direct participation in almost all areas of government and administration can be clearly demonstrated. Its field of activities stretched from diplomacy to financial planning and the administration of justice. Careful investigations of personal histories allow Lackner to identify phases of development in the council, and to establish a profile of its composition in terms of the social origins of its members and their status as clergy or laity.

This is supplemented by a section on ducal itineraries, which benefits from the results of recent research on residences and itineraries.

Lackner has consulted 2,250 original documents from more than 70 archives. In total, he suggests that up to 3,500 documents may have survived from his period. This large number of sources allows him, among other things, to document the dukes' movements in the period under investigation with hardly any gaps, and to analyse Vienna's function as a residence by addressing three complexes of questions: the architectural history of the Hofburg; the interment of princes in St Stephan's; and the emergence of aristocratic and servants' districts.

The third and final part of the study consists of a survey of the documents, drawing on the methods of historical auxiliary sciences (descriptive materials; the handwriting, language, and form of documents; and chancery marks), and of the history of chancery. At least from the middle of the century, the person who transacted chancery business bore the title of Chancellor, and in the decades that followed, he acquired a great deal of influence on the shaping of the duke's policy. In social terms, the incumbents of this office, most of whom had an academic training, represented the non-noble element at court. It is more difficult, by contrast, to find out anything about the lower echelons of the chancery staff. Only a systematic comparison of handwriting styles can provide information about notaries and clerks.

Lackner's study is highly readable and clearly structured, which makes it easy to use in practice. This also applies to the footnotes, which are limited to the most necessary references, but still at first glance convey an impression of the wealth of source material used. The careful procedures which the author employs, particularly in the areas of prosopography and diplomatics, allow him to extract maximum information from the sources, which clearly restrict his investigation. Summaries (*Regesten*) are not available for all the ducal records, and court regulations (*Hofordnungen*) and pay lists are missing completely for the relevant period. Thus it is not surprising that expenditure can be reconstructed only for individual parts of the court, and that amounts and spending structure are fragmentary and can be deduced only indirectly.

Given the difficult source situation, Lackner is forced to concede that 'there are many gaps in the image of the Habsburg court in the second half of the fourteenth century that is presented in this study'. We may, of course, doubt whether it is possible to understand the socially integrative function of the court, and, in general, 'all its com-

plex, political, social, economic, and cultural connections', without taking into account the crucial areas of ceremonial and festive culture. In the chapter on court art, at least, which features the dukes as patrons of the arts, Lackner could have discussed the integrative function of the court's cultural productions. Yet here he exercises self-restraint, and writes prosopographical chapters on a number of court artists (architects, painters, and musicians) on the one hand, and surveys the results of previous research on art, literature, and music history on the other. In his detailed summary Lackner could have made a more courageous attempt to synthesize the individual results achieved by his methodological pluralism, important and welcome though it is. Instead of a conclusion, we get a summary. Yet despite all the gaps—mostly caused by the lack of sources—this study represents progress in research on the court in the late Middle Ages. The full value of Lackner's work will presumably emerge when a number of studies of this sort have been written and can be compared. By then, it should also be clear whether research on residences, the history of chancery, and prosopography really can produce results that are compatible with each other, or whether it will seem preferable, in future, to choose between these methods.

KARSTEN PLÖGER has been a Research Fellow of the GHIL since 2003. His most recent publication is *England and the Avignon Poples: The Practice of Diplomacy in Late Medieval Europe* (2005) and he is currently producing a study of the discourse of boredom in early and high medieval Europe.

PETER WOLF, MICHAEL HENKER, EVAMARIA BROCKHOFF *et al.* (eds.), *Der Winterkönig: Friedrich V. Der letzte Kurfürst aus der Oberen Pfalz. Amberg, Heidelberg, Prag, Den Haag. Katalog zur Bayerischen Landesausstellung 2003*, Stadtmuseum Amberg 9. Mai bis 2. November 2003, Veröffentlichungen zur Bayerischen Geschichte und Kultur 46/03 (Augsburg: Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst; Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 2003), 376 pp. plus CD-ROM. ISBN 3 927233 84 6. EUR 18.00

This attractive volume is the catalogue of a major exhibition dedicated to the life of the 'Winter King', Frederick V of the Palatinate, and his consort, Elizabeth, which took the fashionable form of a rolling display, touring from Amberg to Prague, Heidelberg, and The Hague in 2003 and 2004. Sixteen essays by historians, art historians, and archaeologists precede the detailed catalogue description of the exhibits. The volume includes numerous high quality illustrations, many in colour, and is accompanied by a CD Rom with even more visuals.

Long dismissed as something of a political lightweight, lacking in judgement, manipulated by his advisers, and trapped into the disastrous Bohemian adventure which precipitated the loss of his lands and titles, a career in exile and a premature death, Frederick has latterly enjoyed a measure of revisionist rehabilitation, especially in Peter Bilhöfer's dissertation, *Nicht gegen Ehre und Gewissen*,[1] and in Brennan C. Pursell's *The Winter King*,[2] the latter of which was not available to the catalogue contributors. Frederick's charm and energy, the 'rationality' of his statecraft, and the broad-based appeal among the princes of the Empire of his advocacy of the principle of 'German liberty' against perceived Habsburg threats have been emphasized in these recent treatments. Lacking the argumentative edge of a monograph, the catalogue understandably does not advance a single view of Frederick, revisionist or otherwise. However, whilst they do not challenge the received opinion explicitly, the studies here

[1] Peter Bilhöfer, *Nicht gegen Ehre und Gewissen: Friedrich V., Kurfürst von der Pfalz – der 'Winterkönig' von Böhmen (1596–1632)* (Mannheim, 2000; new edn., 2004).
[2] Brennan C. Pursell, *The Winter King: Frederick V of the Palatinate and the Coming of the Thirty Years' War* (Ashgate, 2003).

can be said to contribute to the 'new view' of the Palatine Elector, clarifying and, in some cases, considerably enhancing our picture of the context in which the decision-making of Frederick and his entourage can be better understood.

In the early chapters, Peter Bilhöfer and Rosalind K. Marshall provide crisp biographies of Frederick V and his wife Elizabeth, whilst Peter Claus Hartmann gives an overview of the period's confessional dynamic. Essays by Johannes Laschinger and Peter Wolf focus on Frederick's birthplace, the Upper Palatinate, and its capital, Amberg. In a particularly original and interesting contribution, Wolf suggests that Palatine diplomacy on the eve of Frederick's fateful decision to accept the Bohemian crown was, at least in part, determined by a tradition of regarding the kingdom as being within the Palatine sphere of interest. A renewed connection between the two states was enthusiastically promoted by Christian of Anhalt, Frederick's *Statthalter* in the Upper Palatinate, who was foremost in urging Frederick to accept the offer of the crown, against the advice of many Palatine officials. It emerges that besides confessional solidarity and dynastic aspiration, a conscious appreciation of economic interest underlay this strategy. The economy of the Upper Palatinate was dominated by its iron industry and related trades. Christian's government had a controlling stake in the commerce in tin-plate, and Christian personally administered important iron mines, foundries, and arms factories. According to Wolf, Christian fully recognized the economic interdependence of the Upper Palatinate and Western Bohemia (most of the tin used in Amberg's industry came from the Horní Slavkov region). He also realized that Bohemia's rich resources could be used to save the ailing Upper Palatine iron industry. Wolf even argues that the prince may also have calculated that precipitating a conflict might allow him personally to profit from a rising demand for armaments. Not lost on the author is the irony that much of the shot with which Frederick's army was bombarded at the Battle of the White Mountain (1620) may have been previously supplied to the Habsburg forces from Christian's own factories.

Amberg was, though, always secondary to Heidelberg, the capital of the Rhenish half of Frederick's territories. Frieder Hepp describes the city in the early seventeenth century, whilst Annette Frese focuses on Heidelberg Castle's celebrated Mannerist garden, the 'Hortus Palatinus'. This 'Eighth Wonder' was created in the astonishingly

short period of 1616 to 1618 by Frederick's Huguenot garden designer, Johann Salomon de Caus, whose forte was the installation of elaborate water features and automata, as well as rarefied symbolism, here decoded. Briefly, of course, Frederick enjoyed another, even grander, capital at Prague. Three of the volume's essays examine Frederick's rule in Bohemia. Joachim Bahlcke places the Bohemian–Palatine 'experiment' in state-formation in European perspective. Eliška Fučíková concentrates on the fabled Rudolphine art collections, earmarked for at least partial sale by the cash-strapped Bohemian Estates in 1619 but retained by Frederick, in contrast to the décor of Prague's cathedral, which suffered severe iconoclasm. In an assessment of Frederick's governance, Jaroslav Pánek charts how the new king only ever enjoyed a narrow base of support among a highly factionalized Bohemian nobility. He antagonized those in the local élite who had assumed that he would rule as a *primus inter pares* and disappointed local expectations that he would bring in financial support for the kingdom. Short of cash, Frederick attempted to increase the royal demesne through confiscation of lands from Catholic nobles and prelates, and sought subsidies from foreign allies (including the Dutch), although tellingly, the total amount of monetary assistance delivered to Frederick represented only one tenth of the sums offered by Spain to his enemies. Pánek suggests that it was financial failure more than Frederick's insensitive religious policies which undermined his position, for even the notorious iconoclasm at St Vitus offended many members of the Estates less because of its sacrilege than for its perceived assault on a prime symbol of Bohemian statehood.

Turfed out of Bohemia after the Battle of the White Mountain, the exiled and banned Winter King became the focus of an unprecedented torrent of printed propaganda, both for and against his cause, which took the form of illustrated broadsheets and pamphlets, and which continued to be produced after his death. A large sample of these features in the exhibition and the genre is analysed in a contribution by Jana Hubková. The broadsheet was a 'multi-functional medium', Hubková notes, and one must pay attention to the complex interaction between its text, image, and, where indicated, melody. One genre of prophetic broadsheet linked the Palatine Elector to ancient and grandiose themes, anticipating that his Bohemian adventure would herald the re-conquest of the Holy Sepulchre, the conver-

sion of the heathen to Christianity, and the foundation of a world-wide Empire of Peace. Later in the war, the same prophecies were transposed to other figures, including Gustavus Adolphus. Corresponding to a section of the exhibition dedicated to Frederick's tenacious adversary, Duke Maximilian I of Bavaria, Michael Kaiser's chapter draws on recent scholarship, not least his own superb monograph on Bavarian strategy in the first half of the War,[3] to give a convincing analysis of Maximilian's attempts to marginalize Frederick after the imposition of the Imperial ban, and to promote his own claims to his titles and lands. Historians working with seventeenth-century diplomatic records often gloss over the intolerably verbose formulae of Baroque protocol which suffuse them. In a clever and original reading, however, Kaiser examines the shifting textual practice of the Bavarian chancery to argue that the diminution of Frederick's status in official documents was no accident, but the articulation of a calculated and systematic political and diplomatic strategy.

In a contrast to these historical essays on the Thirty Years War, Renate Ludwig, Manfred Benner, and Ulrich Klein provide a fascinating joint report on the archaeological survey of two of the possibly seven camps established by Tilly's forces during the siege of Heidelberg in 1622 on the hills overlooking the city. Excavations at the main site (designated 'Camp One') have resulted in over 2,000 separate finds, including weapons, belt-buckles, spurs, medical and writing implements, dice, drinking vessels, and 'Kipper-und-Wipper' coins and tokens, constituting the largest haul of its kind from the period. Whilst the finds add little to existing knowledge, they do provide an interesting and at times poignant witness to the *Alltag* of the common soldiery. Finally, three essays by Simon Groenveld, Willem Jan Hoogsteder, and Alheidis von Rohr treat the years of exile of the royal couple, and after the Elector's death, of Elizabeth and her children, focusing on their residences in the Dutch Republic and with particular reference to their art patronage.

As for the exhibition itself, to judge by the Amberg leg which I attended in September 2003, this was excellently curated. A splendid array of exhibits loaned from many countries occupied the modernized and extended gallery space of Amberg's Stadtmuseum. Among

[3] Michael Kaiser, *Politik und Kriegsführung: Maximilian von Bayern, Tilly und die Katholische Liga im Dreißigjährigen Krieg* (Münster, 1999).

the highlights, all illustrated in the catalogue, were Frederick's and Elizabeth's marriage bed from Montacute House in Somerset, portraits of Elizabeth sporting her characteristic fringe, the horoscope of Maximilian of Bavaria, and a delightful gouache of Elizabeth playing badminton with one of her ladies-in-waiting. This was clearly a major event for the erstwhile capital of the Oberpfalz, with trails to the museum from Amberg's medieval gates signposted by colourful sculptures of Palatine lions and painted lion-paw prints on the pavements. The exhibition was accompanied by a programme of concerts, public lectures, and guided tours of the town's historical treasures. Its organizers are to be warmly congratulated.

TREVOR JOHNSON is Senior Lecturer in History at the University of the West of England, Bristol. His main research interests are the social, cultural, and political history of Germany, and the culture of the Catholic Reformation in Europe. He is currently completing a study on Maximilian of Bavaria and the Thirty Years War.

MICHAEL ROWE, *From Reich to State: The Rhineland in the Revolutionary Age, 1780–1830*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), xi + 331 pp. ISBN 0 521 82443 5. £47.50 ($65.00)

Since the end of the nineteenth century the Rhineland has been a popular topic for historical research. This is no coincidence. As a border region, it experienced several different regimes from the end of the eighteenth century and, especially under Napoleon, these were associated with fundamental reforms and changes. After 1815 the Prussian state, which created the 'Rhine Province' in 1815, faced the task of having to integrate a region which differed clearly from Prussia in many respects, including religion. Precisely because the Rhineland was exposed to various strategies of modernization and reform as well as attempts to create an identity, historians regard it as laboratory of modernity which permits insights into the associated processes and their consequences.

In essence, there are two issues which, with slight changes, run through the whole history of the Rhine Province. The first concerns the long-term impact and consequences of French, or, rather, Napoleonic, policy. The second, closely associated with the first, is that of a Rhenish identity. Were the Rhinelanders really French as the Prussians liked to claim, or were they in fact Germans who were still wedded to the idea of the Old Reich? The French had certainly found the Rhinelanders to be Germans still wedded to the idea of the Old Reich at the beginning of the nineteenth century, while the Prussians repeatedly found them thus until well into its second third. Therefore any policy of making the Rhinelanders French or Prussian met with resistance.

These two questions concerning identity and how deeply Napoleonic rule penetrated the Rhineland run right through this interesting investigation by Michael Rowe, Lecturer in the Department of History at King's College London. However, there is another strand in the account which arises out of his selection of an unusual timeframe. Unlike most studies, which concentrate on the period either before or after 1815, Rowe's book focuses on the time between 1780 and 1830. This makes sense because continuities going beyond the French period, as well as breaks caused by the various regime changes, become much more visible. The third strand in the investi-

gation arises out of this chronological framework. Rowe draws upon the reflections of the Frankfurt school of research on the *Bürgertum* around Lothar Gall and his students, which stresses the significance of the old traditions of the urban bourgeoisie in the emergence of early liberalism. Examining the élites, their values, and view of self, Rowe contributes an important additional aspect to the debate about the old urban bourgeoisie's capacity for change.

The methodological consequence of this approach is that Rowe cannot be content to take the perspective of the state alone, but must always combine regime and society with each other. He succeeds impressively and, as a result, a picture emerges of continuities in a society capable of change. The work of S. N. Eisenstadt is not listed in the bibliography, but, ultimately, Rowe illustrates one of the many paths to modernity. In the case of the Rhineland, this was not a linear process, but mixed existing institutions, traditions, and values with innovations, thus making possible new beginnings and re-evaluations.

Rowe comes to this conclusion in a three-step process. He divides the period up on the basis of politically significant dates, and then investigates any structural changes. At the centre of the account is the Napoleonic period, which also takes up the most space. In the first part, covering the years from 1780 to 1801, Rowe looks at the Rhineland's social and political structures under the *ancien régime*. These include political representation and justice, the agrarian structure, the guild system, religion, and education. This panorama suggests that we are not dealing with a stagnating society at a time of transition. Rather, it was based on established mechanisms of conflict regulation which proved to be capable of reform. The French invasion and occupation of 1792 resulted in a pluralization of political concepts and ideas. This led to serious conflicts within the region, and, after 1797, also with representatives of the administration. These years were also characterized by military violence, price inflation, the loss of cultural assets, and the interruption of social benefits, for example, in the area of poor relief. The clearest break took place at institutional level with the abolition of the bureaucratic structures of the *ancien régime* and the re-organization of the administration. However, this was balanced by a large degree of personal continuity, although some of the notables at first kept the French at a distance. Yet once the princes had fled across the Rhine, these notables

assumed a mediating role and began to collaborate with the new rulers. To the extent that the majority of Rhinelanders modelled themselves on them and their behaviour, the French began to take more notice of the Rhineland, or even of smaller units such as the various regions and towns. A regional patriotism which fed on the old cultural and legal identities and affiliations gained the upper hand over a state-based patriotism, defined as loyalty towards a dynastic state. According to Rowe, however, this sort of state patriotism was not well developed in the Rhineland anyway, with the exception of the Prussian areas.

Rowe returns to this aspect of identity-building in his central chapter on Napoleonic rule (pp. 116 ff.). Here, for the first time, he discusses the issue of a definition of the Rhineland and Rhinelanders. In the perceptions both of foreigners and of the Rhinelanders themselves, there were no clear boundaries, at least before the French period. This applies in respect of both culture and society, as the 'Rhineland' was crisscrossed by many 'borders', such as those between languages and dialects. This is where French policy started with its attempts to impose homogeneity. It aimed for administrative integration, which resulted in a number of new institutions. The Rhinelanders accepted them because they were compatible with the existing system, and because they represented an improvement. The reform of justice, in particular, offered protection from arbitrary decisions, and the Rhinelanders valued the transparency which it brought so highly that they defended it fiercely against the Prussians after 1815. Rowe sees the rule of law as among the most important legacies of the French period in the Rhineland.

The dissemination of new institutions was linked with a policy which aimed to impose the French language throughout the administration and in education. However, during the Napoleonic period this policy did not assume a harder edge until after 1810. Attempts to impose the French language by force were foiled by conditions on the spot, which demanded at least bilingualism, because many people never learned French. Added to this—and here Rowe modifies the existing picture of an efficient, centralized, and authoritarian French bureaucracy under Napoleon—was French dependence on local élites. The Napoleonic system of clientage, however, meant that the local élites made only limited use of the restricted career opportunities on offer, and as a result, no new professional bureaucracy was

created. The Rhinelanders made such a small cultural investment, as Rowe describes their restraint in this area, not least because they had different concepts of education and training, which, unlike the reforms in justice, were incompatible with French ideas. Thus the Rhinelanders continued to prefer private schools and 'German' universities, and not just because of the language barrier. Even after the French period, they displayed no interest in maintaining French 'achievements' in the school and university sector, but returned to their familiar education systems.

How does Rowe interpret these findings in relation to the identity and loyalties of the Rhinelanders? From the outside, that is, from the perspective of the other German states, they became 'new French'. This perception was strengthened, especially in Prussia after 1815, when the population of the Rhineland opted for the institutions of the Rhenish Law. Beyond these attributions, the Rhinelanders, according to Rowe, preserved multiple identities which developed along social lines. Despite perceptions from outside, the Rhinelanders hardly became French. A number of factors suggest that there was no highly developed French identity, despite many mixed marriages. These include a limited willingness to invest cultural capital, in the sense, for example, of seeking an education at a French university outside the Rhineland, and the continued existence of social segregation by nationality. By contrast, Rowe perceives a much stronger European identity. The emphasis on empire during the Napoleonic period could pick up on a tradition which had developed since the Enlightenment. It would surely be worth pursuing this strand of identity through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially since prominent 'builders of Europe' in the twentieth century were self-confessed, dedicated Rhinelanders. It would also be worth asking, in connection with Rowe's work, to what extent there were points of contact and overlaps between this European identity and a patriotism for the Reich, as its survival and a loyalty towards the Habsburgs also continued to constitute part of this identity. The Rhinelanders did not become 'Germans', even if the severance of cultural connections, censorship of the press, and widespread French arrogance towards German culture led to a 'sense of German identity' (p. 129). Here, of course, the question arises as to what a 'German' identity was at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even contemporaries had difficulty defining it. If we accept Arndt's language

criterion, then the fact that French was accepted only hesitantly outside circles to do with trade points at least to one building block of a 'German' identity.

Finally, Rowe's finding that there was a multiplicity of overlapping, complementary, and sometimes contradictory identities, which had a spatial as well as social aspect, coincides with the results of studies on other border regions and immigrant societies, such as, for example, those by Anssi Paasi on Finland and David Kaplan on Canada. Unfortunately, Rowe does not look at his results in the context of this research. To be sure, it robs the Rhine Province of some of its fascination; on the other hand, however, it opens completely new research perspectives. After all, the continuing search for a single identity grows out of ideas and premises based on the nation-state, which, even when we are looking at the past, dictate that identity can be based on loyalty exclusively to one nation.

In the case of Rhenish identity, religious affiliation undoubtedly formed an important component both of how people saw themselves, and of how others saw them. Rowe devotes much space to this aspect, and expertly illuminates the forms and conditions governing religious life in the Rhineland. Here, too, his choice of timeframe proves to be useful because he can demonstrate changing relations between state and Church, as well as within the denominations. Rowe does not concentrate just on Catholicism, the denomination with the most adherents in the Rhineland. The French period brought ambivalences and tensions for all religions, in different ways. This applies in particular to the Jews, whose status improved markedly under Napoleon. However, limits were imposed on full equality, and thus some of the achievements of 1789 were reversed. For Protestants, too, the change of ruler and territorial shifts brought fundamental alterations, which often led to new conflicts with the Catholic neighbours. On the other hand, Rowe suggests, French rule smoothed the path to union between Calvinists and Lutherans because the new political situation and the creation of new communities in areas that had been exclusively Catholic forced them to co-operate.

For Catholics in the Rhineland, rule by the Catholic French represented both a culmination of the *ancien régime* and a new beginning. Napoleon continued the process of regulating and limiting religious life which the eighteenth-century reformers had started, although he was less negative about local forms of religious expression than they

had been. To be sure, the people of the Rhineland experienced the existing tensions between the state and the papacy when the Holy See delayed the appointment of bishops. Napoleon's restrictions on mixed marriages, which were more tolerantly regarded in Germany than in France, though each territory had its own regulations, also led to violent conflicts in Mainz, which continued until well into the nineteenth century.

The main area of co-operation between the state and the Church was education, as the state used the clergy both as teachers and school inspectors. Thus parts of the Rhine Province benefited from the continuation of an education policy which had already resulted in the 'highest literacy rates in Europe' (p. 27) under the *ancien régime.* It is all the more surprising, therefore, that Rowe does not subject to critical scrutiny the observation, voiced by a French official, 'that Protestants were, on average, better educated and wealthier than Catholics' (p. 149). One almost gains the impression that he does not entirely trust his own conclusions concerning the defining cultural force of the Catholic religion until well into the nineteenth century, which, in the Rhine Province, was not in insuperable opposition to Liberalism. For even if Rowe does not explore this aspect further, after reading his work one must ask about the significance of religion in the modern period, and on the way to modernity. The path taken by the Rhine Province represents one of a number of variants in which religion had a central social function. Ultimately, by dissolving the opposition between modernity and the Catholic religion, thus breaking through established ideas and perspectives, Rowe expands the research on the Rhine Province by more than just a new account.

UTE SCHNEIDER is a lecturer at the Technical University of Darmstadt. During the academic year 2004/05 she holds a temporary professorship at the University of Brunswick. She is the author of *Politische Festkultur im 19. Jahrhundert: Die Rheinprovinz von der französischen Zeit bis zum Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges, 1806–1918* (1995), *Hausväteridylle oder sozialistische Utopie? Die Familie im Recht der DDR* (2004), and *Die Macht der Karten: Eine Geschichte der Kartographie vom Mittelalter bis heute* (2004).

LOTHAR KITTSTEIN, *Politik im Zeitalter der Revolution: Untersuchungen zur preußischen Staatlichkeit 1792–1807* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003), 692 pp. ISBN 3 515 08275 1. EUR 76.00

Anybody expecting to find an account of Prusso–French relations between 1792 and 1807 in this study will be disappointed. This is not a history of foreign policy in the traditional sense, but rather, an examination of the political ideas governing Prussian policy during the revolutionary era. Kittstein's analysis is partly based on the following premise: in the long-term, social factors determine the behaviour of political actors. At the time, however, the freedom of the principal political actors to make choices is absolute.

Kittstein's premisses (pp. 12–26) are interesting and they are applied to an analysis of Prussian politics and political behaviour with a degree of success. In his study, Kittstein discerns a number of intellectual trends, for want of a better term, that dominated Prussian thinking during this period. One of the most important, which is a recurrent theme in the first part of the book, was the Prussian political élite's fear of the French Revolution (*Revolutionsfurcht*), something that was underscored by a deep uncertainty about Prussia's power and position, not only in the north of Germany, but, indeed, within the European system. *Revolutionsfurcht* was an especially important factor in Prussia's decision to go to war against France in 1792, fear that propaganda would infect the people, and that north Germany would somehow rise up and destroy everything that the court of Berlin held dear. The Prussian military élite even feared that the spirit of independence and freedom would creep into the rank and file if they were not careful. At the same time, however, this *Revolutionsfurcht*, which can broadly be translated as fear of the democratizing process and fear of anything that could undermine the monarchical system, seems to have been the reason why Prussia withdrew from the war in 1795 — the continuation of the war with France was putting the monarchy in danger — and why it attempted to build a North German neutrality zone as an 'anti-revolutionary protective zone' (p. 78).

The inclusiveness of this explanation is at times a little disconcerting; just about everything Prussia did between 1792 and 1807 is explained in terms of *Revolutionsfurcht*. There is no doubt a great deal in this, as Kittstein admirably demonstrates time and again, but other factors, if not overlooked, seem to have been relegated to a secondary

role in the author's determination to get his point across. Thus, although Kittstein convincingly demonstrates the role that *Revolutionsfurcht* played in the decision to go to war with France, it is a little surprising not to find any reference to T. C. W. Blanning's *The Origins of the French Revolutionary Wars* (1986), synthesizing Great Power relations and the origins of the war of the First Coalition. Kittstein, in other words, reduces the decision to go to war to ideological reasons when Blanning, for example, argues that it had little to do with ideology and much more to do with Great Power relations. It is an interesting debate and one that I think the author could have engaged with more substantially.

But that is perhaps asking the author to write another kind of book, when the reader is already faced with massive amounts of detail and information. This says a great deal about the thoroughness with which Kittstein has trawled the archives (not only in Berlin, but also in Paris, Vienna, Munich, Dresden, and Marburg) to produce an original interpretative work. The problem, though, is that there is so much information that at times it is difficult to know what to do with all this detail. At 620 pages of dense text, the detail risks overwhelming Kittstein's thesis. Moreover, it is written with a specialist audience in mind, that is, a very narrow readership perfectly familiar with the ins and outs of Prussian politics during the revolutionary era, and fluent in German, French, and English (there are extensive quotations in French, and to a lesser extent in English, throughout). Also, the author has a tendency to assume that the reader is familiar with the events and people he is talking about, which, with the exception of a handful of people, is not likely to be the case. There is a list of characters at the back of the book—although no index, which is unacceptable in a book of this length—but that does not really make up for this shortcoming. Nor is there a conclusion at the end that draws it all together. Instead we have a summary of the chapters, useful admittedly, but which hardly takes the place of a conclusion. It raises all sorts of questions about the usefulness of publishing this kind of work—a doctoral dissertation submitted to the University of Bonn. Would it not have been better to publish a series of articles and a more accessible synthesis of 300-odd pages, making it easier for students of the period to grasp the larger themes of the book?

In addition, the manner in which the findings have been structured produces some overlap in terms of chronology. Parts one

(Prussia and the French Revolution) and two (Prussia at the end of the revolutionary era) of the book largely follow a chronological order from about 1792 to 1806. In the third part of the book though, dealing with the Prussian *Regierungssystem* (system of government), Kittstein takes us back to the beginning of the reign of Frederick William III (1797) and then over a number of themes, such as the effectiveness of the *Kabinett*, the invasion of Hanover in 1803, Haugwitz's resignation in 1804, the path to war with France in 1805 and 1806, before going on to the limits of a psychological interpretation of power, and the Prussian reform movement before 1807. Readers on top of the subject would normally be able to take this in their stride, but at the end of the day, Kittstein's treatment is a little frustrating.

With these reservations in mind, Kittstein has teased out some really interesting themes: the analysis of the workings of the *Kabinett* and the personalities around them; the questions it raises about historians' interpretation of the Prussian reform movement, and its failure, prior to 1806; the expectation, unfounded as it turned out, that revolutionary France would somehow eventually return to 'normal' behaviour in politics and reach an accord with the other European powers; the depth of Prussia's own doubts about its place in the European system, as can be seen from the monarchy's failure to celebrate its one hundredth anniversary through fear that it might be a reminder that Prussia was not really a great, but only a second-rate, power. Much of this study is about how Prussia perceived itself, and if Kittstein is right, then it is obvious that the Prussian political élite were ridden with self-doubt, with fear and uncertainty, about Prussia's position in Europe and its future. Kittstein, in short, tries to go beyond the primacy of the foreign/domestic policy dichotomy that has recently been in vogue, largely in the English-language literature, and attempts to explain Prussian politics as an 'expression of a crisis of self-confidence among the political élite' (p. 21).

Kittstein also questions the reliability of the traditional interpretation of Prussia's decadent demise as due to the failings of what is commonly referred to in the English literature as the Kitchen Cabinet. He traces its nefarious influence back to a rumour spread by the Austrian ambassador to Berlin around 1800, Josef von Hudelist. This particular traditional interpretation as an explanation for Prussia's lacklustre foreign political behaviour during this period goes hand-in-hand with the disdain most historians have developed for

Prussia's policy of neutrality. Kittstein's contention—which is that the bad press received by the *Kabinett* was an integral part of the development of an anti-revolutionary sentiment in Prussia (the *Kabinett* was perceived to be pro-French)—is interesting, although I am not sure how much light it throws on the decision-making process at the highest levels of the state.

This work is, nevertheless, in some respects at least, an important study because it can eventually leave the reader with a deeper understanding of the political/ideological motives that governed Prussia's political élite. In other respects, though, it does so at the expense of geo-political considerations. We do not really get a sense, for example, of why Napoleon decided to invade Hanover in 1803 and why Prussia failed to resist the French incursion into its sphere of neutrality. Instead, we have a whole section on the Prussian élite's attitude towards Bonaparte in one part of the book, and another section on whether there was a conflict between Haugwitz and the Cabinet in another part of the book. I am not sure whether I have missed the point, or whether Kittstein thinks that geo-political considerations were irrelevant in the scheme of things. At any rate, any historian who studies Prussia during this period will be obliged to consult this work.

PHILIP G. DWYER is a Lecturer in the School of Liberal Arts at the University of Newcastle, Australia. He has published extensively on the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic period. Among his most recent books are *The Rise of Prussia, 1700–1830* (2000), *Napoleon and Europe* (2001), and *Talleyrand* (2002).

TILMAN FISCHER, *Reiseziel England: Ein Beitrag zur Poetik der Reise-beschreibung und zur Topik der Moderne (1830–1870),* Philologische Studien und Quellen, 184 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2004), 757 pp. ISBN 3 503 07907 6. EUR 64.00

Travel records have long played only a minor role in historical research, mainly because of their highly personal nature. Travellers were suspected of exaggerating or distorting reality in their reports. This has begun to change. At first, social and economic historians were mostly interested in travel writing, especially in the period of industrialization. Since the 1980s, travel records have been discovered by historians and scholars of literature as useful tools of research. In 1982 Michael Harbsmeier, for example, outlined their value for the history of mentalities.[1] Scholars read descriptions of journeys as a means of detecting a certain way of thinking. This allows them not only to make statements about what is perceived, such as another country, but also to gain information about the observer, for example, his social background, intellectual influences, and ways of thinking in his country of origin. Today, the study of travel literature is well established in the fields of history and literary criticism. Travel literature is seen as part and parcel of communicative structures within society, and as having an impact on world views and the exchange of ideas between individuals, groups, and societies.

So far, however, scholars in this field have focused mainly on the eighteenth century, exploring the development of the genre in the Age of Enlightenment. Less research has been devoted to the first half of the nineteenth century. What accounts there are have generally concentrated, in the case of German travel accounts about England, on standard texts by authors such as Hermann Pückler-Muskau, Heinrich Heine, and Theodor Fontane. In 1990 Peter Brenner went so far as to claim that despite the efforts of Heinrich Heine, who had introduced politics and journalism into travel writ-

[1] Michael Harbsmeier, 'Reisebeschreibungen als mentalitätsgeschichtliche Quellen', in Antoni Maczak and Hans Jürgen Teuteberg (eds.), *Reiseberichte als Quellen europäischer Kulturgeschichte: Aufgaben und Möglichkeiten der historischen Reiseforschung,* Wolfenbüttler Forschungen, 21 (Wolfenbüttel, 1982), pp. 1–31.

ing during the *Vormärz* period, the innovative potential of the genre had been exhausted by the middle of the century.[2]

Against this background, Tilman Fischer's splendid study, concentrating on the period from around 1830 to 1870, fills a significant gap. It makes an important contribution to literary research and to the history of Anglo–German relations in the nineteenth century. The book originated in a dissertation at the University of Marburg and runs to more than 750 pages. Based on an amazing number of sources (20,000 pages of documents), its main aims are to add many unknown travel accounts to the present store of knowledge (Fischer records the entire spectrum of contemporary travel accounts, such as travel journals and diaries), and to examine writing strategies, readers' expectations, and even their psychological dispositions during the period of modernization.

As the subtitle of his book indicates, Fischer discusses both general developments in the genre of travel literature, and the specific German encounter with modernity by concentrating on literary descriptions of visits to England. Located within a complex network of pre-conceived images, conventionalized writing strategies, and readers' expectations, the texts produced can be seen as products of a period in which significant experiences were stored, and the intellectual notions which are communicated in public discourse were expressed. Thus travel writing conveys attitudes towards modernity that cannot be detected in other historical sources.

The book is divided into two parts, reflecting the main issues it addresses. The first introduces the reader to the genre of travel literature in nineteenth-century Germany and its specific code. Fischer presents his sources, their authors, and the contemporary readers they were written for. His material consists mainly of travel reports about England written in German and published between 1830 and 1870. However, he also includes accounts that originated during this time but remained unpublished until the twentieth century, such as reports by the socialist writer Georg Weerth and the popular novelist Ida Gräfin von Hahn-Hahn. In general, Fischer distinguishes four types of travel literature: a) accounts written for the general reader; b) accounts written for professional readers; c) travel guides; and

---

[2] Peter Brenner, *Der Reisebericht in der deutschen Literatur: Ein Forschungs-überblick als Vorstudie zu einer Gattungsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1990), p. 491.

d) geography books and manners or customs books. He also gives due weight to the material prerequisites of the genre, that is, travelling itself. As a result of industrialization, travelling in Europe became easier in the nineteenth century as trains and steamships began to provide a reliable connection between England and the Continent. Travelling, especially for the purposes of tourism, became fashionable and affordable for wider social groups, but travelling comfortably remained the prerogative of the wealthy bourgeoisie and aristocracy.

This is the context within which Fischer locates his texts. What were the rules of the genre? Were there characteristic writing strategies? A thorough analysis of the theoretical discourse on travel literature in contemporary journals and dictionaries and a close reading of his source material allow Fischer to decipher the rules and conventions to which travel writers adhered, almost subconsciously, during the nineteenth century. The guiding principles for recording one's experiences were, for example, the claims of veracity (*Wahrhaftigkeit*), directness (*Unmittelbarkeit*), and subjectivity (**Subjektivität**). The 'binding and supra-individual nature of the texts' (p. 13), the 'poetics of the genre', as Fischer calls it, thus emerge clearly from his account. As he looks in detail at the contemporary discussion about travel reports, Fischer explores the position of this genre in the social discourse, and, in particular, defines its social function. Literary travel reports, for example, counted as elevated popular literature, which was positioned somewhere between high literature and light fiction. Contemporaries clearly distinguished between academic and literary travel descriptions. Thus 'travelling for pleasure and writing travel descriptions for entertainment had to fight for social acceptance as legitimate phenomena in the public estimation' (p. 161).

Having outlined the material and conceptual framework of his study, Fischer in the second part focuses on one specific theme: perceptions of modernization within the context of nineteenth-century industrialization, and the role England played in this process for German observers. Fischer relies mainly on two types of travel literature: entertaining travel accounts for the general public, and academic reports for professional readers. Instead of merely summarizing the contents, however, like many such studies, Fischer analyses the production of images, stereotypes, and the patterns of argument

developed in travel reports, as well as the social role which these texts played in society. The author's intention is to clarify the 'constructive character' (p. 14) of travel literature by asking how reality was constructed and interpreted by means of language, current metaphors, topoi, and common patterns of interpretation and argument.

Linking his sources with contemporary academic texts and popular encyclopaedias, Fischer asks specifically how the German discourse on England shaped the Germans' knowledge and perception of that country in the period of modernization. It is well known that for contemporary Germans, England was the epitome of modernity. In the nineteenth century, Germans increasingly travelled to England for the chance of having a glimpse of what the future might hold, for they noticed a clear difference in level of development between Germany and a progressive England. However, the travellers disagreed about how to assess social changes in England. Fischer takes up this point and investigates how German travel writers judged the conditions which they experienced as modern. The author classifies reactions in terms of four dimensions: spatial, comparative, temporal, and structural. Fischer's analysis shows, for example, that in spatial terms, German travellers accorded England a central position in international trade. If, going beyond this, we look at the position of the country in comparison with other states, this assessment corresponds to a classification at the peak of the modernization process, giving rise to the use of superlatives and expressions of uniqueness.

Fischer then examines how experiences of the 'new time' can be observed and interpreted in particular areas by looking at themes and areas of perception specific to modernity, such as the political system, industrialization, the pauperization of large groups of the population, and progressive urbanization. He is not concerned to discuss whether the information about England presented by the writers of the reports was historically accurate, or to elucidate its position in the context of contemporary political movements. Rather, he concentrates on bringing out the theses, arguments, and modes of metaphorical presentation which recur with some regularity in the travel writing of this period.

Fischer brings out these patterns of language and argument clearly, using a great deal of illustrative material. Thus, for example, in the section on the political system, he explains the contexts in which

Book Reviews

England offered travellers 'a serious standard for comparison with conditions in their own countries' (p. 470). The travel writers have little to say about the issues of day-to-day politics in England, concentrating instead on 'judgements about the totality of political conditions with the intention of comparing systems'. Summing up, Fischer states that despite the comparatively long period covered by his investigation, he is able to identify a 'relatively manageable and historically stable reservoir' (p. 641) of collective patterns for dealing with and interpreting modernity in travel writing. This revises some of the views which have been held for decades (pp. 644 ff.). It is noticeable that the veracity of the experiences of England described seems to be guaranteed only if the individual author uses 'established models of perception' and topoi (p. 642) when describing his travels. And this, in turn, strengthens the structures of the genre.

The book contains a valuable appendix comprising an exhaustive list of travel reports enriched with biographical details of authors and their position in nineteenth-century German society. Not least because of this treasure-trove of information, Fischer's book is a highly recommended addition to the growing body of literature on travel writing. Leaving the well-researched Age of Enlightenment, it ventures into unknown territory and charts the development of German travel writing on a modernizing England in the nineteenth century. The study will be of great interest not only to students of literature but also to historians. Tilman Fischer's systematic research provides a foundation for further work, and makes a valuable contribution to the long-standing interest in the relationship between England and Germany.

EDITHA ULRICH is completing her Ph.D. thesis on 'England in den Darstellungen deutschsprachiger Reiseberichte vor dem Hintergrund der deutsch-britischen Beziehungen (1871–1914)' at the University of Jena.

ARNE PERRAS, *Carl Peters and German Imperialism 1856–1918: A Political Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), xii + 286 pp. ISBN 0 19 926510 0. £50.00

If one were looking for a German equivalent to Cecil Rhodes, Carl Peters would be an obvious candidate. There were few individuals, either in Britain or Germany, who placed their political influence, and ultimately their own lives, so exclusively in the service of the imperial idea as these two. To quote Rhodes's well-known sentiment, also cited by Hannah Arendt: 'Expansion is everything. I would annex the planets if I could.'[1] For Peters, who had a much smaller colonial empire to deal with, the idea of reaching out beyond the globe would perhaps have been too fantastic, literally.[2] But in fact, real and imagined, and thus irrational, motives for colonial expansion were not so far removed from each other. On the contrary, colonial fantasies played an important part in the global expansion of the imperial powers at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.

In *Economy and Society*, Max Weber had already pointed out that imperialism, by definition, was a chronic process of conquest, consisting of continuing annexation. The establishment of new colonies, the re-conquest of old ones, and the wars that constantly flared up as a result turned out to be ends in themselves. Ostensibly about trade, access to raw materials, Christian mission, political and economic domination, and military bases, colonial expansion also met a need to seek out the familiar among the alien, a lost home abroad. Carl Peters repeatedly hinted at this in his writings, even if only implicitly, and Cecil Rhodes's idealization of South Africa had no equal. In this sense, the imperial propagandists around 1900 clearly recognized that a relationship existed between nation and expansion, one to which recent research has been paying more attention, namely, the relationship between national, if not regional, ties, and the 'natural'

[1] Hannah Arendt, *Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft* (Munich, 2001; first edn. 1951), p. 286.
[2] On Carl Peters see also Christian Geulen, ' "The Final Frontier ... " Heimat, Nation und Kolonie um 1900: Carl Peters', in Birthe Kundrus (ed.), *Phantasiereiche: Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 2003), pp. 35–55.

will for imperial conquest. National affiliation, which, in the case of Peters was cultivated by exaggerating local ties—for example, by having a colonial monument to himself erected on Heligoland—was directly related to imperial identity. Hegel's world spirit thus found its counterpart in those world-political concepts which the European balance of power system had already perceived as too narrow, and politically too inflexible.

National history and colonial history complemented each other. They were equally parts of what Peters called the 'titanic struggle' for 'enough elbow room'. These quotations are taken from the penultimate issue of the journal *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung*, which ceased publication in the spring of 1943. It referred to Peters in order to equate Nazi *Lebensraum* policy, which preached the need for territory for natural expansion, with colonial policy. This was by no means completely far-fetched. Walter Frank, President of the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte, edited a three-volume edition of Carl Peters's collected works, published between 1943 and 1944. The most celebrated representative of Nazi historiography, he considered the discipline as an ideologically heightened 'fighting science'. Frank praised Peters as the pioneer of *Lebensraum*. The dashing colonial hero fitted only too well into the image that Nazism had of colonial rule: an empire was to be created because the logic of a consistently thought-out nationalism demanded it. It was no coincidence that Africa's indigenous population saw Peters as a man with blood on his hands, an anti-hero who could have provided the model for any number of anti-colonial novels, such as Multatulis's *Max Havelaar* (1860) or Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1902).

Yet, for all their contemporary fame or later notoriety, it was other colonial propagandists who, from the start, captured the attention of posterity, the general public as well as the academic world—Friedrich Fabri, Heinrich Schnee, Wilhelm Hübbe-Schleiden, and Ernst von Weber, to name just a few. Peters, by contrast, was, and frequently still is, described in the literature as a psychopath. However, this is the man who wanted to bring to Germany what he had seen France and Britain as having long since achieved: a national colonial policy which was taken for granted, and which required no justification for its function of transcending national borders through imperial expansion, and thus created an imperial mentality. Peters believed this was necessary for Germany in order first to overcome

the peculiarities of the German Empire, and secondly, to give it a realistic chance in the struggle of the powers to secure a place in the sun. In short, colonial policy, as Peters saw it, was not a project which, like so many others of its time, looked back to the past. Instead, it aimed directly for the future. The dream of a German empire was, to some extent, a colonial fantasy that was not totally separated from reality.

But how does one write the biography of an imperial propagandist of this sort, whose life was the subject of a film made during the Third Reich with Hans Albers in the leading role, but who has held little interest for historians in the years before and since? Arne Perras, whose study is based on an Oxford dissertation of 1999, takes a traditional approach, following strict chronological order in recounting personal and political events, and including the most important professional stations of the subject's life. Any other approach would presumably not have allowed him to do justice to the complex networks in Carl Peters's life, if his book is to be measured by the standards of a political biography. And this is clearly the author's intention, for he could have put other criteria, such as institutional history ones relating to the Alldeutscher Verband (Pan-German League), or the Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft (German Colonial Society) at the heart of his rich and well-sourced study. For Perras, however, Peters as a person is the crucial factor.

Born in 1856 as the son of a clergyman, Peters studied history and political economy, finishing his studies with a thesis on Schopenhauer. *Willenswelt und Weltwille* (1883) pays homage to the metaphysics of what can be done, and later found an equivalent in colonial policy, in particular, in considerations of settlement policy. After founding the Gesellschaft für deutsche Kolonisation (Society for German Colonization) in 1884, Peters, on behalf of the Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Gesellschaft (German East Africa Company) which grew out of the Society for German Colonization, acquired many of the coastal areas which were to form the basis of the later colony of German East Africa, covering an area of about 140,000 square kilometres. Bismarck, like the majority of the German population, was not at first enthusiastic about, or prepared for, such imperial adventures. But in 1885 Bismarck obtained for Peters an imperial letter of safe-conduct for the new colonial areas, which Peters attempted to extend to Uganda in connection with the spectacular liberation of

Emin Pasha. This, of course, failed because it was contrary to the terms of the Heligoland–Zanzibar Treaty of 1890. Unlike Britain and France, Germany became a colonial power overnight, so to speak. The following years were marked by a constant up and down in Peters's political fortunes. German Imperial Commissioner in the Kilimanjaro region from 1891, he was dismissed two years later because of strong criticism of his arbitrary and often cruel administration. On the instigation of August Bebel in particular, the Reichstag considered these accusations in 1896, whereupon Peters was permanently relieved of all duties and dismissed from the service of the state.

When Peters was forced to resign from the presidency of the German Colonial Society he moved to London, where he established a society for the exploitation of Rhodesia's goldfields. He did not return to Germany until after war broke out in 1914. The years out of Germany, spent partly in Britain and partly in Africa, certainly contributed to Peters's view of British imperialism as a model, but mostly as a rival. It was not too late for his successful rehabilitation in Germany, but this did not happen until the Weimar Republic, and especially the Third Reich, when a revisionist view was taken of the colonial period. Peters died in 1918, before he could take part in it personally. Walter Frank, however, took on the task of declaring Peters to be the greatest German pioneer of colonialism, in spite of his wholly unacceptable colonial administration and policies, and of the fact that he had several native villages burned down and his African concubine hanged.

The following could, in fact, well be the most interesting chapters in Carl Peters's biography: first, the continued survival of his imperial ideas after his death; secondly, his incalculable significance for the revisionist view of colonialism between 1918 and 1945; and thirdly, the duration of German imperialism, which, for a long time, scholars have not restricted to the core period of between 1884–5 and the First World War. Important waymarks of imperial thinking have been discovered before 1866. And in addition to the politically motivated revisionist ideas of colonialism after the loss of colonies in 1918, colonial fantasies, as mentioned above, which are interesting from a sociology of culture point of view, have also been identified after the Second World War. The children's song 'Neger, Neger, Schornsteinfeger' is just one of many examples of the long-term impact of the

imperial period. But what part does Peters's political biography play in this context? Arne Perras, whose book only touches upon this question in a few places and in two brief concluding chapters, would have made his study even more attractive if he had placed it into a larger context, examining Carl Peters and the problem of German imperialism as a whole, as well as his place in modern and current German and international research on imperialism.

Carl Peters was characterized by a restlessness which is frequently found in fictional colonial heroes, to mention only Kim in Rudyard Kipling's eponymous novel (1901), and Mr Kurtz in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. Thus the colonizer, in his own life, reflected the nature of imperialism, which for its part was no less restlessly greedy for ever new expansion. In her book *Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft*, Hannah Arendt described this phenomenon as a structural feature of both imperialism and its exponents. Both, she suggested, were obsessed with the notion that the rhythm of life could be found only in the constant acquisition of new colonial regions, and that saturation equalled death. On this point Peters was by no means purely a practitioner, even if he saw colonial practice as the only agency with the right to judge the essence of imperialism and its value. This was directed largely against the critics of colonialism, whom he accused of following what was happening on the periphery from the distance of the metropolis, and thereupon developing theories which had little to do with everyday life. On the other hand, in countless books and essays, newspaper articles and lectures, Peters repeatedly expressed his conviction that practical imperialism required a theoretical justification. It was simply a matter of the correct order.

And here the restlessness, sometimes recklessness, for which the propagandists of colonialism were criticized, was a distinct advantage, as they could present a *fait accompli*, thus de facto making imperial policy. A theoretical justification simply had to be provided afterwards, although this actually took care of itself. After all, if the law of movement, which saw every colonial expansion as fulfilling a principle preordained by nature and history, was a core element of imperial thinking, then the colonizer was merely acting as the total process of life required, indeed, demanded, of him. According to this view, imperialism was pursued for its own sake. Peters, in Schopenhauerian mode, placed imperialism in the total context of the world as an expression of the will on the one hand, and of the idea on the other,

seeing it as a consequence of the natural, sometimes metaphysically heightened, urge to approach salvation more closely by the recognition of both. In short, for Peters, imperialism was a project of modernity which was dynamically directed at the future, not the past, and expansively at the world, not integratively at the nation.

The intellectual biography of Peters, therefore, provides solid evidence to refute Hans-Ulrich Wehler's concept of social imperialism as a vehicle for integrative nationalism. This is not the first criticism to be made of Wehler's thesis, but it is a substantial one. Colonial expansion could, but did not necessarily, unify the nation; it could also split it. Reichstag debates at times of colonial crisis and scandal provide a convincing example, as the case of Peters shows. Arne Perras's intention in writing his political biography of Peters may have been not to push beyond the bounds of the explanations currently accepted for the nature of German imperialism and Wilhelmine *Weltpolitik*. Instead, it puts back into the foreground something that, in Heinz Gollwitzer's words, could be called 'world-political thinking'. Gollwitzer's important study of the same name, which has not yet been superseded, shows where the radicalism of this thinking could lead. He quotes the words of Peters, who claimed that he knew three goals 'which it is worth running the risk of a world war to achieve'.[3] Carl Peters, however, kept these goals to himself.

[3] Heinz Gollwitzer, *Geschichte des weltpolitischen Denkens*, 2 vols. (Göttingen, 1972, 1982), vol. 2, p. 236.

BENEDIKT STUCHTEY is Deputy Director of the GHIL. He is currently working on anti-colonialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in a comparative perspective and his most recent publication is (ed.), *Science across the European Empires, 1800–1950* (2005).

GERD HANKEL, *Die Leipziger Prozesse: Deutsche Kriegsverbrechen und ihre strafrechtliche Verfolgung nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2003), 550 pp. ISBN 3 930908 85 9. EUR 30.00.

War crimes have come back into public view since the end of the Cold War; events in the Balkans and central Africa, and the formation of the International War Crimes Tribunals at The Hague and Arusha have shown that issues of morality, justice, and human rights are not the sole preserve of diplomacy and high politics. Aware that 80 per cent of casualties in wars of the present are suffered by non-combatants, as against some 40 per cent in the First World War,[1] historians and lawyers have started, or re-started, the work of researching the causes of extreme violence in war and the ways in which it has been restrained and penalized. For the half-century after 1945, the Nuremberg tribunal was the benchmark of international law in this regard; to many it will come as a surprise that the first attempt to prosecute war crimes came at the end of the First World War when the Allies demanded the extradition of alleged German (and Turkish) war criminals for judgement before an international tribunal. German officers were accused of waging ruthless warfare, killing thousands of civilians during the invasion of Belgium and France in 1914, cruelty to prisoners of war, U-boat warfare in which unarmed civilians and non-combatants were drowned, and laying waste to territory from which they retreated in 1917 and 1918. Largely owing to the British fear of destabilization in Germany, in February 1920 the Allies dropped the demand for extradition and acceded to the request of the German government to prosecute the accused before the Supreme Court in Leipzig, the *Reichsgericht*. The Leipzig war crimes trials, and above all the subsequent investigations by the *Reichsanwaltschaft* (Reich Prosecutor's Office), are the subject of this important book by Gerd Hankel, a qualified lawyer and former research fellow at the Hamburg Institute for Social Research.

The introduction skilfully sketches the history of war crimes prosecutions until Nuremberg, and provides a brief survey of the contemporary publications (mainly German condemnations of the Allied slur on the honour of the German army), and a review of

[1] Cf. Gerhard Hirschfeld, Gerd Krumeich, and Irina Renz (eds.), *Enzyklopädie Erster Weltkrieg* (Paderborn, 2003): 'Kriegsverluste'.

astonishingly meagre scholarly literature on Leipzig. Partly, this lacuna in the research was due to the fact that the records of the *Reichsgericht* and Reich Prosecutor's Office were kept in the Deutsches Zentralarchiv in Potsdam, and have only become easily accessible since 1990; they are now in the Bundesarchiv in Berlin-Lichterfelde. Mainly, however, it was because of the long shadow thrown by the war crimes of the Second World War and the judgements at Nuremberg.

The first part explains how the Leipzig war crimes trials arose: the extradition clauses in the peace treaty (articles 227–30), the German protests against extradition, and the provisional suspension of the Allied extradition demand. The bulk of the book consists of the second part, which deals with the Leipzig trials (1921–22), the investigations carried out by the Reich Prosecutor's Office, and the decisions of the *Reichsgericht* down to 1927. Within this, a chapter of almost 200 pages discusses the atrocities during the German invasion of Belgium and France familiar to readers of this reviewer's book.[2] There are shorter sub-sections on the laws of war and military doctrine. Other chapters discuss the maltreatment of prisoners of war, deportation and forced labour, and naval warfare. The final, third, part is on the 'disappearance' of the issue of war crimes in the interwar period and its re-emergence during the Second World War.

Of the original list of 853 alleged war criminals submitted to Germany by the Allies, 45 were chosen to be tried at Leipzig as an initial test of Germany's goodwill. In 1921–22, seventeen cases were heard, of which ten ended with convictions and seven with acquittals. The result was disappointing to both sides: in Germany it was condemned as victors' justice, while the Allies rejected the process as a farce and threatened to resume the demand for extradition. Hankel swiftly despatches one possible explanation of the failure of the Leipzig trials: the idea that the Allies contributed to the failure to prosecute more than ten war criminals by their own lack of energy because of a bad conscience over Allied war crimes. As Hankel writes, the Allied wish for prosecutions was no mere diplomatic game or theatrical gesture to satisfy the public at home, but 'the expression of a deep-rooted conviction that after this war, the duration and harshness of

[2] John Horne and Alan Kramer, *German Atrocities 1914: A History of Denial* (London and New Haven, 2001).

which no-one had predicted, one could not simply return to the order of the day' (pp. 14-15). At the heart of it was the intention to apply 'a civilizatory achievement', the legal restraint on the violence of war, in order to prevent future war crimes (p. 15).

A great deal therefore rested on the court and the prosecutors. Failure to comply with the Allies could have had serious repercussions, as with the default on reparations. Yet finding former soldiers guilty, many of them illustrious senior officers, and sentencing them to prison, could have had equally destabilizing consequences within Germany. The biographical material on the staff of the *Reichsgericht* and *Reichsanwaltschaft* is fascinating. Many of the more important investigations of the atrocities were conducted by Paul Jorns, a judge who had presided over the collusion in the prosecution of the murder of Rosa Luxemburg; he joined the staff of the Reich Prosecutor's Office in 1920, and was promoted to Reich Prosecutor in 1925. He later rose to become Senior Prosecutor and Chief Prosecutor (*Oberreichsanwalt*) at the *Volksgerichtshof* until his retirement in 1941. Two other senior figures who worked on the war crimes investigations, Albert Feisenberger and Richard Metz, were Jewish, and were forced to resign from the service in 1933–34. The argument that the judicial establishment was motivated to reach its series of exonerations of war criminals by the desire for recognition by the traditional élites, although it is made only at the end of the book, makes sense to this reviewer, but it would have been better to support it with evidence. More generally, the *Reichsgericht* and Reich Prosecutors appear to act almost entirely in a political vacuum, except for the regular reports to the Ministry of Justice and the brief flurry of exchanges with government in the late 1920s. Were the lawyers really so apolitical, or does this reflect the lack of written records in the *Reichsgericht* files?

The explanation for the politics of the *Reichsgericht* lies, in fact, in German legal doctrine. Hankel shows how before 1914 the German government and army differed from the democratic nations in their implacable rejection of the international peace movement and of the developments towards humanitarian international law. The discussion of 'military necessity', that is, the need to commit an act illegal in international or national law, again shows the distinction between the German concept of *Kriegsräson,* which justified virtually any act in the interest of swift victory, and the acceptance of limitations on

military necessity by American, British, French, and Italian authors. There is a careful comparison of the international legal literature on the concept of 'superior orders' (the defence frequently attempted at Nuremberg), with a similar result contrasting German doctrine and practice with international opinion. The author concludes that the *Reichsgericht* maintained the fiction of massive partisan warfare in Belgium and found no injustice had been committed in the mass killing of inhabitants to contain it.

In the long central chapter there is much valuable material summarizing the salient cases before the *Reichsgericht*. One of these was the trial of Max Ramdohr, whom the Belgians charged with having arrested Belgian boys between the ages of eight and sixteen, kept them for months in dark cells, and tortured them in order to extract confessions that they had sabotaged railway lines. Much evidence was produced by the victims and Belgian doctors, but although Ramdohr himself confessed to the use of 'energetic' methods of interrogation, the court found him not guilty of grievous bodily harm and acquitted him: the evidence of Belgian children could not be considered trustworthy. What was lacking in this trial, namely German evidence to corroborate the accusations, was present in another: the case against General Stenger for having issued orders in August 1914 to kill all captured French soldiers, including the wounded. The emotionally charged atmosphere at the trial, the obvious bias of the judge to favour General Stenger and penalize instead his co-accused, Major Crusius, who was the chief witness implicating Stenger, and the illegal nature of the order, are brought out by Hankel with exemplary clarity. Stenger did not deny saying that the captured and wounded Frenchmen were to be killed, but claimed he had not issued an official order to that effect. Crusius was sentenced to two years in prison for manslaughter and loss of the right to wear the uniform of an officer; Stenger was acquitted. Why? The evidence of German soldiers attesting to criminal orders was rejected by the court as unreliable, because the men were untrustworthy Alsatians, or allegedly deserters.

In a third case, the killing of between 100 and 200 wounded French soldiers captured at Ethe and Goméry in August 1914, Hankel shows how plausible, coherent evidence given by German witnesses of the circumstances of the executions and the probable responsibility of certain officers was ignored by the court. Hankel cites further evidence of orders given by senior German officers, including gener-

als, not to take prisoners. Against Niall Ferguson's thesis of the widespread practice of such killings by all sides, including the British, Hankel points out the difference between the killing of captives in the heat of battle, as certainly happened on all sides, and the killing of captives after the battle or far from the battlefield; and between the issuing of orders by senior commanders as a strategy of annihilation, and spontaneous orders issued by NCOs or junior combat officers. Further comparative research will be needed on this.

The court also followed the principle that German military law took precedence over international law, even when, as with the Hague Convention, the German government had signed an agreement to incorporate it into domestic military law. This is proved by the 1916 edition of the commentary on the military penal code: 'Commanding power ... may explicitly or implicitly declare international law to be a part of its will, but it can also reject it in part or totally. It is therefore basically always our own law, and only our own law, that determines our way of war' (cited pp. 154 and 257). Seldom does one find such a frank admission of dissent from international law. As Hankel says in a circumspect comparative discussion, for several decades before the Great War German military law had significantly diverged from the position taken in other nations, and to that different path this book provides a valuable guide, based on a thorough study of the international literature in international law. With regard to the atrocities against civilians in the invasion, the Reich Prosecutor and the court voiced no doubts about the German army's line of 1914: orders to kill civilians were justified because the troops had been attacked by *'francs-tireurs'* (partisans), even when the court was convinced that the executed civilians had not been involved in the fighting.

Useful material is presented in relation to the deliberate devastations of the areas in northern France from which the German forces retreated in 1917 and 1918 and the displacement or forced evacuation of the population, and on maltreatment of prisoners of war, in some cases even after the armistice. As in other chapters, Hankel shows how evidence produced by the Allies was dismissed as propaganda exaggerations, and even where there was sufficient German testimony to convict the accused, the court generally decided to acquit. If no other legal argument could be found, then it was stated that the accused 'lacked awareness of illegality' ('fehlendes Unrechtsbewußtsein', p. 369).

Book Reviews

The many strengths, but also one weakness, of this book derive
from the source base. Hankel has analysed thousands of files of the
Supreme Court and the Reich Prosecutor's Office. Having used some
of these files, I know the complexity of the task, and admire the
author's knowledge of the sources. However, this was only one insti-
tution's perspective on the legal process, never mind on the wartime
events themselves. Only three documents from the Archives
nationales in Paris have been consulted, none at all in Belgian
archives, and few contemporary published sources from outside Ger-
many. This means that the discussion of the events which the Leipzig
court investigated is one-sided. To make up for this, Hankel could
have made use of *German Atrocities 1914*, which is listed in his bibli-
ography. This would have saved him from having to reconstruct the
events which the *Reichsgericht* investigated almost solely from
German soldiers' testimony. In both the Stenger case and that of the
killings at Ethe and Goméry, and in many others, Hankel would have
found further evidence and an explanation of the soldiers' conduct in
our study.

Nevertheless, much of this book supports, enriches, and occasion-
ally modifies, the findings of *German Atrocities 1914*. Hankel calcu-
lates that by 1927 the *Reichsgericht* ended the prosecution of over
1,700 cases, not 853 as we found. This included many names not on
the published extradition list of February 1920, and cases of common
crime such as theft. Many of those exonerated had been charged with
such serious crimes as mass killings, and Hankel is not overstating
the case to say that 'extensive legal interpretation, even a suppression
of justice and distinct bias' were needed to obtain this result (p. 104).
However, we differ in the assessment of the protests in Germany at
the Allied demand to extradite alleged war criminals in 1919–20.
Widespread opposition and vocal protests there certainly were,
orchestrated by the Reichswehr Ministry, the *Deutschnationale Volks-
partei* (German National People's Party), and other right-wing associ-
ations. But public opinion was far from united, and Hankel appears
to be unaware that the independent socialists even demanded prose-
cutions of Germany's war criminals (cf. *German Atrocities 1914,* p.
345).

At one stage Hankel drops his reluctance to engage with our
book, and, citing our work on the institution of the Belgian *Garde
Civique*, claims that we conclude that

> an unsuspecting and harmless Belgian population was rav-
> aged by a soldiery which committed crime upon crime in
> August 1914. This cannot be accepted as a generalization
> (*Pauschalität*), especially since Horne and Kramer term acts of
> warfare (such as the killing of hostages) as criminal without
> any further reasoning, which they were not in contemporary
> law (p. 279, fn. 616).

Three points in response. The first is that Hankel himself provides
ample evidence of harmless Belgian civilians, including manifestly
unarmed men, women, and children, having been killed in a great
number of incidents. We do not merely 'generalize', we provided
quite precise figures: 5,521 civilians were deliberately killed in
Belgium in the months August to October 1914 under the circum-
stances which became known as the 'German atrocities'. The gener-
alization we made was that for a combination of reasons, which can-
not be discussed at length here but were rooted in mentalities, cul-
ture, history, and the German commanders' view of 'military neces-
sity', in the shock of the confrontation with the destructivity of mod-
ern weapons, and in a very small number of incidents owing to the
participation of the *Garde Civique*, the German military committed
such acts in over 500 incidents in Belgium and France. In other
words, although there were major towns where such incidents did
not occur (like Brussels), they were widespread throughout the inva-
sion zone. Once we had done the transnational research, such a gen-
eralization was permissible, and in fact it was compelling: these were
'atrocities' and 'war crimes' by contemporary understanding (the lat-
ter term having been introduced in 1906 by the German–British inter-
national lawyer, Lassa Oppenheim). Secondly, the German perpetra-
tors called their victims 'hostages' only in a small minority of cases;
far more common was the justification (as at Dinant, where 674 peo-
ple were killed, one in ten of the population) that the victims were
alleged *francs-tireurs*, or were selected because they were men of mil-
itary age, or merely because they were Belgians and *ipso facto* 'guilty'
of supporting the Belgian military resistance. Thirdly, the question of
hostages was indeed somewhat unclear (see Hankel, pp. 268–74). The
taking of hostages was deemed illegal by most international experts
outside Germany, apart from exceptional circumstances; the killing

95

of hostages, however, was clearly prohibited, not only under the Hague Convention on Land Warfare (articles 46 and 50), but under national military legal codes. Germany's leading international lawyer, Christian Meurer, recognized this in his commentary on the 1899 Hague Convention: 'the harsh and cruel ... penalty' which the German army had applied in the Franco–Prussian War of forcing civilians to travel as hostages on the locomotives of military trains to prevent attacks was no longer allowed under the Hague Convention.[3]

As an analysis of the events of the war, this book is unreliable at several points. In his discussion of one of the most important events of the early months of the war, the destruction of Louvain, Hankel mentions the killing of 'several hundred' civilians (the figure is in fact 248), and summarizes the two mutually exclusive explanations by the Belgian and the German side as follows. The Belgian case was that the origin lay in German soldiers mistakenly shooting at each other as troops returned from the battlefield, creating a panic in which the officers lost control of their soldiers, many of whom were drunk. The German government argued there had been a *'franc-tireur'* uprising, timed to co-ordinate with the Belgian army's counter-offensive from Antwerp. In fact, the Belgian charge went much further: the Belgian commission of inquiry's report on Louvain alleged that German warfare consisted of a premeditated, systematic policy to inspire terror in the population. This is not a grave omission, since it is the *Reichsgericht* investigations, not the Belgian charges, which are at stake in this book. However, no attempt is made to evaluate the two explanations. Readers are left on their own to ponder what truth there might have been in the German accusations. The destruction of the university library of Louvain, the internationally known symbol of the 'German atrocities' ever since 1914, also receives no mention. No doubt this reflects what the author found in the Leipzig documentation, but it would have been useful to know why the *Reichsgericht* decided not to investigate those responsible for the burning of the library. Compared with this major omission, it is only a minor error to state that the German troops entered Louvain on 23 August 1914 (p. 206); in fact, it was on 19

[3] Christian Meurer, *Die Haager Friedenskonferenz*, 2 vols (Munich, 1907), vol. 2: *Das Kriegsrecht der Haager Konferenz*, pp. 244–5.

August. At other points, much valuable evidence of shootings is adduced, but without stating which events are referred to (e.g. pp. 220–21, in fact on Les Rivages, a part of Dinant). Some references are incomplete, and the reader cannot tell who the author of quotations was or the date and nature of the document (e.g. four references on p. 331).

Hankel states that it is not known how many German soldiers were killed or injured as a result of 'alleged attacks by the civilian population' (p. 107). It is true there was no contemporary published figure, but there was an internal estimate: in 1916 the German foreign ministry recorded that in the five Belgian provinces where such incidents had mainly occurred, *francs-tireurs* had caused 2,656 German casualties, with 536 men and officers killed (*German Atrocities 1914*, p. 125). In the absence of evidence that the casualties were caused by real *francs-tireurs* or merely by unidentified firing, this figure was problematic. Publication of the figure would have raised doubts about the entire official line, in relation not only to the principle of proportionality, but also to the claim as to the existence of a chimera.

The Treaty of Versailles did not plan to prosecute the former Kaiser Wilhelm II as 'Alleinverantwortliche[r] für den Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkriegs' (solely responsible for the outbreak of the First World War) (p. 10), but 'for a supreme offence against international morality and the sanctity of treaties'. The Allies made no statement implying the Kaiser was solely responsible for the outbreak of the war, but were attempting rather to hold the head of state responsible for the actions of his government. Given the constitutional position of Germany's monarch and his crucial role in the July crisis of 1914, this was not unreasonable. Neither the author's discussion of the legal literature on the responsibility of the Kaiser, which concludes that he was not legally subject to penalty or condemnation because he was not solely responsible and because the starting of war was not an illegal act, nor the objections of the American and Japanese representatives at the Paris Peace Conference to the notion of the potential culpability of a head of state, convinces this reviewer of the contrary.

Hankel is sometimes insufficiently critical of the evidence in the files. One soldier, for example, was interviewed on the events in the region of Liège in August 1914, and claimed that his battalion was shot at by civilians with hunting rifles and pistols. In consequence, some fifty inhabitants of the village were executed. Hankel takes this

to be a 'true account', since the statement was made 'shortly after the reprisal action' and was similar in content to many other statements made to the Reich Prosecutor's Office after the war. In terms of historical methodology this is problematic. Firstly, the similarity of witness statements is hardly surprising, given the phenomenon of a mass delusion, the *franc-tireur* myth complex analogous to the 'Great Fear' of 1789 described by Georges Lefebvre.[4] Secondly, Hankel appears at times to believe in the reality of the '*francs-tireurs*' of 1914, for which this particular statement allegedly provided proof. However, neither the village in question was named, nor the precise date. At least six weeks had elapsed before the interview (with an injured, seriously ill soldier who died shortly thereafter), and this makes it inferior to more immediate sources such as diaries and letters written on the day of the event. This is not to say that no civilians fought spontaneously against the German invasion, for there certainly were a few isolated cases. Ultimately, Hankel tries to have it both ways. He writes, correctly, of a '*franc-tireur* hysteria' among the troops, and acknowledges the phenomenon of 'friendly fire'. He finds that the German army waged 'a brutal war designed to terrorize the Belgian civilian population' in order to combat 'the imagined Belgian people's war' (p. 268). Thirdly, in the absence of corroboration from other sources, such as Belgian evidence, we cannot even be certain that fifty civilians were killed. In other words, this is a 'true account' of a mentality, rather than an event. If one reads the files in this light, then the depositions made by the soldiers are an immensely valuable source.

Nevertheless, the methodological weakness exemplified here—the lack of a rigorous transnational comparison—is far outweighed by the book's strength: the focus on the *Reichsgericht* itself, its politics, the contemporary response to it in Germany, and, above all, the rich evidence unearthed in the Reich Prosecutor's Office. Three technical points may be noted. The name index is not very helpful, for most of the names are today unknown; an index at least of place names would have been useful. The structure of the book is at times unnecessarily complex, and there are some repetitions of material.

Occasional flaws notwithstanding, this is a pioneering study, and an essential monograph for anyone working on the many important

[4] Georges Lefebvre, *La Grande peur de 1789* (Paris, 1932).

issues of war crimes and the laws of war. In his central tasks of analysing the work of the *Reichsgericht* and tracing the history of the first war crimes trials in world history, the author has succeeded admirably.

ALAN KRAMER is Senior Lecturer in Modern History and Fellow of Trinity College Dublin. He is currently working on cultural destruction and mass killing in Europe in the era of the Great War, 1912–23 and on Italian prisoners of war, 1915–19.

RICHARD J. EVANS, *The Coming of the Third Reich* (London: Allen Lane, Penguin, 2003), 584 pp. ISBN 0 713 99648 X. £25.00
RICHARD J. EVANS, *Das Dritte Reich*, vol. 1: *Aufstieg*, trans. by Holger Fließbach and Udo Rennert (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2004), 752 pp. ISBN 3 421 05652 8. EUR 39.90

Richard Evans is no new-comer to German history. But hitherto he has not been regarded as one of the large number of experts on the Nazi period. This is bound to make some of those experts suspicious, if not envious, that he should have been commissioned by one of the big (I am tempted to add: well-paying) names in publishing with such a major historiographical enterprise—a definitive three-volume history of those fateful twelve years. However, those of his colleagues who followed the notorious Irving trial are aware that he has already delved into the most hideous aspects of this period. His students and graduates know anyway that he would not shirk from tackling a historical phenomenon that held such power over both British history students and post-war Germany. In the past, Evans himself has been drawn to the darker sides of German history, as his studies on cholera in Hamburg and the history of the death penalty reveal. One day he was bound to emerge with a major work on Germany under the impact of the Hitler movement. And this is the day, which sees the publication of the first volume of three.

I think it is only fair to judge an author by what he sets out to do rather than by what the expert reviewer expects him to add to his own field of research. Too detailed a knowledge of the period can blur the overall view of the whole picture when it comes to explaining the inexplicable to the ordinary reader: how a man unfit for an officer career in the Great War could emerge as the powerful leader of his country, or how the Holocaust could have been possible in a civilized society in the mid-twentieth century. Evans is perfectly aware of the vast amount of research on this period, as his footnotes and bibliography show. His justification for making a further contribution is, however, sound: 'The number of broad, general, large-scale histories of Nazi Germany that have been written for a general audience can be counted on the fingers of one hand' (p. xvi). And this is what he sets out to provide—not a new interpretation, but a plausible synthesis of what has been produced in innumerable studies on all aspects of the Third Reich, on politics as well as on 'police and jus-

tice, literature, culture and the arts' (p. xviii). Facing such a large canvas he should be allowed a more selective approach. In the preface to this first volume he puts his cards plainly on the table. He wants to produce a narrative account, which, one might add, is not a forte of German scholars. He intends to make full use of statements by contemporaries, 'down to the ordinary citizen' (p. xix).

Evans does not claim that the road to 1933, the coming of Hitler, the would-be saviour of Germany, was pre-determined. Yet it was no accident either. Therefore, in his initial chapters, he tends to highlight only those strands which, combined and enhanced by wartime experience, were to culminate in the disaster of 1933: the deficiencies of the Bismarckian constitution, the obsession with power-politics, unbridled nationalism and anti-Semitism, the divide between the Social Democrats and the bourgeois parties, and so forth. This, of course, conveys the very impression he would like to dispel, that the road was mapped out after all. However, he does not subscribe, as he tells us, to the Bielefeld thesis that imperial Germany was doomed by embarking on a *Sonderweg* as the result of its lack of civic values and an antiquated social structure. As a social historian Evans gives credit to popular sentiment at the time, the awareness that 'Germany was the Continent's wealthiest, most powerful and most advanced economy' (p. 20).

All this came to a shuddering halt in the First World War. Evans could have made more of the wartime experience as a political catalyst. It was, after all, the war and its outcome that infected Hitler's mind, like that of so many others, and propelled him into the limelight. Surprisingly, the July crisis of 1914 and the war guilt issue, which were to overshadow the Weimar Republic and subsequent German historiography, are dealt with only in the German edition, in two and a half extra pages explaining the motives behind Berlin's decision to back Austria at all costs. This may be because of the author's explicit rejection of a moralizing tone, as he clearly states in his preface: 'I have tried as far as possible to avoid using language that carries a moral, or ethical baggage with it' (p. xx). No Whig interpretation of history then. Nor does he indulge in generalizations about the German national character, the German genetic code as it were, which have influenced eminent historians such as A. J. P. Taylor, and linger on in British tabloids up to the present day.

Evans is at his best when he explores the 'Weaknesses of Weimar',

sketching the ideological polarization of society and the culture clash between left and right. With hyperinflation, the whole value-system of society had been debased. Since the Anglo–American world is full of praise for Weimar culture, it is a welcome reminder from an English historian just how much the underlying cynicism of that culture alienated ordinary people and made them 'long for the return of idealism, self-sacrifice and patriotic dedication' (p. 111). Occasionally Evans makes splendid use of statistics, such as his comparison of the print runs of political newspapers, or the very different conviction rates for perpetrators on the left and right. Whenever the social and cultural historian comes to the fore, the narrative becomes more colourful, and yields more insight into the peculiarities of the period.

Hitler is the 'product of circumstances as much as anything else' (p. 161). Evans is absolutely right to stress that he was anything but an agent of the German bourgeoisie. On the contrary, 'Hitler conceived a violent hatred of bourgeois conventions, the establishment, rules and regulations' (p. 163). However, in the early 1930s this did not prevent the middle classes from throwing in their lot with a man to whom they would not entrust their daughter in marriage. Evans depicts Hitler as a Schwabing Bohemian who believed that 'art could change the world' (p. 167). I hope he will dwell more on this aspect of his rule in the forthcoming volumes: 'Politics as the art of the impossible', one might say. This explains, for instance, Hitler's preference for radical and violent solutions. In the last resort he was no opportunist. As to his rhetoric, Evans aptly observes: 'There were no qualifications in what he said; everything was absolute, uncompromising, irrevocable, undeviating, unalterable, final' (p. 171). From *Mein Kampf* he deduces that the *Führer's* ultimate aims were the drive for living space and the elimination of the Jews. The commitment of his followers was crucial for his success and the chapter on the stormtroopers is one of the most elucidating in the whole book.

According to Evans, if there is one overall clue to understanding Nazism, it is the significance of violence, both its ruthless application and the effect of terror as a means of intimidation. Not that this has been overlooked in German studies, but it has never been emphasized to the same extent as a way of explaining the lack of resistance. Here an outsider like Evans, who is not affected by German political correctness, is in a much better position to empathize with ordinary Germans at the time who did not have the guts to stand up to the

Nazi juggernaut, be counted, and then sent to the first makeshift concentration camps. In his effort to comprehend the evil spirit of the time Evans is prepared to employ the kind of intuitive language that a German historian is hesitant to use: 'Rampant masculinity was sweeping aside the squabbling, ineffective and feminized political factions' (p. 292). But how else to convey the appeal of Nazi propaganda to the younger generation, including its student wing, who joined the ranks of the Party's youth movement in large numbers?

In the end it was not Hitler who seized power—it was handed to him by the political establishment—but rather his followers out in the sticks. Evans clearly prefers the local scenario, for example, the town of Northeim, to describe how the Nazis gained control of the whole country in no time: the fiat of the *Führer* was rarely required. He clearly feels that the ordinary reader identifies more with the bottom to top perspective than with what is going on at the centre. In the end it comes down to the question of how to explain the mechanics of dictatorship to a democratic society which wants to believe that power resides within the local community. Again, the unleashing of unbridled violence is a crucial factor for grasping the *Gleichschaltung* process, the political take-over, or rather 'switch-over', at all levels of society: 'The widespread intimidation of the population provided the essential precondition for a process that was in train all over Germany in the period from February to July 1933' (p. 381). It is important to realize, as Evans has clearly shown, that the degree of popular enthusiasm for the new regime—part genuine, part stage-managed—was inconceivable without concomitant collective fear. I see this as his most important contribution on the eternally puzzling question of how it was possible to transform an unpopular democracy into a populist dictatorship within a couple of months.

The last chapter of this first volume carries the somewhat provocative, yet appropriate, title 'Hitler's Cultural Revolution'. Barbarous and destructive as it appears to us today, the approach to culture, the 'cleansing of cultural Bolshevism', gave people the feeling that the Nazis had a mission to fulfil which went beyond seizing and holding power for its own sake. Goebbels set in motion a pseudo-religious awakening when he called for a 'spiritual mobilization'. The bishops of both churches gave their blessing too. Populist culture can be as tempting as pop-culture. And it was not just ordinary people who were seduced. Evans unfolds the story of the philosopher

Martin Heidegger, who fell for the spiritual humbug of the new regime. Indeed, many intellectuals and artists misunderstood Nazism as the second romantic movement, destined to encompass the whole *Volksgemeinschaft.*

What is the author's final answer to the question of whether the unfolding catastrophe could have been averted? Hitler, or more to the point, Hitler's appointment, the result of 'chance and contingency' (p. 444), was not inevitable, but Weimar democracy was doomed nevertheless: 'A military regime of some description was the only viable alternative to a Nazi dictatorship' (p. 442). In the context of German historiography, which hovers around 'democracy versus dictatorship'—*tertium non datur*—this is a somewhat unorthodox conclusion, but one which I find wholly convincing. An authoritarian regime might not have avoided military conflagration on a limited scale. However, it would certainly have saved the world from the horrors of the Holocaust.

What, according to Evans, were the factors that brought Hitler to power? First, the effects of the Depression (hotly disputed by political commentators in Germany today, though, incidentally, also the view of the Foreign Office during the war). Secondly, the appeal to the electorate: Hitler's charisma and the dynamism of his youthful following. And thirdly, the 'substantial overlap between the Nazi ideology and that of the conservatives' (p. 448)—in other words, what Fritz Fischer has called 'the alliance of the élites', and Wilhelm Deist 'a partial overlap in aims'.

What is my final verdict? I would strongly recommend this book to my family and friends as the most informative and illuminating explanation of the Nazi phenomenon in preference to any other study on the market which might find more favour with my academic colleagues. The slightly extended German version (explained in a separate preface), which contains a few more details here and there (for instance regarding the handover of power at the end of January), might also satisfy some of my German colleagues who need no extra briefing, but reassurance that there are no unpardonable gaps. Nowadays new research on some minute aspect is unlikely to change our overall assumptions. But the young generation is in danger of forgetting the most important lesson that this period can teach us, namely, that Hitler was no second Napoleon and should therefore never be rehabilitated. In this context, to throw light on

the right kind of issues and to present them in clear, forceful language is more important than to mention every tiny exhibit of recent research. This is what the author has understood and achieved.

LOTHAR KETTENACKER was Deputy Director of the German Historical Institute from 1975 to 2004. His most recent book is *Germany since 1945* (1997). Currently he is completing a study of German reunification.

HENNING HOFF, *Großbritannien und die DDR 1955–1973: Diplomatie auf Umwegen,* Studien zur Internationalen Geschichte, 14 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003), ix + 492 pp. ISBN 3 486 56737 3. EUR 59.80
HANS-GEORG GOLZ, *Verordnete Völkerfreundschaft: Das Wirken der Freundschaftsgesellschaft DDR–Großbritannien und der Britain–GDR Society. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2004), xiii+ 309 pp. ISBN 3 937209 25 5. EUR 39.00

Of the few British people who knew the German Democratic Republic, many found it a far more familiar place—though not necessarily a more congenial one—than the Federal Republic. State-owned smokestack industry, social housing, sentimentality about proletarian culture, and down-at-heel public space and public services all contributed to a sense that the GDR had affinities with Britain which prosperous, Americanized West Germany did not. For those on the left, there were clearly political attractions, including the traces of Marxist culture to be found in a string of towns across Thuringia and Saxony, one of which had incongruously been renamed after the man himself. Marx may have been born in western Germany, but his tomb was in London, generously funded by the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED). The GDR—a socialist version of Germany which contrasted with the travails of the left in British society—acted, in Horst Domdey's words, as a 'drug'.[1] Alongside this left-wing perspective, however, there were other curious and ambiguous attractions. The GDR perpetuated a type of Prussian formality which appealed to a different constituency. The *Stechschritt* was still in daily use outside the Neue Wache on Unter den Linden, and there were still a Deutsche Post and a Deutsche Reichsbahn to lure nostalgic stamp-collectors and train-spotters. For most people in Britain, however, the GDR—if they thought about it at all—was a small and disagreeable part of Germany which came to produce startlingly efficient Olympic athletes, but which was otherwise hidden behind the Berlin Wall. Its spooky mystery could be enjoyed in safety through *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold* (1963) and later thrillers by John Le Carré. A less serious version of the genre was Roger Moore as 'The Saint', who remarked later in the 1960s: 'You know

[1] H. Domdey, 'Die DDR als Droge', *Deutschland-Archiv*, 26 (1993), pp. 161–9; cited in Golz, p. 10.

there are more People's Police in the German Democratic Republic than there are People's people.'

If not much popular attention was paid to the GDR in Britain, at official level the GDR did not even exist until 1973. The Ulbricht and Honecker regimes were regarded as illegitimate and democratically deficient. The Soviet Union, their sponsor and protector, was still the responsible power and official negotiating partner. Underlying the British position (and that of other Western states), however, was accordance with the Federal Republic's stance on the German situation. Through the Hallstein Doctrine from 1955, Bonn claimed sole right of representation of the German people, and threatened to sever relations with any state (apart from the Soviet Union) which recognized the GDR. Officially, the United Kingdom supported this position and the aspiration to German reunification, despite the fact that Bonn was still holding to the borders of 1937 and thereby implying a challenge to current Polish and Russian territory. Indeed, Britain's position with respect to the GDR was inevitably part of a triangle which included the Federal Republic, and part of the wider constellation of powers during the Cold War. Overall, British attitudes towards the GDR were characterized by official ostracism, minority interest and, in some cases, support, and from 1973 an unenthusiastic acceptance of the alternative German republic. The extraordinary scenes from Berlin in November 1989 excited much interest in Britain, but almost immediately the attitude of the Conservative government was of caution and concern about the prospect of a united Germany. So used had the British become to the division of Germany as a guarantor of peace and security in Europe and as a rein upon the Federal Republic within the European Community, that they were less than overjoyed about the rapid progression of events in 1990.

These and other British responses to the GDR are explored in detail and at length in these two complementary studies. Henning Hoff looks at a variety of contacts between the United Kingdom and the GDR from 1955 to the international recognition of the latter in 1973. A substantial early section presents the situation as it had developed from the end of the War to the mid 1950s. Hans-Georg Golz's book more or less takes the story onward to the collapse of the SED regime and the establishment of German unification in 1989–90. Here too, though, there is considerable scene-setting of the period before the Berlin Wall. Both books have enormous qualities of schol-

arship and understanding, but also strange flaws in construction and arrangement. In terms of content, Hoff's study is the more thorough in its archival base, drawing extensively on the Public Record Office (now the National Archives), other British collections, and GDR documents in Berlin and Bonn. However, the extraordinary level of detail and a tendency to repetition make it a stern read. By contrast, Golz writes a shorter book, based on the Berlin documentation and on a number of letters and interviews, and exhibits in it a lightness of touch and an ironic sense of humour. Dare one say that the latter may derive from his obvious relish in British affairs? The structural problems are these. Hoff has organized his material so that there is constant chronological backtracking. This is because each stage in the narrative—1945–55, 1955–58, 1958–63, 1963–69, and 1970–73—deliberately keeps the British and the GDR perspectives apart. Golz does something of the same thing, but here the main difficulty is that only relatively late in the book (p. 161) does the focus promised in the subtitle fix on the two 'friendship' organizations, DEBRIG (*Deutsch–Britische Gesellschaft*) and BRIDGE (Britain–Democratic Germany Information Exchange) and their successors after 1973, *Freundschafts-gesellschaft DDR–Großbritannien* and the Britain–GDR Society. There is thus an interruption of what is otherwise a lively chronological narrative. This may be because Golz's conclusion is that the friendship organizations were ultimately of very limited significance.

There is indeed a fundamental question for both authors about the real importance of low-level contacts between the two states, involving very small numbers of people. The answers to this remain only partial, but that probably cannot be helped. In both books it is clear that the British lobby for recognition of the GDR played little part in bringing about that recognition in 1973, which was the result of Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik*. However, the parliamentary pressure from Labour backbenchers and a few Conservatives and Liberals had meanwhile prepared the ground to an extent, and had encouraged the development of trade links with the GDR. Looking beyond 1973, Golz highlights the longer-term negative effects for the GDR regime of recognition by the United Kingdom and other capitalist states. Honecker, in particular, was prey to what Peter Bender has called 'the golden fishhook'; the more he travelled and the more he was seen consorting with Westerners, the more obvious became the gulf between the GDR's international standing and the virtual imprison-

ment of its population. If capitalists and social democrats were so bad, why were Politburo members so keen to meet them? And if Erich could visit his sister in the Saar, why should ordinary citizens not have similar opportunities? The SED's rhetorical notion of 'peaceful co-existence' as 'a form of class struggle', explained so well by Golz, may have assuaged the political consciences of the leadership, but it probably made no sense to the wider public.

It is hard to imagine a more thorough account than Hoff's of the twists and turns of British political and diplomatic reactions to the GDR, and of SED perspectives on the British political scene. If one leaves aside the naïvety of some of the Westminster Members of Parliament visiting Berlin, Dresden, and Leipzig, and the Marxist–Leninist cant of the East Germans, one is left with the impression that both sides actually understood each other rather well. Each was also very wary of what they saw as the machinations and hypocrisies of the Bonn government, particularly under Konrad Adenauer. As an example of a multitude of delicious quotations furnished by Hoff, Harold Macmillan in 1958 wrote to his Chancellor and his Trade Minister:

> There is a good deal of trade I think to be done with East Germany. Since we do not recognise the East German Government diplomatically, we are very much at a disadvantage. A slight absurdity of this situation is that we do not recognise the East German Government in order to please the Government of Western Germany. But of course the Federal Government of Western Germany do in effect recognise them, have continual diplomatic and trade relations with them and do a very large business (Hoff, p. 185).

Hoff charts in meticulous detail the growing number of visits to the GDR from the mid-1950s by MPs, particularly Labour MPs. Ian Mikardo was one of the most assiduous, with Coventry MPs, Richard Crossman and William Wilson, drawn in because of the close connection between that city and Dresden. Crossman was characteristically acerbic in his approach to his hosts. He condemned 'dictatorial socialism' and disliked the 'asiatic influence' demonstrated by Ulbricht applauding his own speeches. Many of the Labour left were, however, undoubtedly impressed by what they were shown in the

GDR, and far less impressed by West German Social Democrats who criticized them for engaging in dialogue with the SED. From a GDR perspective, the encouragement of visits was clearly in the cause of gaining official recognition from the UK, but it was understood (especially while Labour remained in opposition) that there would not be immediate results. The assessment of the Labour delegations from within the Foreign Office in 1957 was that

> their hosts are extremely skilled in summing up an individual and exploring any deficiencies of intellect or character. Very often their purpose is served if they can throw him only slightly off balance. Indeed they are not so stupid as to imagine that they can make a Communist out of a Labour Party politician in a fortnight. What they can do is to send back the victim more confused and woolly-minded than when he arrived (Hoff, p. 159).

While Conservative governments and the diplomatic service were displeased by Labour backbenchers commending the GDR and pressing for its recognition by the UK, they were fully aware of the realities and ambiguities of the situation. In June 1953, Churchill considered that the Russians had behaved with restraint in putting down the uprising. Selwyn Lloyd and others after him was of the view that 'everyone — Dr. Adenauer, the Russians, the Americans, the French and ourselves — feel in our hearts that a divided Germany is safer for the time being' (Hoff, p. 43). Macmillan certainly shared this opinion when he visited Khrushchev in Moscow in 1959, during the long-running Berlin crisis. Knowing that Adenauer was very mistrustful about British intentions, Macmillan none the less saw the need to talk with the Kremlin. Khrushchev was playing his own games, however, withdrawing from the talks because of toothache. Discussions behind the scenes caused him to reappear, claiming that a 'special English drill' had done the trick.

The West German position remained crucial, however, and prevented both Conservative and Labour administrations from formally recognizing the GDR. There were some particular low points, such as when, in 1956, an official from the GDR Ministry of Foreign Affairs tried to deliver a note to the British Consulate-General in West Berlin. The Foreign Office instructed:

> we cannot take cognizance of a communication purporting to
> come from the "Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the German
> Democratic Republic". The Note should therefore be returned
> if possible to the East German messengers next time they call
> at the Consulate-General (Hoff, p. 129).

When one of them did call again, the document was torn up in front
of him. While such ludicrous situations were occurring, however,
there was gradual admission on the British side that at least trade
connections were desirable. The first GDR exhibition in the UK—of
children's toys—took place in London in November 1957. A GDR
trading company was set up in Mayfair in 1959. In 1968 a BEA flight
took interested parties from London to the Leipzig Trade Fair, and in
November 1969 the Confederation of British Industry (not the gov-
ernment) came to a three-year trade accord with the GDR.

The Federal Republic was throughout a factor in British thinking.
As negotiations continued with difficulty on Britain's accession to the
European Economic Community (EEC), the curt view from Bernard
Ledwidge in the Foreign Office in 1963 was: 'If Adenauer helps to
keep us out of Europe the Germans cannot go on counting on our
support against Ulbricht. ... Germans ... understand threats better
than cajoleries and are not upset by blunt speaking' (Hoff, p. 334). In
the same year, before he became Prime Minister, Harold Wilson was
just as forthright. He told Khrushchev that 'We have no respect either
for Adenauer or for Ulbricht' (Hoff, p. 339). Once De Gaulle had
vetoed British membership, however, the GDR lost its trump card in
this respect, as the British endeavoured to mend fences with Bonn.

There are two strange imbalances in Hoff's book. He devotes a
considerable amount of attention throughout to SED blandishments
of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB). While it is helpful
historically to have these contacts detailed and documented, it is per-
fectly obvious that they were of practically no consequence. Golz,
who spends far less time on this feature of the situation, is clearer on
the insignificance of the CPGB in British politics. It is evident, too,
from both books that the GDR authorities themselves understood
this, despite the fraternal rhetoric and the doctrinal disputes. The
other odd feature is that, having charted the long-standing debates
about whether or not Britain should accord recognition to the GDR,

Hoff glosses the event itself, culminating in February 1973, very briefly in eighteen pages.

Golz's book provides a shorter but solid account of the diplomatic relations between London, Bonn, and East Berlin. However, his main purpose is to explore British and East German attitudes towards each other, as evidenced by a number of contacts, including the friendship societies. He is particularly strong in his analysis of British scholarship on the GDR, with a very thorough account of individuals, organizations, and publications, and acknowledgement of the known cases of information-gathering on behalf of the Ministry for State Security (MfS). He provides a nice analysis of English-language teaching and broadcasting in the GDR against a rather off-putting background of rigorous travel restrictions. He is also effective in conveying how a variety of people—prominent and less prominent—felt about the GDR. Those better known range from Richard Crossman to Nancy Mitford. Crossman, whom Hoff also quotes extensively, is here recorded in the following vein from 1971:

> I couldn't help heaving a sigh of relief that Germany is safely divided. A phalanx of 17 million Germans marching towards socialism is quite big enough for me. It is a relief to feel that the collective aspirations of the other 60 millions are being sapped by capitalist affluence and Western permissiveness. ... it's one of the most formidable Communist states. Now Germans, when Germans become Communists, they become 100 per cent Communist, it's a monolithic State, it's enormously powerful. I couldn't live there for a day, because I happen to be a decadent Western liberal from their point of view and it's a very illiberal place in that sense (Golz, pp. 196–7).

Nancy Mitford, two years earlier, seems to have regarded her visit to the GDR as a bit of a lark:

> The journey was simply amazing and I'm thankful I went. ... they were all so nice. Mr Friedlander the agent is a shrieker so you may imagine the jokes! Not always in the best of taste ... . Like in all Commy countries nothing works ... . I thought East Berlin vastly preferable to West, which is like one huge Oxford Street, the people are so much nicer. ... Check Point Charlie is

112

too sinister—a gun in your tummy wherever you look. And
we noticed that we were never left alone with anybody for a
minute or allowed out alone, not that one minded. So that's the
journey—I've seldom enjoyed myself more (Golz, pp. 183–4).

The real comedy in Golz's study is reserved for his narration of
events in and around the friendship societies, renegade British
Reuters correspondent John Peet and his journal *Democratic German
Report*, the CPGB, and more besides. We are introduced to a bizarre
range of GDR-fans, who squabbled amongst themselves and with
their SED sponsors, to the idiosyncratic secretaries in obscure offices,
to the branch of the Britain–GDR Society at Heathrow Airport, to the
controversial but appropriately named Jack Berlin, Secretary of the
Society from 1981 to 1989, and to the twinning of Blaenau-Gwent
with Bautzen. If there were pockets of support for the GDR in South
Wales, the situation in Scotland was even more developed. Golz
devotes a fascinating section to the Scotland–GDR Society, and has
some interesting things to say about the connection between Scottish
aspirations for devolution or independence and the GDR's attempt to
position itself on the world stage as separate and independent from
the Bonn republic. Golz also describes the arrangements made for
Burns Suppers in the GDR from 1983 onwards. He cites correspon-
dence from 1986 seeking permission to import into Dresden 75 bot-
tles of whisky and an unspecified quantity of frozen haggis. Here and
elsewhere, Golz acknowledges his debt to the work of Marianne
Howarth on Britain and the GDR.[2]

The authorities in East Berlin for the most part realized what a
shambolic crowd they were dealing with in the friendship societies
and the CPGB. They were not really under any illusions—either
before 1973 or afterwards—that they were consorting with anything
other than bit players. When they did try to give prominent good
publicity to the achievements of the GDR, however, they ran into
trouble with their own propagandists. A two-page advertisement in

[2] For instance, Marianne Howarth, 'Die Westpolitik der DDR zwischen inter-
nationaler Aufwertung und ideologischer Offensive (1966–1989)', in Ulrich
Pfeil (ed.), *Die DDR und der Westen: Transnationale Beziehungen 1949–1989*
(Berlin, 2001), pp. 81–98; and 'Freundschaft mit dem Klassenfeind: Die
Image-Politik der DDR in Großbritannien nach der diplomatischen
Anerkennung', *Deutschland-Archiv*, 36 *(*2003), pp. 25–34.

Book Reviews

The Times in December 1968 was greeted by John Peet as follows:

> I cannot remember having seen such an inept and amateur piece of publicity for a foreign state in a reputable British newspaper. If it were the first attempt of a newly-founded African state it might be excusable; as an advertisement for a highly-developed industrialised state it is inexcusable (Hoff, p. 448).

Both Hoff and Golz mention, but are perhaps a little neglectful of, two areas: espionage and cultural links. The former is undoubtedly problematic, as Golz explains at the outset: the use of the archives of the MfS is restricted in a number of respects. No doubt more could be learned from the documentation about GDR machinations in and with regard to Britain, but, as Golz points out, all the officially 'unofficial' contacts he describes in his book were closely scrutinized by the MfS and its views no doubt imbue the files which are readily accessible. Both authors do make reference to the development of cultural connections over the decades between Britain and the GDR, but there is a lot more to be explored here. The Christian dimension—exemplified by the reconciliation initiative between Coventry and Dresden—would add a different strand to the range of contacts discussed in these volumes. Paul Oestreicher, the former director of the Centre for International Reconciliation at Coventry, appears in Golz's book, as does the recently deceased Horace Dammers, former Canon of Coventry Cathedral, but there is little detail. Fortunately, that is provided elsewhere, in the work of Merrilyn Thomas.[3] Music, literature, and the theatre appear from time to time—the composer Alan Bush, a number of GDR authors, and actual and cancelled visits by the Berliner Ensemble—but there could be more detail and more analysis of this facet. There is no mention of the controversial exhibition of GDR painting which toured Oxford, Coventry, Sheffield, Newcastle, and London in 1984–5.

By the end of these two insightful and fascinating books we are still left with a paradox. According to Henning Hoff, the equation of the Federal Republic with 'Germany'—both by itself and by its

[3] Merrilyn Thomas, *Communing with the Enemy: Covert Operations, Christianity and Cold War Politics in Britain and the GDR* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004).

Western allies—exposed it to all the negative connotations of the recent past. The GDR in a sense 'lost' its nationality and could profit from anti-German attitudes. Hans-Georg Golz seems to agree in part, adding that British love of 'the underdog' played in the GDR's favour, particularly, he suggests, amongst those who chose to engage themselves with GDR affairs and came to dislike West German condescension towards the other German republic. More broadly in Britain, though the image of the GDR remained forbidding, characterized by a combination of two stereotypes: a residual but powerful anti-German discourse and a standard anti-Communist Cold War position. Between them, Hoff and Golz provide an invaluable account both of the trivialities of connections between Britain and the GDR, but also of the more substantial ways in which these connections revealed the legacies of the Second World War for the declining imperial power and the fragmented Germany, set against a background in which the major players were decidedly Washington and Moscow.

JONATHAN OSMOND is Professor of Modern European History at Cardiff University. He is the author of *Rural Protest in the Weimar Republic: The Free Peasantry in the Rhineland and Bavaria* (1993) and co-editor (with Patrick Major) of *The Workers' and Peasants' State: Communism and Society in East Germany under Ulbricht 1945–71* (2002). His current research is on the visual arts and politics in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Germany.

115

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Political Languages in the Age of Extremes. Conference of the German Historical Institute London, held on 26–27 March 2004, at the GHIL.

In recent years, historical studies of the relationship between language and politics are increasingly turning to what Eric Hobsbawm called the Age of Extremes, that is, the decades between the October Revolution in Russia and the end of the Cold War. So far, however, this research has taken place largely in isolation. Thematically, investigations are usually limited to individual countries, short periods of time, or partial aspects. Rarely does a scholar dare to look beyond language or national borders. If a comparison is attempted at all, then, at most, totalitarian regimes are compared with other totalitarian regimes, or democratic systems are compared with each other. Methodologically, too, the situation is dominated by a juxtaposition of unrelated approaches. Methods drawn from discourse analysis, the history of concepts (*Begriffsgeschichte*), and pragmalinguistics, among others, are used, with little consideration of their relative advantages and disadvantages. There is a lack of inter-disciplinary exchange and over-arching hypotheses which could make comparisons possible and guide future research on the use of political language in the twentieth century. The aim of this conference, organized by the German Historical Institute London and conceived by Willibald Steinmetz (Bielefeld), was to suggest ways of overcoming these shortcomings. It was attended by historians, linguists, and political scientists from eight countries (Germany, Britain, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, and the USA).

After the participants had been welcomed by the Director of the GHIL, Hagen Schulze, proceedings began with an introduction by Willibald Steinmetz. He pointed to the structural givens and long-term processes which had characterized political communication during the Age of Extremes. On the one hand tendencies which had begun during what is known as the *Sattelzeit*, that is, the period from the middle of the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, continued: democratization, ideologization, and the temporalization

116

of the entire vocabulary of political concepts. On the other hand, Steinmetz suggested, there were also new circumstances whose impact needs to be examined more precisely, including, in particular, the multiplication of the roles of speaker and addressee because of the mass media. The associated chances for interference between national(-language) communications have increased, as have, in parallel, attempts by governments to ward off 'enemy' political languages, as in the propaganda battles of the two world wars, and the ideological confrontations of the Cold War. This was followed by a theoretically orientated paper in which Angelika Linke (Zurich) looked at politics as linguistic performance. Political speech acts, she suggested, should fundamentally be seen as interaction between speakers and listeners. This concerns the forms and mechanisms by which credibility is created, stable roles constructed, and an emotional readiness for consent created. Not *what* is said, but *how*, and from what position it is said, Linke suggested, is crucial for political success in many cases. This applies as much to promises as to threats. The art of analysing political language, she explained, consisted not merely of using traditional rhetorics to expose speakers' manipulative techniques in the spoken or written language, but also of identifying the listeners' replies and role images to the extent that they can be deduced from the speakers' statements. In the discussion, the methodological difficulties associated with this last point were mainly examined, and it was also asked whether the model of communicative political practice presented by Linke does not, for its part, need to be historicized.

The first session, chaired by Lucian Hölscher (Bochum), looked at linguistic and visual forms of mass mobilization and the cult of political leaders in the 1930s and 1940s. Willibald Steinmetz (Bielefeld) used the propaganda duel between Marshall Pétain and General de Gaulle in the Second World War as an example of a competition for charismatic qualities. An analysis of their radio broadcasts showed that the language of family relations provided the central semantic reservoir out of which claims to leadership were justified and the favour of the French sought. Pétain's credibility as France's self-proclaimed 'father', however, suffered from the fact that as a speaker he found himself in a position which required him to speak ambiguously, whereas de Gaulle was able to perform in a more straightforward and thus more credible way. Emilio Gentile (Rome) looked at the reli-

gious dimensions of the political language of Italian fascism, which he designated *fascistese*. It is too simple, he suggested, to see the religious semantics and symbolism in fascism merely as a manipulative practice used by a demagogic leader to mystify the people. Rather, he said, religious language was a basic constituent of fascism. It functioned as a signal of recognition between fascists, and came to express their mythical worldview which saw politics as a total life experience. The iconography of the Stalin cult in the late 1930s was the subject of a paper by Judith Devlin (Dublin). In her analysis of an exhibition on Stalin's life, organized by Beria in 1936–7, she exposed references in the paintings to legends and anecdotes which formed part of the oral tradition, and to popular pictorial media in the Orthodox religious tradition. Thus the exhibition transmitted a visual discourse to the ordinary folk that subverted the official, written Marxist ideology for the initiated. This mytho-poetic idiom made a crucial contribution to the consolidation of Stalin's public role as Russia's leader. The discussion of the three papers looked, among other things, at the appropriateness of the term 'propaganda' for describing the various linguistic and visual practices discussed. Another topic of discussion was the extent to which, given what is known about fascism and Stalinism, it is possible to speak of a 'sacralization' of rule, at least during the totalitarian dictatorships of the twentieth century. Finally, it was pointed out that not only semantics and symbols, but also the narratives in which they are embedded, should be included in the analysis of political language.

Raphael Gross (London) chaired the second session on the policing of linguistic boundaries by governments, organizations, and individuals in the 1930s and 1940s. Igal Halfin (Tel Aviv) gave a paper on the linguistic patterns of interrogation, confession, and conversion in the interrogations of Communist Party members conducted by the NKVD, the Soviet secret police, during the Stalinist terror. Halfin described the protracted interrogations as a process of mutual probing and a search for formulas which, in the ideal case for both sides, could precipitate a conversion experience and thus lead to convergence in the language of both the interrogator and the person being interrogated. Patterns of language behaviour under conditions of terror were also the subject of the paper by Isabel Richter (Bochum). In her analysis of the records of interrogations conducted by the Gestapo in trials for high treason heard by the Nazi *Volksgerichtshof*

(People's Court), she drew attention to the linguistic survival strategies used by the accused. She interpreted their statements during trials and in clemency pleas after conviction as attempts to find a middle way between maintaining authenticity and reducing the sentence by demonstrating conformity and adopting the language usage that was, they presumed, required. The discussion of both papers concentrated on similarities and differences in the communication situations, and on the foreknowledge which those involved had of the rules governing what could be said in any particular situation.

Siân Nicholas (Aberystwyth) then turned to a different type of language politics, investigating the use of language by the BBC during the Second World War. The BBC imposed no strict line, either from a semantic point of view (vocabulary that was permitted or forbidden in the context of speaking about enemies and allies), or in respect of the correct tone for the broadcasting voice. Rather, the BBC kept up a constant juggling act, balancing the different demands of listener groups and broadcast professionals. Some wanted the enemy to be dealt with factually, while others wanted the Germans to be treated harshly, or with humour. In his paper on patriotic language politics, the construction of enemy images, and the discourse of alertness in the USA during the Second World War, Olaf Stieglitz (Cologne) looked at official and unofficial propaganda (especially text and pictorial material such as comics) as the outcome of a permanent process of negotiation between producers, transmitters, and ordinary citizens, who consumed the material in different ways. Using Foucault's concept of governmentality, Stieglitz argued against the state-centred, top-down notion of influencing behaviour which still dominates many studies of propaganda. Building on these points, the discussion returned to the need for a sharper analytical definition of the term 'propaganda' if it is to continue to be used. In addition, it was discussed whether the politics of language and information was used as a negotiating tool only in the democratic systems of Britain and the USA, as described in the papers, or whether this also applied, albeit in a weaker form, in totalitarian regimes.

The third session, chaired by Nick Stargardt (Oxford), looked at boundaries between private language and public discourse. Jochen Hellbeck (Rutgers, New Jersey) started by pointing out that the distinction between public and private itself is tied to particular histori-

cal situations, and that at least in the Soviet context to which he then turned, it was not a useful analytical tool. In a detailed analysis of diaries written by Soviet intellectuals and citizens in the 1930s, Hellbeck demonstrated that the writers could conceive of their own subjectivity only when it was integrated into a collective and its history, which is interpreted as progress. They were unable to maintain a private existence outside this history of the collective. The findings of Heidrun Kämper (Mannheim), who looked at diaries of dissenters and victims during the Nazi period, were diametrically opposed to those of Hellbeck. In this case diary-writing proved to be a means of camouflage, self-defence, and linguistic immunization against the rules of official language and terror. In the discussion it was suggested that the diaries of committed Nazis should also be investigated in order to allow a more meaningful comparison to be made of where borders are drawn between the concepts of subjectivity and community in the two totalitarian regimes. Emilio Gentile informed the conference that ego-documents of self-declared fascists drew clear boundaries between the private sphere and the community, which suggests that in this area there were differences between the totalitarian regimes.

Chaired by Melvin Richter (New York), the fourth session looked at definitions of friend and foe, in particular, the semantics of inclusion during the Cold War. Thomas Mergel (Prague/Bochum) compared the semantics of anti-Communism in the Federal Republic of Germany and the USA after 1945. Despite the constant flow of American ideas into the Federal Republic, Mergel argued, there were clear differences in this area. In the USA, Communism was presented as a quasi-religious anti-utopia, opposed to the American dream, and the Communist was seen as an enemy to be taken seriously, who believed in his world mission, while in West Germany a territorial coding of the Communist enemy predominated, along with comparisons with the Hitler regime. The construction of the GDR in the official language of the regime was the topic of Ralf Jessen's (Cologne) paper. He identified four semantic strategies by which inclusion and exclusion were signalled to the outside world at different times: temporalization (orientation by the transnational camp of progress); territorialization (restricting the concept of the nation to the territory of the GDR); scandalization (public branding of internal and external enemies); and homogenization (proscribing words which could have

signalled conflicts within the *Volk* or the 'socialist community'). The highly ritualized nature of all public speech in the GDR—Jessen used the expression 'ready-made communication'—meant that anyone who was prepared to accept the ready-made formulas could achieve (apparent) inclusion. The main question thrown up by the discussion was what methodology could be used to measure the effectiveness of the semantics presented in specific decision-making processes or in the everyday life of citizens.

Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey (Bielefeld) chaired the fifth session, which dealt with the ideological struggle for the use of political terms, and the increasingly academic nature of the discussion of political language from the 1960s. In a detailed analysis of statements by the Austrian politician Jörg Haider, Ruth Wodak (Vienna/Norwich) illuminated new, hidden forms of anti-Semitic language. These have replaced the old stereotypes, which were widespread before 1945 and have since been banished from public language. Innuendos, vague insinuations, wordplays and plays on names, and evasive switches into aggressive discourses of justification are just some of the techniques which the new anti-Semites use in virtuoso fashion. Their effectiveness is based on the fact that listeners know who and what is meant without it having to be explicitly articulated. Whether categories drawn from the traditional and new theories of rhetorics can be used to classify these techniques and generalize from them was one of the points raised in the subsequent discussion. Martin Geyer (Munich) looked at the sometimes stormy debates on the meaning of terms in the Federal Republic of Germany from the end of the 1960s. The conservative spectrum, in particular, was slow to accept that it was useless to insist on what they considered the 'correct' meanings of terms, and that they would be better advised to accept the controversial nature of political vocabulary as a condition of their own use of language. One question which was raised, but not satisfactorily dealt with, in the discussion referred to possible mutual influences between the party-political debate and research in historical semantics which was being pursued more intensively at the same time. A similar question was approached from a history of historiography perspective, and in relation to Britain, by Gareth Stedman Jones (Cambridge). He explored the reasons for the success of the Anglo-Marxist paradigm of historiography until the 1970s, and its sudden collapse thereafter. He traced the roots of this paradigm

back to Carlyle's notion of the historical power of the voiceless masses and a corresponding preverbal concept of experience. During the 1970s, the narratives based on these intellectual assumptions were discredited by processes from inside and outside the discipline, namely, the feminist movement and the populist racism of an Enoch Powell. In the discussion there was renewed speculation as to the nature of any connection between the increasingly academic nature of observations on language in the humanities and social sciences on the one hand, and the noticeably increased sensitivity towards language in practical politics from the late 1960s on the other. There was unanimity at least on one thing, namely, that both processes formed an integral part of the Age of Extremes.

The concluding discussion returned to many points raised during individual sessions, and other questions were asked on aspects which had not been given enough attention during the conference, or which require further investigation. We were reminded in particular that the term 'political languages' needs to be more precisely defined in order to prevent the impression of a mere addition of case studies. However, the objection was raised that a restriction to just one theoretical and methodological approach would be rather sterile. In connection with the quest for long-term trends in twentieth-century political language usage spanning countries and regimes, it was noted that in addition to the religious semantics that played a prominent part in a number of papers, technocratic discourse and imagery drawn from medicine and biology could also provide suitable areas for comparative or trans-national studies. What is required, finally, it was suggested, is a comparative historicization of the terminology of the political itself, and thus also of the limits of political communication in each of the countries and regimes studied. In general, it was established that greater international and inter-disciplinary co-operation in research on the analysis of political languages in the twentieth century was desirable. This conference was seen as a first successful step on this path.

Willibald Steinmetz (Bielefeld)

The Hanoverian Dimension in British Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics. Joint conference of the German Historical Institute London and the Centre of International Studies, Cambridge, held at Peterhouse, Cambridge, 17–18 September 2004.

British historians are at present taking a greater interest in the European aspects of the British past. A re-evaluation of the political and cultural significance of the Hanoverian dynasty is part of this development. In order to get closer to this 'German' dimension of British history in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the GHIL, in co-operation with the Centre of International Studies in Cambridge, organized a two-day conference which was held at Peterhouse, Cambridge. A total of eleven papers covered the entire period during which German kings were on the British throne, from 1714 to 1837. In addition to five papers which discussed individual chronological segments, there were six which focused on a cross-section of subjects of special thematic interest. The aim of the conference was to investigate the significance of the dynastic connection for British foreign policy and domestic politics.

In his introductory remarks, Jeremy Black (Exeter) outlined the historiographical and theoretical problems of dealing with this topic. In his paper, 'Hanoverian Nexus: Diplomacy and Debate in the Age of George I and George II, 1714–1760', which he distributed to conference participants in printed form, Black emphasized the need to tie foreign policy decisions made during the rule of the two Georges into a specific context and to particular actors, instead of operating with the simplified categories of 'Hanover' and 'Britain'. Thus Black suggested that several actors representing the Hanoverian point of view could be identified. They all had different opinions and pursued highly diverse political strategies. In addition to the monarch, the Hanoverian minister in London and the Committee of Privy Councillors in the Electorate stood for Hanoverian policy. Similarly, the equation of British interest in the Electorate of Hanover with British interest in continental politics is not convincing. Rather, the two aspects must be presented separately. Against this background, Black discussed the politics of the Whigs and the Tories, and relations between the politicians Walpole, Newcastle, and Pitt the Elder, the monarch, and the Electorate of Hanover.

In his paper entitled 'Hanover in Anglo–French Geopolitics',

Conference Reports

Hamish Scott (St Andrews) opened up a completely new perspective on the implications of the dynastic union. By examining the French documents, Scott tested the thesis that a threat to invade Hanover had been used as a means of exerting political pressure on Britain at Versailles. The outcome of his investigation was highly surprising. For France, the Electorate of Hanover was not attractive booty. In addition to logistical problems which made a military occupation appear problematic, Scott identified three developments which modified France's attitude towards Britain and Hanover. First, Scott pointed out that since the Seven Years War, Prussia not Austria had been France's main political opponent. Secondly, Scott referred to the decline in French power in Europe during the eighteenth century. These two points together led to a change of strategy in French policy, which Scott dated to the beginning of the Seven Years War. According to Scott, the aim of French policy was to keep Europe free of military conflicts. Against this background, Scott discussed the occupation of Hanover by French troops in 1741 and 1757. In both cases Versailles regarded the occupation of Hanover as a provisional military–political solution. Scott concluded that France did not see the Electorate of Hanover as a potential lever to be used against British politics, while conceding that this might have looked quite different from the contemporary British or Hanoverian perspective.

In his paper, 'Pitt and Hanover', Brendan Simms (Cambridge) demonstrated the precision in describing political actors which Jeremy Black had called for. Simms showed that for Pitt the Elder, Hanover was significant as part of a European coalition rather than as the monarch's mother country. The mobilization of Hanoverian troops, and the associated payment of British subsidies, was, for Pitt, always connected with the issue of the mobilization or neutralization of European allies. In 1757, for example, after French troops had occupied Hanover, Pitt tried to persuade the Hanoverian troops to continue the military engagement against France, whereas George II was already at this time doubtful whether the dynastic connection made political sense for the Electorate. Thus although Pitt advocated financially supporting Hanover, the monarch in no way saw this as a policy in favour of the Electorate. Simms distanced himself from both previous interpretations of Pitt's policy, which saw it either as shaped by a coherent ideology, or as distinguished by opportunistic indifference.

The Seven Years War was the starting point of the contribution by Torsten Riotte (London). In his paper entitled 'George III and Hanover', he discussed the significance of the third Hanoverian on the British throne. Whereas British historiography emphasizes continuity in British political structures spanning George III's accession to the throne, from a German perspective, and a Hanoverian one in particular, the reign of the third Hanoverian is seen as a turning point. Riotte stressed the continuities, such as, for example, the close communication between the monarch and the office of the Hanoverian minister in London, which continued to exist after George III's accession to the throne. Beyond this, Riotte presented George III as an ambitious head of state who was concerned about the sovereign rights of his subjects. Riotte contrasted the monarch's political commitment during the Revolutionary Wars and the military engagement with Napoleon with what happened after 1807, when George III became totally blind.

The final contribution to the chronologically structured section was provided by Mijndert Bertram (Hanover). According to Bertram, the Congress of Vienna was a crucial turning point in the development of the dynastic connection. Although there were a number of indicators of the Prince Regent's and monarch's lasting interest in the Electorate of Hanover even after 1815, these were qualitatively quite different from earlier Hanoverian aspects in British politics. Bertram discussed George IV's stay in Hanover, as well as failed reform policy in Hanover. He made two things clear. First, he emphasized Count Münster's extraordinary role in London. And secondly, he stressed that the Kingdom of Hanover was increasingly incorporated into Britain's policy for Germany, with only vestiges of its privileged treatment by Britain remaining. This development was triggered not only by Hanover's reactionary domestic policies, but also by differences of opinion on matters relating to the economy, and fiscal points in particular. These two factors changed with the accession of William IV. The last Hanoverian on the British throne not only dismissed Count Münster from the position which he had held in London for more than twenty-five years, but also approved a new constitution for the Electorate of Hanover. Thereafter relations between the two states did not change again. The end of the personal union, Bertram pointed out, was most unspectacular.

These chronological papers were followed by contributions on specific aspects of the personal union. Bob Harris (Dundee) spoke on

125

Conference Reports

'The Public Sphere and Hanover'. He started by surveying the public discussion about Hanover from 1714 to 1760. According to Harris, the frequency of discussion of this theme by the British public fluctuated strongly. Whereas few comments on Hanover can be found in the period from 1716 to 1720, there was an intense discussion of Hanover later, not only in parliamentary debates, but also in the pamphlet literature and newspaper articles. Harris identified the 1740s as marking the climax of the Hanover debates. Despite the different strategies of argument in the public discussion, Harris suggested, Hanover was primarily a means used by the opposition to criticize government policy.

Nicolas Harding (Florida) similarly discussed the significance of Hanover for the development of a form of British patriotism. In his paper on 'Hanover in British Republicanism', he started by defining the various forms of republicanism. With special reference to Toland's pamphlet, *The Next Foreign Successor*, Harding established that in the public discussion Hanover was used to represent the opposite of British values. Radical groups depicted the Electorate of Hanover as an absolutist power. This negative propaganda, Harding explained, continued until the beginning of the nineteenth century, and was used by radical forces such as the London Corresponding Society, for example. On the other hand, the image of an absolutist Hanover also encouraged comments by conservative thinkers such as Burke, who expressed an opinion on Hanover's constitution after conducting a correspondence with the Hanoverian politician, Brandes.

The Lutheranism of the Hanoverian population formed part of the public debate concerning the Hanoverian kings. In his paper on 'The Confessional Dimension', Andrew Thompson (Cambridge) started by pointing out that contemporaries always described George I's accession to the throne as a 'Protestant succession', not a 'Hanoverian succession'. He further emphasized the significance of denomination by pointing out that the accession to the throne of the Hanoverians in 1714 was the third case since 1603 in which denomination, not birth, had dictated the succession. Yet Thompson made clear that denomination must not be seen only as a trump card of the Hanoverians against the Stuarts. The Hanoverians' Lutheranism also created a number of problems related to the questionable, and hotly debated, incompatibility between Lutheranism and Anglicanism.

Thompson traced the close connection between the confessional dimension and political events in Britain, and, going further, underlined its significance for the majority of dynastic alliances within Europe's ruling families.

As Thompson had already pointed out, the issue of the monarch's denomination became especially significant when it was a question of his children's marriages. In her paper on 'Dynastic Perspectives', Clarissa Campbell Orr (Cambridge) presented George III as not very successful at founding a dynasty. As a result of the rigid house rules and marriage policy implemented by the father of fifteen, most of his children married late, and almost all of them unhappily. Campbell Orr described a number of marriage projects that failed, and discussed the significance of the Royal Marriage Act. In her account, George III did not appear in his usual role as a thrifty person with a strong sense of family. Instead, she suggested the interesting thesis that George III's behaviour provoked the immoral and wasteful lifestyle pursued by most of his sons.

Three of George III's sons were brought up in Hanover. The Electorate of Hanover had acquired a good reputation for education among Britain's intellectual élite, mainly because of the University of Göttingen. In his paper on 'Britain and Göttingen', Thomas Biskup (Oxford/Wolfenbüttel) discussed the significance of this institution for the dynastic connection. In addition to the obvious aspects of unilateral or multilateral cultural transfers, such as Anglophilia in Göttingen, or the monarch's interest in events organized by the university, Biskup described a more complex system comprising a Europe-wide network of academic and administrative élites, in which both Hanoverians and Britons participated. Biskup illustrated these connections in terms not only of communication networks, but also of various marriage projects.

While in Biskup's paper the monarch was one, but by no means the central, figure in the interpretation, in Richard Harding's (London) paper, George II was of no significance at all. Instead, in his paper on 'Hanover in Maritime Strategy', the military historian and expert on the British Navy analysed the decision taken in 1741 by the military leadership in London not to send an expedition to Hanover. Although the Electorate had been occupied by French troops in that year, the majority of British resources were poured into an expedition to the West Indies. Harding saw this not as an ideological decision in

127

favour of a 'blue water policy', but as a rational response dictated by financial difficulties, arrived at, however, only after a protracted decision-making process. For the period that followed, too, Harding saw no dichotomy between continental and colonial policy, and emphasized the lack of an ideological dimension. To this extent it was possible for the British navy to give Hanover military support even at the end of the eighteenth century.

The conference proceedings will be published as Brendan Simms and Torsten Riotte (eds.), *The Hanoverian Dimension in British Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics, 1714–1837* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Torsten Riotte (GHIL)

Third Workshop on Early Modern German History, held at the German Historical Institute London, on 22 October 2004.

For the third time since 2002, British, Irish, and German early modernists met at the premises of the German Historical Institute on a Friday in October to present and discuss their work-in-progress. As in previous years, the two organizers, Peter Wilson (University of Sunderland) and Michael Schaich (GHIL), invited ten scholars, selected from among the respondents to a call for papers, to speak at this meeting, sponsored by the German History Society, the German Historical Institute London, and the University of Sunderland. As the workshop is an inter-disciplinary forum with deliberately wide geographical boundaries, the large audience was offered papers which ranged broadly in both theme and method, and provided an accurate reflection of current trends in research being conducted on the British Isles and in Germany. The spectrum ranged from classical topics such as early modern state-building and confessionalization to examples of the new urban and diplomatic history, and studies of religious and music history.

After a welcome by Peter Wilson, the day began with three connected papers on exorcisms in Bavaria in the century between 1570 and 1670. David Lederer (National University of Ireland, Maynooth), introduced the theme of the session, entitled 'Bavaria, the Jesuits and the Occult', with a lecture on the famous Jesuit and influential religious writer Petrus Canisius. Canisius, who believed unconditionally in the existence of demonic forces, rang in 'the Golden Age of the demoniac' (William Monter) with a series of exorcisms which he performed on members of the Fugger household, developing a specific Jesuit style of exorcism which was long used in Catholic Germany. After the middle of the seventeenth century at the latest, however, it was increasingly criticized, even within the Jesuit order, as the papers by Trevor Johnson (University of the West of England) and Paul Clear (National University of Ireland, Maynooth) demonstrated. In two case studies they showed how in the 1660s the Bavarian Jesuits Willibald Starck and Bernhard Frey exposed cases of alleged possession as fraud, and diagnosed mental illnesses instead.

The second session, chaired by Beat Kümin (University of Warwick), was devoted to perceptions of the early modern city. Marc Schalenberg (Humboldt University, Berlin) gave an overview of his

Conference Reports

Habilitation project, which looks at 'meaning and encoding of public buildings and public space in German residential cities' in the decades around 1800. Taking Berlin, Dresden, Weimar, Munich, Kassel, and Karlsruhe as examples, Schalenberg intends to expose the various levels of meaning which were ascribed to public buildings such as the ruling family's residences, town halls, museums, theatres, and railway stations by different agencies (such as the state, the prince, or the citizen body) in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. While discourse analysis of town planning and architecture therefore plays a central role in Schalenberg's work, Peter Schröder (University College London) in his paper examined the position and value of the German free imperial cities in Machiavelli's political thinking. It rapidly became clear that despite Machiavelli's diplomatic travels in Germany, which took him to a number of imperial cities, he drew a highly idealized picture of urban life in his two main works, *Il Principe* and *Discorsi.* Descriptions of the virtue of the inhabitants and, especially, the lively civic ethos, were intended as an admonition to his Italian readers.

The first of the afternoon sessions, chaired by Trevor Johnson, looked at state-building processes in the early modern period. It was opened by Maren Lorenz (Hamburg University), the second scholar to present a *Habilitation* project, exploring the experience of violence and military occupation in the second half of the seventeenth century. Her area of investigation comprised the regions of Pommerania and Bremen-Verden under Swedish occupation which, in the decades after 1648, became the theatre of various military conflicts. Embedding her comments in methodological reflections on the concept of violence and the problems of the source situation, she discussed the constellations in which physical violence typically broke out, and explained the social implications of the experience of violence. The presentation by Stefan Altorfer (London School of Economics), by contrast, had a very different regional and thematic focus. He looked at the state finances of the Canton of Berne in order to apply the model of state-building, which so far has mostly been tested on large, belligerent states, to the small 'Res publica Bernensis', which was largely spared any wars. The Berne polity proved to be a 'surplus state' which, not least thanks to reduced outgoings for the armed forces, had a low rate of taxation and regularly registered a budget surplus. The surplus funds were invested in, among other places, London's financial markets. A different perspec-

tive on the general theme was taken by Graeme Murdock (University of Birmingham) in his paper on the position of the Transylvanian Saxons in the seventeenth century. The extraordinary degree of religious toleration extended to this and other confessional communities in Transylvania, despite the unmistakable development of a centralized state apparatus, was used by Murdock to question the validity of the confessionalization model in general. As the number of exceptions where the concept does not apply is constantly rising, he suggested, the question of its usefulness must, in principle, arise.

The final session, chaired by Henry Cohn (University of Warwick), looked at approaches drawn from cultural history. The first of two papers on trends in the professionalization of diplomacy and music respectively was given by Heidrun Kugeler (University of Oxford), who examined 'The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy in the Holy Roman Empire, 1648–1750'. She reconstructed the discourse concerning the professional and social demands made of the perfect diplomat, 'le parfait Ambassadeur', in the age of the emergent European system of states. In contrast to earlier research, which had always focused on French models and influences, Kugeler foregrounded the treatises of German authors and discussed concepts for the reform of the diplomatic service which were developed in the Holy Roman Empire in close co-operation with legal and political science theories. Kugeler pointed out that there was a certain lack of sources on her topic, but Stephen Rose (University of Cambridge) had to deal with an even greater dearth of sources for his research on musical copyright law in the seventeenth century. This source situation makes it very difficult to reconstruct the ownership of music in individual cases. None the less, thanks to extended researches, he was able to open out a whole tableau of different constellations of rights concerning the publication and performance of music. Thus a prince could forbid the potentially lucrative publication of a piece of music by his court composer, or a civic music director could charge his apprentices large sums of money for permission to copy his unpublished compositions. Some contemporary authors, in particular, the editors of collections of Lutheran church music, questioned whether the right of ownership applied to music at all, as anybody could memorize a melody. *Ex negativo*, as it were, however, these voices confirmed the general finding that in the seventeenth century, music was regarded as a 'precious commodity'.

The workshop was rounded off by a concluding discussion in which two themes in particular attracted attention. First, the strong presence in early modern research of concepts drawn from discourse analysis and cultural studies was noted by various parties. And second, there was a heated controversy about whether confessionalization theory makes sense. While some participants emphasized the inadequacy of the model and called for it to be phased out, others emphasized the heuristic usefulness of such generalizing concepts and referred to recent productive attempts to apply this particular one to other European national histories, for example, that of Ireland. This general debate as well as the discussion of individual papers demonstrated the real value of the workshop. In addition to providing information on individual research projects, its intention is to promote communication within the English-language research community, as well as between British and German early modernists.

The next workshop will be held on 21 October 2005, at the premises of the GHIL. For further information please contact Michael Schaich (schaich@ghil.ac.uk, 020 7309 2014).

Michael Schaich (GHIL)

European Aristocracies and the Radical Right in the Interwar Years. International conference held by the German Historical Institute London on 29–30 October 2004.

The rise, fall, and occasional political re-birth of European aristocracies was the subject of this conference, which was held at the premises of the GHIL on 29–30 October 2004. It looked at the aristocracies of twelve countries at a particularly testing time: the interwar years, which have sometimes been called a second Thirty Years War. This expression would have especially appealed to the aristocracy. In the aftermath of the First World War they were confronted with revolutions, republics, and an influx of 'Bolshevist' ideas. How did aristocrats react to this 'threat'? Did they become anti-democratic power centres which had ideological and cultural affinities with the radical right? Did they experience a final flourishing in countries where fascist or authoritarian regimes were successful? Or is overestimating the aristocracy's political prowess and underestimating the extent to which they often stood as a conservative bulwark against the radical right simply to fall for a left-wing conspiracy theory?

After an introduction by the conference organizers, Professor Hagen Schulze and Karina Urbach (both GHIL), the situation of aristocracies in Western Europe was examined. Stephan Malinowski (Berlin) showed that even though the French aristocracy hardly had democratic inclinations, they managed to come to an arrangement with the Republic, and kept building bridges with other classes, 'not in the language of pre-fascism but rather in that of Catholic conservatism'. Though right-wing fantasies always circulated, the Dreyfus affair had already revealed the different factions within the French aristocracy. While many prominent aristocrats had opposed Dreyfus, others stood up for him and the Republic. In contrast to the German case, it was precisely this latter faction which grew in the 1930s. While aristocrats remained prominent in organizations such as Action Française and the Croix de feu, they did not find the fragmentation of the radical right, in particular its Jacobin element, very appealing.

However, not all was well on the Western Front of the European aristocracies. Jan De Maeyer (Leuven) demonstrated that the reasons for the Belgian aristocracy's attraction to the radical right can be traced back to the First World War. In addition to the costly rebuild-

ing of their damaged property and increased inheritance taxes, the Russian Revolution had a large psychological impact. The Belgian aristocracy's fight against Communism was a continuation of their involvement with anti-socialist committees during the nineteenth century. The Belgian aristocracy supported Franco, but their sympathy for him was nothing by comparison with the impact that the ultra-right, populist organization REX and its leader, Leon Degrelle, had on the mainly Catholic aristocracy from about 1930 to 1937. Degrelle's authoritarian model of the state was supported by aristocratic circles because it was based on anti-liberalism, anti-socialism, and anti-Communism, initially with patriotic and royalist ingredients. Young aristocrats in particular were attracted by Rexism's 'social' programme—its criticism of capitalism (which was identified with the Jews), the idea of social solidarity, and the enactment of legislation protective of the family (for example, abolishing inheritance taxes for heirs in the direct line). Rexism was also successful within the aristocracy because Degrelle was a good networker who, in his student days, had made friends with members of leading aristocratic families. However, by 1936–7 another charismatic figure had appeared, the Benedictine monk Antoine de Meester, whose discussion groups developed different aims for the aristocracy's role in society. Furthermore, in 1936 Degrelle had made the mistake of coming to a political agreement with the Flemish National Association, a step which in the eyes of the aristocracy demonstrated disloyalty to king and nation. In the end, 904 nobles participated in the Resistance against Nazi Germany during the Second World War, while 33 were convicted for collaboration.

Belgian and other European aristocrats had always perceived the charismatic, urban, and wealthy British aristocracy as a great example. Even in the twentieth century the British aristocracy was considered to have been politically reliable. However, as Karina Urbach (GHIL) argued, in the 1930s many ideological and cultural affinities existed between British aristocrats and the radical right (which did not necessarily mean they supported the British Union of Fascists). Anti-Semitism, anti-Bolshevism, and a belief in charismatic leadership resulted in admiration for leaders such as Horthy and Mussolini, who, through British eyes, seemed to be pursuing a new form of benevolent paternalism. Even during the Second World War Lady Eleanor Cecil found that her aristocratic relatives were privately 'still

tender to Mussolini and the Nazis'. Ultimately British aristocrats did not take the route from Cabinet Room to Cable Street for a number of reasons. The House of Lords played a key part in upholding aristocratic decorum. Furthermore, control over radical family members remained possible because positions and money could still be distributed (unlike in Germany), whereby traditional aristocratic values were also passed on. The Empire also offered lines of retreat, where the English aristocracy could create a flourishing parallel universe, an aristocratic Disneyland. While in Germany the economically lower aristocracy managed to gain the upper hand politically, in Britain solidarity with economic and political losers, such as the Anglo-Irish aristocracy, did not occur.

Rather like the British Union of Fascists, the Dutch NSB (Nationaal Socialistische Beweging) flourished between 1933 and 1935. Yet, as Hans de Valk (The Hague) pointed out, of the 7,000 members of the Dutch aristocracy only 39 played a part in radical right-wing organizations. De Valk argued that membership of radical right-wing parties was against the code of conduct of Dutch aristocrats; they looked down on the middle-class character of the leadership. Furthermore, racism and populism did not appeal to Dutch aristocrats. Those who did harbour radical right-wing ideas were extremely eccentric and often *déclassé*, as the cases of Robert Groenix, Count Maximilien de Marchant et d'Ansembourg, and Ernst van Rappard show. D'Ansembourg was taken up by the German authorities and became governor of Limburg, while Groenix was a nostalgic reactionary who, despite the fact that he had joined all kinds of fascist parties, later fought the Nazis. Rappard had imitated Hitler's movement in 1931, calling his version the Dutch National Socialist Workers Party. Its failure was symptomatic of the political endeavours of right-wing aristocrats.

In southern Europe the aristocracy found itself in a completely different situation from that of its Western cousins. As Carlos Collado-Seidel (Marburg/Munich) explained in his paper, the Spanish aristocracy had retained its economic and social dominance well into the twentieth century. The second Republic (1931–9), however, threatened its position, and prominent members of the aristocracy were subsequently involved in plans for various *coups d'etat* to restore the old order. In the early ideological wilderness years of fascist movements, aristocrats played a decisive role in financing Falange Espanola y de las JONS. It was hoped that the leader of the

party, Marquis de Estella, Antonio Primo de Rivera would follow the Italian model. However, the aristocracy felt alienated by its former favourite when in his party political programme of 1934 he excluded the monarchy and subordinated the Catholic Church to the authority of the state. Though united with the Falange in a reactionary coalition during the Civil War, many aristocrats only half-heartedly co-operated with the Franco regime. In the end they had to give up their dreams of a restoration of the monarchy, and were won over by the regime. General Franco seemed the most convenient option for their social and economic aspirations.

A similar marriage of convenience took place in Italy as Jens Petersen (Rome/Hamburg) demonstrated in his paper. The First World War and its aftermath had a large impact on the decline of the heterogeneous Italian aristocracy. In addition to suffering tax increases and inflation, Italy seemed to be on the brink of a proletarian revolution by 1919. A nostalgia for a leader developed, but could not be fulfilled by the introvert king. The 'co-operation' between monarchy and fascism cunningly achieved by Mussolini seemed convincing and made an impression on many European aristocracies. The position of the Italian aristocracy within the fascist regime, however, remained vague, as Mussolini did not see this group as a 'strategic factor'. However the glamour of aristocratic names was occasionally useful to the new rulers—in Rome and Milan the posts of mayor and governor were taken by local aristocrats. The Piedmontese aristocracy, which had, at first, behaved cautiously towards fascism, was co-operating—albeit from a distance—by 1925 when the dictatorship was stabilized.

Guido Müller's paper (Aachen) took the focus away from the national politics of the aristocracies and towards their supranational concepts. It could have been expected that members of the high aristocracy, in particular, with their European roots and, in the Habsburg case, supranational identities, would have been attracted to European concepts, yet this does not seem to have been the case. Müller therefore concentrated on two key players within the European movement: Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalegri and Karl Anton Prince Rohan, who eventually became a National Socialist. Both had close contacts with the French, Italian, and Hungarian aristocracies, as well as with leading bourgeois intellectuals and members of the Deutsche Herrenclub. However, their ideas were attrac-

tive only to a small élite within the élite. Coudenhove's management style seems to have been too authoritarian, while Rohan's ideas failed not only because of his illusionary alliance with Nazism, but also because of 'internal political, social, and cultural contradictions'.

In his paper Eckart Conze (Marburg) showed that individual and collective experiences (*Erfahrungsgeschichte*) can help us to explore how German aristocrats dealt with the increasing pressures, and how they managed to re-balance the relationship between expectations and experience (*Erwartungshorizont und Erfahrungsraum*). Experiences could vary greatly within the German aristocracy. The new *Führertum* appealed particularly to the Prusso-German military aristocracy, which transformed itself into a 'racial-national warrior community', while the Bavarian nobility still clung to dreams of restoring the monarchy. However, ideological and cultural affinities with the radical right cannot be neatly aligned with the geographical and religious differences within the German aristocracy. The anti-modernism of the New Right corresponded to how the nobility perceived the world around them, while anti-Semitism was a common denominator which the aristocracy could use to explain the disaster of 1918 and their personal experience of decline and loss. Apart from these 'soft' factors, many hard ones brought the aristocracy closer to the radical right—from the threat to expropriate the German princes to the agrarian crisis after 1925. At the same time the Nazi Party was successfully wooing them. The role of the aristocracy in the local community was important for winning over the countryside, and helped to get rid of the Nazi party's plebeian image.

Guido Müller's account of Prince Rohan was resumed by Eagle Glassheim (Princeton). Examining the biographies of such different people as Rohan and Karel Schwarzenberg, Glassheim showed that long-standing noble traditions were easily adapted in a fascist direction. In Czechoslovakia the former imperial supranational aristocracy, after a period of disorientation, used all available survival techniques to fight against land reform and for a new national identity. Since the nineteenth century they had learned to build alliances with either Czech or German national political parties. Now they wholeheartedly embraced the new nationalist rhetorics. One group identified with Czechoslovakia's German minority and claimed discrimination, while the other demonstrated their Czech lineage and previous opposition to the Habsburg monarchy. But even while settling on

opposing national-political loyalties, the two groups shared a 'conservative revolutionary ideology that drew significantly on the Christian corporatism of Austro-fascism'.

Lothar Höbelt (Vienna) asked how politically content the Austrian aristocracy actually was in the interwar period. While the crypto-legitimists took shelter in the Verein der katholischen Edelleute after 1918, the majority of the large landowners were pragmatic, and decided against adopting a 'pointless negativism' towards the First Republic. Self-confidence increased when next-door Hungary returned to a firmly right-wing foundation. The Heimwehr, 'a would-be fascist movement', became a vehicle for the old élites, especially when Prince Starhemberg, who had taken part in Hitler's 1923 beerhall putsch, took over. The aristocracy was satisfied with the *Ständestaat* and believed in a 'Frank Sinatra doctrine' of fascism, defining it in their own way as something that would balance the budget. Höbelt also argued that one reason why some Austrian aristocrats were more eager for an understanding with the Third Reich than others was rooted in foreign policy issues. They wanted Germany and Austria to co-operate in putting pressure on Czechoslovakia.

The Hungarian aristocracy, as Ignac Romsics (Budapest) made clear, could have had as much reason to be satisfied with its regime as the Austrians. Their representation in politics remained considerable in the interwar years. Horthy, a Calvinist petty noble, had turned Hungary into a monarchy with a vacant throne—a half-hearted solution that did not appeal to every aristocrat. The Transdanubian aristocracy in particular tended to look down on Horthy. However, the two aristocratic prime ministers in the interwar years compensated for this. Prime Minister Bethlen, who opposed Western democracies as well as dictatorships, believed that the aristocracy was a natural élite which could help to form a 'guided democracy'. His fellow aristocrat, Pal Teleki, displayed stronger right-wing tendencies. He was a staunch anti-Semite who favoured corporatism, especially in its Portuguese variant, and befriended Salazar. Yet the extreme right did not succeed in gaining the aristocracy's active assistance—the overwhelming majority remained conservative. The aristocrats who did support the radical right, however, were not *déclassé*, but came from all strata of the Hungarian aristocracy, rich and poor alike.

In Hungary and Poland two substitute kings (*Ersatzkönige*) stepped into the monarchical vacuum. In his paper, however, Pawel Skibinski (Warsaw) concentrated more on a radical right-wing organization called ONR (National Radical Camp), which had Catholic roots and has so far not been researched in depth. ONR toyed with two different concepts: on the one hand it advocated some form of conservative authoritarianism; on the other hand, it favoured the Italian example. The aristocracy was not attracted to ONR because its social radicalism put off landowners and the whole movement was too urban. The charismatic figure of Pilsudski must have been more attractive to the aristocracy. Charisma was also the subject of Constantin Iordachi's paper (Budapest). Iordachi demonstrated the fusion between the old Romanian aristocracy and the new 'charismatic aristocracy' of the Iron Guards (also known as the Legion of the Archangel Michael). This movement, an unusual variety of fascism in the interwar years, was a catch-all party including members of the aristocracy. It advocated 'cultural purification' and 'national regeneration' coupled with a virulent anti-Semitism. In Iordachi's opinion, the aristocracy was attracted to it mainly because of the harsh experiences of 1921, when the most radical agrarian reform in interwar Europe hit the Romanian aristocracy.

Debates about a new order (preferably based on the old one) in which aristocrats would play a leading role took place in all countries. For some aristocrats fascism seemed to be a revolutionary conservatism which combined traditional elements and a 'new dynamism'. Ideological transfers between networks of aristocratic families all over Europe seem to have played a part in spreading these ideas. The Italian model in particular had an impact on many European aristocracies, and this requires further research. However, if radical right wing-parties could not offer new avenues to power centres, aristocrats, despite cultural dispositions, were not tempted to join, or soon lost interest. Furthermore, as Eckart Conze put it, 'to be activated, [a] social, political or cultural pre-disposition for political radicalization needed a perception of profound crisis and an idea of a better future which had to correspond with the radical right's offers to overcome the crisis'.

The conference was greatly stimulated by an international mix of chairs and commentators: Martin Baumeister (Munich), Derek Beales (Cambridge), T. C. W. Blanning (Cambridge), Jesko Graf zu Dohna

Conference Reports

(Castell), Robert Evans (Oxford), Dominic Lieven (London), Wolfram Pyta (Stuttgart), Benedikt Stuchtey (GHIL), Richard Trainor (London), and Dieter Weiß (Bayreuth).

The intention is to publish the conference proceedings.

Karina Urbach (GHIL)

NOTICEBOARD

Research Seminar

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

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

10 May Jens Kreutzfeldt
Near Identification? Großbritanniens Weg in die Europäische Gemeinschaft (1961–1975)

17 May Tatjana Tönsmeyer
Adel und ländliche Gesellschaft in der zweiten Hälfte des 'langen' 19. Jahrhunderts—Böhmen, Großbritannien und Preußen

7 June Lars Amenda
Chinesenviertel in Westeuropa: Eine transnationale Migrations- und Wahrnehmungsgeschichte, 1900–1950

28 June Julie Boekhoff
Entnazifizierung in Niedersachsen

5 July Frank Bösch
Die Veröffentlichung des Geheimen: Politische Skandale, Öffentlichkeiten und Massenpresse in Deutschland und Großbritannien (1880–1914)

Noticeboard

12 July   Peter Hesse
          Auswärtige Beziehungen der Stadt Köln im Spannungsfeld
          zwischen Region, Reich und Europa (1396–1475)

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

1 Feb.   Kirstin Schäfer
          'Discovering the Pleasures of War': Britischer Militärkult,
          1793–1914

8 Feb.   Alexander Keese
          Ethnienbildung unter britischem Einfluß: Britische Kauf-
          leute, die Entwicklung von Verwaltungsstrukturen und af-
          rikanische Mittelsleute an der Westküste Schwarzafrikas,
          1750–1950

1 Mar.   Alaric Searle
          Der Clausewitz des 20. Jahrhunderts? Major-General J. F. C.
          Fuller: Militärtheoretiker, Historiker, Querdenker, 1899–
          1939

8 Mar.   Max Lieberman
          Die Walisische Mark und die Geburt Europas, 1067–1300

22 Mar.   Anne Müller
          Geschichtssymbolik als Geltungsgrund: Untersuchungen
          zur Kontinuitätsstiftung im anglonormannischen Mönch-
          tum (1066 bis Ende 13. Jahrhundert)

12 Apr.   Andreas Steinsieck
          Kriegsberichterstatter und Militärs: Wahrnehmungen und
          Interaktion im Südafrikanischen Krieg (1899–1902)

Scholarships awarded by the GHIL

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

During their stay in Britain, German scholars present their projects and the initial results of their research at the Institute's Research Seminar, and British scholars do the same on their return from Germany (see above for the current programme). For the year 2005 the following scholarships have been awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo–German relations.

Ph.D. Scholarships
Lars Amenda: Chinesenviertel in Westeuropa: Eine transnationale Migrations- und Wahrnehmungsgeschichte, 1900–1950
Julie Boekhoff: Entnazifizierung in Niedersachsen
Kate Boyce: Aspects of Women's Discontent in the German Democratic Republic, 1971–1989
Alexander Drost: Tod und Sepulkralkultur im kolonialen Bengalen (17.–19. Jahrhundert)
Thomas Freiberger: Allianzpolitik in der Suezkrise
Peter Hesse: Auswärtige Beziehungen der Stadt Köln im Spannungsfeld zwischen Region, Reich und Europa (1396–1475)
Michelle Henley: A Study of Pietism, Gender and Power in the Salzburger Community of Ebenezer, Georgia and the Anabaptists of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania in the Eighteenth Century, *c.* 1730–1775

Noticeboard

Alexander Keese: Ethnienbildung unter britischem Einfluß: Britische Kaufleute, die Entwicklung von Verwaltungsstrukturen und afrikanische Mittelsleute an der Westküste Schwarzafrikas, 1750–1950
Jens Kreutzfeldt: 'Near identification'? Großbritanniens Weg in die Europäische Gemeinschaft (1961–1975)
Carmen Partes: Die Mobilisierung weiblicher Arbeitskräfte während des Zweiten Weltkrieges: Eine Gegenüberstellung von Propagandafilmen aus Großbritannien und Deutschland
Christiane Reinecke: Regulierung und Kontrolle transnationaler Migration in Deutschland, Großbritannien und Italien im Vergleich, 1880–1933
Andreas Steinsieck: Kriegsberichterstatter und Militärs: Wahrnehmungen und Interaktion im Südafrikanischen Krieg (1899–1902)
Malte Zierenberg: Von Schiebern und Schwarzen Märkten: Der Berliner Schwarzhandel 1939–1950

Postdoctoral Scholarships
Juniorprof. Dr Frank Bösch: Die Veröffentlichung des Geheimen: Politische Skandale, Öffentlichkeiten und Massenpresse in Deutschland und Großbritannien (1880–1914)
Dr Anne Müller: Geschichtssymbolik als Geltungsgrund: Untersuchungen zur Kontinuitätsstiftung im anglonormannischen Mönchtum (1066 bis Ende 13. Jahrhundert)
Dr des. Kirstin Schäfer: 'Discovering the Pleasures of War': Britischer Militärkult, 1793–1914
Dr Alaric Searle: Der Clausewitz des 20. Jahrhunderts? Major-General J. F. C. Fuller: Militärtheoretiker, Historiker, Querdenker, 1899–1939. Kriegserfahrung, Technikbegeisterung und Militärtheorie im Spannungsfeld der Krise britischer Macht- und Empirepolitik und die Herausforderung totalitärer Ideologien, 1899–1939
Dr Tatjana Tönsmeyer: Adel und ländliche Gesellschaft in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts: Böhmen, Großbritannien und Preußen im europäischen Vergleich

Postgraduate Students' Conference

The German Historical Institute London held its ninth postgraduate students' conference on 14–15 January 2005. Its intention was to give postgraduate research students in the UK and Ireland working on German history an opportunity to present their work-in-progress, and to discuss it with other students working in the same field. The Institute also aimed to present itself as a research centre for German history in London, and to introduce postgraduates to the facilities it offers as well as to the Institute's Research Fellows.

In selecting students to give a presentation, preference was given to those in their second or third year who had possibly already spent a period of research in Germany. Students in their first year were invited to attend as discussants. Nineteen projects in all were introduced in plenary sessions held over two days. Three papers were devoted to the intellectual and economic history of the early modern period, one to problems of immigration in the nineteenth century, and the remainder to the twentieth century, covering fairly evenly the First World War and the Weimar Republic, the Third Reich, and the two post-war German societies. Participants gave a short summary of their work containing general ideas, leading questions, sources, and initial findings, and this was followed by discussion.

As well as discussing their subjects and methodologies, the participants exchanged information about practical difficulties such as language and transcription problems, how to locate sources, and finding one's way around German archives. Many comments came from the floor, including information about language courses and intensive courses for the reading of German manuscripts, references to literature already published on the topic, and suggestions about additional sources. Information about institutions that give grants for research in Germany was also exchanged. The German Historical Institute can offer support here by facilitating contact with German archives and providing letters of introduction which may be necessary for students to gain access to archives or specific source collections. In certain cases it may help students to make contact with particular German universities and professors. The German Historical Institute also provides scholarships for research in Germany (see above).

The GHIL is planning to hold the next postgraduate students' conference early in 2006. For further information, including how to

apply, please contact the Secretary, Anita Bellamy, German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, or: abellamy@ghil.ac.uk

Prize of the German Historical Institute London

The German Historical Institute London awards an annual prize, known as the Prize of the German Historical Institute London, for an outstanding work of British or German historical scholarship. The prize was initiated in 1996 to mark the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the GHIL. In 2004 the prize was awarded to Christian Haase for his thesis, 'In Search of a European Settlement: The Königswinter Conference and West Germany—Allied Relations 1939–1973', submitted to the University of Oxford.

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

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

To apply, please send the following to reach the Director of the German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, by 1 September 2005:

1 the complete text
2 all relevant reports from the university to which it is being submitted

3 a declaration that, if a work in German is awarded the prize, the author is prepared to allow the work to be considered for publication in the series *Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts London*, and that the work will not be published elsewhere until the judges have reached their final decision
4 the applicant's current *curriculum vitae.*

The Prize will be presented on the occasion of the Institute's Annual Lecture in November 2005. Future awards will be advertised in the Bulletin of the GHIL.

No member of the Committee of Judges and no employee or blood relative of an employee or ex-employee of the Institute or any member of the Committee shall be eligible as a candidate for the Prize.

Staff News

The academic staff of the Institute changes from time to time, as most Research Fellows have fixed-term contracts of three to five years' duration. During this time, along with their duties at the Institute, they work on a major project of their own choice, and as a result the Institute's areas of special expertise also change. We take this opportunity to keep our readers regularly informed.

DOMINIK GEPPERT, who joined the GHIL in 2000, studied history, philosophy, and law in Freiburg and Berlin, where he also worked as a research assistant for four years. His main fields of interest are British and German contemporary history, international history, and the history of the press. He is currently working on British–German press relations, 1890 to 1914. With Udo Wengst, he has recently edited a volume entitled *Neutralität – Chance oder Chimäre? Konzepte des Dritten Weges für Deutschland und die Welt 1945–1990* (2005). His most recent monographs are *Maggie Thatchers Roßkur: Ein Rezept für Deutschland?* (2003); *Die Ära Adenauer* (2002); and *Thatchers konservative Revolution: Der Richtungswandel der britischen Tories 1975–1979* (2002).

Noticeboard

MARKUS MÖSSLANG, who joined the GHIL in 1999, studied modern and social history at the University of Munich where he was a research assistant in 1997–98. His Ph.D. was published as *Flüchtlingslehrer und Flüchtlingshochschullehrer* (2002); he is co-editor of *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, vol. 2: *1830–1847* (2002) and vol. 3: *1848–1850* (forthcoming 2005/6). His main fields of interest are nineteenth-century Anglo–German relations, the cultural history of diplomacy, the contemporary history of higher education, and history and the new media.

KARSTEN PLÖGER joined the GHIL in January 2003 as a Research Fellow in late medieval and modern history after completing his doctoral thesis at Balliol College, Oxford. Prior to that he studied history, English, and philosophy at the University of Kiel and at the University of Aberdeen. His main fields of interest are the intellectual, cultural, and diplomatic history of Europe in the Middle Ages. In addition to continuing his work on English medieval diplomacy from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, he is currently producing a study on the discourse of boredom in early and high medieval Europe. His most recent publication is *England and the Avignon Popes: The Practice of Diplomacy in Late Medieval Europe* (2005).

MATTHIAS REISS joined the GHIL as a Research Fellow in 2002. He studied history, political science, and economics at the University of Hamburg, before changing to the University of Cincinnati (Ohio) in 1993, where he received an M.A. two years later. His main fields of interest are American, British, and German history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. His Ph.D. was published in 2002 as *Die Schwarzen waren unsere Freunde: Deutsche Kriegsgefangene in der amerikanischen Gesellschaft 1942–1946*. He is currently working on a study of the image of the unemployed in England and Germany from the end of the nineteenth century to the 1980s.

TORSTEN RIOTTE joined the GHIL in January 2003. After finishing his Ph.D. at Cambridge University he is now, with Markus Mößlang, in charge of the Institute's four-volume edition *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*. The results of his research on Hanoverian Britain have been published in various forms, including a monograph entitled *Hannover in der britischen Politik (1792–1815): Dynastische Ver-*

bindung als Element außenpolitischer Entscheidungsprozesse (2005). With Brendan Simms he is editing an essay collection to be published as *The Hanoverian Dimension in British Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics, 1714–1837* (forthcoming 2006).

MICHAEL SCHAICH, who joined the GHIL in 1999, was a student of history and media studies at the University of Munich. After completing his M.A. he became a research assistant in the history department. His Ph.D. thesis on Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment in Bavaria was published in 2001 as *Staat und Öffentlichkeit im Kurfürstentum Bayern der Spätaufklärung*. While at the Institute he is working on the British monarchy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He is also a librarian at the Institute, and has been editing the *Bulletin of the GHIL* since November 2004.

INDRA SENGUPTA-FREY joined the GHIL in September 2004. She took her Bachelor's, Master's and M.Phil. degrees from the University of Calcutta, India and completed her doctoral degree at the University of Heidelberg, Germany in 2002. Apart from working as a college lecturer at the University of Calcutta, she has also been a Research Fellow with the Department of Indology and Religion, Tübingen University, and has held a part-time lectureship in History at South Asia Institute, Heidelberg University. Her main areas of research interest are the history of encounters between European and non-European cultures, German Orientalism, British colonialism, and culture and modernity in India. Her reworked Ph.D. thesis is being published as *From Salon to Discipline: State, University and Indology in Germany 1821–1914* (2005). Her current research project is on monuments, archaeology, and public memory in colonial India.

BENEDIKT STUCHTEY is Deputy Director of the GHIL. His main research interest is presently the history of European imperialism and he is working on anti-colonialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in a comparative perspective. His most recent publication is (ed.), *Science across the European Empires, 1800–1950* (2005). A former editor of the *Bulletin of the GHIL*, he is on the editorial boards of *European Review of History. Revue Européenne d'Histoire* and *Storia della Storiografia. History of Historiography*.

Noticeboard

KARINA URBACH joined the GHIL in January 2004 as a Research Fellow in twentieth-century history. She studied modern history and political science at the University of Munich and took an M.Phil. in international relations and a Ph.D. in history at the University of Cambridge. She taught at the University of Bayreuth and was awarded the Bavarian Ministry of Culture's *Habilitationsförderpreis* in 2001. Her fields of interest include British–German relations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and she is currently working on a book about the international networks of the British and German aristocracies in the interwar years. She is the author of *Bismarck's Favourite Englishman: Lord Odo Russell's Mission to Berlin* (1999), and co-editor of *Der Zeitgeist und die Historie* (2001) and *Birth or Talent? A Comparison of British–German Elites* (2003).

Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914

This conference, to be held at the GHIL on 23–24 September 2005, will deal with the nature of the diplomatic service in the century between the Congress of Vienna and the outbreak of the First World War. In this period the internationally expanding system of permanent diplomatic missions was increasingly confronted with internal and external changes. Internally the diplomatic services in most states were under considerable pressure to reform, which eventually made diplomacy more bureaucratic and professional. Externally diplomats in the age of the (emerging) nation-state and industrialization had to cope with far-reaching political, social, and technological changes.

Using a comparative approach, the conference will investigate the effects of these internal and external developments on the role and function of the diplomatic service, and on the behaviour and self-perception of diplomats. The conference will extend and diversify the traditional focus on the functional role of diplomacy in international relations and thus aims to contribute to a cultural history of diplomacy.

Panels on the following aspects of the diplomatic service and diplomats are planned: status and self-perception; nationality and identity; cultural aspects and different layers of practising diplomacy; press and public opinion; symbolic behaviour and representation;

and modernity and traditions. Geographically the conference will deal with Europe (Austria–Hungary, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Switzerland), North Africa (Morocco), the Ottoman Empire, Japan, and America (USA, Brazil).

For further information please contact Markus Mößlang (moesslang@ghil.ac.uk) or Torsten Riotte (triotte@ghil.ac.uk).

Social Stereotypes and History

Historians have long studied national, racist, and religious stereotypes in order to understand and explain the mental background of peoples' actions in the past. Social stereotypes, however, defined as widely held images of particular groups in society, have so far attracted little attention within the historical profession.

The aim of this conference, to be held on 28–29 October 2005 at the GHIL, is to discuss the value of social stereotypes as an analytical category for historians by using case studies from different countries and time periods. Panel I and Panel II will deal with occupational stereotypes, the former focusing on traditional low-skilled jobs (domestic servant and agricultural labourer), while the latter will deal with modern service professions (white-collar workers and librarians). Panel III will compare one stereotype (father) in three different countries, thus highlighting national particularities. Panel IV will examine the image of defined social ranks in society (aristocrat and bourgeois), while Panel V will focus on those who uphold order in society and those who break it (policeman and criminal).

Anyone interested in the subject is welcome to attend the conference, but must register with Dr Matthias Reiss (reiss@ghil.ac.uk).

LIBRARY NEWS

Recent Acquisitions

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

Aalders, Gerard, *Nazi Looting: The Plunder of Dutch Jewry during the Second World War*, trans. by Arnold Pomerans with Erica Pomerans (Oxford: Berg, 2004)

Abelshauser, Werner, *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte seit 1945* (Munich: Beck, 2004)

Ahonen, Pertti, *After the Expulsion: West Germany and Eastern Europe 1945–1990* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Albert, Marcel, *Die Benediktinerabtei Maria Laach und der Nationalsozialismus*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 95 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Altmann, Georg, *Aktive Arbeitsmarktpolitik: Entstehung und Wirkung eines Reformkonzepts in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 176 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004)

Aly, Götz, *Rasse und Klasse: Nachforschungen zum deutschen Wesen* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2003)

Angelow, Jürgen, *Der deutsche Bund* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003)

Angrick, Andrej, *Besatzungspolitik und Massenmord: Die Einsatzgruppe D in der südlichen Sowjetunion 1941–1943* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2003)

Appelius, Claudia, *'Die schönste Stadt der Welt': Deutsch-jüdische Flüchtlinge in New York* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2003)

Arendt, Hannah, *Denktagebuch: 1950 bis 1973*, ed. Ursula Ludz and Ingeborg Nordmann, 2 vols. (2nd edn.; Munich: Piper, 2003)

Ascheid, Antje, *Hitler's Heroines: Stardom and Womanhood in Nazi Cinema*, Culture and the Moving Image (Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press, 2003)

Augstein, Rudolf, *Schreiben, was ist: Kommentare, Gespräche, Vorträge*, ed. Jochen Bölsche (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2003)

Baberowski, Jörg, *Der rote Terror: Geschichte des Stalinismus* (2nd edn.; Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2004)

Bachrach, David S., *Religion and the Conduct of War, c. 300–1215*, Warfare in History (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003)

Bahr, Egon, *Der deutsche Weg: Selbstverständlich und normal* (3rd edn.; Munich: Blessing, 2003)

Bald, Detlef, *Die 'Weiße Rose': Von der Front in den Widerstand* (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 2003)

Balderston, Theo (ed.), *The World Economy and National Economies in the Interwar Slump* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Balzer, Friedrich-Martin and Werner Renz (eds.), *Das Urteil im Frankfurter Auschwitz-Prozeß (1963–1965)* (Bonn: Pahl-Rugenstein, 2004)

Barth, Christian T., *Goebbels und die Juden* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Bartov, Omer, *Germany's War and the Holocaust: Disputed Histories* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003)

Bastress-Dukehart, Erica, *The Zimmern Chronicle: Nobility, Memory and Self-Representation in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)

Bauer, Dieter R. and Matthias Becher (eds.), *Welf IV. Schlüsselfigur einer Wendezeit: Regionale und europäische Perspektiven*, Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte, Beiheft B/24 (Munich: Beck, 2004)

Baumann, Anette, Peter Oestmann *et al.* (eds.), *Reichspersonal: Funktionsträger für Kaiser und Reich*, Quellen und Forschungen zur höchsten Gerichtsbarkeit im Alten Reich, 46 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003)

Baumann, Angelika and Andreas Heusler (eds.), *München arisiert: Entrechtung und Enteignung der Juden in der NS-Zeit* (Munich: Beck, 2004)

Beck, Birgit, *Wehrmacht und sexuelle Gewalt: Sexualverbrechen vor deutschen Militärgerichten 1939–1945*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 18 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Beck, Friedrich and Julius H. Schoeps (eds.), *Der Soldatenkönig: Friedrich Wilhelm I. in seiner Zeit*, Brandenburgische Historische Studien, 12 (Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 2003)

Behrndt, Karsten, *Die Nationskonzeptionen in deutschen und britischen Enzyklopädien und Lexika im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 03: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, 956 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 2003)

Benz, Wolfgang (ed.), *Selbstbehauptung und Opposition: Kirche als Ort des Widerstandes gegen staatliche Diktatur*, Horizonte und Perspektiven, 1 (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2003)

Benz, Wolfgang (ed.), *Überleben im Dritten Reich: Juden im Untergrund und ihre Helfer* (Munich: Beck, 2003)

Benz, Wolfgang and Peter Reif-Spirek (eds.), *Geschichtsmythen: Legenden über den Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2003)

Berkhoff, Karel Cornelis, *Harvest of Despair: Life and Death in Ukraine under Nazi Rule* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004)

Bernecker, Walther L., *Europa zwischen den Weltkriegen: 1914–1945*, Handbuch der Geschichte Europas, 9, (Stuttgart: Ulmer, 2002)

Besier, Gerhard, *Der Heilige Stuhl und Hitler-Deutschland: Die Faszination des Totalitären* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2004)

Bitterli, Urs, *Golo Mann: Instanz und Aussenseiter. Eine Biographie* (Berlin: Kindler, 2004)

Bitzer, Dirk and Bernd Wilting, *Stürmen für Deutschland: Die Geschichte des deutschen Fußballs von 1933 bis 1954* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2003)

Blaha, Tatjana, *Willi Graf und die Weiße Rose: Eine Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Munich: Saur, 2003)

Blickle, Peter, *Von der Leibeigenschaft zu den Menschenrechten: Eine Geschichte der Freiheit in Deutschland* (Munich: Beck, 2003)

Bönitz, Wolfgang, *Feindliche Bomberverbände im Anflug: Zivilbevölkerung im Luftkrieg* (Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 2003)

Bopf, Britta, *'Arisierung' in Köln: Die wirtschaftliche Existenzvernichtung der Juden 1933–1945*, Schriften des Dokumentationszentrums der Stadt Köln, 10 (Cologne: Emons, 2004)

Borgolte, Michael, *Europa entdeckt seine Vielfalt: 1050–1250*, Handbuch der Geschichte Europas, 3 (Stuttgart: Ulmer, 2002)

Borgstedt, Angela, *Das Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, Kontroversen um die Geschichte (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004)

Bosshart-Pfluger, Catherine, Joseph Jung, and Franziska Metzger (eds.), *Nation und Nationalismus in Europa: Kulturelle Konstruktion von Identitäten. Festschrift für Urs Altermatt* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 2002)

Brakelmann, Günter, *Der Kreisauer Kreis: Chronologie, Kurzbiographien und Texte aus dem Widerstand*, Schriftenreihe der Forschungsgemeinschaft 20. Juli, 3 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2003)

Brandmüller, Walter, *Holocaust in der Slowakei und katholische Kirche* (Neustadt an der Aisch: Schmidt, 2003)

Breuilly, John J., *Austria, Prussia and Germany, 1806–1871*, Seminar Studies in History (London: Longman, 2002)

Briese, Olaf, *Angst in den Zeiten der Cholera*, 4 vols. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003)

Brook-Shepherd, Gordon, *Uncrowned Emperor: The Life and Times of Otto von Habsburg* (London: Hambledon and London, 2003)

Burgdorff, Stephan and Christian Habbe (eds.), *Als Feuer vom Himmel fiel: Der Bombenkrieg in Deutschland* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003)

Cannadine, David (ed.), *History and the Media* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Carl, Horst, *Der Schwäbische Bund 1488–1534: Landfrieden und Genossenschaft im Übergang vom Spätmittelalter zur Reformation*, Schriften zur südwestdeutschen Landeskunde, 24 (Leinfelden-Echterdingen: DRW-Verlag, 2000)

Casagrande, Thomas, *Die volksdeutsche SS-Division 'Prinz Eugen': Die Banater Schwaben und die nationalsozialistischen Kriegsverbrechen* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2003)

Dann, Otto, Miroslav Hroch, and Johannes Koll (eds.), *Patriotismus und Nationsbildung am Ende des Heiligen Römischen Reiches*, Kölner Beiträge zur Nationsforschung, 9 (Cologne: SH-Verlag, 2003)

Davies, Norman, *Rising '44: The Battle for Warsaw* (London: Macmillan, 2003)

Demandt, Philipp, *Luisenkult: Die Unsterblichkeit der Königin von Preußen* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003)

Deventer, Jörg, Susanne Rau, *et al.* (ed.), *Zeitenwenden: Herrschaft, Selbstbehauptung und Integration zwischen Reformation und Liberalismus. Festgabe für Arno Herzig zum 65. Geburtstag*, Geschichte, 39 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2002)

Diestelkamp, Bernhard (ed.), *Das Reichskammergericht am Ende des Alten Reiches und sein Fortwirken im 19. Jahrhundert*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Höchsten Gerichtsbarkeit im Alten Reich, 41 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002)

Dietz, Burkhard, Helmut Gabel, and Ulrich Tiedau (eds.), *Griff nach dem Westen: Die 'Westforschung' der völkisch-nationalen Wissenschaften zum nordwesteuropäischen Raum (1919–1960)*, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur Nordwesteuropas, 6; 2 vols. (Münster: Waxmann, 2003)

Dillinger, Johannes (ed.), *Zauberer, Selbstmörder, Schatzsucher: Magische Kultur und behördliche Kontrolle im frühneuzeitlichen Württemberg* (Trier: Kliomedia, 2003)

Dönhoff, Marion Gräfin, *Ein wenig betrübt, Ihre Marion: Marion Gräfin Dönhoff und Gerd Bucerius. Ein Briefwechsel aus fünf Jahrzehnten*, ed. Haug von Kuenheim and Theo Sommer (Berlin: Siedler, 2003)

Dudink, Stefan, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh (eds.), *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, Gender in History (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004)

Dülmen, Richard van, *Poesie des Lebens: Eine Kulturgeschichte der deutschen Romantik 1795–1820*, vol. 1: *Lebenswelten* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002)

Düsterberg, Rolf, *Hanns Johst, 'Der Barde der SS': Karrieren eines deutschen Dichters* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Ebendorfer, Thomas, *Chronica regum Romanorum*, ed. Harald Zimmermann, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum: Nova Series, 18; 2 parts (Hanover: Hahn, 2003)

Ebi, Michael, *Export um jeden Preis: Die Deutsche Exportförderung von 1932–1938*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 174/2 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004)

Edelmann, Heidrun, *Heinz Nordhoff und Volkswagen: Ein deutscher Unternehmer im amerikanischen Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003)

Eglau, Hans Otto, *Fritz Thyssen: Hitlers Gönner und Geisel* (Berlin: Siedler, 2003)

Ehbrecht, Wilfried, Angelika Lampen, *et al.* (ed.), *Der weite Blick des Historikers: Einsichten in Kultur-, Landes- und Stadtgeschichte. Peter Johanek zum 65. Geburtstag* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002)

Eibach, Joachim, *Frankfurter Verhöre: Städtische Lebenswelten und Kriminalität im 18. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Eifert, Christiane, *Paternalismus und Politik: Preußische Landräte im 19. Jahrhundert*, Theorie und Geschichte der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft, 20 (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2003)

Eisele, Klaus and Rolf-Ulrich Kunze (eds.), *Mitverschwörer, Mitgestalter: Der 20. Juli im deutschen Südwesten*, Porträts des Widerstands, 7 (Constance: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004)

Elz, Wolfgang and Sönke Neitzel (eds.), *Internationale Beziehungen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Festschrift für Winfried Baumgart zum 65. Geburtstag* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Epkenhans, Michael and Gerhard P. Groß (eds.), *Das Militär und der Aufbruch in die Moderne 1860 bis 1890: Armeen, Marinen und der Wandel von Politik, Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft in Europa, den USA sowie Japan*, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, 60 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)

Eppelmann, Rainer, Bernd Faulenbach, and Ulrich Mählert (eds.), *Bilanz und Perspektiven der DDR-Forschung: Hermann Weber zum 75. Geburtstag* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Etlin, Richard A. (ed.), *Art, Culture, and Media under the Third Reich* (Chicago, Ill.: Chicago University Press, 2002)

Feldkamp, Michael F., *Goldhagens unwillige Kirche: Alte und neue Fälschungen über Kirche und Papst während der NS-Herrschaft* (Munich: Olzog, 2003)

Fichtner, Paula Sutter, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1490–1848: Attributes of Empire*, European History in Perspective (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Fiedler, Gudrun and Hans-Ulrich Ludewig (eds.), *Zwangsarbeit und Kriegswirtschaft im Lande Braunschweig 1939–1945*, Quellen und Forschungen zur braunschweigischen Landesgeschichte, 39 (Brunswick: Appelhans, 2003)

Fontius, Martin and Jean Mondot (eds.), *Französische Kultur, Aufklärung in Preußen*, Aufklärung und Europa (Berlin: Berlin-Verlag Spitz, 2001)

Freytag, Nils, *Aberglauben im 19. Jahrhundert: Preußen und seine Rheinprovinz zwischen Tradition und Moderne (1815–1918),* Quellen und Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preußischen Geschichte, 22 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2003)

Füssel, Ronald, *Die Hexenverfolgungen im Thüringer Raum*, Veröffentlichungen des Arbeitskreises für historische Hexen- und Kriminalitätsforschung in Norddeutschland, 2 (Hamburg: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Dokumentation und Buch, 2003)

Fulbrook, Mary (ed.), *Europe since 1945*, The Short Oxford History of Europe, 11 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Gall, Lothar and Andreas Schulz (eds.), *Wissenskommunikation im 19. Jahrhundert*, Nassauer Gespräche der Freiherr-vom-Stein-Gesellschaft, 6 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003)

Galle, Petra, *RIAS Berlin und Berliner Rundfunk 1945–1949: Die Entwicklung ihrer Profile in Programm, Personal und Organisation vor dem Hintergrund des beginnenden Kalten Krieges*, Medien und Kultur, 1 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2003)

Geisthövel, Alexa, *Eigentümlichkeit und Macht. Deutscher Nationalismus 1830–1851: Der Fall Schleswig-Holstein*, Historische Mitteilungen, Beiheft 50 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003)

Genscher, Hans-Dietrich and Ulrich Frank-Planitz (eds.), *Nur ein Ortswechsel? Eine Zwischenbilanz der Berliner Republik: Zum 70. Geburtstag von Arnulf Baring* (Stuttgart: Hohenheim Verlag, 2002)

Gierl, Martin, *Geschichte und Organisation: Institutionalisierung als Kommunikationsprozess am Beispiel der Wissenschaftsakademie um 1900*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Dritte Folge, 233 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004)

Gißibl, Bernhard, *Frömmigkeit, Hysterie und Schwärmerei: Wunderbare Erscheinungen im bayerischen Vormärz*, Münchner Studien zur neueren und neuesten Geschichte, 23 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 2004)

Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah, *A Moral Reckoning: The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003)

Golz, Hans-Georg, *Verordnete Völkerfreundschaft: Das Wirken der Freundschaftsgesellschaft DDR-Großbritannien und der Britain-GDR Society. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2004)

Goren, Haim, *'Zieht hin und erforscht das Land': Die deutsche Palästinaforschung im 19. Jahrhundert*, trans. from the Hebrew by Antje Clara Naujoks, Schriftenreihe des Instituts für deutsche Geschichte der Universität Tel Aviv, 23 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003)

Goschler, Constantin and Philipp Ther (eds.), *Raub und Restitution: 'Arisierung' und Rückerstattung des jüdischen Eigentums in Europa*, Die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2003)

Greschat, Martin and Jochen-Christoph Kaiser (eds.), *Die Kirchen im Umfeld des 17. Juni 1953*, Konfession und Gesellschaft, 31 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2003)

Grimmer-Solem, Erik, *The Rise of Historical Economics and Social Reform in Germany 1864–1894*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003)

Grütz, Reinhard, *Katholizismus in der DDR-Gesellschaft 1960–1990: Kirchliche Leitbilder, theologische Deutungen und lebensweltliche Praxis im Wandel*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 99 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Grzywatz, Berthold, *Stadt, Bürgertum und Staat im 19. Jahrhundert: Selbstverwaltung, Partizipation und Repräsentation in Berlin und Preußen 1806 bis 1918*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preußischen Geschichte, 23 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2003)

Guenther, Irene, *Nazi Chic? Fashioning Women in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Berg, 2004)

Haasis, Hellmut G., *Tod in Prag: Das Attentat auf Reinhard Heydrich* (Reinbek b. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2002)

Hachmeister, Lutz, *Schleyer: Eine deutsche Geschichte* (Munich: Beck, 2004)

Häberlein, Mark and Martin Zürn (eds.), *Minderheiten, Obrigkeit und Gesellschaft in der Frühen Neuzeit: Integrations- und Abgrenzungsprozesse im süddeutschen Raum* (St Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 2001)

Haffner, Sebastian, *Germany: Jekyll and Hyde. An Eyewitness Analysis of Nazi Germany* (2nd edn.; London: Libris, 2005)

Haffner, Sebastian, *Überlegungen eines Wechselwählers* (Berlin: Kindler, 2002)

Hage, Volker, *Zeugen der Zerstörung: Die Literaten und der Luftkrieg. Essays und Gespräche* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2003)

Hagemann, Frank, *Parteiherrschaft in der Nationalen Volksarmee: Zur Rolle der SED bei der inneren Entwicklung der DDR-Streitkräfte (1956 bis 1971)*, Militärgeschichte der DDR, 5 (Berlin: Links, 2002)

Hammer, Ulrike, *Kurfürstin Luise Henriette: Eine Oranierin als Mittlerin zwischen den Niederlanden und Brandenburg-Preußen*, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur Nordwesteuropas, 4 (Münster: Waxmann, 2001)

Hanuschek, Sven, *Geschichte des bundesdeutschen PEN-Zentrums von 1951 bis 1990*, Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur, 98 (Tübingen: Niemyer, 2004)

Harnack, Adolf von, *Wissenschaftspolitische Reden und Aufsätze*, ed. Bernhard Fabian (Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 2001)

Hartmann, Anja V. and Beatrice Heuser (eds.), *War, Peace and World Orders in European History*, The New International Relations (London: Routledge, 2001)

Hartmann, Gerhard and Karl Rudolf Schnith (eds.), *Die Kaiser: 1200 Jahre europäische Geschichte* (Augsburg: Weltbild Verlagsgruppe, 2003)

Harvey, Elizabeth, *Women and the Nazi East: Agents and Witnesses of Germanization* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003)

Heim, Susanne (ed.), *Autarkie und Ostexpansion: Pflanzenzucht und Agrarforschung im Nationalsozialismus*, Geschichte der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft im Nationalsozialismus, 2 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2002)

Heinrich, Guido and Gunter Schandera, *Magdeburger biographisches Lexikon: 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Biographisches Lexikon für die Landeshauptstadt Magdeburg und die Landkreise Bördekreis, Jerichower Land, Ohrekreis und Schönebeck* (Magdeburg: Scriptum Verlag, 2002)

Herbst, Ludolf and Thomas Weihe (eds.), *Die Commerzbank und die Juden 1933–1945* (Munich: Beck, 2004)

Herzig, Arno, Hans Otto Horch, and Robert Jütte (eds.), *Judentum und Aufklärung: Jüdisches Selbstverständnis in der bürgerlichen Öffentlichkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002)

Herzog, Markwart, Rolf Kießling, and Bernd Roeck (eds.), *Himmel auf Erden oder Teufelsbauwurm? Wirtschaftliche und soziale Bedingungen des süddeutschen Klosterbarock*, Irseer Schriften. N.F., 1 (Constance: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 2002)

Hochstadt, Steve (ed.), *Sources of the Holocaust* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Hoerle, W. Scott, *Hans Friedrich Blunck: Poet and Nazi Collaborator, 1888–1961*, Studies in Modern German Literature, 97 (Oxford: Lang, 2003)

Hösch, Edgar, Karl Nehring, and Holm Sundhaussen (eds.), *Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2004)

Holtfrerich, Carl-Ludwig, Harold James, and Manfred Pohl, *Requiem auf eine Währung: Die Mark 1873–2001* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2001)

Hopman, Albert, *Das ereignisreiche Leben eines 'Wilhelminers': Tagebücher, Briefe, Aufzeichnungen 1901 bis 1920*, ed. Michael Epkenhans, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, 62 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

Hosenfeld, Wilm, *'Ich versuche jeden zu retten': Das Leben eines deutschen Offiziers in Briefen und Tagebüchern*, ed. Thomas Vogel (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2004)

Hug-Biegelmann, Raimund, *Friedrichshafen im Luftkrieg 1939–1945*, Schriftenreihe des Stadtarchivs Friedrichshafen, 4 (Friedrichshafen: Stadtarchiv, 2003)

Hull, Mark M., *Irish Secrets: German Espionage in Ireland 1939–1945* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2003)

Jackson, Julian, *The Fall of France: The Nazi Invasion of 1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Jarausch, Konrad H. and Martin Sabrow (eds.), *Die historische Meistererzählung: Deutungslinien der deutschen Nationalgeschichte nach 1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002)

Jasper, Willi and Joachim H. Knoll (eds.), *Preußens Himmel breitet seine Sterne.... Beiträge zur Kultur-, Politik- und Geistesgeschichte der Neuzeit. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Julius H. Schoeps*, Haskala, 26; 2 vols. (Hildesheim: Olms, 2002)

Jonas, Hans, *Erinnerungen: Nach Gesprächen mit Rachel Salamander*, ed. Christian Wiese (Frankfurt/M.: Insel Verlag, 2003)

Karlen, Stefan, *Schweizerische Versicherungsgesellschaften im Machtbereich des 'Dritten Reichs'*, Veröffentlichungen der UEK, 12; 2 vols. (Zurich: Chronos Verlag, 2002)

Kater, Michael H. and Albrecht Riethmüller (eds.), *Music and Nazism: Art under Tyranny, 1933–1945* (2nd edn.; Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2004)

Katz, Robert, *Fatal Silence: The Pope, the Resistance and the German Occupation of Rome* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003)

Kaukoreit, Volker and Jörg Thunecke (eds.), *126, Westbourne Terrace: Erich Fried im Londoner Exil (1938-1945). Texte und Materialien* (Vienna: Turia + Kant, 2001)

Kersting, Franz-Werner (ed.), *Psychiatriereform als Gesellschaftsreform: Die Hypothek des Nationalsozialismus und der Aufbruch der sechziger Jahre*, Forschungen zur Regionalgeschichte, 46 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Kersting, Wolfgang (ed.), *Die Republik der Tugend: Jean-Jacques Rousseaus Staatsverständnis*, Staatsverständnisse, 4 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2003)

Kessler, Harry Graf, *Das Tagebuch: 1880–1937*, ed. Roland S. Kamzelak and Ulrich Ott, Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Schillergesellschaft, 50; vol 2: *1892–1897*, ed. Günter Riederer and Jörg Schuster; vol. 3: *1897–1905*, ed. Carina Schäfer and Gabriele Biedermann (Stuttgart: Cotta, 2004)

Keßler, Mario, *Arthur Rosenberg: Ein Historiker im Zeitalter der Katastrophen, 1889-1943,* Zeithistorische Studien, 24 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003)

King, Jeremy, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002)

Kintzinger, Martin and Jörg Rogge (eds.), *Königliche Gewalt – Gewalt gegen Könige: Macht und Mord im spätmittelalterlichen Europa*, Zeitschrift für historische Forschung, Beiheft 33 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2004)

Koch, Roland (ed.), *Heinrich von Brentano: Ein Wegbereiter der europäischen Integration* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

Kohl, Helmut, *Erinnerungen*, vol. 1: *1930-1982* (Munich: Droemer, 2004)

Kortüm, Hans-Henning (ed.), *Krieg im Mittelalter* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001)

Krause, Konrad, *Alma mater Lipsiensis: Geschichte der Universität Leipzig von 1409 bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2003)

Kreikamp, Hans-Dieter (ed.), *Die Ära Adenauer: 1949-1963*, Freiherr vom Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe, Reihe C: Quellen zum politischen Denken der Deutschen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, 11 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003)

Krieger, Karsten (ed.), *Der 'Berliner Antisemitismusstreit' 1879–1881: Eine Kontroverse um die Zugehörigkeit der deutschen Juden zur Nation. Kommentierte Quellenedition*, 2 parts (Munich: Saur, 2003)

Krumeich, Gerd and Susanne Brandt (eds.), *Schlachtenmythen: Ereignis – Erzählung – Erinnerung,* Europäische Geschichtsdarstellungen, 2 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003)

Kruse, Wolfgang, *Die Erfindung des modernen Militarismus: Krieg, Militär und bürgerliche Gesellschaft im politischen Diskurs der Französischen Revolution 1789-1799*, Pariser Historische Studien, 62 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)

Küng, Hans, *My Struggle for Freedom: Memoirs*, trans. John Bowden (London: Continuum, 2003)

Küsters, Hanns Jürgen (ed.), *Adenauer, Israel und das Judentum*, Rhöndorfer Gespräche, 20, Veröffentlichungen der Stiftung Bundeskanzler-Adenauer-Haus (Bonn: Bouvier, 2004)

Kundrus, Birthe and Beate Meyer (eds.), *Die Deportation der Juden aus Deutschland: Pläne, Praxis, Reaktionen 1938-1945*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus, 20 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004)

Kunisch, Johannes, *Friedrich der Große: Der König und seine Zeit* (Munich: Beck, 2004)

Lehmann, Hartmut and Jean Martin Quédraogo (eds.), *Max Webers Religionssoziologie in interkultureller Perspektive*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 194 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003)

Lehmann, Hartmut and Otto Gerhard Oexle (eds.), *Nationalsozialismus in den Kulturwissenschaften*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 200 and 211; 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004)

Lilla, Joachim (ed.), *Statisten in Uniform: Die Mitglieder des Reichstags 1933–1945. Ein biographisches Handbuch. Unter Einbeziehung der völkischen und nationalsozialistischen Reichstagsabgeordneten ab Mai 1924* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2004)

Lillie, Sophie, *Was einmal war: Handbuch der enteigneten Kunstsammlungen Wiens* (Vienna: Czernin, 2003)

Lingen, Kerstin von, *Kesselrings letzte Schlacht. Kriegsverbrecherprozesse, Vergangenheitspolitik und Wiederbewaffnung: Der Fall Kesselring*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 20 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Maarsen, Jacqueline van, *Ich heiße Anne, sagte sie: Anne Frank, Erinnerungen von Jacqueline van Maarsen*, trans. Stefanie Schäfer (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2004)

Maier, Helmut (ed.), *Rüstungsforschung im Nationalsozialismus: Orga-
nisation, Mobilisierung und Entgrenzung der Technikwissenschaften*,
Geschichte der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft im National-
sozialismus, 3 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2002)

Mallmann, Klaus-Michael and Gerhard Paul (eds.), *Karrieren der
Gewalt: Nationalsozialistische Täterbiographien*, Veröffentlichungen
der Forschungsstelle Ludwigsburg der Universität Stuttgart, 2
(Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004)

Manig, Bert-Oliver, *Die Politik der Ehre: Die Rehabilitierung der Berufs-
soldaten in der frühen Bundesrepublik*, Veröffentlichungen des Zeit-
geschichtlichen Arbeitskreises Niedersachsen, 22 (Göttingen:
Wallstein, 2004)

Marti, Hanspeter, *Klosterkultur und Aufklärung in der Fürstabtei St.
Gallen*, Monasterium Sancti Galli, 2 (St Gallen: Verlag am
Klosterhof, 2003)

McElligott, Anthony and Tim Kirk (eds.), *Working towards the Führer:
Essays in Honour of Sir Ian Kershaw* (Manchester: Manchester
University Press, 2003)

Meyen, Michael, *Denver Clan und Neues Deutschland: Mediennutzung
in der DDR*, Forschungen zur DDR-Gesellschaft (Berlin: Links,
2003)

Meyhoff, Andreas, *Blohm & Voss im 'Dritten Reich': Eine Hamburger
Großwerft zwischen Geschäft und Politik*, Hamburger Beiträge zur
Sozial- und Zeitgeschichte, 38: Darstellungen (Hamburg:
Christians, 2001)

Michalczyk, John J. (ed.), *Confront! Resistance in Nazi Germany* (New
York: Lang, 2004)

Mittenzwei, Werner, *Zwielicht. Auf der Suche nach dem Sinn einer ver-
gangenen Zeit: Eine kulturkritische Autobiographie* (Leipzig: Faber &
Faber, 2004)

Mlynárik, Ján, *Fortgesetzte Vertreibung: Vorgänge im tschechischen
Grenzgebiet 1945–1953* (Munich: Herbig, 2003)

Moran, Daniel and Arthur Waldron (eds.), *The People in Arms:
Military Myth and National Mobilization since the French Revolution*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Murdock, Graeme, *Beyond Calvin: The Intellectual, Political and Cul-
tural World of Europe's Reformed Churches, c. 1540–1620*, European
History in Perspective (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Musial, Bogdan (ed.), *Sowjetische Partisanen in Weißrußland: Innenansichten aus dem Gebiet Baranovici 1941–1944. Eine Dokumentation*, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, 88 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

Naphy, William G., *Plagues, Poisons and Potions: Plague-Spreading Conspiracies in the Western Alps, c. 1530–1640*, Social and Cultural Values in Early Modern Europe (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002)

Nepit, Alexandra, *Die SED unter dem Druck der Reformen Gorbatschows: Der Versuch der Parteiführung, das SED-Regime durch konservatives Systemmanagement zu stabilisieren*, Extremismus und Demokratie, 8 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004)

Neu, Viola, *Das Janusgesicht der PDS: Wähler und Partei zwischen Demokratie und Extremismus*, Extremismus und Demokratie, 9 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004)

Niethammer, Lutz, *Ego-Histoire? und andere Erinnerungsversuche* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2002)

Nitschke, Bernadetta, *Vertreibung und Aussiedlung der deutschen Bevölkerung aus Polen 1945 bis 1949*, Schriften des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, 20 (2nd edn.; Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

Noetzel, Thomas, *Geschichte Irlands: Vom Erstarken der englischen Herrschaft bis heute* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2003)

Oberste, Jörg, *Der 'Kreuzzug' gegen die Albigenser: Ketzerei und Machtpolitik im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003)

O'Sullivan, Donal, *Stalins 'Cordon sanitaire': Die sowjetische Osteuropapolitik und die Reaktionen des Westens 1939–1949* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Paul, Ina Ulrike, *Württemberg 1797–1816/19: Quellen und Studien zur Entstehung des modernen württembergischen Staates*, Quellen und Reformen in den Rheinbundstaaten, 7; 2 vols. (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Pflieger, Klaus, *Die Rote Armee Fraktion – RAF. 14.5.1970 bis 20.4.1998* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004)

Pohl, Hans (ed.), *Geschichte des Finanzplatzes Berlin* (Frankfurt/M.: Knapp, 2002)

Pommerin, Reiner (ed.), *Hundertfünfundsiebzig Jahre TU Dresden*, 3 vols. (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003)

Rasch, Manfred and Gerald D. Feldman (eds.), *August Thyssen und Hugo Stinnes: Ein Briefwechsel 1898–1922*, Schriftenreihe zur Zeitschrift für Unternehmensgeschichte, 10 (Munich: Beck, 2003)

Read, Anthony, *The Devil's Disciples: The Lives and Times of Hitler's Inner Circle* (London: Cape, 2003)

Reuchlin, Johannes, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften in co-operation with Stadt Pforzheim, vol. 2: *1506–1513,* ed. Matthias Dall'Asta und Gerald Dörner (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2003)

Rhode-Jüchtern, Anna-Christine and Maria Kublitz-Kramer (eds.), *Echolos: Klangwelten verfolgter Musikerinnen in der NS-Zeit* (Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2004)

Roloff, Stefan, *Die Rote Kapelle: Die Widerstandsgruppe im Dritten Reich und die Geschichte Helmut Roloffs* (Munich: Ullstein, 2004)

Rosenkötter, Bernhard, *Treuhandpolitik: Die 'Haupttreuhandstelle Ost' und der Raub polnischer Vermögen 1939–1945* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2003)

Rossbacher, Karlheinz, *Literatur und Bürgertum: Fünf Wiener jüdische Familien von der liberalen Ära zum Fin de Siècle*, Literatur und Leben, 64 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2003)

Rossino, Alexander B., *Hitler Strikes Poland: Blitzkrieg, Ideology, and Atrocity,* Modern War Studies (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2003)

Rublack, Ulinka, *Die Reformation in Europa* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2003)

Ruck, Michael and Karl Heinrich Pohl (eds.), *Regionen im Nationalsozialismus*, IZRG-Schriftenreihe, 10 (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2003)

Rüther, Daniela, *Der Widerstand des 20. Juli auf dem Weg in die Soziale Marktwirtschaft: Die wirtschaftspolitischen Vorstellungen der bürgerlichen Opposition gegen Hitler* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002)

Rupieper, Hermann-Josef and Alexander Sperk (eds.), *Die Lageberichte der Geheimen Staatspolizei zur Provinz Sachsen 1933 bis 1936*, 2 vols. (Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag, 2003–2004)

Rupps, Martin, *Troika wider Willen: Wie Brandt, Wehner und Schmidt die Republik regierten* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2004)

Ruzicka, Dagmar, *Friedrich Wilhelm Graf von Haugwitz, 1702–1765: Weg, Leistung und Umfeld eines schlesisch-österreichischen Staatsmannes* (Frankfurt/M.: Verlag Neue Wissenschaft, 2002)

Ryding, Erik S. and Rebecca Pechefsky, *Bruno Walter: A World Else-where* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2001)

Schenk, Dieter, *Die braunen Wurzeln des BKA* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2003)

Schilling, Heinz, *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen zur europäischen Reformations- und Konfessionsgeschichte*, ed. Luise Schorn-Schütte and Olaf Mörke, Historische Forschungen, 75 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2002)

Schöllgen, Gregor, *Willy Brandt: Die Biographie* (2nd edn.; Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2001)

Schönhoven, Klaus, *Wendejahre: Die Sozialdemokratie in der Zeit der Großen Koalition 1966–1969*, Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie nach 1945, 2 (Bonn: Dietz, 2004)

Schütz, Oliver M., *Begegnung von Kirche und Welt: Die Gründung katholischer Akademien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1945–1975*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 96 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Schwarz, Hans-Peter, *Anmerkungen zu Adenauer* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2004)

Searle, Alaric, *Wehrmacht Generals, West German Society, and the Debate on Rearmament, 1949–1959* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003)

Selig, Wolfram, *'Arisierung' in München: Die Vernichtung jüdischer Existenz 1937–1939* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2004)

Shore, Zachary, *What Hitler Knew: The Battle for Information in Nazi Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Siedler, Wolf Jobst, *Wir waren noch einmal davongekommen: Erinnerungen* (Munich: Siedler, 2004)

Sigmund, Anna Maria, *Des Führers bester Freund: Adolf Hitler, seine Nichte Geli Raubal und der 'Ehrenarier' Emil Maurice — eine Dreiecksbeziehung* (Munich: Heyne, 2003)

Smith, Helmut Walser, *The Butcher's Tale: Murder and Anti-Semitism in a German Town* (New York: Norton, 2002)

Steigmann-Gall, Richard, *The Holy Reich: Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Steinbach, Peter, *Der 20. Juli 1944: Gesichter des Widerstands* (Munich: Siedler, 2004)

Stibbe, Matthew, *Women in the Third Reich* (London: Arnold, 2003)

167

Stone, Dan (ed.), *The Historiography of the Holocaust* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Strunk, Peter, *Die AEG: Aufstieg und Niedergang einer Industrielegende* (Berlin: Nicolai, 2002)

Süß, Peter, *'Ist Hitler nicht ein famoser Kerl?': Eine Familie und ihr Unternehmen vom Kaiserreich bis zur Bundesrepublik* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Tampke, Jürgen, *Czech–German Relations and the Politics of Central Europe: From Bohemia to the EU* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Taylor, Frederick, *Dresden: Tuesday, February 13, 1945* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004)

Timmermann, Nicola, *Repräsentative 'Staatsbaukunst' im faschistischen Italien und im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland: Der Einfluß der Berlin-Planung auf die EUR* (Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2001)

Ueberschär, Gerd R., *Stauffenberg: Der 20. Juli 1944* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2004)

Unabhängige Expertenkommission Schweiz—Zweiter Weltkrieg (ed.), *Die Schweiz, der Nationalsozialismus und der Zweite Weltkrieg: Schlussbericht* (2nd edn.; Zurich: Pendo Verlag, 2002)

Unseld, Siegfried (ed.), *Peter Suhrkamp: Zur Biographie eines Verlegers in Daten, Dokumenten und Bildern* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2004)

Wagner, Cosima, *Briefe: Eine erstaunliche Korrespondenz. Cosima Wagner, Ludwig II. von Bayern*, ed. Martha Schad (Munich: Piper, 2004)

Walter, Dierk, *Preußische Heeresreformen, 1807–1870: Militärische Innovation und der Mythos der 'Roonschen Reform'*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 16 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)

Walter, Rolf (ed.), *Geschichte des Konsums*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 175 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004)

Weber, Reinhold, *Bürgerpartei und Bauernbund in Württemberg: Konservative Parteien im Kaiserreich und in Weimar (1895–1933)*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 141 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2004)

Wedekind, Michael, *Nationalsozialistische Besatzungs- und Annexionspolitik in Norditalien 1943 bis 1945: Die Operationszonen 'Alpenvorland' und 'Adriatisches Küstenland'*, Militärgeschichtliche Studien, 38 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)

Wegner, Bernd (ed.), *Wie Kriege enden: Wege zum Frieden von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 14 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002)

Winzen, Peter, *Reichskanzler Bernhard Fürst von Bülow: Weltmachtstratege ohne Fortune – Wegbereiter der großen Katastrophe*, Persönlichkeit und Geschichte, 163 (Göttingen: Muster-Schmidt, 2003)

Wolff, Christian, *'Deutsche Politik': Vernünftige Gedanken von dem gesellschaftlichen Leben der Menschen und insonderheit dem gemeinen Wesen*, ed. Hasso Hofmann, Bibliothek des deutschen Staatsdenkens, 13 (Munich: Beck, 2004)

Wolff, Stefan (ed.), *German Minorities in Europe: Ethnic Identity and Cultural Belonging* (New York: Berghahn, 2000)

Wolfrum, Edgar (ed.), *Die Deutschen im 20. Jahrhundert* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2004)

Zadek, Peter, *My Way: Eine Autobiographie 1926–1969* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2004)

Zaremba, Michael, *Johann Gottfried Herder, Prediger der Humanität: Eine Biografie* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002)

Zaunstöck, Holger and Markus Meumann (eds.), *Sozietäten, Netzwerke, Kommunikation: Neue Forschungen zur Vergesellschaftung im Jahrhundert der Aufklärung*, Hallesche Beiträge zur Europäischen Aufklärung, 21 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003)

Zuckermann, Moshe (ed.), *Deutsche Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts im Spiegel der deutschsprachigen Literatur*, Conferences, 2 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

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

Vol. 2: Lothar Kettenacker (ed.), *Das 'Andere Deutschland' im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Emigration und Widerstand in internationaler Perspektive; The 'Other Germany' in the Second World War: Emigration and Resistance in International Perspective* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1977)

Vol. 3: Marie-Luise Recker, *England und der Donauraum, 1919–1929: Probleme einer europäischen Nachkriegsordnung* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1976)

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

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

Vol. 6: Hans-Christoph Junge, *Flottenpolitik und Revolution: Die Entstehung der englischen Seemacht während der Herrschaft Cromwells* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980)

Vol. 7: Milan Hauner, *India in Axis Strategy: Germany, Japan, and Indian Nationalists in the Second World War* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 8: Gerhard Hirschfeld and Lothar Kettenacker (eds), *Der 'Führerstaat': Mythos und Realität. Studien zur Struktur und Politik des Dritten Reiches; The 'Führer State': Myth and Reality. Studies on the Structure and Politics of the Third Reich* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 9: Hans-Eberhard Hilpert, *Kaiser- und Papstbriefe in den Chronica majora des Matthaeus Paris* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 10: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds), *Sozialprotest, Gewalt, Terror: Gewaltanwendung durch politische und gesellschaftliche Randgruppen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 11: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds), *Die Entstehung des Wohlfahrtsstaates in Großbritannien und Deutschland 1850–1950* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 12: Peter Alter, *Wissenschaft, Staat, Mäzene: Anfänge moderner Wissenschaftspolitik in Großbritannien 1850-1920* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 13: Wolfgang Mock, *Imperiale Herrschaft und nationales Interesse: 'Constructive Imperialism' oder Freihandel in Großbritannien vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 14: Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exil in Großbritannien: Zur Emigration aus dem nationalsozialistischen Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 15: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds), *Auf dem Wege zur Massengewerkschaft: Die Entwicklung der Gewerkschaften in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880–1914* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984)

Vol. 16: Josef Foschepoth (ed.), *Kalter Krieg und Deutsche Frage: Deutschland im Widerstreit der Mächte 1945–1952* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985)

Vol. 17: Ulrich Wengenroth, *Unternehmensstrategien und technischer Fortschritt: Die deutsche und britische Stahlindustrie 1865–1895* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Vol. 18: Helmut Reifeld, *Zwischen Empire und Parlament: Zur Gedankenbildung und Politik Lord Roseberys (1880–1905)* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 19: Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 20: Karl Heinz Metz, *Industrialisierung und Sozialpolitik: Das Problem der sozialen Sicherheit in Großbritannien 1795–1911* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 21: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Schwentker (eds), *Max Weber und seine Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 22: Lothar Kettenacker, *Krieg zur Friedenssicherung: Die Deutschlandplanung der britischen Regierung während des Zweiten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)

171

Vol. 23: Adolf M. Birke and Günther Heydemann (eds), *Die Herausforderung des europäischen Staatensystems: Nationale Ideologie und staatliches Interesse zwischen Restauration und Imperialismus* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)

Vol. 24: Helga Woggon, *Integrativer Sozialismus und nationale Befreiung: Politik und Wirkungsgeschichte James Connollys in Irland* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 25: Kaspar von Greyerz, *Vorsehungsglaube und Kosmologie: Studien zu englischen Selbstzeugnissen des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 26: Andreas Wirsching, *Parlament und Volkes Stimme: Unterhaus und Öffentlichkeit im England des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 27: Claudia Schnurmann, *Kommerz und Klüngel: Der Englandhandel Kölner Kaufleute im 16. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 28: Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, *Vom Wiener Kongreß zur Pariser Konferenz: England, die deutsche Frage und das Mächtesystem 1815–1856* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 29: Peter Alter (ed.), *Im Banne der Metropolen: Berlin und London in den zwanziger Jahren* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 30: Hermann Wentker, *Zerstörung der Großmacht Rußland? Die britischen Kriegsziele im Krimkrieg* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 31: Angela Schwarz, *Die Reise ins Dritte Reich: Britische Augenzeugen im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland (1933–1939)* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 32: Johannes Paulmann, *Staat und Arbeitsmarkt in Großbritannien: Krise, Weltkrieg, Wiederaufbau* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 33: Clemens Picht, *Handel, Politik und Gesellschaft: Zur wirtschafspolitischen Publizistik Englands im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 34: Friedrich Weckerlein, *Streitfall Deutschland: Die britische Linke und die 'Demokratisierung' des Deutschen Reiches, 1900–1918* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994)

Vol. 35: Klaus Larres, *Politik der Illusionen: Churchill, Eisenhower und die deutsche Frage 1945–1955* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 36: Günther Heydemann, *Konstitution gegen Revolution: Die britische Deutschland- und Italienpolitik 1815–1848* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 37: Hermann Joseph Hiery, *Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee (1900–1921): Eine Annäherung an die Erfahrungen verschiedener Kulturen* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 38: Michael Toyka-Seid, *Gesundheit und Krankheit in der Stadt: Zur Entwicklung des Gesundheitswesens in Durham City 1831–1914* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 39: Detlev Clemens, *Herr Hitler in Germany: Wahrnehmung und Deutung des Nationalsozialismus in Großbritannien 1920 bis 1939* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 40: Christel Gade, *Gleichgewichtspolitik oder Bündnispflege? Maximen britischer Außenpolitik (1910–1914)* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Vol. 41: Benedikt Stuchtey, *W. E. H. Lecky (1838–1903): Historisches Denken und politisches Urteilen eines anglo-irischen Gelehrten* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Vol. 42: Sabine Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalismus im englischen Exil: Zum sozialen und politischen Innenleben der deutschen Kolonie in London 1848 bis 1871* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997)

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

Vol. 44: Bärbel Brodt, *Städte ohne Mauern: Stadtentwicklung in East Anglia im 14. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997)

Vol. 45: Arnd Reitemeier, *Außenpolitik im Spätmittelalter: Die diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Reich und England 1377* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1999)

173

Vol. 46: Gerhard A. Ritter and Peter Wende (eds), *Rivalität und Partnerschaft: Studien zu den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Festschrift für Anthony J. Nicholls* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1999)

Vol. 47: Ulrich Marsch, *Zwischen Wissenschaft und Wirtschaft: Industrieforschung in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880–1936* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2000)

Vol. 48: Lothar Reinermann, *Der Kaiser in England: Wilhelm II. und die britische Öffentlichkeit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001)

Vol. 49: Josef Reindl, *Wachstum und Wettbewerb in den Wirtschaftswunderjahren: Die elektrotechnische Industrie in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Großbritannien 1945–1967* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001)

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

Vol. 51: Willibald Steinmetz, *Begegnungen vor Gericht: Eine Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte des englischen Arbeitsrechts (1850–1925)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002)

Vol. 52: Andreas Rödder, *Die radikale Herausforderung: Die politische Kultur der englischen Konservativen zwischen ländlicher Tradition und industrieller Moderne (1846–1868)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002)

Vol. 53: Dominik Geppert, *Thatchers konservative Revolution: Der Richtungswandel der britischen Tories (1975–1979)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002)

Vol. 54: Nikolaus Braun, *Terrorismus und Freiheitskampf: Gewalt, Propaganda und politische Strategie im Irischen Bürgerkrieg 1922/23* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)

Vol. 55: Andreas Fahrmeir, *Ehrbare Spekulanten: Stadtverfassung, Wirtschaft und Politik in der City of London, 1688–1900* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)

Vol. 56: Christoph Heyl, *A Passion for Privacy: Untersuchungen zur Genese der bürgerlichen Privatsphäre in London, 1660–1800* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

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

Vol. 58: Ursula Rombeck-Jaschinski, *Das Londoner Schuldenabkommen: Die Regelung der deutschen Auslandsschulden nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, forthcoming 2005)

STUDIES OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON — OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Eckhart Hellmuth (ed.), *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Centur*y (Oxford, 1990)

Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (eds.), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450–1650* (Oxford, 1991)

Rolf Ahmann, Adolf M. Birke, and Michael Howard (eds.), *The Quest for Stability: Problems of West European Security 1918–1957* (Oxford, 1993)

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

John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth (eds.), *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford, 1999)

Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.), *British and German Historiography 1750–1950: Traditions, Perceptions, and Transfers* (Oxford, 2000)

Willibald Steinmetz (ed.), *Private Law and Social Inequality in the Industrial Age: Comparing Legal Cultures in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States* (Oxford, 2000)

Martin H. Geyer and Johannes Paulmann (eds.), *The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Society, and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War* (Oxford, 2001)

Jeremy Noakes, Peter Wende, and Jonathan Wright (eds.), *Britain and Germany in Europe 1949–1990* (Oxford, 2002)

Benedikt Stuchtey and Eckhardt Fuchs (eds.), *Writing World History 1800–2000* (Oxford, 2003)

Dominik Geppert (ed.), *The Postwar Challenge: Cultural, Social, and Political Change in Western Europe, 1945–1958* (Oxford, 2003)

Benedikt Stuchtey (ed.), *Science across the European Empires, 1800–1950* (Oxford, 2005)

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)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds.), *Social Protest, Violence and Terror in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe* (London: Macmillan, 1982)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Lothar Kettenacker (eds.), *The Fascist Challenge and the Policy of Appeasement* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1983)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exile in Great Britain: Refugees from Hitler's Germany* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion, Politics and Social Protest: Three Studies on Early Modern Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion and Society in Early Modern Europe 1500–1800* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Josef Foschepoth and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *Die britische Deutschland- und Besatzungspolitik 1945–1949* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds.), *The Development of Trade Unionism in Great Britain and Germany, 1880-1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds.), *Imperialism and After: Continuities and Discontinuities* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *The Policies of Genocide: Jews and Soviet Prisoners of War in Nazi Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Ralph Uhlig, *Die Deutsch-Englische Gesellschaft 1949–1983: Der Beitrag ihrer 'Königswinter-Konferenzen' zur britisch-deutschen Verständigung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds.), *Max Weber and his Contemporaries* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987)

Peter Alter, *The Reluctant Patron: Science and the State in Britain 1850–1920* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1987)

Stig Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Ronald Robinson (eds.), *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa: The Berlin Africa Conference 1884–1885 and the Onset of Partition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)

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

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

Dagmar Engels and Shula Marks (eds.), *Contesting Colonial Hegemony: Africa and India 1858 to Independence* (London and New York: British Academic Press, 1993)

Ulrike Jordan (ed.), *Conditions of Surrender: Britons and Germans Witness the End of the War* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1996)

Hermann Hiery and John Mackenzie (eds.), *European Impact and Pacific Influence: British and German Colonial Policy in the Pacific Islands and the Indigenous Response* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1997)

Peter Alter (ed.), *Out of the Third Reich: Refugee Historians in Post-War Britain* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 1998)

Sabine Freitag and Peter Wende (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866,* vol. 1: *1816–1829*, Camden Fifth Series, 15 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2000)

Markus Mößlang, Sabine Freitag, and Peter Wende (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866,* vol. 2: *1830–1847*, Camden Fifth Series, 21 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2002)

Sabine Freitag (ed.), *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003)

Dominik Geppert and Udo Wengst (eds.), *Neutralität: Chance oder Chimäre? Konzepte des Dritten Weges für Deutschland und die Welt 1945–1990* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

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

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

Gerhard A. Ritter, *The New Social History in the Federal Republic of Germany* (London, 1991)

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

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

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

Otto Gerhard Oexle, *The British Roots of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* (London, 1995)

Lothar Kettenacker and Wolfgang J. Mommsen (eds.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1978–1983* (London, 1983)

Frank Rexroth (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1983–1988: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1990)

Ulrike Jordan (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1989–1994: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1996)

Andreas Fahrmeir (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1995–1997: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1998)

Regina Pörtner (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1998–2000: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 2002)

Annual Lectures of the German Historical Institute London

1979   Samuel Berrick Saul, *Industrialisation and De-Industrialisation? The Interaction of the German and British Economies before the First World War* (London, 1980)

1980   Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Gustav Stresemann: The Revision of Versailles and the Weimar Parliamentary System* (London, 1981)

1981   A. J. P. Taylor, *1939 Revisited* (London, 1982)

1982   Gordon A. Craig, *Germany and the West: The Ambivalent Relationship* (London, 1983)

1983   Wolfram Fischer, *Germany in the World Economy during the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1984)

1984   James Joll, *National Histories and National Historians: Some German and English Views of the Past* (London, 1985)

1985   Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Britain and Germany 1800 to 1914: Two Developmental Paths Towards Industrial Society* (London, 1986)

1986   Owen Chadwick, *Acton, Döllinger and History* (London, 1987)

1987   Hagen Schulze, *Is there a German History?* (London, 1988)

1988   Roger Morgan, *Britain and Germany since 1945: Two Societies and Two Foreign Policies* (London, 1989)

1989   Thomas Nipperdey, *The Rise of the Arts in Modern Society* (London, 1990)

1990   *Not available*

1991   Lothar Gall, *Confronting Clio: Myth-Makers and Other Historians* (London, 1992)

1992   Keith Robbins, *Protestant Germany through British Eyes: A Complex Victorian Encounter* (London, 1993)

1993   Klaus Hildebrand, *Reich – Nation-State – Great Power: Reflections on German Foreign Policy 1871–1945* (London, 1995)

179

1994   Alan Bullock, *Personality and Power: the Strange Case of Hitler and Stalin* (London, 1995)

1995   Ernst Schulin, *'The Most Historical of All Peoples': Nationalism and the New Construction of Jewish History in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (London, 1996)

1996   Michael Howard, *The Crisis of the Anglo-German Antagonism 1916–17* (London, 1997)

1997   Johannes Fried, *The Veil of Memory: Anthropological Problems when Considering the Past* (London, 1998)

1998   David Blackbourn, *A Sense of Place: New Directions in German History* (London, 1999)

1999   Gerhard A. Ritter, *Continuity and Change: Political and Social Developments in Germany after 1945 and 1989/90* (London, 2000)

2000   Peter Pulzer, *Fog in Channel: Anglo-German Perceptions in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2001)

2001   Heinrich A. Winkler, *The Long Shadow of the Reich: Weighing Up German History* (London, 2002)

2002   *Not available*

2003   Werner Paravicini, *Fact and Fiction: St Patrick's Purgatory and the European Chivalry in the Later Middle Ages* (2004)

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

Bulletin *Index, 1979–1996* (London, 1996), plus supplement for the years 1997–2001