German Historical Institute London

Bulletin

CONTENTS

                                                                 (cont.)

Contents

Conference Reports

Noticeboard

Library News

SEMINARS AT THE GHIL
SUMMER 2007

15 May **CHRISTOPHER CLARK (CAMBRIDGE)**
Rethinking the History of Prussia
Christopher Clark has been a Fellow of St Catharine's College, Cambridge since 1990. An expert on modern German history, he has published widely on subjects at the interface between religion, culture and politics. His most recent book is *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600–1947* (2006, German trans. 2007).

24 May **GEOFF ELEY (MICHIGAN)**
(Thurs.) **Hitler's Silent Majority? Conformity and Resistance under the Third Reich**
Geoff Eley is the Karl Pohrt Distinguished University Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Michigan. In addition to German history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, on which he has published widely, his research and teaching interests include Europe since 1945, nationalism, cultural studies, and historiography. He is the author (with K. Nield) of *The Future of Class in History: What's Left of the Social?* (2007).

29 May **MARTIAL STAUB (SHEFFIELD)**
The Republic of the Dead in Reformation Nuremberg: Endowment, Freedom and Solidarity in an Age of Participation
Martial Staub has been Professor of Medieval History at the University of Sheffield since September 2004. From 1993 to 2004 he was a Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute of History in Göttingen. His main research interests range from the history of the medieval Church to the history of urban societies in late medieval and Renaissance Germany and Italy. He is the editor (with M. Derwich) of *Die 'neue Frömmigkeit' in Europa im Spätmittelalter* (2004).

Seminars

26 June **JOST DÜLFFER (COLOGNE)**
Are Democracies Really more Peaceful? Democratic Peace Theory Revisited
Jost Dülffer was appointed Professor of Modern History at the University of Cologne in 1982, the only history chair in Germany with a specialization in peace and conflict research. In 2005/6 he was Konrad Adenauer Visiting Professor at the BMW Center for German and European Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, DC. His main research areas are the history of international relations, modern German history, and European history since 1945. He is the author of *Europa im Ost-West-Konflikt, 1945–1991* (2004).

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.

ARTICLES

HITLER'S GAMES: RACE RELATIONS IN THE 1936 OLYMPICS

David Clay Large

On 29 April 1931 the International Olympic Committee (IOC) voted 43 to 16 to hold the 1936 Olympic Summer Games in Berlin, Germany, over runner-up Barcelona, Spain. At that time Germany was still a democracy, albeit a beleaguered one. Less than two years later, the country was under the control of a Nazi-led government that stood as a mockery of the Olympic ideals of internationalism and peaceful competition among the peoples of the world, independent of religious, racial, and ethnic considerations. Nonetheless, despite protests from a number of quarters and the threat of a boycott by some nations, most notably the USA, the IOC held fast to its decision to stage the Summer Games in Berlin. In June 1933, five months *after* Hitler came to power, the IOC awarded the 1936 Winter Games to the Bavarian twin villages of Garmisch-Partenkirchen.

Holding the 1936 Olympics in an avowedly racist and anti-democratic nation was undoubtedly the most controversial move ever made by the IOC, a body that has seen more than its share of controversy and scandal over the years. For Nazi Germany, which enthusiastically embraced the games after initial misgivings about hosting them, the Olympic venture proved in general to be an organizational and propaganda success, promoting the image of a friendly and harmonious nation open to the world.[1] One can never know what would have happened had the IOC denied Hitler his greatest propa-

This article is based on a lecture given at the German Historical Institute London on 14 Nov. 2006.

[1] There is a wealth of literature on the 1936 Olympics. The most useful book-length contributions include Richard D. Mandell, *The Nazi Olympics* (New York, 1971); Duff Hart-Davis, *Hitler's Games: The 1936 Olympics* (New York,

ganda coup, but some observers at the time believed that such a move would have strengthened resistance within Germany to the Nazi tyranny.[2]

Apart from the valuable propaganda boost for the Nazis, the 1936 games introduced technical innovations and set organizational standards that have shaped the Olympic movement ever since. Although the inaugural 'modern' Olympics were held in Athens in 1896, the German games of 1936 were the first to take on the scope and trappings familiar to us today. The Germans games were the first to receive extensive logistical and financial support from a national government. They were the first to be broadcast worldwide by radio and (albeit very primitively and only locally) by television. They pioneered the pre-competition Olympic Torch Relay from Olympia in Greece to the host site as well as the release of doves on opening day. They featured a wide range of the now-ubiquitous ancillary hoopla, such as dress balls, banquets, art exhibitions, parades, and concerts. They encouraged corporate advertising and endorsements (Coca-Cola was a 'proud sponsor' of the '36 games, as were Mercedes-Benz and Lufthansa). And, most ominously, they made 'safety' for visitors and athletes a major priority, providing a security apparatus of unprecedented proportions.

Given the limits of space here, this article obviously cannot tell the whole story of the 1936 Olympics. What I propose to do is to focus on some of the political and racial dimensions of this affair, honing in on the boycott threat and the German response to it. Following that I shall discuss the unprecedented success of American black athletes in the track and field competition in Berlin, paying particular attention to the manner in which that success was interpreted, both in

1986); Arnd Krüger, *Die Olympischen Spiele 1936 und die Weltmeinung: Ihre außenpolitische Bedeutung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der USA* (Berlin, 1972); Arnd Krüger and William Murray (eds.), *The Nazi Olympics: Sport, Politics, and Appeasement in the 1930s* (Urbana, Ill., 2003); Guy Walters, *Berlin Games: How Hitler Stole the Olympic Dream* (London, 2006); and David Clay Large, *Nazi Games: The Olympics of 1936* (New York, 2007).

[2] America's consuls in Berlin argued vociferously that a loss of the 1936 Olympics would constitute a significant domestic political blow to the Nazi regime. See cables from Consuls Messersmith and Geist to the State Department, in Olympic Games, 862.4016, National Archives, Washington, DC (hereafter NA).

Germany and the United States. Here I hope to dispel some of the misconceptions that persist to this day regarding the American blacks' experience in Berlin, including the myth that Jesse Owens was snubbed by Hitler, and the all-too confident conclusion that the black triumphs represented a major blow to the doctrines of white racial superiority that were prevalent at that time.

I

I should preface my comments on the boycott threat by noting that before Hitler assumed power in January 1933 it seemed unlikely that a Hitler-run government, should one in fact come to pass in Germany, would even want to host the Olympic Games. The Nazi leadership and Nazi sports commentators had shown nothing but contempt for the modern Olympic movement, and indeed for all international sporting events, calling instead for purely German competitions and fitness programmes focusing on *Turnen*, the synchronized group-gymnastics that had been developed in Germany in the early nineteenth century. In the early 1920s they had objected to Germans competing with athletes from the Allied countries, which had imposed the so-called 'Yoke of Versailles' on the Fatherland. They had also objected to 'Aryans' competing with 'racial inferiors' such as Slavs, blacks, and Jews.[3]

The Nazi objection to competing with blacks was particularly relevant because black athletes, having had a modest presence in the Olympics of 1920 and 1924, performed especially well in the Los Angeles games of 1932. African-American runners Eddie Tolan and Ralph Metcalfe, labelled the 'Sable Cyclones' in the American press, excelled in the sprints, with Tolan setting a world record in the 100-metre race and an Olympic record in the 200-metre event. R. M. N. Tisdall, one of Britain's first black Olympians, won the 400-metre race. For Nazi ideologues, it was a disgrace that white athletes,

---

[3] For Nazi objections to the Olympics see, among others, Georg Haller, 'Der Olympische Gedanke', *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, 3 (1933), pp. 388–96; Bruno Malitz, *Die Leibesübungen in der nationalsozialistischen Idee* (Munich, 1933); Hans-Joachim Teichler, *Internationale Sportpolitik im Dritten Reich* (Schorndorf, 1991), pp. 45–7.

including a German runner named Arthur Jonath, had deigned to compete at all with the likes of Tolan and Metcalfe.[4] And looking towards the 1936 games the *Völkischer Beobachter*, the Nazi Party's principal organ, editorialized:

> Blacks have no place in the Olympics. . . . Unfortunately, these days one often sees the free white man having to compete with blacks, with *Neger*, for the victory palm. This is a disgrace and a degradation of the Olympic idea without parallel, and the ancient Greeks would turn over in their graves if they knew what modern men were doing with their sacred national games . . . . The next Olympic Games will take place in Berlin. Hopefully, the men in control will do their duty. Blacks must be excluded. We demand it.[5]

As late as 1932, Hitler himself called the modern Olympic Games 'a plot against the Aryan race by Freemasons and Jews'.[6]

Hitler did not begin to change his tune on the Olympics until after he had assumed the chancellorship. In March 1933 one of the key members of the German Olympic Organizing Committee (GOC), Theodor Lewald, who happened to be half-Jewish, argued in a meeting with Hitler that hosting the games would provide an invaluable propaganda opportunity for Germany and undoubtedly constitute an economic windfall for the Reich.[7] But what really seems to have brought Hitler around was the prospect of building a grandiose stage for the games in Berlin: grand architectural schemes, after all, excited him more than just about anything else. In May 1933 he therefore let it be known that his government not only would support the Olympic project, but host the most magnificent Olympic festival ever.

Yet even while belatedly endorsing the games, the Nazi government and German sporting associations pursued policies that clash-

[4] See Teichler, *Internationale Sportpolitik*, p. 47.

[5] 'Neger haben auf der Olympiade nichts zu suchen', *Völkischer Beobachter*, 19 Aug. 1932.

[6] Quoted in Hart-Davis, *Hitler's Games*, p. 45.

[7] Lewald to Lammars, 16 Mar. 1933, R8077, 46/173/612, Bundesarchiv Berlin.

ed sharply with Olympic principles of openness and fair play in athletic competition. From the outset the Hitler government's programme of anti-Jewish persecution embraced the world of sport, which was 'coordinated'—forced into conformity—with Nazi dogma along with other dimensions of public life. Addressing the imperative of a thorough purge of German sports, Bruno Malitz, the Berlin SA's sports authority, ranted that Jews were 'worse than cholera, syphilis, drought, and poison gas'.[8] Accordingly, in spring 1933, the German Swimming Association banned Jews from its member clubs. Germany's Davis Cup tennis team expelled one of its stars, Dr Daniel Prenn, because he was Jewish. The German Boxing Federation forbade Jews to fight in, or officiate over, German championship contests. The *Völkischer Beobachter* called for the dismissal of Theodor Lewald from the GOC on grounds of his part-Jewish ancestry, and he would have been dismissed had not the IOC warned that such a move might compromise Berlin's chances of holding on to the 1936 games.[9]

However, the retention of Lewald in his post was hardly enough to reassure a growing chorus of critics around the world who were beginning to insist that the games be removed from Berlin, and to threaten a massive boycott of the Olympics if they transpired in the Nazi capital after all. Interestingly, the Olympic protest and boycott movement had its origins and greatest resonance in America—a nation that was hardly without its own tradition of racial discrimination in sports. I shall focus here on the American boycott movement, which, whatever one might say about the rule that people in glass houses should not throw stones, came within a hair of succeeding. And had the Americans decided to shun Berlin, other Western democracies, most notably France and Britain, would probably have stayed home too, with the result that Hitler's party in 1936 would have been a pretty paltry affair.

The boycott movement in America was initially an almost exclusively Jewish affair, American Jews having reacted with alarm and outrage to the Hitler government's anti-Semitic pronouncements and measures. In mid-April 1933 various Jewish groups asked Avery

[8] Quoted in [Anonymous], *Der gelbe Fleck: Die Ausrottung von 500,000 Deutschen Juden* (Paris, 1936), pp. 187–8.
[9] Teichler, *Internationale Sportpolitik*, pp. 45–7.

9

Brundage, the irascible president of the American Olympic Committee (AOC), to take a stand against holding the games in the German capital. What the Jewish activists did not know was that Brundage was dead set against moving the games out of Germany, or, for that matter, boycotting them should they remain there. Time and again, he would justify this stance on grounds that 'sports' and 'politics' occupied independent realms, and that the Olympic movement in particular could survive only if politics were kept out of it.[10] But there can be no question that Brundage's own anti-Semitism played a role here as well. The fact that the primary opposition to an Olympiad under Hitler came (at least initially) from Jews led him to see in this opposition a diabolical Jewish plot to subvert the entire Olympic enterprise. He also believed that the Jews were out to get him personally. At one point, one of Brundage's AOC colleagues, Gus Kirby, could write to him in exasperation: 'I take it that the fundamental difference between you and me is that you are a Jew hater and Jew baiter and I am neither; that you enjoy being hated and despised and threatened by the Jews and I don't; that you have made no promises to the Jews and I have.'[11]

Although Brundage himself initially avoided taking a stance on the question of Berlin's suitability as an Olympic host by insisting that venue considerations were solely the province of the IOC, the German Organizing Committee was deeply concerned about the American protests. Hoping to nip the protest in the bud, Theodor Lewald convinced the Hitler government to issue a statement promising to respect the Olympic charter and to welcome to Germany 'competitors of all races'. The regime added a significant caveat, however: the composition of Germany's own team was nobody's business but Germany's.[12] The Germans hoped the IOC would agree.

And in fact, for the most part, the IOC did agree. IOC President Henri de Baillet-Latour, a Belgian aristocrat, held views similar to Brundage's in regard to the relationship between the Olympic move-

---

[10] For evidence of Brundage's view of the Olympics as 'above politics', see his voluminous correspondence in the Avery Brundage Archive (hereafter ABC) at the University of Illinois. See also Allen Guttmann, *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement* (New York, 1984), *passim.*
[11] Kirby to Brundage, 27 May 1936, Box 29, ABC.
[12] 'Brundage's Views Stir Berlin Press', *New York Times*, 20 Apr. 1933.

ment and politics. He believed that the IOC should avoid taking any 'political' positions except in the case of possible Communist penetration of the games, which he thought must be avoided at all costs.[13] Although he was astute enough to see a threat to Olympic principles in the Nazi regime's open racism, he also believed that if the racism in question was confined to the German domestic scene, the IOC had no right to interfere. Thus he issued a statement in April 1933 saying that the agency was holding fast to its 1931 decision to hold the 1936 Summer Games in Berlin, provided that 'every people and every race is allowed to participate in complete equality'. The requirement of equality, he was quick to add, did not mean that the IOC could concern itself with Germany's internal affairs. If Germany did not wish to be represented by any Jewish athletes, this was entirely its own business.[14]

The stance of the IOC guaranteed that the games would not be moved out of Berlin, but it did nothing to dampen the boycott threat. In fact, Jewish groups in America now called openly for a US boycott of Berlin unless the Germans suspended their racist policies and opened their own Olympic programme to qualified competitors regardless of religion or ethnicity. Jewish groups also promised to withhold any financial contributions to the American Olympic programme should the AOC decide to send a team to Berlin.[15]

Fearing that American Jews had the influence to bring about a boycott—Avery Brundage's stance notwithstanding—the Germans decided to give some ground, at least on paper. At the Vienna meeting of the IOC in June 1933 they promised not only to observe all Olympic regulations but also that 'Jews would not be excluded from membership in German teams'.[16] The reality, however, was that Jewish athletes, of whom Germany actually had a sizeable number, including some very good ones, were never given a fair shake at membership on the German teams for Garmisch or Berlin. Most

[13] Karl Lennartz, 'Difficult Times: Baillet-Latour and Germany, 1931–1942', *Olympika,* 3 (1994), p. 101.
[14] Hans-Joachim Teichler, 'Zum Aussschluß der deutschen Juden von den Olympischen Spielen 1936', *Stadion*, 15/1 (1989), pp. 47–8.
[15] Moshe Gottlieb, 'The American Controversy over the Olympic Games of 1936', *American Jewish Historical Quarterly,* 61 (Mar. 1972), pp. 184–5.
[16] Quoted in Teichler, 'Zum Ausschluß', p. 50.

notably, a German female high jumper named Gretl Bergmann was denied the chance to compete in the qualifying rounds in 1936 despite having won the German national championship in 1935.[17] And, of course, anti-Semitic policies in other dimensions of public life in Nazi Germany continued unabated.

Against this backdrop of persistent government-backed racism in Germany, the American boycott movement expanded beyond its original Jewish base to include Catholic and Protestant organizations, labour groups, and the American Civil Liberties Union. On 7 March 1934 a mass rally was held in Madison Square Garden in New York City to protest against Nazi racial policies and to threaten boycotts of German goods as well as the 1936 Olympics if these policies persisted. In response to the growing boycott movement, Avery Brundage made a 'fact-finding trip' to Germany in the autumn of 1934, promising to investigate the sporting scene in the Third Reich. He did interview some Jewish sporting officials, but only in the presence of uniformed SS officers. At one point he put his Nazi hosts at ease by pointing out that his own men's club in Chicago would not allow Jews or blacks.[18] Upon his return to America he gave the Germans a clean bill of health, saying he saw no evidence of racism and echoing German assurances that that there would be no discrimination against any of the foreign athletes competing in the German games. 'You can't ask for more than that', he said.[19]

But of course, many in America continued to believe that you *could* ask for more than that and were totally unconvinced by Brundage's whitewash. Because the boycott movement continued to pick up steam, with a number of influential Protestant and Catholic publications saying the Yanks should stay home, other initiatives were mounted by the American Olympic establishment to undercut pro-boycott sentiment. The most important was launched by Charles Sherrill, one of the three American members of the IOC, and, like Brundage, a strong believer in the importance of keeping the games

[17] On Bergmann, see Volker Bloch, *Berlin 1936: Die Olympischen Spiele unter Berücksichtigung des jüdischen Sports* (Constance, 2002), 76–8; 'Je wütender ich war, desto besser sprang ich', *Die Zeit*, 19 July 1996; 'Der Fall Bergmann', *Die Zeit*, 24 July 1961.

[18] Krüger, *Die Olympischen Spiele 1936*, p. 52.

[19] 'U.S. Will Compete in 1936 Olympics', *New York Times*, 27 Nov. 1934.

in Berlin. In late summer 1935 Sherrill travelled to Germany with the goal of persuading Hitler to name at least one Jew to its Olympic teams, a gesture he privately compared with the American tradition of 'the token Negro'. In his meeting with Hitler he warned that if Germany did not do this, America might well boycott the German games. To reinforce his point, he reminded Hitler of the Jews' tremendous influence in America, especially in New York City, where he said 'the Jew La Guardia' (the mayor's mother was Jewish) was cultivating 'anti-Nazi sentiment' to promote his own political fortunes.[20] Hitler listened respectfully to Sherrill but told him there could be no Jewish participation on the German teams, period. In fact, he said that rather than having Jews pollute the German teams he would call the whole damn thing off and substitute 'purely German Olympic Games' for the international festival.[21]

But this turned out to be a hollow bluff. Hitler knew that German-only games would not have been useful in terms of propaganda, nor would they have provided a world stage for the grand architectural display he envisaged. In the end, he acquiesced with a gesture of compromise tokenism worked out between Charles Sherrill and the GOC. The Germans agreed to add a half-Jewish fencer named Helene Mayer to their team for Berlin. For the Nazis the pain of this decision was eased by the fact that Fräulein Mayer was an excellent fencer, having won a gold medal in the Amsterdam Olympics in 1928 and world championships in 1929 and 1931. Moreover, she looked like a perfect Aryan Valkyrie—with a strapping physique, green eyes, and ropes of braided blond hair piled up on her head in the *Schnecke* style favoured by the *Bund deutscher Mädel* (League of German Girls). Also crucial was the fact that according to the newly enshrined Nuremberg Laws Mayer could still be considered a German citizen, as her mother was 'Aryan'. Moreover, although her fencing club in Offenbach had expelled her in 1933 and since then she had been living in Oakland, California, she spoke in glowing terms about the new

[20] Aufzeichnung über den Empfang [Sherrills] am 24.8.34, 4508, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes, Berlin (hereafter PAAA).

[21] Ibid. See also Arnd Krüger, '"Dann veranstalten wir eben rein deutsche Olympische Spiele": Die Olympischen Spiele 1936 als deutsches Nationalfest', in H. Breuer and R. Naul (eds.), *Schwimmsport und Sportgeschichte: Zwischen Politik und Wissenschaft* (St Augustin, 1994), pp. 127–49.

Articles

Germany and expressed a desire to return home to compete once again for the Reich in the upcoming Berlin Olympics. According to the German consul-general in San Francisco, she had turned down an invitation to participate in a local anti-Nazi rally. She also made clear that she did not subscribe to the Jewish faith, had no contact with Jewish organizations and, in fact, did not think of herself as Jewish at all.[22] Reichssportführer Hans von Tschammer und Osten could confidently declare Mayer to be an 'honorary Aryan'.[23] (As it happened, in the fencing competitions in Berlin Mayer did not bring home the gold medal that her Nazi sponsors had so counted on; she came in second, losing to a Hungarian woman who was fully Jewish.)

Germany also added a half-Jewish ice hockey player named Rudi Ball to its team for the Winter Games in Garmisch-Partenkirchen. This decision was not made to appease the Americans or international opinion but solely to improve the prospects for the German ice hockey team, which hoped to win a medal in Garmisch as it had in Lake Placid in 1932. Having been instrumental in Germany's taking the bronze medal in Lake Placid, Ball was such a valuable asset that the Nazi authorities saw fit to overlook his 'tainted' ethnicity. (Alas, during the Garmisch Olympics Ball was able to help the Germans win only their first two contests; severely injured in game three, he had to sit out the rest of the competition.)

There is no evidence that Germany's strategic concession with Helene Mayer impressed many American critics of the German games; and Sherrill himself, the tokenism broker, did not help matters by attending the 1935 Nazi Party Rally in Nuremberg as Hitler's personal guest and then returning home to insist that America had no right to push Germany any further on the Jewish issue. He said in a press conference:

> I went to Germany for the purpose of getting at least one Jew
> on the German Olympic team and I feel that my job is finished.
> As to obstacles placed in the way of Jewish athletes or any
> other athletes in trying to reach Olympic ability, I would have
> no more business discussing that in Germany than if the Ger-

[22] German Consulate, San Francisco to German Embassy, Washington, 18 Nov. 1935, 4520, PAAA.
[23] Mandell, *The Nazi Olympics*, p. 77.

mans attempted to discuss the Negro situation in the American South or the treatment of the Japanese in California.[24]

Sherrill's mention of 'the Negro situation in the American South' is interesting in light of the fact that anti-black racism in the US was fast becoming an issue in the debate over whether America should participate in the 1936 games—and whether, if America did participate, African-Americans should be part of the US team. The American black community took up this question when it became evident that Negroes were likely to constitute a significant component of the team America sent to Berlin, especially in track and field. Given the fact that Germany was undeniably racist towards blacks as well as Jews, the question was: should the African-American community join the American Jewish community in pushing for a boycott of the Berlin games? Conversely, given the equally obvious fact that America harboured its own brand of racism, especially against blacks, did America have any right to claim the moral high ground and stay away from the German games?

Many black-owned newspapers pointed out that it was hypocritical for American sports officials to demand equal treatment for German Jews when they tolerated, indeed practised, discrimination against black athletes at home.[25] Yet at the same time, the black press, along with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), strongly opposed Nazi racial policies, and, in light of the openly expressed hostility toward blacks in the Nazi press, worried about how African-American athletes would be treated were they to compete in Germany. As early as October 1933 Roy Wilkins, the assistant secretary of the NAACP, had written to the three American IOC members (William May Garland, Ernest Lee Jahncke, and Charles Sherrill) expressing his organization's 'increased apprehension [over] the reiterated emphasis on color and race' emanating from Germany. 'We are particularly concerned', he went on, 'that there shall be no discrimination against colored athletes who may be chosen to represent the United States of America and other coun-

[24] 'Sherrill Rebuffs Olympic Ban Plea', *New York Times*, 22 Oct. 1935.
[25] David K. Wiggins, 'The 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin: The Response of America's Black Press', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 54 (Sept. 1983), pp. 278–92.

tries.' He asked the American members of the IOC to make inquiries on this point, warning: 'Unless Germany gives unqualified and unequivocal assurance of fair play to those possible colored competitors, we respectfully request the American members of the International Olympic Committee to refuse to permit Americans to compete at Berlin.'[26]

As the American boycott debate wore on, with Jewish organizations putting considerable pressure on the black community to come out firmly against American participation in Berlin, the black press split sharply on the issue; a few papers endorsed the boycott, many others opposed it. The anti-boycott faction generally made the argument that the best way to refute Nazi racial policy was to send American blacks to Berlin and watch them beat the pants off their German (and other white) competitors. In November 1935 the NAACP officially called upon American Negro athletes 'not [to] participate in the 1936 Olympics . . . under the present situation in Germany'. In sending news of this resolution to the American Jewish Committee, however, Roy Wilkins admitted to a certain ambivalence about the decision for he, too, saw advantages in watching American blacks put the lie to the Nazi doctrine of racial superiority on the athletic field. '[The fact that] the United States Olympic team will be decidedly brunette in composition gives us a great opportunity to strike a blow at all that Hitler stands for and to do so on the high plane of sportsmanship.'[27]

Not surprisingly, the response of most black athletes to the suggestion that they refuse to participate in the Olympic Games was anything but positive. They had trained hard to reach the level of Olympic competition and were anxious to show off their skills to the largest possible audience. Moreover, some of the American black athletes had participated in earlier competitions in Nazi Germany without encountering any discrimination. Ralph Metcalfe of Marquette University, impressed by his warm reception while competing in Germany in 1934, declared that he and other black American athletes had been 'treated like royalty' and expected similar treatment in

---

[26] Wilkins to Garland, 11 Oct. 1933, NAACP, C-384, Library of Congress (hereafter LC).
[27] Wilkins to Strauss, 15 Nov. 1935, ibid.

1936.[28] 'Royal treatment' in Germany, of course, contrasted sharply with the treatment that amateur black athletes often received at home in America. Neither Jesse Owens nor David Albritton, a black high jumper, was allowed to live in on-campus housing at Ohio State University. Owens was denied a scholarship and had to work at several part-time jobs to pay his tuition. Black athletes could not compete alongside whites in university-level competitions across the South. And, embarrassingly, none of America's Olympic qualification events could be held in the South because of a ban on interracial competition.

Despite widespread reservations in the black community about holding Germany accountable for iniquities that were present also in America, Jesse Owens, the most prominent black track and field athlete of all, initially came out in favour of boycotting the Berlin games. Owens had in one hour broken three world records and tied another at the 1935 Big Ten track championships in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Expected to be a shoo-in for the American Olympic team, he was hounded by all sides to say where he stood on the boycott question. During a radio interview in November 1935, Owens declared: 'If there is discrimination against minorities in Germany, then we must withdraw from the Olympics.'[29] Owens's declaration won him an immediate letter of gratitude from Walter White, the secretary of the NAACP. In congratulating Owens on his stand, however, White, like Wilkins before him, confessed to being 'somewhat divided' on the boycott issue. On the one hand, seeing Nazi racial policy as 'a duplication of what we Negroes have suffered for three centuries in America', he believed that American blacks should stay away from Berlin. On the other hand, as he told Owens, 'because of the preeminence of athletes like yourself, Eulace Peacock, [Ralph] Metcalfe, [Cornelius] Johnson and others, the American team will be decidedly brunette in complexion [that quaint phrase again]. There have been times when I have felt that there might be a certain psychological value in having blond Nazis run ragged by yourself and others.' Yet on balance, White considered the pro-boycott position Owens

[28] Quoted in Wiggins, 'The 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin', p. 65.
[29] Quoted in William J. Baker, *Jesse Owens: An American Life* (New York, 1986), p. 65.

had just taken 'a much finer one', and he asked the athlete to tell him more about how he felt on the matter.[30]

Owens did not reply, and for good reason: he was in the process of changing his mind. Larry Snyder, Owens's coach at Ohio State, was flabbergasted by his charge's pro-boycott declaration and immediately set about getting him to reverse it. This proved not terribly difficult to do, for Snyder had a powerful influence on Owens, and the athlete himself was not really committed to a boycott, his radio comments notwithstanding. Like his colleagues, Owens truly looked forward to competing in Berlin, where he confidently expected to win. He was especially anxious to shine on the international stage because he had recently been snubbed at home, his name having been removed from the list of finalists for the Sullivan Memorial Award honouring the year's best amateur athlete (a booster at Ohio State had secured him a bogus summer job). Moreover, like other black athletes, he had not been invited to the upcoming Sugar Bowl track meet in New Orleans, Louisiana, where a strict Jim Crow policy prevailed. As Coach Snyder put the issue: 'Why should we oppose Germany for doing something we do right here at home?'[31]

Along with five other top black athletes, Owens announced in December 1935 that if selected for the American team he intended to go to Berlin after all. In support of his decision, a black journalist writing in the *New York World Telegram* pounced on the issue of double standards:

> One wonders if, by chance, the next Olympics were to take place in, let us say, Atlanta, Georgia, or almost any one of the states below the Mason–Dixon Line, would 'the powers that be' remove signs in the railroad stations reading, 'Whites on this side, Colored on that side'? Would the fine hotels, some of them built especially to accommodate visitors to the games, extend their hospitality to call comers, regardless of race?[32]

Not surprisingly, the decision by Owens and other top African-Americans to compete in Berlin greatly frustrated American Jewish

[30] White to Owens, 4 Dec. 1935, NAACP, C-384, LC.
[31] Quoted in Baker, *Jesse Owens*, p. 66.
[32] Text of article in Olympic File, NAACP, C-384, LC.

leaders, who accused the athletes of betraying the 'bond' between blacks and Jews that came with shared victimization. But at the same time, even black leaders who favoured a boycott of Berlin, such as Walter White, deeply resented this charge of betrayal, and they by no means agreed that American Jews and blacks shared a common heritage of oppression.[33] (In the sparring between black and Jewish activists over American participation in the Berlin Olympics one can see a mild harbinger of the hostilities that have come to mar the relations between American black radicals and Jews in more recent years.)

All the controversy surrounding the boycott effort indeed jeopardized the fund-raising drive for the American Olympic team, with Jews in particular keeping a lid on their pocketbooks. The paucity of Jewish financial support, however, was partly made up for by large donations from German-American groups, and even by secret contributions from the German government. Eventually the AOC became flush enough that Avery Brundage was able to turn down an offer of $100,000 from General Mills, which had hoped to be able to advertise that American Olympians ate *Wheaties*, the 'Breakfast of Champions'.[34]

II

Having overcome the fund-raising challenges as well as the impassioned boycott movement, America's 384-person Olympic team, including nineteen blacks (two of whom were women), arrived in Berlin on 25 July 1936. All but six of the blacks competed in track and field events, and they so dominated the US track squad that a black journalist joked that for an 'offay' (white guy) to make the team he would have to put cork on his face. The Americans, blacks as well as whites, received a very cordial welcome in the German capital. German officials, along with the populace at large, went out of their way to be friendly and accommodating, as if to prove that there had been no reason to fear any ill treatment. Jesse Owens, as the acknowledged star of the American team, was mobbed by autograph seekers

[33] See the correspondence between Walter White of the NAACP and Robert Rockmore of the American Jewish Committee, ibid.
[34] 'Offer Was Rejected', *New York Times*, 17 June 1936.

wherever he went in the city. He and his colleagues were impressed by the Olympic Village, which, among other amenities, provided each team with food suited to its national tastes, meaning for the Americans such items as underdone steaks and milkshakes.

What Owens and his colleagues did not know, however, was that their every move was being monitored by the German police, who were determined to prevent any embarrassing incidents involving the foreign athletes, or any politically unsuitable contacts between the visitors and the natives. Nazi officials feared above all that acts of miscegenation might occur between black athletes and willing German women. On the eve of the games the Gestapo issued fifty-two warning citations to German women 'for approaching foreigners, especially coloured foreigners, in an unseemly manner'.[35] The Gestapo also carefully inspected all mail coming into the Olympic Village. A British leftist tried to get a letter to Jesse Owens urging him to turn down on political grounds any medals he might win. Owens was instructed to say: 'It was an honour for me to represent my nation and compete against the best athletes of the world. However, I must reject with contempt this prize that comes from a government that preaches racial hatred.'[36] Leaving aside the fact that the Olympic medals were not awarded by the German government, Jesse Owens would never have acted on this advice had he received it, which of course he did not.

As the American black press had predicted, Uncle Sam's 'race boys' performed brilliantly in the track and field events at the Berlin games. Jesse Owens's victories in the 100- and 200-metre races, the long jump, and the 4x100-metre relay undoubtedly constituted the most impressive achievement by a single athlete in the '36 Olympiad, but one should not forget other noteworthy African-American performances, such as Ralph Metcalfe's gold medal in the 4x100-metre relay and silver medal in the 100-metre sprint; Mack Robinson's silver medal in the 200-metre race; Archie Williams's gold medal in the 400 metres; James LuValle's bronze medal in the 400-metre race; John Woodruff's gold medal in the 800-metre race; Cornelius Johnson's gold and David Albritton's silver medal in the high jump; and Fritz

[35] Quoted in Krüger, *Die Olympischen Spiele 1936 und die Weltmeinung*, p. 194.
[36] Reichs-Sicherheitshauptamt, Olympische Spiele, R58, 2322, Bundesarchiv Berlin.

Pollard's bronze in the 110-metre hurdles. All told, American blacks accounted for 83 of America's total of 107 points in track and field.[37] The black press was understandably jubilant over this success, which in its view was the perfect commentary on Nazi racial theories. Much of the white press in America also saluted the black performances, likewise suggesting that they disproved Nazi racial dogma. However, most Southern papers chose to record the black victories without any commentary. Even the *Atlanta Constitution*, the most 'liberal' of the Southern papers, did not print a single photograph of Jesse Owens or any other American black Olympian, and it featured only the victories of American whites.

According to the black American press, and indeed to most of the mainstream press, Hitler was so upset over American Negro victories, including those of Jesse Owens, that he could not bring himself to congratulate the victors. Most infamously, he supposedly refused to shake Jesse Owens's hand after his great triumphs. Actually, this story of racial slighting is largely a myth. The reality is more complicated, though hardly more flattering to Hitler (or, for that matter, to Owens). On the first day of the games Hitler had personally shaken the hands of German and Finnish victors in his stadium box, a gesture that, as Baillet-Latour hastened to inform him the next day, was a breach of IOC etiquette, which discouraged heads of state from playing such a prominent role. If Hitler insisted upon putting himself in the spotlight in such fashion, said Baillet-Latour, he would have to congratulate *every* victor in the same way down the line.[38] Perhaps anticipating that he might have to press the flesh with Jesse Owens and other blacks, Hitler promised that for the rest of the games he would not shake hands in the stadium with *any* of the winners. Thus he did not technically snub Owens, but he probably would have done so had the opportunity presented itself. The Nazi Youth Leader, Baldur von Schirach, claimed in his memoirs that Hitler told him he would not have shaken Owens's hand under any circumstances: 'The

[37] On African-American victories in Berlin, see James A. Page, *Black American Medalists* (Englewood, Colo., 1991), pp. xiii–xiv; and Charles H. Williams, 'Negro Athletes in the Eleventh Olympiad', *Southern Workman*, 56 (1937), pp. 45–6.

[38] Arnd Krüger, 'The 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin', in Peter J. Graham and Horst Ueberhorst (eds.), *The Modern Olympics* (West Point, NY, 1976), p. 183.

Americans should have been ashamed to let blacks compete on their team', Hitler reportedly said. 'I would never shake the hand of a black man.' Schirach also claimed that when he suggested that the Führer be photographed with Owens, Hitler screamed in indignation: 'Do you really think I'd allow myself to be photographed with a black?'[39]

Interestingly enough, Owens himself never felt any animosity towards Hitler, nor did he claim to have been snubbed by the Reich Chancellor. On the contrary, upon his return to America after the games he told an audience of 1,000 blacks in Kansas City that it was *President Roosevelt* and not Hitler who had shown disrespect for him following his triumphs at the Olympic Games. 'Hitler didn't snub me — it was our president who snubbed me. The president didn't even send me a telegram.'[40] Owens also claimed that although he had not had the good fortune to meet Hitler in Berlin, despite several attempts to do so, he had once caught the Führer's eye at the stadium, and that Hitler had gracefully acknowledged him. 'When I passed the Chancellor he arose, waved his hand at me, and I waved back at him.'[41] (No one else observed this putative wave, and it is highly unlikely that it ever happened.) Back in America Owens had nothing but good words to say about the Nazi leader, whom he seems to have genuinely admired. 'I think the [American] newspaper writers showed bad taste in criticizing the man of the hour in Germany', he declared.[42] In campaigning for the Republican presidential candidate Alf Landon against Roosevelt in the autumn of 1936, Owens called Hitler 'a man of civility' and urged cordial relations between the United States and Nazi Germany.[43] In his view, America's real enemy was Soviet Communism, not Nazism.

By all accounts the German public was generally hospitable towards America's black athletes during the games. Certainly Jesse Owens was much celebrated by the German fans, who chanted his

[39] Baldur von Schirach, *Ich glaubte an Hitler* (Hamburg, 1967), pp. 217–18.

[40] Owens's statement in Olympic File, NAACP, C-384, LC.

[41] Quoted in Donald E. Fuoss, 'An Analysis of Incidents in the Olympic Games from 1924 to 1948 with Reference to the Contribution of the Games to International Goodwill and Understanding' (Ed. D. Thesis, Columbia University Teacher's College, 1951), p. 186.

[42] Quoted ibid.

[43] See Baker, *Jesse Owens*, p. 137.

name whenever he appeared in the stadium. Leni Riefenstahl also made Owens one of the heroes of her famous documentary film, *Olympia*, though it should be noted that her film did not include images of the long lines of Germans seeking the star's autograph. Hoping to project an image of openness and tolerance, Joseph Goebbels's Propaganda Ministry instructed the German press not to emphasize racial issues or to minimize foreign victories, including those of American blacks, whose 'sensitivities' were to be respected.[44]

Clearly, however, the Nazi government's official efforts to downplay race during the games only masked the regime's ongoing contempt for black athletes, who were regarded as little more than physically gifted freaks. According to Albert Speer, Hitler believed that blacks owed their victories in the Olympics to their 'jungle inheritance', which gave them especially strong physiques. Hitler also told Speer that once Germany had become the dominant world power, it would hold all future Olympiads in Nuremberg and keep them free of non-Nordics, including blacks.[45] Goebbels, his instructions to the German press notwithstanding, was privately disgusted by the presence of black athletes in Berlin, and reportedly tried to force Riefenstahl to cut the extensive footage of Owens from her film. Like Hitler, SS-leader Heinrich Himmler attributed the successes of American blacks to their 'primitive physicality', and to the fact that they saw themselves engaged in a race war with whites.[46] Martha Dodd, the daughter of Washington's ambassador to Germany, wrote later that an aide to Joachim von Ribbentrop, then Germany's envoy to London, expressed to her the view that Negroes were 'animals, utterly unqualified to enter the games'. This official also stated that 'if Germany had had the bad sportsmanship to enter deer or another species of fleet-footed animal, they would have taken the honors from America in the track events'.[47] (Germany ended up winning the largest number of medals overall in the Berlin games, but finished behind America and Finland in the track and field competition.)

---

[44] Hans Bohrmann (ed.), *NS-Presseanweisungen der Vorkriegszeit*, 7 vols. (Munich, 1984–2001), iv, pt. 2: *1936*, p. 831.

[45] Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich* (New York, 1970), pp. 70–3.

[46] Rede an die Männer der 8. [SS] Klasse, 3.7.38, MA312, Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich.

[47] Quoted in Martha Dodd, *Through Embassy Eyes* (New York, 1939), p. 212.

The idea that blacks and other supposedly 'primitive' peoples owed whatever athletic successes they might achieve to special physical endowments was hardly unique to the Nazis. In the aftermath of the 1936 games, American sports commentators, officials, and coaches advanced similar explanations for the victories of Jesse Owens and his black teammates. Avery Brundage opined that 'one could see, particularly with Jesse Owens, how the Negroes could excel in [track] athletics. Their muscle structure lends itself to this sort of competition.'[48] Dean Cromwell, assistant coach of the American Olympic track team in 1936, wrote in 1941: 'The Negro excels in the events he does because he is closer to the primitive than the white man. It was not long ago that his ability to spring and jump was a life and death matter to him.'[49] Even Owens's coach at Ohio State, Larry Snyder, proposed that the success of his 'boy' and other black sprinters derived from 'the striation of their muscles . . . and the cell structure of their nervous system'. It also helped, he said, that the Negro athletes were willing to take orders from their white coaches. 'Most colored boys take to coaching very readily. They have perfect confidence in their coach . . . and are willing and glad to leave their training, their form, and the perfection of their technique up to him.'[50] In an article entitled 'The Real Winners of the 1936 Games', a professor of Experimental Physiology at the Johns Hopkins university insisted that the victories of the American blacks in Berlin did not necessarily undermine the doctrine of general white supremacy on the athletic field. 'Perhaps in the short races some anatomical advantage of bone or muscle structure gives the black man an advantage over the white', he wrote, but in all other competitions, especially those requiring brain power, the black remained inferior. 'In any case, we must remember that the Negro boys were trained by white men in the white men's institutions.' Moreover, the professor added, if one assessed national performances in 1936 on the basis of population rather than the sheer number of medals, the small northern and central European countries with relatively homogenous white popula-

---

[48] Quoted in Richard Lapchick, *Broken Promises: Racism in American Sports* (New York, 1984), p. 180.
[49] Quoted ibid.
[50] Larry Snyder, 'My Boy Jesse', *Saturday Evening Post*, 7 Nov. 1936, p. 100.

tions were the clear winners, and the weakest performers were 'those [nations] whose populations represent the greatest racial mixtures'.[51]

In other words, although some contemporary observers (and indeed many later commentators) interpreted the black successes in 1936 as a crippling blow to Nazi theories of white athletic supremacy, what really happened is that these victories simply hardened earlier stereotypes regarding racial differentiation, whereby blacks were said to possess biological advantages in certain events, but, owing to alleged character and intellectual shortcomings, could never surpass whites in contests requiring discipline, fortitude, stamina, strategy, and teamwork. Thus, according to the wisdom of the day, blacks might continue to win in sprints but they would never be any good in basketball or long-distance running![52] Tellingly, there were no blacks on America's gold-medal winning basketball team in 1936.

It hardly needs to be added that, in the years just after the 1936 games, the so-called 'Festival of Peoples' did not do much to undercut broader patterns of racism around the world, especially in Germany and the United States. We should recall that Goebbels effectively manipulated anti-black stereotypes in the last months of the Second World War when he claimed that 'drunken Niggers' were terrorizing and murdering German civilians. In the American army that invaded Germany, blacks were still segregated in their own units and had to contend with a largely white officer corps whose prejudices toward blacks were probably even more virulent than those prevailing in the German populace. Back home in America the effective segregation of races in much of the nation, not just the South, persisted unabated for some time after the war. This was as true for sports as it was for schools and neighbourhoods. In major league baseball the colour line was not broken until 1948, in basketball and football not until 1950. The Washington Redskins professional football team, headquartered in the national capital, maintained an all-white policy until the early 1960s. In 1968, when the American black activist Harry Edwards called for a black boycott of the upcoming Mexico City Olympics to protest against continuing racism in the Olympic movement and American sports, it almost seemed as if one were back in 1936.

[51] Charles D. Snyder, 'The Real Winners of the 1936 Olympic Games', *Scientific Monthly,* 13 (Oct. 1936), p. 374.
[52] Lapchick, *Broken Promises*, p. 181.

Does this mean, then, that the role of American blacks in the Berlin games had no significant effects on patterns of racism in American society? This is obviously not the place to discuss in detail the immensely complicated problem of race relations in the United States over the past half-century. But it might be argued that if all the controversy surrounding the black contribution in 1936 had a negligible effect on racism in the short run, it perhaps helped in some measure to reduce (if clearly not to end) racial discrimination in the long run, especially in sport. The boycott advocates' attempt to keep blacks out of the Berlin games failed, but the debate over a possible boycott sharpened an ongoing critique of American racism, and not just among blacks. This debate constituted a significant forerunner of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. The impressive performances of American blacks in 1936 helped pave the way for the later integration of American professional sports by suggesting to sports entrepreneurs that blacks could make important—and lucrative—contributions to the traditionally all-white clubs. Of course, gaining a place in big league professional sports did not necessarily mean gaining immediate equality or respect, as lower pay scales for black athletes and lingering questions about whether blacks could pitch (in baseball) or play quarterback (in football) showed.

Jesse Owens's own career after the 1936 games exemplified the ambivalences and incompleteness of the black athletes' struggle for equality in post-war America. Upon returning to the United States he was expelled from amateur athletics because, after having been run ragged in a slew of post-games exhibition contests, he refused to participate in another exhibition in Sweden. Thereafter he raced for money in sleazy competitions against racehorses, dogs, cars, and even the boxer Joe Louis. At the same time, however, he was much sought after as a spokesman for mainstream political causes—above all for crusades against Communism and the emerging black radical movement. At the behest of Avery Brundage, who had in the meantime become president of the IOC, Owens denounced the famous 'black-power' demonstrations by the African-American sprinters John Carlos and Tommy Smith at the 1968 Mexico City games.[53] Writing in 1969, Harry Edwards wondered whether Owens was aware that blacks, because of economic disadvantages and a persist-

[53] Baker, *Jesse Owens*, pp. 212–13.

ent unofficial colour line, were effectively barred from some 80 per cent of scheduled Olympic sports, such as rowing, skating, skiing, shooting, equestrianism, yachting, fencing, and water polo.[54]

No doubt Edwards had a point. I would submit, however, that the very fact that Owens was allowed, indeed, asked to weigh in on the crucial political and social issues of the day was a sign that the times were changing, at least to some degree. And the fact that sports, professional and amateur, eventually came to constitute the most thoroughly integrated domain in American society owes much to the legacy of Jesse Owens and the other American black Olympians of 1936.

[54] Harry Edwards, *The Revolt of the Black Athlete* (New York, 1969), pp. 78–9.

DAVID CLAY LARGE is Professor of Modern History at Montana State University. His numerous publications include *And the World Closed its Doors: The Story of One Family Abandoned to the Holocaust* (2003); *Berlin* (2000); and *Where Ghosts Walked: Munich's Road to the Third Reich* (1997). His most recent book, entitled *Nazi Games: The Olympics of 1936*, is published in spring 2007.

THE LONG SHADOWS OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR: THE IMPACT OF EXPERIENCES AND MEMORIES OF WAR ON WEST GERMAN SOCIETY*

Axel Schildt

The Federal Republic of Germany is not past history. Rather, it has a history which is not completed, but continues to affect the politics and society of the present day. In the expanded Germany which, with good reason, retained the name 'Federal Republic' after 1990, the history of the Bonn state and West German society gains interest as a point of orientation given an uncertain future. Not least, it has to be told to Germany's new citizens, that is, the people of the former GDR and migrants from many different cultures, just as the West Germans must become aware of the history of these new citizens. In the process, it will be important to convey the fact that West German history itself has a historiography which discovered late, but not by chance, that the long shadows of the experiences and memories of the war provided a particular access to this history. The rediscovery of these shadows behind the processes of modernizing, liberalizing, and Westernizing the Federal Republic, especially since the late 1950s, adds an important factor to our understanding of post-war history without negating these processes. The history of the Federal Republic of Germany can only be understood if it is also seen as the history of a society after the worst war which humanity has experienced. It therefore casts very long shadows over German society in the post-war period.

Ever since contemporary historians started to look systematically at German history after the Second World War,[1] the question of how the relationship between continuity and change in 1945 should be

*This article, presented as a lecture at the German Historical Institute London on 31 October 2006, is based on an essay written for a volume edited by Jörg Echtenkamp and Stefan Martens, to be published in German in 2007.

[1] A methodologically aware synthesis is Edgar Wolfrum, *Geglückte Demokratie: Die Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart, 2006); on the state of research see Axel Schildt, *Die Sozialgeschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland bis 1989/90* (Munich, 2007).

portrayed has been a major focus of interest. Tied up with this is the precise definition of the influence of the war on civil society in the post-war period. Until well into the 1970s a popular view of history prevailed in the Federal Republic that was largely independent of historical research, and was determined by the political strategies of the Cold War. According to this view, Germany 'collapsed' in 1945 and the Western part was then able, by the efforts of its own inhabitants but also with the help of the Western Allies, to rise like a phoenix from the ashes to the heady heights of democracy and prosperity. This master narrative of public memory did not sit comfortably with the topic of continuities, for instance, the fact that members of the elite from the period before 1945 lived on keeping their social status in the new era. It was not until the final phase of the 'old' Federal Republic, when the Cold War had lost its dramatic character and new generations, who no longer had first-hand experience of the Third Reich, had taken the stage, that West German society was able to approach its own history with some sort of composure. And this meant talking about continuities without denying the abrupt break represented by 1945 in political terms. In an important volume of essays on the social history of the Federal Republic, published in 1983, whose subtitle (contributions to the problem of continuity) suggests a new perspective, the historian Werner Conze said that despite the deep political caesura at the end of the war, the 'continuity of settlement (*Siedlungskontinuität*) formed the crucial bridge between past and present'.[2] To put it more simply, although the political situation had changed radically, the people were still the same and had brought their biographies with them into the new era. This generational factor must always be taken into account when looking at post-war German society. Anyone who was a 65-year-old pensioner in 1950 had grown up in the Kaiserreich. Many of the men had already started their family life before the First World War and had gone on

[2] Werner Conze, 'Staats- und Nationalpolitik: Kontinuitätsbruch und Neubeginn', in id. and M. Rainer Lepsius (eds.), *Sozialgeschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Beiträge zum Kontinuitätsproblem* (Stuttgart, 1983), pp. 441–67, at 442; for a critical voice on this see Lutz Niethammer, 'Zum Wandel der Kontinuitätsdiskussion', in Ludolf Herbst (ed.), *Westdeutschland 1945–1955: Unterwerfung, Kontrolle, Integration* (Munich, 1986), pp. 65–83; Paul Nolte, *Die Ordnung der deutschen Gesellschaft: Selbstentwurf und Selbstbeschreibung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2000), pp. 212–14.

to fight in it. The middle phase of their lives was the interwar period. This generation of *Wilhelminer* played an important political part—one only has to think of Adenauer—because the next generation, those born around the turn of the century, were far more heavily tainted by their involvement with Nazism in the Third Reich.[3] Below the level of state leadership, however, this generation also played a major part in reconstruction after 1945. And amongst historians there is a broad consensus that an even younger generation clearly set the tone if we look at the history of the Federal Republic over a longer period, namely, the generation of the Hitler Youth, also known as the *Flakhelfer-Generation*. This refers to those born around 1930, who grew up under the Nazi regime and who, in the fanatical final battle at the end of the Second World War, were called to arms. Dirk Moses has labelled this generation the Forty-Fivers,[4] because completely new career opportunities opened up for its members in 1945, indeed, new perspectives for the whole structure of their lives. Politicians such as Helmut Kohl (born in 1930), philosophers such as Jürgen Habermas (also born in 1930), sociologists and historians such as Ralf Dahrendorf (born in 1929) and Hans-Ulrich Wehler (born in 1930), writers such as Hans Magnus Enzensberger (born in 1929) and Günter Grass (born in 1927) all belong to this generation. Of course, the generational dimension does not explain everything because there are no homogeneous generations as active subjects, but their experiences must be taken into account as an important factor in the long shadow the war cast over the civilian society of the post-war period.[5] In any case, the discovery and discussion of biographical continuities was the prelude to professional contemporary historical research and

---

[3] See Volker Depkat, *Lebenswenden und Zeitenwenden: Deutsche Politiker und die Erfahrungen des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 2007); in his *Habilitation* thesis for the University of Greifswald, Depkat describes addressing the turning point of 1945 as an 'awareness of a zero point pushing towards the reorientation of an autobiographical awareness of periodization in the Federal Republic of Germany' (ibid. 186).

[4] Dirk Moses, 'The Forty-Fivers: A Generation between Fascism and Democracy, *German Politics and Society*, 17 (1999), 105–27.

[5] See numerous references to the research in Jürgen Reulecke, *Generationalität und Lebensgeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2003).

offered a new approach to embedding the history of the Federal Republic into the history of the twentieth century.[6]

Contemporary historiography thus recognized something that the people had long known from their own experience. In the early 1960s Heinrich Böll (born in 1917) stated in an essay that the West Germans distinguished between the 'bad' times and the 'good' times, and saw as the turning point not as 8 May 1945, but 20 June 1948, the day of the currency reform in West Germany.[7] In retrospect, for a large section of the population this day seemed to mark the end of the bad times, which included the end of the war and the early post-war years, in other words, the end of the period marked by suffering and the immediate consequences of the war.

In public memory, and, indeed, to a large extent in private memory too, 1945 was seen as a humiliating collapse, as Germany's darkest hour, and in the words of Friedrich Meinecke, the 'German catastrophe', which, in turn, was followed by another dark period. A public opinion poll commissioned by the German federal government and conducted by the Institut für Demoskopie in Allensbach in 1951 asked: 'When, do you feel, was Germany's best time in this century?' Forty-four per cent of respondents replied that the Third Reich was Germany's best time, 43 per cent the Kaiserreich before the First World War, and only 7 per cent the Weimar Republic. Even further behind, with only 2 per cent, was the 'period after 1945'. In fact, 80 per cent named the post-war period as Germany's worst time, presumably thinking of what had happened to them personally.[8] In the

---

[6] Axel Schildt, 'Nachkriegszeit: Möglichkeiten und Probleme einer Periodisierung der westdeutschen Geschichte nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg und ihrer Einordnung in die Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 44 (1993), pp. 567–84; for the European dimension see Ulrich Herbert and Axel Schildt (eds.), *Kriegsende in Europa: Vom Beginn des deutschen Machtzerfalls bis zur Stabilisierung der Nachkriegsordnung 1944–1948* (Essen, 1998).

[7] Heinrich Böll, 'Hierzulande', *Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte*, 12 (1961), pp. 129–34.

[8] See Axel Schildt, *Moderne Zeiten: Freizeit, Massenmedien und 'Zeitgeist' in der Bundesrepublik der 50er Jahre* (Hamburg,1995), pp. 306–8; in this data the Third Reich was, quite naturally, it seems, conceptually separated from the Second World War.

popular view this was bound up with diverse memories of crises during the interwar period related to the bourgeois democracy of the 1920s and certainly not to the Nazi regime. During the phase of rapid armament before the Second World War, many had been able to keep their jobs and untold opportunities for advancement had opened up, especially for the young, all of which seemed to have been cut off abruptly by the outcome of the war. Admittedly, this view could be accompanied by a posthumous positive transfiguration of the Third Reich, but at its centre was a private perspective from which the 1930s and 1950s soon came to be perceived as equally peaceful, happy times.[9] In 1985 Richard von Weizsäcker, the President of the Federal Republic, in a speech commemorating the end of the war, said for the first time that, without denying the feeling of collapse, Germany had also been liberated. This break with the traditional rules of speech in official memorial culture, especially as he also paid tribute for the first time to the Communist resistance and hitherto unmentioned victims of Nazism, gave rise to considerable public criticism at the time. Since then, however, it has largely been accepted in the differentiated form he put forward there.[10]

It is easy to see why the majority of contemporaries recalled the end of the war as a catastrophic collapse rather than a liberation. This does not apply, of course, to those released from prisons and concentration camps—Jews, those imprisoned for ideological reasons, and political prisoners—nor to those few who had worked for the end of the Nazi regime through illegal resistance or internal opposi-

[9] See Ulrich Herbert, 'Die guten und die schlechten Zeiten', in Lutz Niethammer (ed.), *'Die Jahre weiß man nicht, wo man die heute hinsetzen soll': Faschismuserfahrung im Ruhrgebiet* (Berlin, 1983), pp. 67–96; Ulrich Herbert. 'Zur Entwicklung der Ruhrarbeiterschaft 1930 bis 1960 aus erfahrungsgeschichtlicher Perspektive', in Lutz Niethammer and Alexander von Plato (eds.), *'Wir kriegen jetzt andere Zeiten': Auf der Suche nach der Erfahrung des Volkes in nachfaschistischen Ländern* (Berlin, 1985), pp. 19–51.

[10] Speech quoted from Richard von Weizsäcker, *Von Deutschland aus: Reden eines Bundespräsidenten* (Munich, 1985); see Peter Reichel, *Politik mit der Erinnerung: Gedächtnisorte im Streit um die nationalsozialistische Vergangenheit* (Munich, 1995), pp. 290–2; Jan-Holger Kirsch, 'Wir haben aus der Geschichte gelernt': Der 8. Mai als politischer Gedenktag in Deutschland (Cologne, 1999), pp. 96–8; in general also Burkhard Asmuss et al. (eds.), *Der Krieg und seine Folgen: 1945. Kriegsende und Erinnerungspolitik in Deutschland* (Berlin, 2005).

tion to it. But at the end of the war the over-riding emotion for most of the population was relief, often overlaid with apathy and fear, either specific or more abstract. Germany had lost the war. Nazi propaganda, which to the last had promised 'final victory' and which many had believed in for a long time if not to the very end, had clearly been exposed as lies. National hubris was followed by a mood of moral depression. But all the same, at least the risk of dying a completely pointless soldier's death at the very end had gone. Of the more than 4 million German *Wehrmacht* soldiers killed, half had died in the last year of the war, and almost a quarter of them actually in the final battles of the last months. Families back home no longer had to fear that just before the end of the war they would see in the newspaper that their husband, brother, or father had died a hero's death for 'Führer, Volk und Vaterland'. Those born between 1906 and 1927 paid the highest price; among soldiers born in 1920, the death rate was 41.1 per cent.[11]

Women, children, and old people in towns and cities who, since 1942–3, had spent countless nights in cellars and bunkers sheltering from Allied air raids, could breathe freely again. It has been estimated that Allied bombing raids killed up to half a million people; about 3 million people were wandering around rootless as evacuees; and about a quarter of the housing stock of the Western zones (in some of the major cities as much as three-quarters), including schools and hospitals, had been destroyed.[12] Simply not having to lie in bed fully clothed with emergency supplies for the air-raid shelter close to hand, but being able to go to sleep without fear—this is described as a deeply-felt relief in many personal testimonies.

The widespread apathy, confirmed by many observers, and the emotional paralysis of the German people which accompanied the relief can easily be traced back to the enormous stress of the war which, to the end, was conducted with brutal ruthlessness. The main feature of the final Nazi weekly newsreel was women being raped by Red Army soldiers and children being killed in East Prussia. They

[11] Details in Rüdiger Overmans, *Deutsche militärische Verluste im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich, 1999).

[12] See Olaf Groehler, *Bombenkrieg gegen Deutschland* (Berlin, 1990); Michael Krause, *Flucht vor dem Bombenkrieg: 'Umquartierungen' im Zweiten Weltkrieg und die Wiedereingliederung der Evakuierten in Deutschland 1943–1963* (Düsseldorf,1997).

presaged the fate of the Germans after defeat. 'Enjoy the war, peace will be dreadful', was the message whispered everywhere, one which the Nazi leadership used to try to take the whole population with them into the abyss of a final battle they could never win. Those who hung the white flag from their windows prematurely, or said that there was no longer any point in the war, risked being hanged from the nearest tree by units of the field police or the Gestapo, with a placard round their necks calling them 'traitors'. The last deserter was shot 'according to orders' as late as 11 May in Flensburg at the command of the government that succeeded Hitler under Admiral Karl Dönitz and Lutz Graf Schwerin-Krosigk—by which time British troops were already in the town.[13]

Widespread fears amongst the people were initially caused by anticipation of draconian punishment, which even those who had not been embroiled in the crimes of the regime feared would come their way. It soon became clear, however, that the Allies were not going to impose 'collective punishment' in their zones of occupation. Even the plans concocted during the second half of the war by Lord Robert Vansittart in Britain and Henry Morgenthau Jr. in the USA to transform Germany from an industrial society into a largely agricultural one as a measure against the danger of Prussian militarism, had, by the end of the war, already been consigned to the files by their respective governments.[14]

The families of the POWs were extremely concerned. After the inhumane treatment of Soviet prisoners in Germany in particular—at first they were left to starve, and then in the second half of the war they were exploited quite brutally as forced labourers—many expected a similar fate for the German POWs, 1.7 million of whom had survived the war. After the capitulation the number catapulted up to 9 million, though all but 2 million of them had been released by the

---

[13] See Wolfram Wette, Ricarda Bremer, and Detlef Vogel (eds.), *Das letzte halbe Jahr: Stimmungsberichte der Wehrmachtpropaganda 1944/45* (Essen, 2001); Jörg Hillmann and John Zimmermann (eds.), *Kriegsende 1945 in Deutschland* (Munich, 2002); Bernd-A. Rusinek (ed.), *Kriegsende 1945: Verbrechen, Katastrophen, Befreiungen in nationaler und internationaler Perspektive* (Göttingen, 2004).
[14] Bernd Greiner, *Die Morgenthau-Legende: Zur Geschichte eines umstrittenen Plans* (Hamburg, 1995); Jörg Später, *Vansittart: Britische Debatten über Deutsche und Nazis 1902–1945* (Göttingen, 2003).

spring of 1947. Most of the remaining POWs were released by 1950. The gap between their conscription at the outbreak of war and their return to an uncertain future at home might have been as long as a decade.[15] Very often husbands and wives had become alienated; during the first five years of the war the divorce rate was extremely high. People often found it difficult to get close to their own children, and, if it happened at all, it was a very gradual process.

Another concern was the punishment of former Nazis. At the end of the war the Nazi Party had some 6 million members; the organization as a whole, including branches and associations, had many more. Condemnation of the 'major war criminals' at the Nuremberg trials was largely accepted. After all, these were the prominent functionaries of the Third Reich. But the denazification undertaken by the Western Allies was highly unpopular with the people, partly because it was done so bureaucratically and disadvantaged the unimportant members and fellow-travellers (*Mitläufer*) who were dealt with first. The cases of the higher functionaries were generally decided later, and often dealt with leniently, with the result that there was talk of a 'factory of fellow-travellers'.[16] What is more, there was a widely held view that the victors, who had conducted the air war against the German civilian population, had no right to sit in judgement on Germans. This view, nowadays held only by those on the extreme right, was that of the majority in the post-war years and was vigorously supported by prominent clergymen of both the major Christian denominations, in particular, Protestant bishops. In fact, however, considering the number of punishments, the degree of denazification

[15] See Albrecht Lehmann, *Gefangenschaft und Heimkehr: Deutsche Kriegsgefangenschaft in der Sowjetunion* (Munich, 1986); Arthur L. Smith, *Die 'vermisste' Million: Zum Schicksal deutscher Kriegsgefangener nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich, 1992); Klaus-Dieter Müller et al. (eds.), *Die Tragödie der Gefangenschaft in Deutschland und der Sowjetunion 1941–1956* (Cologne, 1998); Rüdiger Overmans, *Soldaten hinter Stacheldraht: Deutsche Kriegsgefangene des Zweiten Weltkriegs* (Berlin, 2000).

[16] Lutz Niethammer, *Die Mitläuferfabrik: Die Entnazifizierung am Beispiel Bayerns* (Berlin, 1982). See also the regional studies by Rainer Möhler, *Entnazifizierung in Rheinland-Pfalz und im Saarland unter französischer Besatzung von 1945–1952* (Mainz, 1992); and Armin Schuster, *Die Entnazifizierung in Hessen 1945–1954: Vergangenheitspolitik in der Nachkriegszeit* (Wiesbaden, 1999).

was very modest. In a total of about 3.6 million trials, initially in Allied denazification courts and then in courts run by Germans, 1,667 people were given prison sentences or severe fines as 'major criminals' and 23,000 as criminals, while 15,000 got away with small fines as minor accessories. The remaining 95 per cent of the trials ended with the defendant either being classed as a 'fellow-traveller' or exonerated, or else they were halted prematurely by amnesties. The Bundestag put a stop to it all for a decade with one of its first laws passed at the end of 1949, which meant that even serious Nazi criminals, including those who had committed murder, could no longer be pursued by the courts.[17]

However, to assess denazification as a failure would be very superficial. The elites guilty of Nazi involvement saw the post-war period, when many were held in Allied internment camps for months or even years on 'automatic arrest', as a life crisis. At the end of it came social integration, with roughly the same status as before the war, but it was understood as a warning not to get involved with the extreme right again.[18] This corresponded to the main thrust of what Norbert Frei has called West German *Vergangenheitspolitik*. Offers of far-reaching social integration were combined with official stigmatization of the expression of Nazi or anti-Semitic views. The process of learning and assimilating was not difficult in the 1950s because personal social integration was combined with the stabilization of parliamentary democracy as a model for success, economic recovery, and growing prosperity. But in 1945 this could not yet be foreseen.

In the immediate post-war period fears concerning collective punishment were combined with worries about survival in a situation of

[17] See Jörg Friedrich, *Die kalte Amnestie: NS-Täter in der Bundesrepublik* (Frankfurt/M., 1984); Clemens Vollnhals (with Thomas Schlemmer), *Entnazifizierung, politische Säuberung und Rehabilitierung in den vier Besatzungszonen 1945–1949* (Munich, 1991); Cornelia Rauh-Kühne, 'Die Entnazifizierung und die deutsche Gesellschaft', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 35 (1995), pp. 35–70; Norbert Frei, *Vergangenheitspolitik: Die Anfänge der Bundesrepublik und die NS-Vergangenheit* (Munich, 1996).

[18] See Axel Schildt, 'NS-Eliten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland', *Geschichte, Politik und ihre Didaktik*, 24 (1996), pp. 20–32; Ulrich Herbert, 'Deutsche Eliten nach Hitler', *Mittelweg 36*, 8 (1999), pp. 66–82; Norbert Frei, *Karrieren im Zwielicht: Hitlers Eliten nach 1945* (Frankfurt/M., 2001).

extreme hardship. It would, of course, be a total exaggeration to say that the Germans never lived as well as during the Second World War.[19] But the regime, by ruthlessly plundering the occupied territories, made sure that there was plenty of food on the Home Front, unlike in the First World War. At the beginning of the war, around 2,700 calories per day were given out to the German population and by the spring of 1945 it was still officially 2,100, though in many places supplies had dried up.

In the first year after the war the Allies imposed a ration of 1,500 calories per day for 'normal consumers'. No one could live on this in the long run, but combined with meals for school children made possible by foreign aid in the Western zones at least, vegetables grown in community gardens, foraging trips by urban dwellers into the countryside to exchange jewellery, clothes, and other desirable items for food, or risky deals on the Black Market which, though obviously illegal, was tolerated, it was just about enough to survive on. The situation became dramatically more critical when, in the spring of 1946, rations in the US zone were reduced to 1,330 calories, in the British zone to 1,050 calories, and in the French zone to 900 calories per day. This was only about a third to a half of pre-war levels. Admittedly, there were no great plagues or epidemics as there had been after the First World War, largely because of the vaccinations immediately provided by the Allies. But the lack of adequate food, clothing, and shoes led to a general decline in the ability to work and an increased susceptibility to illness. The deterioration in the population's general health could also be attributed to the second great problem of the early post-war period, that is, a lack of fuel and lengthy electricity supply cuts during the very long and cold winters, especially in 1946–7, when hundreds of people froze to death.[20] At

[19] This is the impression created by Götz Aly's recently widely discussed book, *Hitlers Volksstaat: Raub, Rassenkrieg und nationaler Sozialismus* (Frankfurt/M., 2005); cf., by contrast, the more balanced account in Jörg Echternkamp (ed.), *Die deutsche Kriegsgesellschaft 1939 bis 1945*, Das Deutsche Reich und der Zweite Weltkrieg, 9, pt. 2 (Munich, 2005).

[20] On the social misery of the post-war period, especially the lack of food, see Karl-Heinz Rothenberger, *Die Hungerjahre nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg: Ernährungs- und Landwirtschaft in Rheinland-Pfalz 1945–1950* (Boppard, 1980); Gabriele Stüber, *Der Kampf gegen den Hunger 1945–1950: Die Ernährungslage in der britischen Zone Deutschlands, insbesondere in Schleswig-Holstein und Ham-*

the time these hundreds of people left a deeper mark on the memory than the millions who died in the war.

It was, indeed, a characteristic of what Christoph Klessman has called 'a society in collapse' (*Zusammenbruchsgesellschaft*) that the social inequalities that continued to exist and the new ones that were added were thus covered over. Because no general overview of the situation was possible, the description of a society totally engulfed by poverty that we encounter in many contemporary publications ignored the fact that social status made a great difference. The experience of a working-class family which had been bombed out in a city and was now wandering around without any means of support was not the same as that of the bourgeois owner of a villa in a still-intact suburb whose life might, at times, be disrupted by being forced to take in tenants, but who was allowed to keep his property. At the latest the currency reform of June 1948, which virtually impoverished normal savers when they exchanged their Reichmark for the new DM, while property owners saw the value of their property increase enormously, brought the social inequalities sharply into focus again.

The erosion of the 'people's community'(*Volksgemeinschaft*) during the final phase of the war and the immediate post-war years, as detected by historical research, was reflected in the degree to which the people empathized with the various victims of the war, as revealed in contemporary demoscopic surveys. Top of the list, of course, were members of one's own family, relations, and friends, including work colleagues and neighbours. Then came those whose fates people could imagine—victims of the war and those who had been bombed out. On the other hand, those who had been liberated from prisons and concentration camps, many of them Jews, and were now waiting as Displaced Persons (DPs) to be repatriated to their European homelands or to emigrate overseas, were largely regarded with mistrust and suspicion. The fact that they were, for a time, given

burg (Neumünster, 1984); Michael Wildt, *Der Traum vom Sattwerden: Hunger und Protest, Schwarzmarkt und Selbsthilfe* (Hamburg, 1986); Willi A. Boelke, *Der Schwarzmarkt 1945–1948: Vom Überleben nach dem Kriege* (Brunswick, 1986); Paul Erker, *Ernährungskrise und Nachkriegsgesellschaft: Bauern und Arbeiterschaft in Bayern 1945–1953* (Stuttgart: 1990); Günter J. Trittel, *Hunger und Politik: Die Ernährungskrise in der Bizone (1945–1949)* (Frankfurt/M., 1990); and Rainer Gries, *Die Rationen-Gesellschaft. Versorgungskampf und Vergleichsmentalität: Leipzig, München und Köln nach dem Kriege* (Münster 1991).

preferential treatment by the authorities in terms of food and accommodation, caused great annoyance, though this was hardly reflected in the media.[21]

The largest group of people affected particularly severely by the war, but whom the indigenous population was far from willing to help, were the refugees and expellees.[22] They also represented the largest number of war victims amongst the civilian population: according to semi-official estimates, there were 2 million of them. They died when, on their treks, they were caught between the fronts of the final battle, froze to death, or simply could not survive the hardships of being on the run. The 'refugee' as a vernacular generic term—it is far more differentiated in official statistics—for those who left, or had to leave, their homeland because of the war, was elevated in contemporary sociology into a 'figure of the changing times', a symbol of humanity per se.[23]

The first census held in the Federal Republic in 1950 registered 7.9 million refugees. This figure comprised Germans who were living in the eastern areas of the German Reich when war broke out and who no longer counted as Germans, and 1.5 million who had immigrated

[21] See Wolfgang Jacobmeyer, *Vom Zwangsarbeiter zum heimatlosen Ausländer: Die Displaced Persons in Westdeutschland 1945–1951* (Göttingen, 1985); Patrick Wagner, *Displaced Persons in Hamburg: Stationen einer halbherzigen Integration 1945–1958* (Hamburg, 1997); Angelika Eder, 'Displaced Persons/ "Heimatlose Ausländer" als Arbeitskräfte in Westdeutschland', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 42 (2002), pp. 1–17; Sonja von Behrens, *Die Zeit der 'Polendörfer'* (Petershagen, 2005).

[22] The contemporary standard work is Eugen Lemberg and Friedrich Edding (eds.), *Die Vertriebenen in Westdeutschland: Ihre Eingliederung und ihr Einfluß auf Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft, Politik und Geistesleben*, 3 vols. (Kiel, 1959); the voluminous research literature includes Wolfgang Benz (ed.), *Die Vertreibung der Deutschen aus dem Osten: Ursachen, Ereignisse, Folgen* (Frankfurt/M., 1985); Marion Frantzioch, *Die Vertriebenen: Hemmnisse, Antriebskräfte und Wege ihrer Integration in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Berlin, 1987); Rainer Schulze et al. (eds.), *Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in der westdeutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte: Bilanzierung der Forschung und Perspektiven für die künftige Forschungsarbeit* (Hildesheim, 1987); R. Endres (ed.), *Bayerns vierter Stamm: Die Integration der Flüchtlinge und Heimatvertriebenen nach 1945* (Cologne, 1998); and Dieter Hoffmann et al. (eds.), *Vertriebene in Deutschland: Interdisziplinäre Ergebnisse und Forschungsperspektiven* (Munich, 2000).

[23] Elisabeth Pfeil, *Der Flüchtling: Gestalt einer Zeitenwende* (Hamburg, 1948).

from the Soviet zone/GDR. Most were initially settled in predominantly agricultural regions of Schleswig-Holstein (the expellees and refugees made up 33.2 per cent of the population in September 1950), Lower Saxony (27.3 per cent), Bavaria (21.2 per cent), and Hesse (16.6 per cent), where in some regions they actually constituted a majority of the population. Members of the former minority German group in Czechoslovakia (Sudeten Germans) mainly settled in Bavaria.

The integration of refugees and expellees into village communities was not without its problems. Many farmers did not regard them as citizens with equal rights, but as foreigners, at best as welcome cheap labour to replace the forced labourers who had left after the war. Rapid integration was also hindered by the fact that refugees and expellees who were looking for their families kept changing their place of work and residence. The main points of conflict arose from the fact that farmers were forced to provide them with accommodation, and were then disappointed when those they had taken in turned out not to be skilled labourers because they had previously done quite different jobs. In addition, the arrival of the expellees often caused a split in communities that had previously been of one denomination, and this could certainly cause conflict. Nonetheless, the Catholic and Protestant communities set great store by integrating the new citizens from outside.[24]

The political situation gradually stabilized. There was a relatively high turn-out for the elections to the regional parliaments in the Western zones, in which the Christian Democrats and a new supradenominational union and other bourgeois parties gained a majority.[25] A new constitution, the Basic Law, was promulgated with elements of traditional German democracy and Western influences, and the Federal Republic was founded. But below the surface of a new 'normality', the catastrophe of the war remained ever-present in various diverse dimensions. Initially the image—literally—of post-war

[24] Hartmut Rudolph, *Evangelische Kirche und Vertriebene 1945 bis 1972*, 2 vols. (Göttingen 1984–5); Michael Hirschfeld, *Katholisches Milieu und Vertriebene: Eine Fallstudie am Beispiel des Oldenburger Landes* (Cologne, 2002); Rainer Bendel, *Aufbruch aus dem Glauben? Katholische Heimatvertriebene in den gesellschaftlichen Transformationen der Nachkriegszeit 1945–1965* (Cologne, 2003).
[25] For a detailed account see Gerhard A. Ritter and Merith Niehuss, *Wahlen in Deutschland 1946–1991: Ein Handbuch* (Munich, 1991), pp. 121–3.

society was strongly influenced for many years by those disabled in the Second World War (and, indeed, there were still some veterans left from the First World War). Between 1.5 and 2 million people disabled in the Second World War, both soldiers and civilians, were living in the Federal Republic in 1950. To integrate this group of people into society was seen as an important political task.[26] It was a common experience for pupils in the 1950s to be instructed by someone who had been disabled in the war. It became part of the German vernacular that people would go on about their 'Stalingrad experiences', and even today, this still means boring listeners with tales of heroic deeds in the war. And, of course, war experiences were constantly disseminated not only in classrooms but also in pubs and popular literature, of which there was plenty. Subjective descriptions of what happened during the war obviously met a widespread need, and contradicted the thesis often put forward that Nazism and the war were 'suppressed' by the public, although 'suppression', as a psychoanalytical concept, should not be equated here with not talking about it.[27] In fact, the war was never talked about more than in the 1950s. The question is, how was it remembered? The answer is: by excluding or 'suppressing' the Holocaust and always holding up *Wehrmacht* soldiers and, indeed, wives on the home front, as positive heroes.[28]

To a large degree memory of the war was also kept alive by social policy formalized in the *Bundesversorgungsgesetz* (Federal Support Law) passed at the end of 1950. In the first year it applied to about 3.9 million people entitled to financial support. In addition to the 'war-wounded', this included about 900,000 widows and 1.3 million orphans. The number of those receiving state support rose slightly towards the middle of the 1950s but after that it gradually declined.

[26] James M. Diehl, *The Thanks of the Fatherland: German Veterans after the Second World War* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1998).

[27] Manfred Kittel, *Die Legende von der 'zweiten Schuld': Vergangenheitsbewältigung in der Ära Adenauer* (Berlin, 1993), for instance, makes this simplistic equation.

[28] Axel Schildt, 'Der Umgang mit der NS-Vergangenheit in der Öffentlichkeit der Nachkriegszeit', in Wilfried Loth and Bernd-A. Rusinek (eds.), *Verwandlungspolitik: NS Eliten in der westdeutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft* (Frankfurt/M., 1998), pp. 19–54.

However, in the last year of the 'old' Federal Republic it was still 1.4 million, half of them war invalids—a clear sign of the long-term social burdens imposed by the Second World War.[29]

Although, as has already been mentioned, almost all the POWs had returned by the time the Federal Republic was founded, the media kept this topic alive. Every day the Red Cross ran missing-persons announcements in the newspapers and virtually every hour after the news on the radio. This upset many people during the early years of the Federal Republic and ensured that memory of the war did not fade away. The last POWs, some of them rightly condemned as war criminals, returned from Siberia after Konrad Adenauer's visit to Moscow in 1955. To this day, a wave of films and books deals with their return, although this group was by no means representative of the whole group of POWs, but particularly well suited to tales of national sacrifice.[30]

In addition, in a differentiated political culture, the expellees' associations flourished, headed by a number of functionaries with Nazi pasts. The Sunday speeches of the expellee functionaries, who were often not free of Nazi taint, especially at the Whitsun meetings of the regional groups, constantly referred to the crime of driving people from their homeland and the end of the war and the post-war period as a catastrophe. It was not until the expellees were gradually integrated into the society of the Federal Republic, given state accommodation, and incorporated into the booming economy, that this particular culture of war memory gradually started to fade.[31]

Given the lack of an army and militarism, the society of the early Federal Republic was literally a civilian society. The clear subordination of the military to the primacy of politics after the *Bundeswehr* was founded guaranteed this clear discontinuity compared to the inter-war period. Nonetheless, in the first half of the 1950s the social status

[29] Lutz Wiegand, 'Kriegsfolgengesetzgebung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 35 (1995), pp. 71–90.

[30] See Robert G. Moeller, *War Stories: The Search for a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany* (Berkeley, 2001), pp. 88–90.

[31] See, for different evaluations, Samuel Salzborn, *Grenzenlose Heimat: Geschichte, Gegenwart und Zukunft der Vertriebenenverbände* (Berlin, 2000); Matthias Stickler, *'Ostdeutsch heißt Gesamtdeutsch': Organisation, Selbstverständnis und heimatpolitische Zielsetzungen der deutschen Vertriebenenverbände 1949–1972* (Düsseldorf, 2004).

of the military was discernibly upgraded and former professional soldiers were rehabilitated. This manifested itself in a self-confident veterans' culture among former members of the *Wehrmacht* and the *Waffen-SS*, which the political parties also acknowledged. At this time a strict distinction was drawn between a 'clean *Wehrmacht*' and 'dirty SS' in popular films, for instance, although members of the *Waffen-SS*, who also guarded concentration camps in rotation, were numbered among the soldiers without taint. High-ranking politicians and church leaders even spoke up for the war criminals in Allied prisons, and large sections of the press sympathized with them as 'condemned by war'.[32]

Thus there were a number of factors that allowed the war to influence the civilian society of the Federal Republic. The war was so strongly present that it was not necessary to recall it. An additional factor was that on the front between the two world systems, fear of war was especially rife. The majority of West Germans expected the Third World War to break out in the near future, imagining themselves to be in a brief period of respite between two world wars. During the Korean War in the early 1950s there was stockpiling of food supplies, and in the town-planners' debates about high-rise flats, which had not existed in Germany before 1945, a point against them was that they would be easily identifiable enemy targets in the next war.[33] The end of the Second World War, therefore, did not mean the end of the fear of war, but introduced a phase in which this fear could be communicated in a restructured public sphere.[34] What still needs to be analysed, however, is which war experiences could be discussed in public and in what form—and which ones could not. As we know, the Holocaust was largely excluded for nearly two

[32] See Bernd-Oliver Manig, *Die Politik der Ehre: Die Rehabilitierung der Berufssoldaten in der frühen Bundesrepublik* (Göttingen, 2004).

[33] See Axel Schildt, *Die Grindelhochhäuser: Eine Sozialgeschichte der ersten deutschen Wohnhochhausanlage. Hamburg-Grindelberg 1945–1956* (Hamburg, 1988), p. 147; see id., 'Die Atombombe und der Wiederaufbau: Luftschutz, Stadtplanungskonzepte und Wohnungsbau 1950–1956', *1999: Zeitschrift für Sozialgeschichte des 20. und 21. Jahrhunderts*, 2/4 (1987), pp. 52–67.

[34] In this context, a comparison between the post-war periods of the First World War and Second World War would be of interest; see Gottfried Niedhart and Dieter Riesenberger (eds.), *Lernen aus dem Krieg? Deutsche Nachkriegszeiten 1918 und 1945* (Munich, 1992).

decades,[35] and many war crimes received no official attention. The violence done to women by soldiers was taboo in many families and remained so until very recently. The whole dimension of a society traumatized by war still leaves much to be examined.[36]

Work on West German rearmament up to the formation of the *Bundeswehr* in 1956 has shown that the motives for rejecting it were so mixed up that they are difficult to distinguish. Nationalism, anti-Westernism, and national neutralism were overlaid by more every-day emotions ('Ohne mich');[37] it was not so much a question here of an abstract fear of war, rather a fear of the Russians. Using political posters the German Federal Government headed by Konrad Adenauer successfully functionalized the enemy image of the Bolshevik, designated as Asiatic, as an argument in favour of creating an army that was integrated into the Western alliance. The engineering of a culture of fear,[38] and the organization of propaganda strategies are, nowadays, presented in different ways by historians.[39]

[35] See Peter Reichel, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Deutschland: Die Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Diktatur von 1945 bis heute* (Munich, 2001); Volkhard Knigge and Norbert Frei (eds.), *Verbrechen erinnern: Die Auseinandersetzung mit Holocaust und Völkermord* (Munich, 2002).

[36] Regina Mühlhäuser, 'Vergewaltigungen in Deutschland 1945: Nationaler Opferdiskurs und individuelles Erinnern betroffener Frauen', in Klaus Naumann (ed.), *Nachkrieg in Deutschland* (Hamburg, 2001), pp. 384–408; see Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann (eds.), *Life After Death: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s* (Cambridge, 2003).

[37] See Michael Geyer, 'Der Kalte Krieg, die Deutschen und die Angst: Die westdeutsche Opposition gegen Wiederbewaffnung und Kernwaffen', in Naumann (ed.), *Nachkrieg in Deutschland,* pp. 267–318.

[38] Bernd Greiner, 'Zwischen "Totalem Krieg" und "Kleinen Kriegen": Überlegungen zum historischen Ort des Kalten Krieges', *Mittelweg 36,* 12/2 (2003), pp. 3–20; see Axel Schildt, ' "German Angst": Überlegungen zur Mentalitätsgeschichte der Bundesrepublik', in Daniela Münkel and Jutta Schwarzkopf (eds.), *Geschichte als Experiment: Studien zu Politik, Kultur und Alltag im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Festschrift für Adelheid von Saldern* (Frankfurt/M., 2004), pp. 87–97; Eckart Conze, 'Security as a Culture: Reflections on a "Modern Political History" of the Federal Republic of Germany', *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute London*, 28/1 (May 2006), pp. 5–34.

[39] See esp. the pioneering work by Bernd Stöver, *Die Befreiung vom Kommunismus: Amerikanische Liberation Policy im Kalten Krieg 1947–1991* (Cologne,

Nonetheless, it would not have been possible to keep enemy images and fears alive if they had not been rooted in experience and disseminated a million times in public media. One small episode shows how deep-seated was the expectation that one day 'the Russian' would come. A contemporary witness recalls a childhood scene from the early 1950s. A neighbour had built two rooms on to his house. When the witness's father went to have a look, our witness overheard him ask quietly: 'And where is the hollow space?' The neighbour immediately knew what he meant, and just pointed with his finger to a spot under the staircase. When the witness asked his father that evening what it meant, his father replied: 'That's where you put important papers and jewellery when Ivan comes.'[40] Fear of Communism, or, as contemporaries mostly called it, 'Bolshevism', constituted one of the most powerful lines of continuity from the Second World War to the newly constructed society of the Federal Republic. The arsenal of the ideologically hegemonic Western apotheosis in the first half of the 1950s included the construction of a metaphysical opposition between freedom (in the sense not of 'liberal', but of a Christian ideology) in the West and the collectivist East that offers great scope for political analogies.[41] After the 1950s, a decade of overcoming the immediate material consequences of war, discussion of German war victims, and abatement of the real fear of war, the interest of the public gradually became less intense. Although this cannot easily be presented in statistics, however, deep-seated individual and family problems remained that continued to leave their mark on society. Families torn apart, the death of close relatives or friends, alienation between husbands and wives after the separation of the war years, youngsters growing up without fathers, the trauma of air-raids, flight and expulsion, and rape by Allied soldiers—all these continued to have an impact beneath the surface of successful reconstruction, but were discussed very little within the family.[42] In

2002); Thomas Lindenberger (ed.), *Massenmedien im Kalten Krieg: Akteure, Bilder, Resonanzen* (Cologne, 2006).

[40] Reported by Harm Mögenburg, *Kalter Krieg und Wirtschaftswunder: Die Fünfziger Jahre im geteilten Deutschland* (Frankfurt/M., 1993), p. 99.

[41] See Axel Schildt, *Zwischen Abendland und Amerika: Studien zur westdeutschen Ideenlandschaft der 50er Jahre* (Munich, 1999), pp. 21-3.

[42] See Vera Neumann, *Nicht der Rede wert: Die Privatisierung von Kriegsfolgen*

public, on the other hand, from the 1960s onwards, Nazi mass crimes against the Jews, and, indeed, against other 'forgotten victims' who were not part of the *Volksgemeinschaft* were constantly unearthed: Gypsies, homosexuals, and, finally, also the millions of foreign forced labourers.[43] Then in the 1990s came heated discussions about the crimes of the German *Wehrmacht*, when the fiction of a large, clean *Wehrmacht* was called into question.[44]

Finally, in recent years there has been a revival of the discourses of self-victimization, supposedly under the auspices of breaking taboos, even though they have since become part of the mainstream of popular memory culture. The end of the East–West divide has created a new mass-media forum for previously internalized memories of private experiences, and not only in Germany.[45] This applies above all to discussions about the victims of air raids, flight, and expulsion. What is more, the generation of war children has grown older; they have come to the end of their careers and want to sum up their lives. This generation, which was largely 'mute' as regards their own experiences, but who played a crucial part in the controversies about German history, are now starting to articulate their own traumatization in the war and immediate post-war period, often in literary form, and have attracted considerable interest from the media.[46] The current debate about Günter Grass's new book, *Beim*

in der frühen Bundesrepublik. Lebensgeschichtliche Erinnerungen (Münster, 1999); Harald Welzer et al., *'Opa war kein Nazi': Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust im Familiengedächtnis* (Frankfurt/M., 2002); Volker Ackermann, 'Das Schweigen der Flüchtlingskinder: Psychische Folgen von Krieg, Flucht und Vertreibung bei den Deutschen', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 30 (2004), pp. 434–64.

[43] On the 1960s see some of the essays in Axel Schildt et al. (eds.), *Dynamische Zeiten: Die 60er Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften* (Hamburg, 2000; 2nd edn. 2003).

[44] Dozens of books have been published on this; see some of the essays in Michael T. Greven and Oliver von Wrochem (eds.), *Der Krieg in der Nachkriegszeit: Der Zweite Weltkrieg in Politik und Gesellschaft der Bundesrepublik* (Opladen, 2000); most recently Hannes Heer, *Hitler war's: Die Befreiung der Deutschen von ihrer Vergangenheit* (Berlin, 2005).

[45] See, out of an enormous amount of literature, Christopher R. Browning, *Holocaust History and Postwar Testimony* (Madison, Wis., 2003); and Wulf Kansteiner, *In Pursuit of German Memory: History, Television, and Politics after Auschwitz* (Athens, OH, 2006).

[46] Martin Sabrow, Ralph Jessen, and Klaus Große Kracht (eds.), *Zeitgeschichte*

Häuten der Zwiebel (2006), in which, aged 78, he mentions for the first time that at the age of 17 he belonged to the *Waffen-SS* is symptomatic of the fact that German society has by no means dealt with the subject of the war and shows how difficult it is for those who went through it to lay it to rest.[47]

Looking back over the last ten or twenty years, it is clear that incidents giving rise to debates on Nazism, the war, and mass crimes have been following one another in ever more rapid succession. They range from the *Historikerstreit* in the second half of the 1980s,[48] to the discussion about compensation for forced labourers,[49] the books by Goldhagen and Aly,[50] the erection of the Holocaust Memorial in

als Streitgeschichte: Große Kontroversen seit 1945 (Munich, 2003); id., *Die zankende Zunft: Historische Kontroversen in Deutschland nach 1945* (Göttingen, 2005).

[47] Günter Grass, *Beim Häuten der Zwiebel* (Göttingen, 2006); on the discussion see Manfred Bissinger (ed.), *Die Springer-Kontroverse: Ein Streitgespräch* (Göttingen, 2006); Willi Gorzny (ed.), *Die Grass-Debatte: Berichte, Stellungnahmen, Kommentare, Interviews, Leserbriefe. Bibliographie und Pressespiegel (12.8.–31.8.2006)* (Pullach, 2006); on the background see Harro Zimmermann, *Günter Grass und die Deutschen: Chronik eines Verhältnisses* (Göttingen, 2006).

[48] See *'Historikerstreit': Die Dokumentation der Kontroverse um die Einzigartigkeit der nationalsozialistischen Judenvernichtung. Texte von Rudolf Augstein u.a.* (Munich, 1987; 9th edn., 1995); Richard Evans, *Im Schatten Hitlers? Historikerstreit und Vergangenheitsbewältigung in der Bundesrepublik* (Frankfurt/M., 1991); Alfred D. Low, *The Third Reich and the Holocaust in German Historiography: Toward the Historikerstreit of the mid-1980s* (New York, 1994); Jürgen Peter, *Der Historikerstreit und die Suche nach einer nationalen Identität in den achtziger Jahren* (Frankfurt/M., 1995); Charles S. Maier, *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997); Wolfgang Wippermann, *Wessen Schuld? Vom Historikerstreit zur Goldhagen-Kontroverse* (Berlin, 1997); Steffen Kalitz, *Die politische Deutungskultur im Spiegel des 'Historikerstreits': What's right? What's left?* (Wiesbaden, 2001).

[49] Since the 1980s dozens of local studies and studies of individual businesses have been published; for an overview see Mark Spoerer, *Zwangsarbeiter unter dem Hakenkreuz: Ausländische Zivilarbeiter, Kriegsgefangene und Häftlinge im Deutschen Reich und im besetzten Europa 1939–1945* (Stuttgart, 2001); on the compensation debate see Susanne-Sophia Spiliotis, *Verantwortung und Rechtsfrieden: Die Stiftungsinititiative der deutschen Wirtschaft* (Frankfurt/M., 2003).

[50] The controversy about Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's book, *Hitlers willige Vollstrecker: Ganz gewöhnliche Deutsche und der Holocaust* (Berlin, 1996;

Berlin,[51] the planned centre against expulsion,[52] and the biography of Günter Grass, to give just a few striking examples. Historians should take this as a challenge to present the so-called second history of Nazism, that is, the history of the repercussions of the Third Reich and the Second World War and how it was dealt with, in a differentiated way at a level beneath the spectacular cases. Without this dimension it is impossible, even today, to understand the history of the Federal Republic as the history of a post-war society under the very long shadows of the Second Word War.[53]

German edition), is outlined by Michael Schneider, 'Die "Goldhagen-Debatte": Ein Historikerstreit in der Mediengesellschaft', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 37 (1997), pp. 460–81; ten years later, the book by Aly, *Hitlers Volksstaat*, had a similar but shorter-lived resonance. In both cases experts in the field were devastating in their criticism—see numerous contributions to the internet journal *Sehepunkte*, 5 (2005) and the journal *Sozial.Geschichte: Zeitschrift für historische Analyse*, 20/3 (2005). But the experts' judgements contrasted with the positive response on the part of the general public with an interest in history, which used these books as a screen on which to project its own need to deal with the topic.

[51] Lea Rosh, *'Die Juden, das sind doch die anderen': Der Streit um ein deutsches Denkmal* (Berlin, 1999); Michael S. Cullen (ed.), *Das Holocaust-Mahnmal: Dokumentation einer Debatte* (Zurich, 1999); Jan-Holger Kirsch, *Nationaler Mythos oder historische Trauer? Der Streit um ein zentrales 'Holocaust-Mahnmal' für die Berliner Republik* (Cologne, 2003); Claus Leggewie and Erik Meyer, *'Ein Ort, an den man gerne geht': Das Holocaust-Mahnmal und die deutsche Geschichtspolitik nach 1989* (Munich, 2005).

[52] Samuel Salzborn, 'Geschichtspolitik in den Medien: Die Kontroverse über ein "Zentrum gegen Vertreibungen" ', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 51 (2003), pp. 1120–30; Piotr Madajczyk, 'The Centre against Expulsions vs. Polish–German Relations', *Polish Foreign Affairs Digest, Warsaw*, 4/2 (2004),pp. 43–78; Bernd Faulenbach (ed.), *Zwangsmigration in Europa: Zur wissenschaftlichen und politischen Auseinandersetzung um die Vertreibung der Deutschen aus dem Osten* (Essen, 2005); Jan M. Piskorski, *Vertreibung und deutsch-polnische Geschichte: Eine Streitschrift* (Osnabrück, 2005).

[53] Beyond this, it is interesting that this theme relating to German or West German society has also become one of the most important focal points for contemporary history with a transnational orientation; see, most recently, Bernd Faulenbach and Franz-Josef Jelich (eds.), *'Transformationen' der Erinnerungskulturen in Europa nach 1989* (Essen, 2006).

AXEL SCHILDT is Professor of Modern History at the University of Hamburg and Director of the university's Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte. A leading expert on the history of the Federal Republic of Germany and on popular culture after the Second World War, he has published extensively on this and other subjects. Among his most recent publications are (with Detlef Siegfried) *Between Marx and Coca Cola: Youth Cultures in Chanigng European Societies, 1960–1980* (2006) and *Die Sozialgeschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland bis 1989/90* (2007).

REVIEW ARTICLES

PRUSSIAN JUNKERS

William W. Hagen

PATRICK WAGNER, *Bauern, Junker und Beamte: Lokale Herrschaft und Partizipation im Ostelbien des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Moderne Zeit. Neue Forschungen zur Gesellschafts- und Kulturgeschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, 9 (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2005), 623 pp. ISBN 3 89244 946 5. EUR 54.00

This important book paints a bold new picture of grass-roots government in nineteenth-century east Elbian Prussia. Looming largest is not aristocratic domination—*Junkerherrschaft*, or rule of the noble-born (Junker) estate owners—but rather what Patrick Wagner weightily calls *Durchstaatlichung*, or penetration of the countryside by the power of the modern regulatory state (Max Weber's *Anstaltsstaat*) (p. 14). This challenges the view, sturdily surviving in classic works of Thomas Nipperdey and Hans-Ulrich Wehler, but also in contemporary historiography, upholding a far-reaching Junker primacy, traceable famously to Weber but also to the Junkers' other liberal critics of the late German Empire (notably the jurist Hugo Preuß, drafter of the Weimar constitution). Wagner quotes Norbert Steinbeck's 'nice formulation' of this hitherto hegemonic perspective: 'under the Empire too the Junkers held on "fossil-like to the lordly existence *en miniature* of the patrimonial master of bygone centuries"' (p. 11).[1]

[1] It does not seem necessary to burden this article with citations of the standard literature on 19th-century German and Prussian history, which will be familiar to many readers of these pages, and which Wagner's book scrupulously cites. Bibliographically useful also is Hartwin Spenkuch, 'Vergleichsweise besonders? Politisches System und Strukturen Preußens als Kern des "deutschen Sonderwegs"', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft,* 29 (2003), pp. 262–93. Substantively, Spenkuch vigorously challenges 'revisionist' critiques of the

Wagner himself, never averse to lexical Anglicism, faults the historiographical *Mainstream* for characterizing 'east Elbian power relations by their stasis and traditionalism' (p. 590). He rightly debunks the widespread misunderstanding of agrarian east Elbia as a domain of large estate owners and peon-like estate labourers. In 1875, but 18.7 per cent of the rural population of Prussia's east Elbian provinces lived under direct landlordly administration in 'large-estate districts' (*Gutsbezirke*), while the remaining 81.3 per cent—the vast majority—lived in self-governing, state-regulated 'village communes' (*Landgemeinden*). By 1910 the former number had declined to 16.3 per cent (p. 534).

Though Wagner does not dwell on the subject, the distribution of east Elbian farmland (excluding forests) favoured village farmers (mainly *Mittel- und Großbauern*) over estate owners in an overall pro-

argument for the German *Sonderweg* or 'separate path to modernity', which he upholds in roughly the same form as it was influentially formulated by Hans Rosenberg and Hans-Ulrich Wehler. This entails the sociologically reductionist view of the Prussian state as an executive committee of the Prussian Junkers which Patrick Wagner's book shows to be untenable, politically powerful though the east Elbian Prussian noble landlords were. The same may be said of the viewpoint taken in Hartmut Harnisch's valuable essay, *Adel und Großgrundbesitz im ostelbischen Preußen 1800–1914: Antrittsvorlesung 16. Juni 1992* (Humboldt University Berlin, Institut für Geschichtswissenschaft, 1993). Christopher Clark's synoptic *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600–1947* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006) spares its reader extended presentation of the social-political structural analysis characteristic both of the Weber-beholden Bielefeld school (*Gesellschaftsgeschichte*) and Patrick Wagner's book. In invoking, however ironically, 'the "Asiatic steppe" of Prussian east Elbia', and in emphasizing in post-1871 Prussian political life an 'influence of the conservative rural interest' so powerful as to block electoral-constitutional reform and bring about Prussian self-immobilization (pp. 561–3), Clark's masterful book falls within the broad historiographical consensus which Wagner challenges and revises. But it does not take a stand on the issues central to Wagner's book. This is true, too, of Margaret Lavinia Anderson's sophisticated and illuminating study, *Practising Democracy: Elections and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (Princeton, 2000), whose treatment of east Elbia concentrates on estate owners' influence over their labourers' and other clients' voting behaviour (cf. pp. 152–98, 425), the strength of which Wagner would not contest. But Wagner's analysis encompasses a wider east Elbian landscape.

portion, varying by province, of some 60:40 or more, with the long-term trend favouring the villagers. In 1910, among east Elbia's roughly 17,000 noble properties (*Rittergüter*), only 5,000 qualified as 'large estates' (*Großbetriebe*). Most of these reposed in aristocratic hands, although in the late nineteenth century 'the core group of noble estate owners in all of Prussia numbered at the most 2,000 persons' (p. 45). Among them, multi-generational possession of an ancestral property was more exception than rule. The smaller estates belonged mostly to upwardly mobile, non-noble entrepreneurs. Wagner frequently contrasts the provinces of East and West Prussia, with their numerous landed peasantry or village farmer class and their many commoner estate owners (often political liberals), with Silesia's agrarian heartland, where aristocratic landlords with deep roots in the land overshadowed a smallholding peasantry.

The pre-existing literature has accustomed some social historians to accept the cohabitation in the eastern countryside of magnate aristocrats, the Junker service nobility, bourgeois estate owners, a thick-spread landed peasantry, numerous smallholders and cottage-labourers, alongside landless workers of both sexes, including many Poles, working on long-term contracts and seasonally. Yet Wagner shows in telling quotations how German *political* history continues to accord 'the Junkers' hegemonic power, both in their rural bailiwicks and at the heart of executive power in the kingdom of Prussia and the German Empire.

Nor does Wagner aim to topple the Junkers en masse from this pedestal. 'The thesis of the present study', he writes, 'does not propose a decline in the power of the conservative Junkers at the highest level of the state.' Their power in the parliaments and ministries, at the court and on the army's commanding heights remained 'firmly institutionalized'.

> But—and *this* is what was at stake in this investigation, and *here* is where it departs from the accustomed views of east Elbia—these power-positions did *not* rest on a solid foundation of traditional structures of lordship in east Elbia's rural districts. In the year 1900 the Junkers were no longer [as Weber in 1895 described them] a ruling class deployed (*disloziert*) across the land (pp. 584–5).

Wagner does not oblige the reader with a lapidary formulation in positive terms of his book's central thesis, but rather distils it as a set of findings from his deep excavations of the primary sources, especially those extracted from regional archives, the press, and 'above all', as he says, the proceedings of the Prussian Chamber of Deputies and its documentary publications (*Drucksachen*) (pp. 29–30). Wagner draws methodological and theoretical inspiration from recent conceptualizations of authority or lordship (*Herrschaft*) as negotiated (*ausgehandelt*) rather than imposed top-down on passive subjects. He makes creative use of Gerd Spittler's and Trutz von Trotha's studies of European rule in colonial Africa. These emphasize, in harmony with views stressing the 'organization of modernity' through state power, the crucial dimension of information-gathering, at the expense of relatively autonomous local power elites and tax-liable villagers, through an ever more omnipresent and efficient bureaucratic network, a process that Wagner finds at work in nineteenth-century east Elbia.[2]

Though Wagner disputes Hans-Ulrich Wehler's judgements, he shares Wehler's essential Weberianism, fusing it, as Wehler has also done, with Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical visions. Wagner puts Bourdieu's ideas on bureaucratization and his categories of economic, social, and cultural capital to productive use, but in the end, it is the instrumental rationality of economic and political power which governs Wagner's book. Central to his analysis, at the explicitly stated expense of 'culturalist' approaches, are 'questions of resource extraction and distribution, of taxes and road-building, of attempts by particular groups to appropriate material resources and the state's efforts to monopolize them or share them only with groups of its own choosing' (p. 25).

Nor, despite their place of honour in Wagner's book title, do nineteenth-century east Elbian village farmers or peasants (*Bauern*) emerge in brighter light or fuller individuality from Wagner's pages.

[2] Gerd Spittler, *Herrschaft über Bauern: Die Ausbreitung staatlicher Herrschaft und einer islamisch-urbanen Kultur in Gobir (Niger)* (Frankfurt, 1978); Trutz von Trotha, *Koloniale Herrschaft: Zur soziologischen Theorie der Staatsentstehung am Beispiel des 'Schutzgebietes Togo'* (Tübingen, 1994). See also James Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, 1998) and Peter Wagner, *A Sociology of Modernity: Liberty and Discipline* (London, 1994).

Their voices, as recorded (subject to distortion) in the bureaucratic and journalistic record, are seldom heard in this hefty and densely documented tome. When Wagner has them speak, it is more often than not to express naive monarchism and paranoia-laden anxieties about designs against them on the part of landlords (including, perhaps especially, liberal-capitalist landlords), and occasionally also (in nationalist perspective) of Poles and (for socio-economic reasons) Jews, from whom they hoped the king/emperor and his officials would shield them (e.g. pp. 361 ff.). Such emphasis lends weight to the unhistorical 'anthropological' and 'naturalistic' concept of 'the peasantry' which, as Wagner interestingly shows, Prussian officials often embraced, in part to justify their tutelage of the rural common folk. But, as he concedes, his book does not aim to reconstruct the villagers' material and cultural world. Not inaccurately, he writes that 'research has made at most a beginning on the east Elbian peasantry under the Empire', adding also (despite many valuable studies of Junker lineages) that 'investigations of the exercise of authority within the large-estate districts are a desideratum' for Imperial German history (pp. 28, 527; cf. 362).

Wagner's book stands in the shadow of Heinrich Heffter's path-breaking study of German 'self-administration' in the nineteenth century. Yet it differs in its steady focus on the political contestation of local government and the contending parties' actual practices, as they are now damningly, now tediously, and sometimes amusingly revealed in Wagner's sources.[3] His central finding, contradicting the 'myth' of *Junkerherrschaft*, highlights 'the growing power of the bureaucracy in relation to local elites'. As the nineteenth century progressed, it was 'only the bureaucracy's protection that secured the power of the noble large landowners'. Though they still wielded much authority on their own within the large-estate districts, the Junkers on the eve of 1914 commanded 'only enclaves in a society now thoroughly penetrated by state power' (p. 570).

Wagner traces the emergence of this state of affairs through three nineteenth-century stages. First came *Erosion* of the Old Regime structures privileging the landed aristocracy, a process which Wagner, following Reinhart Koselleck and others, associates with the

---

[3] Heinrich Heffter, *Die deutsche Selbstverwaltung im 19. Jahrhundert: Geschichte der Ideen und Institutionen* (Stuttgart, 1950).

post-1815 era, though in reality, if not *de jure*, it reaches back to the seventeenth century. In any case, by the 1840s and 1850s it was clear that the Junkers were widely incapable of — or uninterested in — exercising the police powers they possessed over villages outside the boundaries of their estates and nearby settlements of their dependent labourers. Nor were they keener to finance and uphold their patrimonial courts (abolished in the aftermath of the 1848 revolution), or to shoulder poor-relief responsibilities. The post-1815 system of noble-dominated provincial and county assemblies stymied infrastructural improvements through conservative particularism and blockage of the Prussian government's mobilization of rural commoners, whose assent to further taxation required political concessions.

There followed Wagner's second stage, that of 'a creeping administrative *Substitution*' of state action for landlordly inaction, culminating in the Prussian parliament's County Ordinance (*Kreisordnung*) of 1872 and the Rural Commune Ordinance (*Landgemeindeordnung*) of 1891. These instituted far-ranging state control over police and education, and elected, if inegalitarian, village and county assemblies with corresponding mayors and executive committees. The third stage comprised a conflict-ridden *Transformationsprozeß* stretching from 1872 into the 1890s. Here the Prussian bureaucracy, acting especially through the offices of the increasingly powerful and autonomous Rural (or County) Commissioners (*Landräte*), forced its domination of the new political institutions on landlords and villagers alike, to the advantage of all who willingly bowed their heads to the Berlin government, including when they voted for deputies to the Prussian parliament (*Landtag*) and the Imperial Reichstag.

By 1900 the 'career *Landräte*', and not the Junker landlords, ruled the east Elbian countryside. Crucially, the *Landräte* succeeded in bending the villagers' new political leadership to their will. They forced the village farmers to accept that they stood to gain most from loyalty to the government, and to lose most not only from subordination to the traditionally suspect or even hated Junkers, but likewise from hearkening to oppositional liberal landlords, whom from the late 1870s the government, under Minister of Interior Robert von Puttkamer, ground down in their East and West Prussian redoubts. Wagner views sceptically the formerly influential arguments of Hans-Jürgen Puhle and others, who saw in the Bund der Landwirte

or Agrarian League—the powerful Wilhelmine-era lobby of the east Elbian landlords and village farmers—a force independent of, and often opposed to, the government. In Wagner's view, the Bund, though sometimes restive, generally accepted local alliances with the *Landräte*, without whose support funding of local projects and virtually every other important fiscal-administrative action sought by the Bund's membership were unachievable. The Bund as well as the Prussian government saw to it that the economic interests of the east Elbian middle- and large-holding farmers, especially as livestock producers, found protection and consideration, so that the political alliance of these villagers with Junker and state officialdom reflected their 'common interests' (pp. 386–403).

As for the notion that the *Landräte* were but Junkers outfitted in the king's coat, Wagner shows that while many were supernumerary sons of the landed nobility, more were the offspring of civil-military officials and middle-class professionals. In any case, the ethos and discipline imposed on those entering the Prussian civil service, alongside rising standards of education and professional competence, made of the *Landräte* an elite corps tied to their superiors in Berlin and rarely drawn from, or beholden to, the local nobility among whom they worked, often but fleetingly, as they struggled to climb the bureaucratic ladder (pp. 370–1).

It was crucially important, undoubtedly, that the Imperial regime, under Bismarck and his successors, determinedly sought to defend the east Elbian large landowners' economic interests and political privileges, and to maintain them as the 'first servants of the State'. Yet this did not, in Wagner's view, entail the 'condominium' of Junker landlord and Prussian *Landrat* which Hugo Preuß postulated. The condominium existed, especially in the most aristocratized regions of east Elbia, but everywhere it was, Wagner concludes, 'deeply asymmetrical', to the state's advantage (cf. pp. 381 ff., 581).

Wagner builds on the social science literature dealing with patron–client relations, appropriate to what he takes, perhaps too trustingly, as the patrimonialism of the Prussian Old Regime. He adopts Eric Wolf's concept of 'broker' (not yet fully Weber's 'bureaucrat') to illuminate the post-1848 *Landrat*'s semi-autonomous role in mediating between state and social groups. More broadly, Wagner compares east Elbia's nineteenth-century state-driven development, under the guidance of the *Landrat*–broker, to similar processes in the

Italian Mezzogiorno and Spanish Andalucia, tracing out a 'specific path to modernity' alongside other regional patterns within the larger European national state (pp. 386 ff., 413 ff., and 591). Such promising comparisons call for further pursuit.

Wagner ends his analysis not in 1914, or 1918, or 1933, but at the twentieth century's dawn, when the penetration of the agrarian east by the institutions of state power had achieved the ends its governmental proponents had sought. This may disappoint those readers who wish to understand the implications of Wagner's analysis for war and defeat, and the subsequent Nazification of the east Elbian countryside. Doubtless the statist thrust of Wagner's book works against social-political arguments emphasizing a fateful pre-1914 pressurization of the Prussian and Imperial governments into extremist domestic and foreign policy measures by the forces of political radicalization on right and left. Instead, Wagner's argument underscores the domination and autonomy of the state itself, whose entry into self-destructive war seemingly resulted from the ambitions and self-delusions of power.

As for the Nazis, Wagner records the blow the Junkers suffered in the abolition in 1927 of the east Elbian large-estate districts, leaving them finally to be absorbed into unitary rural communes encompassing both manor-house and village. 'The large landowners reacted in part by retirement into private life, in part by political radicalization', that is, self-Nazification. But, perpetuating the discourse of the German 'separate path' or *Sonderweg*, Wagner concludes that the villagers' inability to make better use of the freedoms they gained under the Weimar Republic

> points to the ambivalence of [their] late emancipation and also to the fatal consequences for the development of democratic attitudes of their earlier subordination. After 1918 east Elbia's village farmers possessed no accustomed mental resources for making an arrangement—in the terminology of Hans Fallada's novel *Bauern, Bonzen und Bomben*—with the 'big shots' (*Bonzen*) representing the democratic party-political state. Their yearning for a welfare state that would also take them under its wardship made the turn toward *Bomben* more attractive (p. 592).

Here, again, are evident both Wagner's forceful statism and perhaps, too, his inclination to accept the 'anthropological' view of the peasantry which, when Prussian bureaucrats articulated it, he found ideological and untenable. But until the histories of the nineteenth century and of the 1914–33 cataclysm are more fully told in the east Elbian villagers' words and interpreted from their viewpoint, all efforts to explain their rationale and motives for flocking to Hitler will be speculative and, in E. H. Carr's phrase, 'soaked in theory'.

* * *

Among the highlights and central findings of Wagner's ten substantive chapters is his emphasis on the flimsiness of local Junker power after 1815, and the determination of the central government, after the heart-stopping crisis of monarchical authority in 1848, to seize control of the east Elbian countryside, acting through bureaucratically more efficient *Landräte* dependent for their personal fortunes far more on Berlin than on the local gentry. Formalized bureaucratic print-culture (*Verschriftlichung*) soared to hitherto unknown levels, driven partly by ordinary villagers' growing demand for documentation of their rights and interests (p. 72). Wagner is lucid on the post-1848 tax reforms—the new personal income tax of 1851, and the subjection in 1861 of noble properties to a newly defined land tax—showing also how the *Landräte* colluded in under-assessment of the nobility and other forms of genteel tax-evasion widely tolerated among the propertied classes.

Analysing widespread, sometimes turbulent post-1848 protest among poorer villagers against the state's enforcement, in line with liberal orthodoxy favouring more prosperous landowners, of privatization and enclosure of formerly communal pastures and woodland, Wagner again underscores the fragility of rural structures of authority, whether estate-owners' police officials, village mayors, or the *Landräte* themselves. That soldiers needed occasionally to be dispatched to quell rural disorders proves the point. Wagner concludes that 'the state's success in the imposition of its norms depends crucially on local demand for these norms and for the state to play the role of their guarantor' (p. 110). But before the late nineteenth century such demand was low in east Elbian villages, even when criminality was in play (p. 112).

Wagner discovers a 'disintegration', after the abolition in 1807–16 of seigneurialism and the peasantry's legal subjection, of pre-existing structures of village governance. East Elbian village mayors had rarely been strong authorities. After 1815 the old-established oligarchy of village fullholders and halfholders lost its grip, as property ownership fell into flux, and a new polarization emerged of beneficiaries of freehold legislation vis-à-vis sinking smallholders and the landless. Village assemblies grew chaotic. It was, Wagner argues, a triumph of the bureaucracy to impose, in the 1872 *Kreisordnung* and 1891 *Landgemeindeordnung*, the property-weighted three-class voting system as the electoral schema governing the new system of village and rural self-government, for it made of the middle- and large-holding peasants allies and tools of the state in domination of the countryside.

Yet the Prussian state's refusal (before 1927) to merge the east Elbian estate districts into the village communes condemned these latter to economic and political debility. Estate owners escaped the fiscal burden of developing the rural infrastructure, while the village communes remained too small to flourish independently. Among them in 1850 there were 20,500, of a total of 23,000, counting fewer than 500 inhabitants. By contrast, Rhenish rural communes were considerably more populous and richer in ownership of communal lands whose rents fattened village budgets (p. 142).[4]

Wagner traces, in fine detail, the nineteenth-century rise to rural political hegemony of the Prussian *Landrat*. One of his chapters bears the characteristically Weberian–Wehlerian title, 'From Estate Owner-*Landrat* to Career-*Landrat*: The Transformation of a Functional Elite and the Erosion of Estates-Bound Authority' (p. 205). Building on John Gillis's durable work, Wagner shows that while mid-nineteenth-century Prussian officialdom subordinated the Junkers to its centralized power, it aimed *also* at 'the strengthening of the conservative, noble, and long-settled segment of estate property, whose local power resources were thus indeed expanded, though it fell into increasing dependency on the bureaucracy' (p. 287).[5]

[4] The effects of post-1870 rural emigration (the *Landflucht*) are evident in the fact that of the 24,500 east Elbian communes in 1889, only 40 % numbered more than 300 souls. Wagner, *Bauern, Junker und Beamte*, p. 535.
[5] John Gillis, *The Prussian Bureaucracy in Crisis: Origins of an Administrative Ethos* (Stanford, Calif., 1971).

Wagner excavates interesting evidence of the Prussian Conservative Party's anti-Semitic demagoguery, which found considerable echo among rural commoners, in the politics of the post-1858 liberal 'New Era' and ensuing constitutional struggle (pp. 296–303, 310–11). Yet the book largely bypasses ideological and *weltanschaulich* matters in favour of hard economic and political interests. Wagner reduces the post-1840 political liberalism among Junkers, notably in East and West Prussia, to concern for capitalist rationality and anti-governmental factionalism, not unlike centre–periphery power struggles in modern southern Italy.

In the debates preceding the promulgation of the 1872 *Kreisordnung* liberals hoped by the reform to replace the 'reactionary Junkers' with a new east Elbian 'gentry', comprising modern-minded noble estate owners and upwardly mobile rural property-holders of all types. But Wagner discounts this ambition, to which Heinrich Heffter attached much importance as one among other German paths not taken. Wagner writes coldly that 'the 1868 proposal of the Progressive Party to introduce in all the Prussian provinces a uniform county structure [encompassing village and non-village lands], to dissolve the estate districts, and create self-government authorities in all communes elected according to the three-class law was hopeless from the beginning' (p. 322).

Conversely, Wagner offers weighty evidence that profit-seeking agrarian entrepreneurs, often drawn toward the liberal parties, imposed new wage-labour discipline, while overturning the old-rooted cottage-labour system based on yearly contracts and provision of extensive natural incomes. As Max Weber and other social scientists of the day emphasized (though they sometimes confused the cottage-worker regime with 'traditional' *Junkerherrschaft*), this deeply embittered the landless or land-poor east Elbian villagers, driving them after 1870 increasingly into emigration, and into local protest whose extent remains uncharted.

Instead of a liberal gentry, new rural 'power elites' emerged from the elections which the 1872 reform mandated to newly created County Assemblies and Executive Committees (*Kreisausschüsse*, and above them, geographically larger *Amtsbezirke* presided over by *Amtsvorsteher*, commonly a lesser estate owner or estate manager). The three-class voting system ensured that none but well-heeled villagers and other rural commoners should join the Junkers in partici-

pation in these organs, to which (at the *Amtsbezirk* and provincial levels) the country towns usually dispatched municipal officials little inclined or even legally entitled to political intransigence. Wagner shows, moreover, that the *Landräte* were in most cases quick to reduce these modest institutions to rubber-stamps of their own initiatives. As the *Landräte* came to embody the interventionist, modernizing state, and to control the money centrally allocated to east Elbian infrastructural improvements, it behooved the new power elites (a crucial step in Wagner's argument) to curry the favour of the *Landrat*, acting in his role as 'broker' between Berlin and grass-roots interests.

Yet Wagner resists old stereotypes of the east Elbian common people's passivity under elite domination (without denying rural labourers' deference to Junker prestige and patriarchalism, where they survived) (cf. pp. 531 ff.). The lawsuits which individual citizens initiated in the Empire's Administrative Courts (*Verwaltungsgerichte*) show that 'readiness to defend individual rights against acts of officialdom in rural East Prussia (and likewise in Brandenburg, Pomerania, or Silesia) was no less firm than in the industrial zones of the west' (p. 421).

East Elbian villagers yielded to the pressure of the *Landrat* acting in his role as 'electoral manager' (*Wahlmanager*), to vote in Prussian and Imperial elections for pro-governmental candidates. This illustrates Wagner's cold-blooded conviction that the 'retributive character' of elections or, in other words, the *Landrat*'s readiness to withhold resources from renitent communities 'figured in east Elbian agrarian society as self-evident, while electoral choice was understood as part of a trade-off of "economic action" for "political counter-action" ' (p. 424). Politics rested on cost–benefit calculations.

The villagers' old habituated distrust of the Junkers inclined them the more readily to join the *Landratspartei* and so, too, did the advancing subjection of village schoolmasters (and clergymen–school inspectors) to state patronage and control (pp. 453, 565–7). And if upwardly mobile commoner agriculturalists successfully acculturated into the Junker milieu, this can only be termed 'neo-feudalization' if it is accepted that the Junker *habitus* in the Wilhelmine era was a complex product 'of the nineteenth and precisely not of the eighteenth or any earlier century' (p. 444).

61

* * *

The 'post-structuralist' turn in Prussian history has tilted away from those arguments, old and new, which traced the German 'separate path' to fascist dictatorship to the power of 'pre-modern elites' and, pre-eminent among them, 'the Junkers'. By highlighting nineteenth-century penetration of the modernizing state's bureaucratic regulatory authority into the east Elbian countryside in a process that subordinated *both* villagers and estate owners to its hegemony, Wagner's book focuses attention away from social-structural explanations of the drift of Bismarckian–Wilhelmine Germany into war and revolution. Instead, it emphasizes the role of *modern* state power—that is, the kind of developmentalist and modernizing, heavily bureaucratized, activist and interventionist state power that emerged in Prussian-led Germany—in shaping what, from a present-day perspective, may and must be constructed, though non-teleologically, as the path toward 1918, 1933, and 1939.[6]

Wagner himself does not address this overarching problem of German history, but his book beckons backwards toward older conceptions of German political culture as heavily—too heavily—stamped by trust in and dependence on state power: the 'vulgar Hegelianism' of Heinrich von Treitschke, an attitude not absent from Thomas Mann's *Reflections of an Unpolitical Man* or the ideological blueprints of pre-1933 German Social Democracy. At the same time, Wagner's book looks forward to recent historiography on the dystopian aspects of the welfare state and the Weberian–Foucauldian administrative 'disciplining' state in general.[7]

What seems to characterize the German pattern is, first, a dichotomy or antagonism, widely perceived under the German Empire in the propertied classes, between democratic self-government and stable, protective state power. Second, the catastrophic failure of state power (in the First World War and its aftermath), inspired wide-

[6] See my essay, 'Master Narratives After Postmodernity: Germany's "Separate Path" in Historiographical-Philosophical Light', *German Studies Review*, 33/1 (February 2007), pp. 1–32.

[7] For a penetrating discussion of a broad literature focused on Germany, see Edward Ross Dickinson, 'Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse About "Modernity" ', *Central European History*, 37/1 (2004), pp. 1–48.

spread longings—often tinged with utopianism or redemptionism—which undermined much of the shaky confidence in self-government that had managed to coalesce before 1930. If 'modernity' must be 'organized' through state power, it is evidently disastrous for governments to fail in their most essential, self-legitimizing domestic projects, or in their grand military–diplomatic gambles.

Wagner's book displays an east Elbia which, rather than languishing in pre-modern aristocratic–authoritarian backwardness, had been enticed and coerced into junior partnership in a 'modernization offensive' that, until 1914, Prussian officialdom, especially the *Landräte*, efficiently managed to the economic and political advantage of both estate-owners and commercialized village farmers.[8] Imperial Germany's attempt during the First World War to 'seize world power'—its *Griff nach der Weltmacht*, with its terrible consequences—cannot plausibly be primarily derived from the east Elbian agrarian conservatives' noisy and egocentric pre-1914 politics. It followed, instead, from the Bismarckian–Wilhelmine state's success in organizing German society for growth and power. Wagner's book offers deep and often vivid insight into this process in its east Elbian manifestation.

[8] The phrase is Peter Wagner's. See n. 2 above.

WILLIAM W. HAGEN is Professor of History at the University of California, Davis. He specializes in the history of early modern and modern Germany and Eastern Europe. His book *Ordinary Prussians: Brandenburg Junkers and Villagers, 1500–1840* (2002) was awarded the Hans Rosenberg Prize of the Central European Conference Group of the American Historical Association.

FLIRTING WITH HITLER: BIOGRAPHIES OF THE GERMAN AND BRITISH NOBILITY IN THE INTERWAR YEARS

Karina Urbach

JONATHAN PETROPOULOS, *Royals and the Reich: The Princes von Hessen in Nazi Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 544 pp. ISBN-10: 0 19 920377 6. ISBN-13: 978 0 19 920377 2. £20.00
DIETER J. WEIß, *Kronprinz Rupprecht von Bayern (1869–1955): Eine politische Biografie* (Regensburg: Pustet, 2007), 464 pp. ISBN 978 3 7917 2047 0. EUR. 39.90
IAN KERSHAW, *Making Friends with Hitler: Lord Londonderry and the Roots of Appeasement* (London: Allen Lane, 2004), 512 pp. ISBN 0 71 399717 6. £20.00; German edition: *Hitlers Freunde in England: Lord Londonderry und der Weg in den Krieg*, trans. Klaus-Dieter Schmidt (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2005), 527 pp. ISBN 3 421 05805. EUR 39.90
NEIL C. FLEMING, *The Marquess of Londonderry: Aristocracy, Power and Politics in Britain and Ireland*, Tauris Academic Studies (London: Tauris Publishers, 2005), vi + 281 pp. ISBN 1 85043 726 2. £47.50

In May 2006 the *Daily Telegraph*, traditionally deferential to the Royal Family, presented a little scoop that subsequently went unnoticed. Among recently released papers at the National Archives a journalist discovered a bizarre file. From 1959 onwards the Foreign Office had developed and over the years regularly updated a top secret plan codenamed Blue Thread. It provided for British forces to evacuate thirty-eight German aristocrats in case of a Soviet invasion of Germany. At the time this was a politically highly sensitive document. If there had been an invasion, the aristocrats would have received the same treatment as British military personnel, ranking above British tourists. The potential evacuees would not have been flown to Britain though (which was not considered safe in case of a simultaneous nuclear attack), but to Lyons. All thirty-eight aristocrats were referred to in the papers as 'Royal Relatives', yet in fact they were relatives of the Duke of Edinburgh and Lord Mountbatten,

who thought up the plan. Mountbatten's dynastic thinking is well known, but his persistent letters to the Foreign Office regarding this issue also give us an inkling of the enormous fear of Communism which the aristocracy as a whole had lived under ever since 1918. It was assumed that relatives of the Tsar, such as the Hesse family, would be killed first by Soviet invaders. Although not mentioned in the files, the chequered past of some of these would-be evacuees would have presented a problem for the British side. While most of the Baden family had behaved impeccably during the Nazi regime, this could not be said of members of other dynasties, such as the Hohenlohe-Langenburg or the Hesse family, as will be shown below.

Gems like this file from the National Archive are still few and far between. When it comes to the twentieth century, it is not easy to work on the nobility, first for the very basic but decisive reason that access to archive material is restricted. Anyone who has had the doubtful pleasure of begging to get into a private archive can testify to this. While British private archives often charge scholars (the most outrageous rate so far is £70 a day in the Duke of Bedford's archive at Woburn Abbey), German archivists offer their services free of charge but often live in fear. Many are trained historians who serve two masters—their employer, usually the head of an aristocratic family who prefers hagiographies, and their fellow historians, whom they genuinely want to help. Issues which German archivists fear most, apart from Nazi skeletons, are wills (which are not made public in Germany) and references to illegitimate children (which always make an entertaining read during an uneventful day at the archives). One would expect the British aristocracy to be more open on these issues. But even if access is gained to their twentieth-century papers, the archives often turn out to have been as sanitized as those of the German nobility. Even in the case of a well known British Nazi supporter such as Viscount Lymington, whose papers are deposited in a *public* archive, letters written by his German, Austrian, and Italian partners in crime are missing. The two books on Lord Londonderry which will be reviewed below show, however, that some descendants no longer indulge a selective memory and have become brutally honest about their family's past—a laudable exception.

But even if one has overcome the archival hurdle, studying the nobility in the twentieth century also presents methodological prob-

lems. Were aristocrats in Germany or Britain still a distinctive group after 1918? Even if they saw themselves as a group apart from the rest of society, were their actions of any political or social relevance? If they were relevant, a political study of them would make sense; if they were not, scholars could focus more on the social problems of a group in decline. This has been the viewpoint of novelists, who formed our perception of the aristocracy in the past. Countless Penguin Classics describe the decline of the European aristocracies in the twentieth century. Evelyn Waugh showed sympathy for 'his' dis-orientated Catholic aristocrats in *Brideshead Revisited*; Hugo von Hofmannsthal ceremoniously staged the late summer of the Austrian nobility; while Marcel Proust pitilessly dissected the great French aristocratic families. Yet Proust also gives us a clue to the survival techniques of the aristocracy: 'the power of such people is seen to reside not so much in their wealth or inherited position, much less in their talent or personality. Rather it lies in the power of names themselves, the imaginative recognition ascribed to them by others and the authority that the name appears to inscribe in them as people.'[1]

While British historians have always worked extensively on the nobility as a politically crucial group and only started to study the middle classes twenty years ago, developments in Germany went in the opposite direction. There, thanks to the projects of the Frankfurt and Bielefeld schools, the *Bürgertum* was at the centre of interest from the 1980s onwards. The nobility was seen as an irrelevant, declining group which, after 1918, played a negligible walk-on part in German history. This perspective changed with the works of Heinz Reif and his 'Adel und Bürgertum' project. Reif's Ph.D. students have pro-duced a number of monographs covering economic, political, and cultural aspects of the German nobility from the nineteenth century onwards.[2] Eckart Conze, who published his study of the aristocratic Bernstorff family at the same time and continued to work on the sub-ject with his colleague Monika Wienfort, therefore rightly pointed to

[1] For this see Simon Gunn, 'Ascription as Inscription: Occupations and the Transformative Power of Names', paper given at the University of Green-wich, 22 Nov. 2002.
[2] See e.g. Heinz Reif (ed.), *Adel und Bürgertum in Deutschland*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 2000–1); René Schiller, *Vom Rittergut zum Großgrundbesitz: ökonomische und soziale Transformationsprozesse der ländlichen Eliten in Brandenburg im 19. Jahr-hundert* (Berlin, 2003); Wolfram G. Theilemann, *Adel im grünen Rock: adliges*

a new boom in aristocracy studies.[3] The Dresden group around Josef Matzerath and Silke Marburg has brought the Saxon nobility back to life,[4] while monographs by Hartwin Spenkuch and Patrick Wagner concentrate on the Prussian *Herrenhaus* and the Junkers respectively.[5] Both liberated this thorny subject from ideological interpretations. This little bibliographical survey already indicates that today the aristocracy is to historians what the working class was for them in the 1970s. So, do we need any more monographs on the German aristocracy? When it comes to the Third Reich we certainly do.

Economic, political, and social transformation processes have been a constant companion of the aristocracy since the nineteenth century. After the First World War, however, these processes intensified tremendously. Aristocrats were confronted with revolutions, republics, and an influx of 'Bolshevist' ideas. How did they react to this threat? How, if at all, did they as a result become anti-democratic power centres?

In answering this question, Stephan Malinowski's dissertation 'Vom König zum Führer' has led the field.[6] He untangled the complex relationship between an old elite and its 'successor', the National Socialists. Malinowski was the first to question the post-war myth of the German nobility as early anti-Nazis who had always detested the 'plebeian Brown Shirts' and portrayed Stauffenberg as their representative. Instead Malinowski uncovered their anti-Semitism, their deference to Hitler, and the Nazi tone of their 'union',

Jägertum, Großprivatwaldbesitz und die preußische Forstbeamtenschaft 1866–1914 (Berlin, 2004). All these volumes are published in the series 'Elitenwandel in der Moderne'.

[3] Eckart Conze, V*on deutschem Adel: Die Grafen von Bernstorff im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2000); id. and Monika Wienfort (eds.), *Adel und Moderne: Deutschland im europäischen Vergleich im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 2004).

[4] Silke Marburg and Josef Matzerath (eds.), *Der Schritt in die Moderne: Sächsischer Adel zwischen 1763 und 1918* (Cologne, 2001).

[5] Patrick Wagner, *Bauern, Junker und Beamte: lokale Herrschaft und Partizipation im Ostelbien des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 2005); Hartwin Spenkuch, *Das preußische Herrenhaus: Adel und Bürgertum in der Ersten Kammer des Landtages 1854–1918* (Düsseldorf, 1998).

[6] Published as Stephan Malinowski, *Vom König zum Führer: sozialer Niedergang und politische Radikalisierung im deutschen Adel zwischen Kaiserreich und NS-Staat* (Berlin, 2003; several new edns).

the Deutsche Adelsgenossenschaft (German League of Aristocrats). He showed that at least for a while the German nobility gained a new status, new jobs in the military, and new land in the East as the result of following a charismatic new leader.

From the macro level of Malinowski, Jonathan Petropoulos has now gone to the biographical level and looked at a particularly interesting family in detail: the House of Hesse. His book aims to verify the comment by Prince Michael of Greece on royal clans, namely, that 'they keep a whole crowd of skeletons closely guarded in their closets' (p. 8). Petropoulos does, indeed, identify many of these skeletons. At the centre of his work are two brothers: Prince Christoph von Hessen-Kassel, who was married to a sister of the future Duke of Edinburgh, and his older brother Philipp, married to a daughter of the King of Italy. British tabloids today are particularly intrigued by the Hesse-Edinburgh connection, though the Duke of Edinburgh could not, in the event, be turned into a Nazi. Although his sisters were in the Party, his mother hid Jewish friends and he himself fought on the side of the Allies.

Petropoulos, close to private sources, describes the Hesse brothers' descent into the Nazi Party as a Faustian story. The usual grievances—lost war, fear of Bolshevism, admiration for the Italian model, hope for a German awakening—and some diffuse anti-Semitism drove them into the Nazi camp. In Germany they became door-openers for Hitler's unpolished movement; abroad they were useful to the Nazis in forging ties with the Italian and the British elites (they were close to lesser British royals). Göring had spotted their potential early on and became their sponsor. He famously kept a ménage of aristocrats with international contacts, including Max Egon von Hohenlohe, the Duke of Coburg, and the Wieds. In return, these aristocrats were showered with perks and given the feeling that they could play a political role again. As the Duke of Coburg once summed it up in a letter to his sister, the Countess of Athlone: 'but what pleases me most is that they still need our help. In spite of their saying nowadays that the young must rule.'[7]

---

[7] Duke of Coburg to his sister, Alice, Countess of Athlone, 2 Mar. 1939, AU/FF 3/ALA/10, Royal Archives Windsor. I should like to thank Pamela Clark for access to the Duke of Coburg Papers at the Royal Archives Windsor.

The artistic Prince Philipp von Hessen in particular seems for a while to have become a second Albert Speer to Hitler, a soul-mate knowledgeable about architecture and painting. (Philipp's bisexuality — one of his prominent lovers had been Siegfried Sassoon — did not seem to be a problem at the time.) Philipp accompanied Hitler on his state visits to Italy and together they dreamt of a *Führermuseum* in Linz to rival the Uffizi Gallery. In the past Petropoulos has been an expert witness on looted art cases and the way in which he uncovers Philipp's questionable dealings in the art world for the regime is impressive.[8] Worse, however, was Philipp's role regarding the Hadamar sanatorium, a killing centre for the T-4 programme (murdering patients who lived an 'unworthy life'). Philipp handed Hadamar over to the Reich Interior Ministry and US investigators later summed up: 'after he facilitated the use of this sanatorium, about 10,000 mentally ill people were exterminated' (p. 249).

Philipp's dashing brother Christoph meanwhile joined the SS, was complicit in the Röhm putsch, and headed the *Forschungsamt*, Göring's (and later Himmler's) intelligence agency. Many members of the nobility worked for the *Forschungsamt*, as the Americans found out after the war, posing as diplomats and using old international contacts. From 1942, however, the princes, their knowledge and cosmopolitanism, became a liability. Hitler had lost interest in his former favourites and the Stauffenberg plot, though of course completely unconnected to the Hesses, did not exactly raise his confidence in the nobility. The Hesse brothers sank back into oblivion.

While the Hesse case is an excellent example of the worst cooperation of the German nobility with the Nazi regime, the Wittelsbach case is one of the few positive stories about resistance. Malinowski has already shown that Bavarian aristocrats were more prone to distance themselves from Hitler. This was not simply a matter of religion (after all, Catholicism did not prevent the Westphalian nobility from falling for Hitler). One reason why Bavarian aristocrats were comparatively immune might have been the dignified leadership of Crown Prince Rupprecht. Dieter Weiß's biography of Rupprecht will be the definitive work on this subject for a long time to come. Weiß had unrestricted access to the Wittelsbach archives and was the first to use the diaries and private correspondence of the Crown Prince.

[8] See also Jonathan Petropoulos, *The Faustian Bargain: The Art World in Nazi Germany* (London, 2000).

His work shows that from very early on Rupprecht was the antidote to the Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm, who flirted with the radical right even before the outbreak of the First World War. The two competed militarily from 1914 onwards, with Rupprecht being a more successful and level-headed commander than his Prussian counterpart. He was far from being a warrior prince though, and tried to forge a role as a cultural sponsor in the tradition of Ludwig I of Bavaria (1825–48). Ultimately this became impossible financially, but as a friend of Franz von Lenbach and a supporter of the work of Adolf von Hildebrand, Rupprecht could make an impact. While Friedrich Wilhelm partied away the 1920s and campaigned actively for Hitler, Rupprecht warned members of his family not to join the SA or SS: 'To allow a movement that is hostile to us to use us as advertising would be the stupidest thing we could do' (p. 283).

The 1920s were turbulent times in Bavarian politics and the Crown Prince was approached by the Nazis several times. Weiß's chapters on this period are the most gripping. He shows the role of Ernst Röhm and many others who tried to persuade Rupprecht to support the party, and although a personal meeting with the 'talkative Austrian' took place in 1922, it was never repeated. Only for a very short period did Rupprecht share with members of other dynasties the illusion that one could control and use the National Socialists. He had also made it clear after his father's death that he did not want to achieve a restoration of the monarchy by force. Reading Weiß's analysis of the events of 1932–3 one could almost wish that the Crown Prince had been more ruthless in seizing power in Bavaria before Hitler achieved complete control. At the time Rupprecht had the backing of the Bavarian SPD which, after the Nazi seizure of power, saw the monarchy as the last saviour. However, Rupprecht's plan to put a non-partisan government in power alienated the Bavarian minister president, Held. In the end he failed Rupprecht as much as the Bayerische Volkspartei (Bavarian People's Party), Hindenburg, and the *Reichswehr*. What followed was a life surrounded by Nazi spies. In 1939 Rupprecht left for Italy, though his wife had advocated emigration to the USA. Himmler made sure that the Crown Prince would not be let back into the Reich. His wife, son Albrecht, and Albrecht's family were, after Stauffenberg's assassination attempt, deported to concentration camps in Sachsenhausen, Flossenbürg, and Dachau.

When questioned by the American Forces in 1946, Rupprecht advocated a constitutional monarchy for Bavaria based on the British model. He had travelled to Britain in the interwar years and been entertained, among others, by Catholic aristocratic families whose work had left an impression on him. This was quite a common experience. In general, British aristocrats have been perceived as a success story and as setting an example to their European cousins, who were not as charismatic, urban, wealthy, or adaptable to the modern world. In 1938 Noël Coward wrote the lyrics: 'The Stately Homes of England,|How beautiful they stand,|To prove the upper classes,|Have still the upper hand.'[9] In the twentieth century the British aristocracy were considered to have been politically reliable—a Horthy regime or a Prussian camarilla would never have been possible in England. Aristocrats who are known to have supported radical right-wing groups have often been portrayed as eccentric figures, or marginalized as disgruntled, 'declining landowners'.[10] In 2004 an accolade for the aristocracy came to the conclusion that: 'Class war, socialism, fascism were un-English ideas, only suitable, if suitable at all, for foreign countries . . . [This was because of the British Aristocracy which] for three centuries guaranteed the rights and liberties of all the British people so effectively as to make a written constitution unnecessary.'[11]

So all is well on the Western Front of the European aristocracies? Not if we look at the two very different biographies of Lord Londonderry under review here. The most interesting verdict on him was by a contemporary, Harold Nicolson, who called him a grandee who 'remained 1760 in 1936'.[12] This sounds a bit apologetic, considering Nicolson's own brief infatuation with Oswald Mosley, but it gives an inkling of Londonderry's dynastic mindset. Like so many of his class, Londonderry's wish to strike a deal with Germany was prompted by his fear of Bolshevism. In addition, his overtures to Hitler were based on pragmatism—he knew that Britain had to prevent a war before it

[9] Quoted from Charles Castle, *Noël* (New York, 1973), p. 153.

[10] Cannadine thinks that they were mainly 'déclassé and marginal aristocrats'. David Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (London, 1992), p. 547.

[11] Peregrine Worsthorne, *In Defence of Aristocracy* (London 2004), pp. 27 f.

[12] Harold Nicolson, *Diaries and Letters, 1930–1964*, ed. Stanley Olson (New York, 1980), p. 93.

was rearmed—and by a degree of identity with the Nazi regime. As a biographer of Hitler, Kershaw's best chapters are on Londonderry's dealings with the Nazis. His handling of the appeasement movement and the question of why someone of Londonderry's background finally left the political centre for good is extremely well written. The problem, however, is that his subject bursts on to the stage in the 1930s, and the reader misses out on Londonderry's First World War experiences and the whole Irish question which formed his personality and decision-making processes. Kershaw is aware of this and makes it clear from the start that he is interested in only one part of Londonderry's career, namely, 'his involvement in the appeasement of Germany' (preface).

A more rounded picture of Londonderry is presented by Neil Fleming's dissertation. Fleming does not write with the same panache as Kershaw, but puts his subject into context. He is very much aware of the dynastic thinking of an aristocratic family; in the case of the Londonderrys the family hero is Viscount Castlereagh (1769–1822) and his rather debatable achievements at the Congress of Vienna. Castlereagh accumulated political capital for the family, an achievement that the 7th Marquis wanted to emulate. Ancestor-worship is very similar in all aristocracies, of course. European noble families often describe themselves as links in a chain. For them this metaphor symbolizes the way in which one generation builds upon another and a missing 'link' can destroy the family. Ancestors, current, and future members of the family are one; they exist outside the conventions of space and time. The family and its glory must be at the centre of the thinking of every 'link'. Londonderry certainly believed in something similar, his inherited right to rule. Unlike many of his German counterparts, however, he had the socio-economic structures to realize this ambition. His wealth as a coal owner and the tireless campaigns of his family on his behalf turned him from Irish politics, the 'graveyard of aristocratic ambition' (p. 44) into a Secretary of State for Air. To achieve this aim compromises had to be made. His mother already knew that one had to work with talented members of the bourgeoisie, and this 'aristocratic embrace' (F. M. L. Thompson) was later perfected by Londonderry's glamorous wife Edith, who cultivated middle-class politicians relentlessly. This did not mean that she became a full-blown democrat. In her memoirs Lady Londonderry makes it plain that Ireland was not yet ready for

'democracy as the British know it . . . It is not for southern Ireland. They are of a different race. They want firm, wise but powerful control, to prevent them from trying to eat each other up.'[13]

The Troubles in Ireland made an impact on the Londonderrys, but the First World War had been more decisive. Even without kitchen psychology it is clear that Londonderry's glasshouse upbringing, banned by his parents from serving in the Boer War and only allowed to serve behind the lines during the First World War, frustrated him enormously. His escape was a fixation on aeroplanes, and he early on realized their enormous military potential. Churchill made it possible for his cousin Londonderry to be appointed to the Air Council after the 1918 general election and from then on his main loyalty lay with the Royal Flying Corps (later RAF). Londonderry's greatest achievement, according to Fleming, was that 'Britain maintained the core of an air force that would eventually repel the Luftwaffe in what was later called "Britain's finest hour"' (p. 78). In his final verdict the author thus agrees with the fickle Chips Channon: '[Londonderry] always maintained that there were only two possible courses for us: either to make friends with Germany, or, if this was impossible, to re-arm. We did neither, and war was the result' (quoted in Fleming, p. 216). The Marquis's greatest mistake, however, was to underestimate Hitler's cunning and to hang on to Anglo-German relations after everyone else had abandoned the project. This had nothing to do with politics; here vanity and gullibility were decisive.

Flirting with Hitler gave the German and the British aristocracy only a short flush of excitement. After the war, they were eager to delete this embarrassing little romance from the records. These important biographies make sure that they do not get away with it.

---

[13] Marchioness of Londonderry, *Retrospect* (London, 1938), p. 189.

Review Articles

KARINA URBACH is a Research Fellow at the GHIL. She is the author of *Bismarck's Favourite Englishman: Lord Odo Russell's Mission to Berlin* (1999) and is completing a monograph (for the *Habilitation*) on 'Nobilities and Networks 1914–1939'. She is currently editing *European Aristocracies and the Radical Right in the Interwar Period* (forthcoming, 2007) and is commissioned to write a biography of Queen Victoria.

BOOK REVIEWS

DIETER BERG, *Die Anjou-Plantagenets: Die englischen Könige im Europa des Mittelalters (1100–1400)* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2003), 348 pp. ISBN 3 17 014488 X. EUR 19.00

The development of the House of Anjou-Plantagenet, from its first beginnings in the late ninth century to the extinction of the main line after the deposition (1399) and death (1400) of King Richard II, or the extinction of the last collateral line in 1499, has so far been a major topic of research in the English-speaking world. Most of these works treat the history of the Angevins and their empire from the viewpoint of national history, that is, largely concentrating on the history of England. In his survey Dieter Berg, professor at the University of Hanover and an established expert on English medieval history, shares the dynastic focus of earlier works and is thus in line with the thematic emphasis of the Urban-Taschenbücher series. But Berg's approach is different in that he places English history from *c.*1100 to 1400 more strongly into a European framework and concentrates particularly on the position of England in Europe. His account of important domestic developments (principles and forms of political rule in England; tensions between Crown and aristocracy; basic features of the development of the financial, administrative, and legal systems; and the development of Parliament) is rather cursory, but he pays more attention to the English monarchs' foreign relations, which explicitly include relations with Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. Berg's work is based on a premiss that he has held for some time, namely, that 'foreign policy' should not be associated exclusively with the existence of sovereign states of the modern type. On the contrary, he argues, the political protagonists of medieval Europe in general and England in particular were aware of a difference between domestic and foreign affairs in the sense that they believed that certain actions transcended a ruler's immediate sphere of power and thereby assumed the character of foreign policy. As Berg has argued elsewhere,[1] such an awareness existed in England as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

[1] Dieter Berg, *England und der Kontinent: Studien zur auswärtigen Politik der*

The eleven individual chapters of this book deal with the well-known topics of English dynastic history in the high and late Middle Ages, namely, the conflicts between the Anglo-Norman rulers of England and the House of Anjou until the middle of the twelfth century (ch. 1); the building of the Angevin empire (ch. 2); the Angevin kingdom and its role on the Continent and in the Middle East (ch. 3); the crisis and end of the Angevin empire (ch. 4); the English policy of expansion on the Continent and constitutional crises in England (ch. 5); the strengthening of the kingdom under Edward I and his policy towards the Celtic realms of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales (ch. 6); the decline of the kingdom and the growth of new political powers under Edward II (ch. 7); England's position within European power structures during the early period of the Hundred Years War (ch. 8); and crises of domestic and foreign policy, and the development of Parliament's powers (ch. 9). In line with Berg's dynastic approach, the chronological frame for these chapters is dictated by the lifespans of the individual kings. Each chapter ends with a useful brief account of how each king and his reign were judged in his lifetime and how they are seen today. Chapter 10 is a thematic survey of the fundamental problems of social, economic, and cultural developments during the English high and late Middle Ages. The main areas of interest are the ownership of land and the agrarian system; towns; the Jewish minority; the education system; the Black Death; foreign trade; religiosity; and literature. For a German readership it is especially useful that Berg frequently makes comparisons with comparable developments in the Holy Roman Empire. The volume ends with a brief look forward to the end of the Plantagenet dynasty and the rise of the Houses of Lancaster and York in the fifteenth century (ch. 11).

The account focuses mainly on the events up to the deposition and death of Richard II, which means that strictly speaking the author does not quite fulfil the intention declared in the blurb and forew ord, namely, to present the history of dynastic and political events in England up to the Wars of the Roses (1455–85). Despite the claims in the blurb, social and cultural developments in the period under investigation are not the volume's real, substantive focus.

anglonormannischen Könige im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert (Bochum, 1987), pp. 1–5, and id., *Deutschland und seine Nachbarn, 1200–1500*, Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, 40 (Munich, 1997), pp. 1–4, 47–8.

In his own words, Berg's approach is Eurocentric, meaning that the 'island kingdom is regarded less as isolated than as part of the community of Christian empires in the West' (p. 9). It could be asked whether this is not to some extent tautological, as long after the loss of Normandy in 1204 the English Crown still had possessions on the Continent, and was, therefore, naturally still a continental power. From the same point of view, Berg's repeated use of the term 'island empire' (*Inselreich*) would also deserve discussion, as it is really only appropriate for the situation after the almost complete loss of England's continental possessions in 1453.

The denseness of the account in terms of content is welcome as such, but what is not an easy read anyway is made even more difficult by the small size of the print and the amount of text crammed on to each page. Footnotes are sparse—a total of 149 for just over 300 pages of text. While there are no objections to this in principle, it is not clear to the reader what criteria the author followed in each case when inserting a bibliographical reference. For a non-professional readership these references are indecipherable anyway, as there is no separate list of abbreviations, and only an extensive search in the references to each chapter reveals the titles to which each abbreviation refers. The use of abbreviations for places of publication and a separate list of these seems unnecessarily complicated. The addition of maps to clarify territorial developments, especially in south-west France, would have made it easier to follow the discussion in the text.

A number of questions remain unanswered, not least that concerning the formative forces behind the creation of the Angevin empire. Thus Berg speaks of 'new perspectives for the creation of an Anglo-Norman–Angevin empire' in the first half of the twelfth century (pp. 21, 22), but provides no evidence that this sort of 'creation' was ever a long-term goal of royal policy. Later on he appears to contradict himself when he points to the 'rather haphazard way in which an extensive territory came together' (p. 53). Similarly, the question of whether we can really speak of an Angevin 'system of alliances' in the strict sense (p. 307), or whether we should assume a largely unsystematic accumulation of individual, short-lived, and ad hoc alliances, deserves further discussion. 'Foreign policy' certainly had a 'special significance' for the history of England in the high and late Middle Ages (p. 9), but whether there was a primacy of foreign policy in the sense that it was 'at the heart of the political actions of all

Angevin kings' (p. 304) seems questionable, at least with respect to the rule of Edward II (1307–27). In the light of recent research on medieval foreign policy, the bald statement that the norms of international law were 'not relevant' (p. 306) for diplomatic processes cannot be upheld.[2]

Berg carefully sums up his substantive account by pointing out that a 'comprehensive appreciation of the political acts of the Plantagenets' is hardly possible, and instead limits himself to describing 'a few of the basic features and main elements' of their rule in domestic and foreign policy (p. 300). The main problems which dictated the actions of all the Anglo-Norman and Angevin kings were securing their rule at home, maintaining the unity of the empire with its continental and insular parts, and expanding their own power. In the final chapter, Berg also looks at factors which determined foreign policy and the means and techniques used. Readers might have hoped to find out more about how the Anjou-Plantagenets saw themselves in the context of dynastic identity-formation; on this point Berg is satisfied with a brief reference to the fact that the existence of a 'specifically "Angevin culture" ' cannot be assumed (p. 301).

What should be noted here is that, despite these minor criticisms, Berg's survey guides the reader through the confused events of the dynastic politics of three colourful centuries with complete mastery. German students and researchers now have quick access to a reliable source for the history of this dynasty which was so important to the shaping of Western Europe.

---

[2] See the proceedings of the conference 'Rechtsformen internationaler Politik: Theorie, Norm und Praxis vom 12. bis 18. Jahrhundert', held in Münster in 2006, now being prepared for publication.

KARSTEN PLÖGER is a Research Fellow in late medieval and early modern history at the German Historical Institute London.

LYNDAL ROPER, *Witch Craze: Terror and Fantasy in Baroque Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), xiv + 362 pp. ISBN 0 300 10335 2. £25.00. German trans. *Hexenwahn: Geschichte einer Verfolgung* (Munich: Beck, 2007).

Following the basic argument of her earlier work *Oedipus and the Devil*,[1] Lyndal Roper in her new study sees witch beliefs and witch hunts as motivated by the unconscious. She stresses that the unconscious is not ahistorical. Rather, it is shaped by cultural conditions and expressed in products of culture beyond the purely individual sphere, for example, in the accusations and testimonials of witch trials. Elaborating on another idea from *Oedipus and the Devil,* Roper also argues that witchcraft is essentially about motherhood and fertility. She does not discuss any alternative interpretation of the multi-layered phenomenon of witch beliefs and witch hunts. Goethe would have applauded her approach. The *Geheimrat* already suspected that we need a psychological explanation of witch hunts: 'There is the famous era of witches in history which, it seems to me, has not received an adequate psychological explanation.'[2]

In terms of organization the lavishly illustrated book consists of nine chapters arranged in four parts.[3] Part I, 'Persecution', provides an overview of the denominational, economic, legal, and administrative background of the German witch hunts. Here Roper is not afraid of generalizations. Some of her statements, however, are too sweeping; a few are simply wrong (for example, Bishop Peter Binsfeld, an influential demonologist and supporter of the witch hunts, is said to have been a Jesuit, p. 64). Part II, 'Fantasy', explores the more outlandish aspects of witchcraft: cannibalism, that is, the witches' taste

[1] Lyndal Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Sexuality and Religion in Early Modern Germany* (London, 1994).
[2] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe to Frau von Stein, 1787, quoted in Wolfgang Behringer (ed.), *Hexen und Hexenprozesse* (3rd edn.: Munich, 1995), p. 457.
[3] Some parts of *Witch Craze* have been published before. Ch. 3 is based on a German text published in 1997: 'Kinder ausgraben, Kinder essen: Zur psychischen Dynamik von Hexenprozessen in Nördlingen', in Nada Boškovska Leimgruber (ed.), *Die Frühe Neuzeit in der Geschichtswissenschaft: Forschungstendenzen und Forschungserträg*e (Paderborn, 1997), pp. 201–28. Ch. 9 is partly identical with an article in *Past and Present*: 'Evil Imaginings and Fantasies', *Past and Present*, 167 (2000), pp. 107–39.

for infants, sex with demons, and witches' Sabbaths or nocturnal gatherings of witches and demons. Witches allegedly killed children and stole the dead bodies of infants from their graves to eat them. In order to explain the gruesome stories told in the torture chambers, Roper resurrects Freud: judges forced the suspects, mostly elderly women, into the role of the evil mother who, in an act of identification, consumes her child. The judges, Roper suggests, might to a certain degree have identified with the cannibalistic witches. As they had inherited their power from an older generation, they had in a way 'swallowed' their predecessors. When the judges condemned the women of that older generation—some the widows of their predecessors—as witches, they rid themselves of the remnants of the past.

Considering that demons do not have material bodies, sex with them is a fascinating topic. Following her main argument Roper stresses that the spirits of hell were sterile. Even in this respect, witchcraft remained alien and hostile to procreation and fecundity. Finally, as far as the nocturnal gatherings are concerned, Roper gives an accurate picture of the Sabbaths of the witches' confessions, not the Sabbaths of some demonologists' fantasies. Contemporaries imagined the witches' gathering as a banquet—starving people dreaming about finally eating their fill might have played a part here—a dance, and the opportunity to engage collectively in malevolent magic. The Sabbath of popular imagination was certainly not a Black Mass nor even a pagan ritual.

In part III, 'Womanhood', Roper discusses the wider background of witch beliefs. She presents the witch as an infertile old woman. Even though these problems sound strangely modern, Roper identifies delayed marriage and a fascination with fertility as basic elements of early modern culture. Economic matters placed practical restrictions on marriage. There were laws against marriage between people whose income was judged insufficient to support a family. Yet these restrictions were not intended to imperil the existence of peasant households. The fertility of the lawfully married couple, therefore, was of great importance. Fertility, Roper argues, was not only an economic necessity; it became an obsession for early modern culture. Thus, the woman past menopause became the ultimate outsider. At best expendable and ridiculed, the old woman could be feared as envious of the young and fertile. Young mothers and their babies, livestock, and fields whose fertility were crucial to the sur-

vival of the peasant household were thus the prime targets of malev-
olent magic. In order to strengthen her argument Roper discusses the
caricature-like images of old women in Baroque art. She draws not
only on Hans Baldung Grien's pictures that appear in many books on
witch trials, but also on other works that she integrates admirably
into her narrative. She has no patience with that out-dated feminist
bogeyman 'the patriarchy', and demonstrates that women shared the
dislike of the 'old crone'. In fact, the fertile young woman and the
young mother who felt especially vulnerable and was more attentive
to any potentially dangerous influence than anyone else were deeply
suspicious of their significant other, the infertile old woman. Thus,
women were responsible for a large number of witchcraft accusa-
tions against other women. As Roper also shows, contemporaries
more readily attributed authority and wisdom to old men.
Nevertheless, one wonders why the impotent old man was appar-
ently not considered a threat to the fertility of the younger members
of his sex.

The last part of the study, entitled 'The Witch', presents variants
of that theme and investigates the decline of witch beliefs in the
eighteenth century. Roper interprets witch trials against children
involving illicit sex as a symptom of the decline of the demonological
pattern of witchcraft. The elaborate symbolism of demonology was
no longer used as a code for tensions between parents and children,
the old and the young. The new role of the mother in the bourgeois
household and the reduced interest in agricultural fertility in an
increasingly urbanized society helped to rid German society of the
fear of witches. That fascinating and potentially dangerous oddity of
the mother past child-bearing, the witch, metamorphosed into the
fairy-tale character of the nineteenth century. Fittingly enough, the
story that, according to Roper, was always about children finally
becomes a story for children. As she emphasizes, even the Grimms'
fairy tale 'Hänsel und Gretel' points to maternity as the centre of the
witchcraft imagination. Although the epilogue about the harmless
nineteenth-century witch might be read as a conclusion to the book,
the reader would have wished for a summary.

As the starting point for her discussions, Roper describes several
witch trials in her individual chapters. These extensive narratives are
extremely detailed and concentrate exclusively on source materials
from the German heartland of the witch hunts. Roper focuses on

cases from Augsburg, Marchtal, and Nördlingen and mostly provides transcripts of the records in the original language along with her translation. The language of German witch trials is extremely complicated. Not only is it written in the contemporary regional dialect, but it also swarms with unusual expressions, allegations, and images. Even though there are minor mistakes (for example, on pp. 109, 128, 205), Roper demonstrates great command of that most difficult idiom. Unfortunately, however, the lengthy narratives offer little that is new or surprising to professional historians. For anyone beginning to read about witchcraft, less narrative and more analysis would have been helpful. Nevertheless, *Witch Craze* does give the reader a very good idea about many aspects of everyday life, especially women's lives, in early modern Germany, and it undoubtedly does so in a most entertaining way.

Roper is a much more gifted writer than most historians. She presents the highly complex historical material in a way that the reader, especially the general reader, can connect with. This is certainly one of the reasons why *Witch Craze* has rekindled the slackening interest in witchcraft as a historical topic. The reader gains the impression that he or she has at last understood a phenomenon that is very difficult to understand. The problem might be that the reader—contrary to Roper's intention—gains the impression that he or she has understood *everything* about the witch hunts, not just one aspect of them. This does not mean that *Witch Craze* is simplistic—it certainly is not. This reviewer likes best those books that teach you a lot and yet show you that there is a great deal more to learn. Unwary readers, however, might read *Witch Craze* as their first and last book about witch hunts.

This is problematic since Roper tends to overstate her case in some respects. She certainly overestimates the importance of cannibalism for the witchcraft imagination. It would be easy to quote hundreds of trials in which that element played no part. In addition, although there can be no doubt that the cultural image of the witch as an old crone was dominant, it is next to impossible to say anything conclusive about the actual percentage of women beyond child-bearing age among the victims of the witch trials, as Roper admits. Roper's arguments are also often daring. Her assertive insistence on the paramount importance of fertility is not free of the odd non sequitur. And is it really convincing to group the magical murder of

children, charms for stealing wine out of the cellar, harmful magic against male potency, the magical destruction of livestock, and weather magic that destroyed the harvest together under the label 'magic against fertility'? In this context it is revealing that Roper underestimates weather magic. The supporters of witch hunts, especially among the so-called common men, peasants, and townspeople, did not tire of pointing out that witches destroyed their livelihood by weather magic. In large parts of Germany, the witch was first and foremost a weather magician. Weather magic, mostly hail and thunder storms, did not damage the fertility of the fields. It simply destroyed the crops. The same holds true for magic against livestock. Of course, witches were said to make farm animals infertile, but mostly they were believed simply to kill them. It could be said that witchcraft was more about property than fertility.

The imagery of magic in popular culture that might have provided links between demonology and the utterances of the suspects, the political aspects of the witch hunts, and their administrative necessities also play little part in Roper's book. However, there are other experts on these aspects of the witch trials. Roper wants to tell a different story. And she does so with great skill. Her study is erudite, sophisticated, and marvellously eloquent. She challenges other interpretations of the witch hunts with a well-argued case for the imagery of maternity as the basis for witch beliefs. Thus Roper's book provides rich food for thought. It is a valuable contribution to the historiography of witchcraft and one which no scholar with a serious interest in the subject can afford to ignore. In addition, *Witch Craze* is a fascinating read. It comes close to uniting historiography and art. However, for students just starting to read about witchcraft and the role of magic in German history a more conventional survey might be more advisable.[4]

[4] E.g. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (eds.), *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Period of the Witch Trials* (Philadelphia, 2002); Wolfgang Behringer, *Witches and Witch-Hunts: A Global History* (Cambridge, 2004).

Book Reviews

JOHANNES DILLINGER is Lecturer in Early Modern History and Regional History at the University of Trier, and former Director of an Emmy Noether Research Group in the Department of History, University of Trier. His research interests include the history of criminal justice, comparative and anthropological historiography, folk beliefs, and local representation in early modern Europe and New England. Among his publications are *'Böse Leute': Hexenverfolgungen in Schwäbisch-Österreich und Kurtrier im Vergleich* (1999) and *Zauberer — Selbstmörder — Schatzsucher: Magische Kultur und behördliche Kontrolle im frühneuzeitlichen Württemberg* (2003).

HELKE RAUSCH, *Kultfigur und Nation: Öffentliche Denkmäler in Paris, Berlin und London 1848–1914*, Pariser Historische Studien, 70 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006), 797 pp. ISBN-13: 978 3 486 57579 8. ISBN-10: 3 486 57579 1. EUR 79.80

Although published by Oldenbourg in the GHI Paris series Pariser Historische Studien, this weighty tome makes little attempt to disguise its origins as a German doctoral dissertation, written under the supervision of Volker Sellin at Heidelberg and submitted in 2002. If its excessive length, copious references—single sentences are often interrupted by as many as four or five footnotes—and rather tortuous style make the book difficult to digest, however, no one could deny that Rausch has made a serious and valuable contribution to the growing scholarly literature on nineteenth-century monuments. Its comparative perspective in particular will be welcomed in a field still dominated by single-country studies. As such it joins a small and select band of works that seek to test fashionable theories of nationalism and nation-building—first and foremost Bendict Anderson's 'imagined communities', but also Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger's 'invented traditions', and Alon Confino's 'nation as a local metaphor'[1]—by examining monuments in more than one national context.[2] Rausch's specific focus is on monuments to named individuals (*Personendenkmäler*): Nelson, Napoleon, and Bismarck, of course, but also hundreds of less prominent figures from the armed services, politics, science, and the arts who were commemorated in monumental form during the long nineteenth century. The book aims to provide a 'symbolic topography' of such monuments in the three capital cities, concentrating less on issues of iconography than on the

[1] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationality* (London, 1992); Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983); Alon Confino, *The Nation as Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory 1871–1918* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1997).

[2] Earlier examples include Franz Bauer, *Gehalt und Gestalt in der Monumentalsymbolik: Zur Ikonologie des Nationalstaats in Deutschland und Italien 1860–1914* (Munich, 1992); Charlotte Tacke, *Denkmal im sozialen Raum: Nationale Symbole in Deutschland und Frankreich im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1995); Rudolf Jaworski and Witold Molik (eds.), *Denkmäler in Kiel und Posen: Parallelen und Kontraste* (Kiel, 2002).

national discourses and ritual practices that surrounded the monuments' planning, construction, and reception. How important were these *Kultfiguren* in the construction of British, French, and Prusso-German national identities?

As the author rightly observes, the size and quality of the literature on nineteenth-century monuments varies widely in the national historiographies of Britain, France, and Germany, with the latter in the lead and the former bringing up the rear. Lest one think otherwise, however, this does not reflect the number of monuments actually erected: Rausch's study identifies 81 in Paris, 64 in London, and only 62 in Berlin. As these totals imply, proponents of the *Sonderweg* thesis will find little encouragement here, with George Mosse coming in for particular criticism: 'the crowds at the unveiling of English monuments remained just as excluded from official festivities and pushed back behind barriers [as they did in Wilhelmine Germany], and . . . despite indications of a more pluralistic festive culture, the same exclusionary practices represented the rule rather than the exception in France too . . . Mosse's *Sonderweg* argument is based here on a consistent disregard of the comparative perspective', she argues (p. 35). Of course, the comparative approach is more easily said than done, and Rausch concedes that the scarcity of such studies has left 'a considerable analytical–methodological deficit' (p. 51). Her efforts to make up this deficit are confident and well-informed, but whether her topic—any topic—can really justify a 122-page 'Introduction' is altogether less certain.

Rausch's specific focus on *Personendenkmäler* is defensible, but it does lead to some significant omissions. Excluded from her analysis are the many architectural monuments dedicated to the nation or its armies, such as the Prussian Victory Column in Berlin (1865–73), and all war memorials, although exceptions are made for the Mur des Fédérés at Père Lachaise cemetery in Paris, and the thwarted efforts to construct a monument to the victims of the March 1848 revolution in Berlin. Excluded too are the vast majority of Imperial Germany's national monuments—the Niederwalddenkmal (1877–83); the Kyffhäuserdenkmal (1892–7); the Völkerschlachtdenkmal (1900–13), and so on—because they were 'landscape monuments' erected in non-metropolitan locations. It is true that these monuments have already been studied in great detail, but their omission here does at least call into question the quantitative basis of Rausch's comparison.

The main text is divided chronologically into two: the period from 1848 to the early 1870s is examined in part one; and from the 1870s to 1914 (and beyond) in part two. The parts are subdivided into four and nine chapters respectively, with each chapter consisting of sections on Paris, Berlin, and London in turn, followed by an attempt at a comparative analysis. The imbalance between the two parts is explained by the number of monuments built: just 36 in the earlier period and more than 160 in the latter. A final and mercifully short concluding chapter rounds off the volume, together with a useful index of all the monuments mentioned. The book's architecture might therefore be described as functional rather than aesthetic, and anyone concerned about the popularization or 'dumbing down' of history will find this a reassuringly strenuous read. Stylistic shortcomings aside, the rigid structure of the book highlights a more serious weakness in Rausch's edifice: while 1870 makes for a logical caesura in the cases of France and Germany, it clearly makes less sense with regard to Britain. Much the same can be said for the book's starting point: 1848 is undoubtedly a key year in French and German history but, with all due respect to the Chartists, rather less so in Britain. Rausch is hardly to blame, but it does help to explain why the comparative approach often works better in theory than in practice.

For all its faults, *Kultfigur und Nation* contains a wealth of fascinating detail, drawn almost entirely from primary sources. Fourteen major archives were consulted by the author, who must be congratulated on a genuinely impressive feat of research. Thus while a more selective use of examples might have made for a more readable book, there can be no doubt that Rausch's findings will prove invaluable to anyone working in this field. It was particularly interesting to discover that the military and aristocratic presence on monument-building committees was strongest in London, while the contribution of the educated middle classes was greatest in Berlin (p. 121). Nowhere, of course, did the monuments reflect social realities. Women, the working class, and, with few exceptions, oppositional political forces more generally had little opportunity to participate in either the conception or unveiling of such structures. The contrast between the rhetoric of unity and inclusion, and the exclusionary practices of social reality, was stark indeed. However, if monuments rarely met with open expressions of protest—they occurred most frequently in

Paris, but remained exceptional even there—all three societies were sufficiently pluralistic by the end of the nineteenth century to permit a wide range of press criticism and some imaginative forms of opposition. Thus, when Berlin City Council called on residents to 'illuminate' their homes in celebration of the unveiling of the official Kaiser Wilhelm National Monument in March 1897, the working-class districts of the north and east of the city responded with a blackout which left much of the city in darkness (p. 388).

MATTHEW JEFFERIES is Senior Lecturer in German History, University of Manchester. His main research interests lie in the cultural and social history of Germany between 1870 and 1945. Among his publications are *Politics and Culture in Wilhelmine Germany: The Case of Industrial Architecture* (1995) and *Imperial Culture in Germany 1871–1918* (2003). He is currently working on the history of naturism/nudism in Germany.

SONJA LEVSEN, *Elite, Männlichkeit und Krieg: Tübinger und Cambridger Studenten 1900–1929*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 170 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2006), 411 pp. ISBN 3 525 35151 8. EUR 46.90

In 1920 the Tübingen student corporation Igel was so poor it could no longer afford to buy toilet paper, while students at Cambridge continued their pre-war life of plenty. This difference in material living conditions, argues Sonja Levsen in this book, was matched by a difference in political mentalities between Tübingen and Cambridge students that could hardly have been stronger. Whether this divergence of British and German student cultures and mentalities in the interwar period was the result of long-term pre-existing differences between Britain and Germany or the different experiences of war is the subject of her book.

The result of Levsen's travails is a very ably written book. Her study is the published version of her Tübingen Ph.D. thesis comparing the self-images and identities of Cambridge and Tübingen students—whom she sees as representing national elites—both before and after the First World War. Her argument in a nutshell is that pre-war differences have generally been overdrawn and are insufficient to explain what happened during the interwar period. For Levsen, nothing is more significant in explaining the differences between interwar students at the two universities than the fact that Britain had won the war while Germany had been defeated. Because Britain had come out of the war on top, the deaths of so many Cambridge students had not been in vain. The survivors who returned to their Alma Mater on the Cam after the war had thus found closure. Hence they were happy to endorse the post-war political order. Levsen tells us that over time Cambridge student culture stripped off its militarist, masculine characteristics, as Cambridge sports lost the dominance they had commanded before the war. By contrast, Tübingen students never demobilized after 1918 because they had lost the war. Levsen's argument is that they felt they owed it to their fallen peers to continue the fight until final victory was achieved. For the decade following the war they thus defined themselves as student soldiers, always prepared to go into action. Levsen sees post-war students at Tübingen as brutalized and drunk on orgies of violence.[1]

[1] While Levsen's post-war chapters are truly original, her pre-war chapters

Book Reviews

Levsen's approach is strongly influenced by the new cultural history and gender history. She carries out a textual analysis of student publications that exist in printed form to examine how male students constructed themselves as national elites. For the Cambridge side she relies primarily on student newspapers and the like, while for Tübingen she uses mainly annual reports, the newspapers of student corporations, and speeches given at official functions of student corporations. She argues that male students at both universities were more often than not misogynists whose male student cultures ensured that they resisted change. She also contends that they contributed to a culture that produced the abyss of the First World War — a war which students on both sides of the English Channel were eager to join.

While she argues against the existence of a German *Sonderweg*, Levsen's argument owes more to Hans-Ulrich Wehler and Konrad Jarausch than to David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley in that she sees Cambridge's pre-1914 students just as darkly as Konrad Jarausch saw German students in his seminal and masterful 1982 book on the

advance arguments reminiscent of Paul Deslandes's 1990s Toronto Ph.D. thesis (published in 2005 as *Oxbridge Men: British Masculinity and the Undergraduate Experience*), Patricia Mazón's 1995 Stanford Ph.D. thesis (published in 2003 as *Gender and the Modern Research University*), and my own contribution to the subject. Levsen refers to my D. Phil. thesis, 'Oxford and Heidelberg Universities before the First World War: British and German Elite Institutions in Comparative Perspective' (University of Oxford, 2003); 'Anti-Semitism and Philosemitism among the British and German Elites: Oxford and Heidelberg before the First World War', *English Historical Review*, 118 (2003), 86–119; and 'Studenten', in Gerhard Hirschfeld et al. (eds.), *Enzyklopädie Erster Weltkrieg* (Paderborn, 2003), 910–12. Her lack of engagement with Mazón's and Deslandes's dissertations is easily forgivable as she does not seem to have been aware of their existence. Levsen graciously acknowledges my work where our interpretations differ, yet is at times slightly more selective in referring to my research where our interpretations are similar. Readers of her book could indeed be forgiven for assuming that Levsen is the first scholar to argue that pre-war British and German elite student cultures were more similar than different, that student duelling was not an individualistic sport, that British elite students were rather militarist, that 'militarism' was, indeed, not always used as a negative term in pre-war Oxbridge culture, that Germany was not seen as an imminent threat, and that group mechanisms among students explain high rates of volunteering in 1914.

growth of illiberalism among German students.[2] For Levsen, in the pre-1914 academe on both sides of the English Channel the glass was thus not half full but three quarters empty. Both British and German elite student cultures became ever less liberal: gender and racial hierarchies were reinforced, change was opposed on principle, and nationalism and militarism were on the rise.

Hers is a powerful argument. However, occasionally it runs the risk of using twenty-first century standards to judge the early twentieth century. After all, despite the worrying and troubling aspects of British and German elite universities, they were slowly moving towards greater equality and modernity. Was the pre-war generation of British and German students really sliding into an abyss of intolerance, as Levsen suggests? Or did elite universities in both countries experience a dialectic of stasis and change? It is important to remember that even though the opponents of change generally shouted most loudly, more often than not they failed to win the day. Similarly, one might ask whether British and German universities really did see a meteoric rise of confrontational nationalism amongst students, as Levsen contends, or whether national and transnational identities at British and German elite universities often overlapped? Significantly, even the Deutsche Burschenschaft supported the Rhodes scholarships. One might thus question whether British and German student militarism pushed for any specific war or even for a cataclysmic remaking of the world the students inhabited. Or does British and German elite student militarism 'merely' explain why, in a situation of war, students would be willing to take up arms. Likewise, if Levsen is right that gender hierarchies were reinforced and racism was on the rise at Cambridge and Tübingen, how do we make sense of the slowly improving conditions and opportunities for women, Jews, and foreigners at British and German universities?

Levsen also argues that although the pre-1914 students of both universities had been ready to take up arms, Tübingen students turned war into a heroic and mythic endeavour, while Cambridge students took part in 'war games' and thus saw war as a game. Moreover, she claims that Cambridge students used more sombre and rational language than their Tübingen counterparts when discussing

[2] Konrad Jarausch, *Students, Society and Politics in Imperial Germany: The Rise of Academic Illiberalism* (Princeton, 1982).

nationalism. The problem with this assertion is that 'war games' were not the pre-First World War equivalent of the board game 'Risk'. 'War games' were exercises conducted by all professional armies at the time. At any rate, 'war games' were hardly a British peculiarity, as the term was a direct translation of the German 'Kriegsspiel'. Furthermore, membership of the Officer Training Corps at both Oxford and Cambridge was far more significant than membership of the war game societies. Oxbridge students regularly talked about wars using a heroic and mythic code borrowed from ancient Greek poets and writers that was certainly not sombre and rational. As the popularity of Henry Newbolt's poems or the entries in undergraduate poetry competitions show, Oxbridge students saw war as both a heroic endeavour and a game.

If this reviewer has doubts about some of Levsen's interpretations, these are almost exclusively driven by a difference in opinion about how evidence should be weighed. Levsen's heavy reliance on qualitative data, sometimes at the expense of quantitative data, might also have influenced her argument. Most significantly, Levsen compares Tübingen student corporations with Cambridge colleges, rather than the entire student bodies of the two universities. There is a problem with comparable units in this approach because in almost all German universities less than half of the male students belonged to a corporation. Even at Tübingen about half the student body did not belong to a corporation. In other words, Levsen compares a self-selected minority of the student body in one case, with the entire student body in the other. One might wonder what her comparison would have looked like if she had compared, for instance, only the members of the Cambridge University Officer Training Corps with the entire Tübingen student body. I suspect that in that case the German peculiarities of her book would become British ones.

Another problem is that many German universities housed a considerable number of Jewish and Catholic corporations which were often attacked as un-German (or worse) by the kind of corporations Levsen writes about. She is thus writing about an even smaller subsection of the German student body than her figures suggest. Finally, major differences existed even between the nationalism of the Society of German Students and that of, for example, the Corps or Burschenschaften. Thus to take a quotation from a publication of the Society of German Students as *pars pro toto* for all German student corporations

and, by extension, the entire German student body, is not without its dangers.

Comparing Cambridge with Berlin or Heidelberg rather than Tübingen might also have produced different results. While their student bodies made Berlin and Heidelberg national universities, Tübingen was a provincial university. Three out of four students at Heidelberg University, for example, came from outside Baden, while three out of four students at Tübingen, well into the twentieth century, came from inside Württemberg. Nineteen Imperial senior government ministers had indeed been educated at Heidelberg, while only four had attended Tübingen. Furthermore, there were about four times as many foreign students at Berlin and Heidelberg as at Tübingen. We also need to know more about the political character of Cambridge. Levsen describes Cambridge as a conservative university. What criteria does she employ here? The fact remains that compared to Oxford, Cambridge was far more likely to attract Liberal than Tory students.

Levsen's reliance on student journalism and student corporation magazines at the expense of more personal, private papers is also significant. Not only can we question how representative these magazines were, but the realities behind the façades of Cambridge and Tübingen student cultures erected by student magazines were rather more complex than Levsen's book allows. For a start, we need to bear in mind that British student discourse was more gentlemanly than its German counterpart. In other words, the fact that a Cambridge student was less likely than one from Tübingen to yell out that he hated Jews, foreigners, or women does not necessarily mean that he did not hate them. We also have to take into account that Oxbridge university authorities were more likely to censor student publications than their German counterparts. Moreover, contrary to the image created by articles in student corporation magazines, many women studying at German universities before the First World War described positive interactions with male students. Student diaries from the first days after the outbreak of war do not support Levsen's belief that students immediately joined up, but suggest that many initially had doubts, and went through a process of adaptation towards the war.

Levsen's book greatly advances our understanding of interwar Britain and Germany in showing how students in nationalist student corporations in the one case, and at colleges in the other, engaged in

a fundamentally different public discourse about the meaning of the First World War. Yet questions also remain about Levsen's argument that because of the different outcomes of the war for the two groups, students at Cambridge became ever less militarist, while at Tübingen the opposite was the case. While reporting some troubling incidents of anti-Semitism and anti-Bolshevism at Cambridge, Levsen portrays a Cambridge student body that was at ease with itself, embracing progress, individualism, modernization, and the League of Nations. By contrast, her portrayal of Tübingen is dark and gruesome. Tübingen students returning from the front, Levsen tells us, became hostages to the fallen and would be set free only once they had fought a successful war of national liberation. The majority of German students thus supposedly joined the Free Corps, and both fought against the Weimar Republic and dreamed of a future war with France. The author describes vividly how a Tübingen student battalion helped to crush the short-lived Munich Soviet Republic and fight Communism in the Ruhr and the Baltic. Her central thesis is that Tübingen students had been brutalized by the First World War and were thus eager to worship violence. According to Levsen, their political mentalities were unchanged between 1918 and 1929. The radicalization of German students was thus a result not of the conditions of Weimar, but of the war. She acknowledges the work of scholars such as Richard Bessel, Frank Becker, and Dirk Schumann,[3] but argues that it does not apply to students. Unlike veterans as a whole, she claims, students really were eager to join Free Corps; they were anti-republican, anti-modern, collectivist, uniformist, *völkisch*, anti-Semitic, and, above all, brutal.

Much of this is very persuasive. And yet, I remain to be convinced of parts of Levsen's argument. If we take the entire Tübingen male student population as a point of reference for a comparison with Cambridge, then we will see that, in fact, more than half of Tübingen's students did not join a Free Corps. Moreover, to look only at self-

[3] Cf. e.g. Frank Becker, *Amerikanismus in Weimar: Sportsymbole und politische Kultur, 1918–1933* (Wiesbaden, 1993); Richard Bessel, *Germany after the First World War* (Oxford, 1993); Dirk Schumann, 'Einheitssehnsucht und Gewaltakzeptanz: Politische Grundpositionen des deutschen Bürgertums nach 1918', in Hans Mommsen (ed.), *Der Erste Weltkrieg und die europäische Nachkriegsordnung* (Cologne, 2000), pp. 84–105, at 91 f.

selected groups (that is, collectives) is perhaps not the best way to identify individualism at Tübingen.

Even with regard to student corporations, questions remain. Do the poems that Levsen quotes to suggest a brutalization of students really support her argument? Can, for instance, a student poem in which the poet argues that his student battalion had not committed the atrocities of which Socialists had accused them really be taken as evidence that students celebrated violence? Similarly, can a 1927 satire from a Cambridge student magazine about a soft and decadent Oxford, where students no longer row but have all become aesthetes, really be taken as evidence that Oxbridge male identities had been demilitarized? Or should it be taken as showing that the old playful contempt and rivalry between Oxford and Cambridge students had survived the war? Moreover, many of the examples Levsen cites suggest that, contrary to her argument, the conditions of Weimar did indeed matter and that the war experience was not as central as she thinks. It is true that a significant number of corporation students fought against Communist insurrections as early as 1919. However, at that time they were fighting on the instigation of the democratically elected Reich and state governments. Only much later did they start to fight against the government. This leaves open the possibility that only the experiences of 1919 and after changed the students Levsen writes about. Significantly, in many of the sources she quotes, anti-Bolshevism is far more dominant than any references to the fallen of the First World War. Furthermore, the fact that students at Irish universities were heavily involved in the Irish civil war suggests that in both Germany and the United Kingdom, post-war conditions and not merely the war experience of the First World War determined the political mentalities of students. Another problem with using the war as a master variable to explain British liberalism and German reaction is that it does not explain why victorious countries such as Italy, Greece, or even France, and countries uninvolved in the war such as Spain, witnessed an anti-liberal tide after the war.

There is a persistent sense in this book that the student body Levsen engages with is rather too homogeneous to be completely representative, that her approach is rather too teleological to be wholly convincing, and that her source base not wide enough to do justice to the complexities of life at British and German elite universities. Nevertheless, Levsen's book provides a wonderful source of intellec-

tual stimulation. It raises exactly the right questions and almost always provides original answers. No one interested in the impact of the First World War on the twentieth century can afford not to read Sonja Levsen's book.

THOMAS WEBER is a Mellon Fellow in the History Department at the University of Pennsylvania. He is the author of *Lodz Ghetto Album* (2004) and *Our Friend. 'The Enemy': British and German Elite Education before World War I* (forthcoming 2007). He is currently working on a book on Hitler's regiment in the First World War.

ZARA STEINER, *The Lights that Failed: European International History 1919–1933*, Oxford History of Modern Europe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), xv + 938 pp. ISBN 0 19 822114 2. £35.00 (hardback)

In future, anyone working on the history of international relations in the interwar period will not be able to get around Zara Steiner's *opus magnum*. A comparable German-language survey does not exist, as the relevant volume in the handbook on the history of international relations edited by Heinz Duchhardt and Franz Knipping has not yet been published. When it is, it will have to measure up to Steiner's work—and the pole is pegged high. There is no comparable work in the English language either, as Steiner's study is more than just a handbook. Her comprehensive work dips deep into the research on international history in the years after the First World War. She reviews it broadly, takes a position, and has her own suggestions for interpretation ready. The book clearly owes its magisterial power to years of work on the history of international relations and a profound knowledge of the sources and literature. And it is equally obvious that this book (and its sequel on the period 1933 to 1939, which is close to being finished) could only have been created in an academic climate in which international history, including political history, has always had a firm and recognized place within the discipline of history. Similarly attributable to the British academic climate is Steiner's programmatic claim to be writing *international* history, which is more than the history of foreign policy, or even an addition of the history of the foreign policy of several nations. This approach forces the author to take a systemic perspective which dictates the structure of the volume and prevents the account from being merely chronological, or following events.

Steiner's book, which is almost 1,000 pages long, is divided into two parts. The first, which makes up almost two-thirds of the volume, deals with the period from the end of the First World War to the beginning of the Great Depression (1929), while the second part looks at the four years before the National Socialist seizure of power in Germany. Whether, from the perspective of international relations, 1933 is a suitable selection for the turning point could be debated. If, for example, we look at structural developments in the international system during the interwar period, as the author does, then the crucial change seems to come at the beginning of the 1930s, rather than

precisely on 30 January 1933. The crisis year of 1931, in particular, whose significance Steiner rightly stresses, marks the switch from a phase in which reconstruction, stablization, internationalism, multilateralism, and disarmament were still important factors, to one in which a new nationalism, aspirations for national economic self-sufficiency, and rearmament gained strength. From 1933 the Nazi regime reinforced and accelerated these factors and, crucially, pushed them towards a war.

This is probably why the author decided to take 1933 as the turning point. Going against other accounts, she argues that it is analytically unsound to treat the 1920s as the run-up to the Second World War, and thus to see developments in the decade after 1919 as deterministically leading to 1939. In her view this distorts our openness to the situation after the First World War, and also leads to a lack of appreciation of political efforts towards internationalism, multilateralism, and collective security. And as a result, their historical significance is not appreciated. Moreover, she suggests, it prevents us from assessing historical situations such as those of 1918–19 or 1925 in their own terms, or against the background of the First World War, and thus more positively. This cannot be denied, yet any historical analysis of the interwar period, and not just in international relations, must be orientated by National Socialism and the Second World War, just as any history of the Weimar Republic is, in this sense, also a prehistory of the Third Reich. In this case, to draw a clear distinction between prehistory and posthistory sets up alternatives which, in reality, were not mutually exclusive. Prehistory and posthistory flowed into each other, and this applies more strongly to the interwar period than to any other historical period.

Nonetheless, the different emphases which arise out of Steiner's thesis and her systematic perspective are always refreshing, for example, when she assesses the Versailles Treaty as an attempt to achieve a legitimate post-war order acceptable to victors and vanquished alike, or her reassessment of Stresemann's Locarno policy which, of course, in the light of recent research, does not require any further demythicization. Stresemann, she makes clear, was neither a nationalist wolf in sheep's clothing, nor the internationalist founding father of the European integration of the 1950s. Steiner's analytical approach clearly reveals the structural complexities of the international system, in which traditional ideas and forces sometimes co-

existed or even combined with new concepts and influences, while at other times they were rivals, or in a relationship of tension. The way in which Steiner captures and analyses these complexities and contradictions is one of the great strengths of her book. These complexities naturally also include the growing significance of economic and financial factors, and not only with reference to the ubiquitous question of reparations. Further, the growing interlinkage and interdependence between developments within states and societies on the one hand and international relations on the other also increased the complexity of the system. Paradoxically, this process was pushed forward both by the advance of democratization in Europe after 1918, and by the simultaneous rise of authoritarian regimes with a mass basis.

Although the post-1919 international system had long stopped being a European system, it is remarkable to see to what extent European politicians continued to think in European categories. Steiner's account, however, does not adopt this view. Rather, it places European developments, which are undoubtedly the main focus of the volume, in a larger, supra-European context which features not only the United States as an actor, but also the Soviet Union and Japan as semi-European actors. If she did not take such a wide view, Steiner would not be able to bring out the fundamental significance of the year 1931 (Manchurian Crisis) for the transformation of the international system, including a further de-Europeanization. In her analysis of American foreign policy, and in particular with respect to America's contribution to stabilizing Europe after the war, Steiner draws a sharp distinction between foreign policy in the narrow sense, and American financial and economic engagement, which she ultimately describes as 'unpolitical'. This assumes a narrow concept of politics which, in the opinion of this reviewer, does not do justice to the American policy of stabilization (not least in the context of the Dawes and Young Plans). After all, even if the USA's economic and financial commitment in Europe, and especially in Germany, did not come directly from the US government but from private industry, it was encouraged and supported by Republican administrations in the context of a wider foreign policy and European policy strategy.

The decisive and pointed way in which Steiner presents her views means that this volume will always stimulate contradiction and discussion. This is the result of her intention not to provide a sober and

balanced overview, but to open up new interpretative paths in a highly complex and multi-layered terrain on which there is hardly a problem that has not been discussed in international research over recent decades. Given this, Steiner demonstrates the ability not only to penetrate and explain complex situations with analytical precision and then to achieve a masterly synthesis, but also to encourage us to make judgements through her own interpretations and assessments. Whether one uses her book as a handbook or reference work, or finds arguments in it to provoke disagreement and further discussion, this is quite clearly a standard work which is unique in the research landscape and will continue to hold this position for years to come

ECKART CONZE is Professor of Modern History at the University of Marburg. He was a Visiting Fellow at the GHIL from January to March 2007. Among his recent publications are (with Ulrich Lappenküper and Guido Müller) *Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen: Erneuerung und Erweiterung einer historischen Disziplin* (2004) and *Kleines Lexikon des Adels: Titel, Throne, Traditionen* (2005).

MICHAEL KATER, *Hitler Youth* (Cambridge, Mass.: Havard University Press, 2004), 355 pp. ISBN 0 674 01496 0. £18.95. $27.95 (hardback). German trans. *Hitler-Jugend* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2005)

Just as Günther Grass, winner of the Nobel prize for literature, struggled to find the right words to admit that during the Nazi period he had been a member of the *Waffen-SS*, so many of his generation find it difficult to confess what the Third Reich meant to them. No one knows better than Michael Kater just how much they, as youngsters, believed in the promises of the Nazi regime, even that of the 'final victory'. In his overview with the simple title *Hitler Youth*, written in an appealing style that is both concise and clear, the Emeritus Professor at the University of Toronto looks at the generation which, born between 1916 and 1934, literally grew into the National Socialist state.

The author, an expert on the history of National Socialism, sets out to examine the collective experience of those who were young during the Third Reich. Using memoirs and diaries, private letters, interviews, and all sorts of notes, Kater, who is well known for his books on doctors in the Third Reich, the SS *Ahnenerbe*, the NSDAP, students, and, lastly, composers in the Nazi state, now looks at the youth organization of the Third Reich. He does not categorize his findings, nor does he characterize his sources or reflect on how to deal with them as a scholar. He also does without a bibliography. This may, quite rightly, be a source of regret to the specialists amongst his readers, but it undoubtedly makes this short, readable study, intended for a broad readership, even more attractive.

In Kater's book actresses, former soldiers, future academics, authors, former functionaries of the *Bund Deutscher Mädel* and even a Federal Chancellor all have their say. Examining their youth and experience of the political events, especially the war, the author uses individual examples to draw broad conclusions. There are informative answers to questions such as what made the Hitler Youth so attractive, how its widespread network functioned, what indoctrination meant, what consequences the outbreak of war had for youngsters, and also what happened to those who refused to join.

Kater's book closes a gap that is particularly conspicuous in the Anglo-American sphere where there are hardly any studies of the Hitler Youth. On the German-speaking research scene it is, admittedly, somewhat different. Since Arno Klönne's pioneering work in

the 1950s, differentiated studies of the organization, structure, and personnel of the Hitler Youth have been undertaken. However, Kater's book also enriches research in the German-speaking area since, inspired by recent works on the perpetrators in the Nazi state, the author raises questions that still remain unanswered: what was the motivation of those young people who became involved in the Hitler Youth? To what extent were they responsible for, and guilty of, the crimes of the Third Reich? The book's strength lies in the author's empirical approach. Unlike the authors of older works, Kater is not so much interested in questions of structural history, but rather in a broad presentation of what, in the eyes of contemporaries, made the Hitler Youth so attractive. Kater does not bring any new facts to light, but he places different emphases, for example, by including the gender aspect that has so far been largely neglected in Nazi research. He is the first scholar to look at the interaction between the male and female branches of the Hitler Youth. The author is not concerned to empathize with his protagonists; rather he wants to find out how it came about that young people allowed themselves to be drawn into the service of a criminal regime. According to Kater there are psychological reasons why those involved often kept quiet about it for a long time and only started to think about it decades later, for example, not wanting to re-evoke that bitter feeling created by defeat in the war and the 'collapse'. The author does not, however, interpret findings such as these in more detail. This is a shame, as it would certainly have made a valuable contribution to memory research, which he obviously wants to leave to others. One of the main reasons why Kater's book is informative and worth reading is that he meticulously draws together the testimonies and self-interpretations of those who tied the hopes and longings of their youth to the Third Reich.

During their *Kampfzeit* the National Socialists put themselves forward as a movement of young people, determined to do away with the Weimar 'gerontocracy'. And 'Make way, You Old Ones!' is what Kater calls his introductory chapter. Youngsters were already aggressive, racist, and enthralled by drill and discipline in the 1920s. Many of them had joined the *Wandervogel*, the first German youth movement founded around the turn of the century, and many later transferred to the *Bündische Jugend*, which during the Weimar period was far stronger than the Hitler Youth. Resentment about modernity in general and the Weimar state in particular was characteristic of

organized, anti-democratic youth long before 1933. Kater shows that right from the start the Nazi regime knew how to exploit the energy of young people searching for identity and meaning in order to tie them closely to the *Führer*. To sum it all up: 'It was one of the great propaganda achievements of the Nazi rulers that they were able to offer a political and ideological world view that granted status, certainty, and power to young people, so much so that teenagers of both genders could accept and abide by the prescribed behaviors with hardly any qualms' (p. 4).

At the time of the Nazi seizure of power the Hitler Youth, which had emerged around 1925 from various youth associations of the Weimar period, already had 100,000 members—by the end of 1933 it was more than 2 million. The newly appointed *Reichsjugendführer*, Baldur von Schirach, was by then already convinced that he would be able to incorporate the entire German youth into his organization. At the end of 1936 the peer pressure on boys and girls was given legal force and from March 1939 it became obligatory for all those aged between 10 and 18 to join the Hitler Youth. Anyone who performed this service negligently, or, indeed, not at all, had to reckon with harsh sanctions, especially during the war. In the chapter 'Serving in the Hitler Youth' Kater sketches life in the Hitler Youth: drill and discipline, sport, camping, and social evenings. In short, everything that those taking part remember as 'comradeship' and 'experience of community', along with a desire for adventure and a feeling of liberation and escape from parental control, seems to be what made the Hitler Youth so attractive. It quickly established itself as a so-called 'third pillar' alongside the family and school, but made no secret of its sole claim on young people, stirring up and instrumentalizing already existing generational conflicts.

The slogan 'youth should be led by youth' seemed particularly enticing, meaning, after all, that 11 and 12-year-olds were already in command of those even younger. The leadership organization soon became a structural problem for the Hitler Youth as incompetence, abuse of power, and corruption began to spread. Children and adolescents were quite capable of turning their supposed responsibility for the younger ones into superiority, and of getting hold of money by blackmail, double book-keeping, and humiliation (it was often spent on alcohol and tobacco). The Nazi regime tried to counteract this by training youngsters 'capable of leadership' for the Hitler

Youth at 'leadership academies', for instance, the Hitler Youth *Reichs-führerschule* in Potsdam and the *Akademie für Jugendführung* in Brunswick. However, these plans did not come to much as there was insufficient personnel and the level of education remained poor. To the last, the regime never got to grips with the problems of education, discipline, and leadership within the Hitler Youth. Lina Heydrich, for example, widow of the former head of the Reich Security Main Office, felt compelled in the summer of 1944 to ask Himmler for permission for her son to leave the Hitler Youth so that he would not be led astray under the supervision of 16-year-olds; Himmler immediately granted her wish (p. 57).

As *Reichsführer SS* and head of the German police, Himmler gave older members of the Hitler Youth clearly political tasks. Performing 'patrol duty', members of the Hitler Youth, along with SS and Gestapo, kept an eye on 'suspicious' youngsters. Even during the *Anschluß* of Austria they were already involved in campaigns against Jews, and again in the November pogrom of 1938, when Jewish homes and businesses were stormed all over Germany.

It was not until the war had started that girls and young women, who were forced into service just as much as boys, were required to perform duties connected with racial policy. As camp helpers in conquered Poland, for example, they gave instruction to *Volksdeutsche* in the wake of 'Germanization' and the 'new racial order'. The indigenous populace in whose homes the *Volksdeutsche* were living had previously been evicted and usually forcibly deported. In his chapter 'German Girls for Matrimony and Motherhood' Kater describes the organization and activities of the *Bund Deutscher Mädel* (BDM) before and during the war. He looks very closely at gender-specific differences and integrates findings from gender-research, though in this respect he does not move beyond the position of the early 1990s. Under the heading 'Eugenics and Race' the author looks at the BDM project 'Glaube und Schönheit', which scholars have largely neglected so far, and shows plausibly how the institution, founded in 1938, which only accepted 'Nordic'-looking young women aged between 17 and 21, served to cultivate 'racial' perfection, and also as a reservoir of potential partners for the SS elite. Kater breaks new ground when he maintains that cultivating racial purity, the key objective of the Nazi state, released libidinous energies among adolescents of both sexes and gave free rein to promiscuity (p. 106)—by no means

the traditional view. Kater's remarks on how sexuality was dealt with in the Hitler Youth, backed up by the sources, the potential for conflict it created, and the disintegration of traditional values and norms are particularly interesting in terms of social history.

The regime rigorously pursued and punished unrestrained sexual activity, especially in the case of youngsters who refused to join the Hitler Youth. In the chapter 'Dissidents and Rebels' Kater sets out the various forms of deviant behaviour and outlines—in each case paying attention to social profile—*Swing-Jugend*, *Edelweißpiraten,* and other 'gangs' and 'packs'. The author powerfully describes what the youngsters objected to about the state's claims and how each group cultivated its own identity. From the start of the war onwards the Nazi regime reacted with increasing toughness to young people who would not conform. Justice took a radical course: beatings, arrests, detention, and, finally, a special concentration camp for young men and women. Kater goes into rather too much detail about the *Weiße Rose*, which has already been well researched, and it is difficult to understand why, at the end, the author measures juvenile resistance against the fictitious yardstick of the degree of 'self-sacrifice' in each case.

'Hitler's Youth at War' is the fifth and most impressive chapter in the book. Kater focuses on the war experiences of the young people and describes their fanaticism and enthusiasm. Long-established enemy images seem to be confirmed here, such as their belief that they belonged to the 'master race'. The *Wehrmacht* quickly recruited year-group after year-group from the Hitler Youth. Kater assesses his sources with sensitivity to show the young people's gradual disillusionment, their traumas, but also their brutalization in the face of everyday violence. A special section is dedicated to the anti-aircraft auxiliary service: drill in the training camp, everyday life in the bunker close to the anti-aircraft positions, and assisting the soldiers in shooting down enemy aircraft. As anti-aircraft auxiliaries, young people lived far away from their parents and were proud to have already grown out of the Hitler Youth, but they were far too young for the soldiers to take them at all seriously. They became increasingly alienated from their social environment and developed their own sense of identity and belonging, which endured beyond the end of the war.

In brilliant sections of this chapter Kater shows how much the Nazi regime, especially in the *Endkampf*, relied on the unconditional

support of young people. Both the SS and the *Wehrmacht* acquired their new recruits from military training camps. A few were recruited voluntarily but generally the SS forced the boys to join, often by using tricks and even violence. At the end, 13 and 14-year-olds were deployed at the front. Likewise, juveniles, including girls, were active in the *Volkssturm* on the home front, and even amongst the *Werwölfe* who carried out acts of sabotage against the Allies in suicide commandos. As auxiliaries to the various *Wehrmacht* units and other organizations, young women had already been in active service since the defeat of Stalingrad. Now they were deployed as anti-aircraft auxiliaries and, in the *Volkssturm*, fought with bazookas.

In the final chapter Kater goes far beyond the caesura of the end of the war and looks at the Allied Re-Education Programme and the long-term consequences for the young people of the 'shock' of unconditional surrender. The author does not, however, adequately address the difficult question of the responsibility of the young people, as the concepts he selects, but does not explain (for example, 'complicity') are not sufficiently differentiated. Indeed, the passages in which Kater deals with the concept of guilt are the weakest in the book. On the other hand, what he has to say about this generation's recall ability is important and worthy of more extensive research. Kater identifies two memory-triggers, though does not say whether or how they are connected to one another: perception of their own psychological damage, and the question of what their own place was in the rule of terror.

SYBILLE STEINBACHER is a *wissenschaftliche Assistentin* in the Department of Modern and Contemporary History at the Friedrich Schiller University in Jena. She is working on her *Habilitation* on the social history of sexuality in Germany after the Second World War. Her publications include *Auschwitz: A History* (2004; 2nd edn. 2005); *'Musterstadt' Auschwitz: Germanisierungspolitik und Judenmord in Ostoberschlesien* (2000); and *Dachau: Die Stadt und das Konzentrationslager in der NS-Zeit. Die Untersuchung einer Nachbarschaft* (1993; 2nd edn. 1994). She was a Research Fellow at the Unabhängige Kommission zur Erforschung der Geschichte des Hauses Bertelsmann im Dritten Reich and in 2004/5 studied at Havard University with a scholarship from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

JAMES J. BARNES and PATIENCE P. BARNES, *Nazis in Pre-War London, 1930–1939: The Fate and Role of German Party Members and British Sympathizers* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2005), x + 283 pp. ISBN 1 84519 053 X. £55.00

It is facile to believe that facts speak for themselves. Generally facts are produced to make a point or to buttress an argument, especially when it comes to historical research and analysis. In this case we are faced with a great deal of solid historical research on the Nazi Party in pre-war London and virtually no analysis. All in all this whole book gives the appearance of a lengthy memo for MI5, British home intelligence. At the time, when Britain was faced with the threat of war, this would have been very useful, if only for the many names and exact whereabouts of people who might serve as a fifth column in the event of an invasion. Instead of a bibliography the authors have attached an appendix which lists some 350 Party members: names, addresses, date of birth, occupation, length of stay in Britain, Party membership number and date of joining, internment, yes or no. This information has been gathered from the Berlin Document Centre, now part of the German Federal Archives, where all files on Party members are stored.

Today most of this kind of information, for instance on the various Party headquarters, is perfectly useless unless it can be demonstrated that all these activities described in tedious detail served a political purpose or sinister plot beyond the aims mentioned in the Party's official charter, that is, to found and organize a political home for German Nazis abroad under the umbrella of the *Auslandsorganisation der NSDAP* (AO) headed by Ernst Bohle. The ordinary reader might be thrilled to learn about real-life Nazis getting up to mischief in pre-war London. However, this does not satisfy the professional historian who might, for instance, want to know whether the British *Landesgruppe* of the Nazi party figured prominently in any way, for instance, within the institutional infighting of the various Nazi organizations, or in the context of Anglo-German relations during the period of appeasement. However, notwithstanding the wealth of police intelligence, the reader cannot help feeling that the Nazis in pre-war London constituted but a *quantité négligeable* from whatever point of view one looks at them. Figures are perhaps most revealing: the small number of Party members, sympathizers, and opportunists

(approximately 1,000–1,500) in relation to the vast majority of German citizens (approximately 20,000 before *Reichskristallnacht* in 1938) or British nationals of German origin. By 1940 this figure had swollen to some 70,000, the great majority of them refugees (approximately 55,000) from Nazi Germany who, of course, did not wish to have anything to do with the Nazi Party in Britain. By that time Party members had left the country or were interned for the rest of the war. Nor did the British government seem to have been greatly concerned about another fascist fringe of foreign nationals as long as they did not meddle with British politics or seek to collaborate with the British Union of Fascists. In this respect the Nazi Party in Britain went out of its way not to give offence, in accordance with orders from Hamburg (AO headquarters) and Berlin. Occasional questions in Parliament or newspaper articles insinuating a threat to national security did not cause the government any headaches except for one aspect: allegations of harassment of decent German citizens by proselytizing Nazi fanatics. Nor are there any indications that Hitler or Ribbentrop had any ambitious plans for the Nazi Party in Britain. Their embassy in London can have left them in no doubt as to the political insignificance of this group of loyalists. Their interest was primarily a negative one: to keep them out of trouble in their guest country. Because of the book's exclusive focus on Nazi club life in London, the reader learns nothing about Hitler's plans for England, a subject on which there is a substantial amount of historical literature. This would have put the main subject of the book into proper perspective.

The authors should at least be given credit for having exhausted the source material on their chosen subject. Readers of this review are therefore entitled to a summary of the contents, which will give them an idea of what it is all about. The book starts off with Hans Wilhelm Thost, the first correspondent of the *Völkischer Beobachter,* the Nazi Party daily, establishing himself in London at the end of 1930, shortly after the spectacular Nazi electoral victory. 'Whether he could become a mediator between the two nations', the authors tell us, 'depended on the tone of his articles' (p. 19). However, although they reproduce his correspondence with Alfred Rosenberg, the paper's chief editor, not one single article is traced or analysed. In fact, we do not learn anything about London in the 1930s as viewed by German ex-pats, whatever their political affiliation. A year later Thost rose to become the first leader of the newly established London *Ortsgruppe*

of the NSDAP, the main event of this year being a week-long visit by Rosenberg. The following year Thost was reprimanded by his boss for giving a lecture to the Anglo-German Club in Oxford. German representatives, he was told, should refrain from spreading the Nazi gospel in Britain: publicity should be avoided like the plague for fear of alienating British authorities. Berlin knew perfectly well that the longed-for friendship with Britain could only be jeopardized by Nazi zealots in London. However, this aspect is not pursued by the authors. Instead the appointment of a new leader, Otto Bene, and the frustrating search for permanent headquarters are given full coverage (chs. 3 and 4), as are his activities in rallying the faithful to the cause by organizing dances, church fetes, and the like. One circular letter detailing dates and places of meetings is reproduced in full length and provides ample evidence of the pathetic innocence and irrelevance of the London Nazis. At one of these meetings Bene told his parishioners 'that it is strictly forbidden for any Nazi to discuss or to participate in English politics and particularly they were not to fraternise with members of Fascist organisations here such as the British Fascists' (p. 19).

However, this did not prevent the British press from insinuating that the London *Ortsgruppe* was 'a center of espionage and subversion' (p. 29). Instead of exploding this myth the authors list every such alarming news item and give the impression that 'the reality was much more subtle' (p. 29), thus suggesting that the reader had better be on his guard. Two whole chapters are then devoted to the expulsion of Thost and Bene. Thost was involved in an encounter which could be construed as espionage and a pretext for getting rid of an unsavoury Nazi journalist. As for Bene, the Foreign Office refused to acknowledge the promotion of a Nazi Party official to Consul-General. Eventually he was transferred to this position in Milan. The transition from Party official to civil servant was the best thing that could happen to any Nazi: it would entitle him to a pension after the war. The following chapters deal with the *Gleichschaltung* of the German news agencies, and the infiltration by Party and SS members of the embassy (especially during Ribbentrop's tenure as ambassador), business, and labour. These efforts were only partly successful: business people had the best standing in London and DAF (German Labour Front) officials apparently the worst because they tended to put German domestic servants under pres-

sure not to work for Jewish families, or to enlist them as informers. A chapter on the German Protestant parishes in Britain has nothing new to report on Dietrich Bonhoeffer's time in London, except that most of his colleagues joined the Nazi Party (as they did, incidentally, in Germany) and yet supported his struggle for autonomy. The chapter on the British Union of Fascists is of interest only inasmuch as the authors dispute the claim by Oswald Mosley's biographer that he was not under the control of foreign powers,[1] that is, the Italians and Germans. Mosley received financial aid from Mussolini, so they claim, and modelled himself more and more on the Nazis, who welcomed him in Germany while distancing themselves from his party in Britain. A chapter entitled 'Nazi Influence over the British Legion' suggests that British veterans were in the pocket of Nazi Germany. Far from it. It is true to say that Hitler tried to use veterans' organizations in France and Britain to pose as a champion of peace. However, it is quite obvious from this chapter that British veterans were not duped by the show of propaganda when visiting Germany; their loyalty to king and country was never in doubt.

The most interesting chapter, one which would certainly justify an article in a scholarly journal, presents the whole debate between various government departments, notably the Foreign Office and the Home Office, on whether it was advisable to ban all Nazi organizations in Britain. A growing number of refugees were seeking asylum in the UK and, if possible, British nationality. There was agreement among officials that the latter would not be granted to foreigners affiliated to the Nazi Party or a fascist party. When the topic was first brought up in the summer of 1936, officials of all departments concerned wished to take MI5's advice and kindly ask the German and Italian embassies to dismantle 'their party organisations in this country, the presence of which is considered unusual and undesired here' (p. 182). The most outspoken advocate of drastic action was Sir Robert Vansittart who did not much care for appeasement. However, cabinet ministers were reluctant to follow suit and the matter was allowed to drift for more than a year. With the attempt to incorporate Bene into the embassy staff as Consul-General, and with the arrival of the Nazi stalwart Joachim von Ribbentrop as German ambassador, the situation grew worse and less easy to handle. Nor was the new

[1] Robert Skidelsky, *Oswald Mosley* (London, 1975), p. 453.

prime minister, Neville Chamberlain, keen to tackle this problem. A ban on all Nazi organizations in Britain could 'now create a first-class storm' (p. 186), particularly following a big conference in Stuttgart, the centre for German *Volkstum* abroad, where prominent speakers protested the political innocence of Germans living in foreign countries. Since the British government was reluctant to take action for fear of antagonizing Berlin, it was up to the Home Office and MI5 to identify undesirable foreigners and make sure that they left the country. Journalists with dubious credentials and Nazi agents who were caught in acts of intimidation towards fellow countrymen were the first targets for expulsion. It is to the credit of British officials that they felt the need to protect ordinary Germans such as domestic servants from the political zealots of their own country. In their final chapter the authors have to admit that no case for serious espionage by German agents could be made. After all, most cases of espionage 'prior to the war involved British subjects, not members of the Nazi party in Britain' (p. 248). Even before a state of war was declared on 3 September, some 880 undesirable Germans had been rounded up and interned; others managed to slip out of the country. The declaration of war solved a long-debated question in a matter of hours.

Admittedly, history books are not written just for the satisfaction of professional historians. The authors may have banked on the consuming interest of the British public in Nazis, new and old, as any news editor will know, and their penchant for fact and fiction regarding espionage and treason might have furnished an additional stimulus for undertaking this piece of hard work. No doubt it provides ample background material for future fiction of this kind. Yet the reviewer finds the claim that 'Neither the history of London nor the history of Nazism will look quite the same again' (dust jacket) a good candidate for the Guinness Book of hyperboles.

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

DIETER KUNTZ and SUSAN BACHRACH (eds.), *Deadly Medicine: Creating the Master Race*, exhibition catalogue, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 240 pp., 270 illus. ISBN 0 8078 2916 1. $45.00 (hardcover)

Deadly Medicine was conceived as a catalogue to an exhibition of the same name, held at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington from 2004 to 2006. It tells the story of German medicine, focusing on the dissemination and radicalization of ideas of racial hygiene. This is a legitimate and fruitful perspective because biological interpretations of the social and the doctrine of biologically defined inequality were the main elements of the Nazis' racist health and social policies. However, this approach means that other ideas which also exerted a considerable influence on the conception of Nazi health policy take a back seat, such as the attempt to establish a 'new German art of healing' (Neue Deutsche Heilkunde) based on alternative rather than scientific medicine. Similarly, the Deutsche Arbeitsfront's attempts to push industrial medicine in a direction which combined physiological and psychological approaches to work with an exaggerated ideology of achievement are also somewhat overshadowed. In recompense, however, the contribution made by anthropologists, geneticists, and medical doctors to the drawing up and implementation of Nazi race and social policy emerge all the more clearly, as do the connections between the Nazi's scientifically based racism and the murder of the European Jews. This is no mean achievement of this in many respects excellent catalogue.

The curators of the exhibition have resisted the temptation to simplify the history of racial hygiene by presenting it as part of a German *Sonderweg*. They describe the increasingly significant ideas of racial hygiene as belonging to an international movement which saw itself as the cutting edge of contemporary science, and found many areas of common concern with other disciplines. Against this background peculiarities of the German situation stand out, such as the central significance of the First World War for the radicalization of eugenic ideas.

Three of the seven essays (Sheila Faith Weiss, 'German Eugenics 1890–1933'; Daniel J. Kevles, 'International Eugenics'; and Benoit Massin, 'The "Science of Race"') tell the story of the establishment of

racial hygiene as the leading human science from a history of ideas and history of science perspective. Three further essays (Gisela Bock, 'Nazi Sterilization and Reproductive Policies'; Michael Burleigh, 'Nazi "Euthanasia" Programs'; and Henry Friedlander, 'From "Euthanasia" to the "Final Solution" ') stress the cooperation of medical doctors in mass crimes committed by the Nazis. The concluding essay by the geneticist Benno Müller-Hill, 'Reflections of a German Scientist', spans the period from the close cooperation of leading geneticists with the Nazis in power to the culture of remembrance of the post-war period, in which acknowledgement of this situation was largely repressed until the 1980s.

The essays in this catalogue are by established specialists, and are mostly based on previously published monographs. Experts will find little in it that is new, but the essays provide concise summaries of the state of research which will be useful in adult education as much as for academic teaching. Only the contribution by Michael Burleigh does not quite match the high standard of the others. According to the estimates of Werner Faulstich, the total number of euthanasia victims can be stated more precisely than 'more than 200,000' (p. 153).[1] The claim that the murder of patients by mass gassing was halted in the summer of 1941 because, among other things, 70,000 deaths fulfilled the targets of those responsible for T-4 (p. 150) has been relegated to the realm of myth at least since the publication of the Goebbels' diaries. First, the diary entry of 31 January 1941 suggests that the programme of planned murders was much more extensive; and secondly, with the aid among other things of the diary entries of August 1941, it is possible to reconstruct a chain of command which makes a causal connection between the stopping of T-4 and the sermons of the bishop of Münster, August Graf von Galen, seem conclusive. It is also questionable whether Burleigh was well advised to concentrate his survey on the centralized murders of patients for the T-4 programme, because this means that his essay deals only in pass-

[1] Faulstich's estimate, which for the first time provides reliable information about death rates during the phase of decentralized euthanasia, puts the total number of German euthanasia victims at *c*.212,000 plus at least 80,000 French, Polish, and Soviet Russian victims in psychiatric institutions in the areas under German occupation. Werner Faulstich, *Hungersterben in der Psychiatrie 1914–1949: Mit einer Topographie der NS-Psychiatrie* (Freiburg, 1998), p. 582.

ing with the second, decentralized phase of euthanasia which claimed more than 100,000 further victims from the summer of 1942.

The numerous and carefully selected illustrations are a genuine strength of this catalogue. The quality of their reproduction and their educational value exceed those of comparable publications. It is especially to be welcomed that the images are not mere illustration; text and image supplement each other in a way that advances knowledge. In this respect the exhibition curators have done a magnificent job. Instead of relying on a handful of constantly reprinted photographs and propaganda material, they have taken considerable trouble to research new and in some cases hitherto unknown material. The objects illustrated range from instruments used to measure and classify the human body to sources from the lives of the persecuted (such as pictures of psychiatric patients from the Prinzhorn collection) and perpetrator documents, such as the originals, long believed lost, of the infamous Hartheim balance sheet of murders for the T-4 programme, which Henry Friedlander tracked down to a branch of the Washington National Archives. This is why everybody teaching courses on the history of National Socialism or the history of the biosciences in the first half of the twentieth century will find the material in this catalogue extremely useful.

WINFRIED SÜSS is a Research Fellow (*Habilitationsstipendiat*) in the Department of History at the University of Munich. He is the author of *Der 'Volkskörper' im Krieg: Gesundheitspolitik, medizinische Versorgung und Krankenmord im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland 1939–1945* (2003) and editor (with Rüdiger Hachtmann) of *Hitlers Kommissare: Sondergewalten in der nationalsozialistischen Diktatur* (2006). He has published numerous articles on different aspects of German contemporary history, health policy, and the history of the modern welfare state. He is currently completing a study entitled *Von der Reform in die Krise: Der westdeutsche Wohlfahrtsstaat 1966–1982.* Winfried Süß is co-editor of the series Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus.

The Jäger report, perhaps the most chilling document detailing the murder of the Jews of Lithuania, constitutes a murderous tally of Einsatzkommando 3, a company-sized detachment (150 men) of Einsatzgruppe A. In the period from 4 July to 1 December 1941, this detachment descended on seventy-one different Jewish communities, in some instances returning more than once. In all, the Jäger report contains 112 entries listing mass killings, with the total number of victims given as 137,346 people. The vast majority of those killed were Jewish men, women, and children, but the document also mentions Russians, Poles, Communists, Gypsies, and the mentally ill. The Jäger report communicates cold, efficient killing, but we know that the numbers reported were not as exact as they seemed. Often representing conjecture, they sometimes underestimated the number of Jews killed. In her book *There Once Was A World*,[1] Yaffa Eliach reconstructed a massacre that took place in the Shtetl in which she was born. For 27 September 1941 the Jäger report lists the elimination of 989 Jewish men, 1,636 Jewish women, and 821 Jewish children in Eysisky (Eishyshok), and totals the deaths at 3,446. The date of the entry is not correct, as the massacre took place over two days. On 25 September the troops killed men; on the next day women and children. They also killed Jews from the surrounding villages, so that the total number was closer to 5,000. The report does not describe the other atrocities that happened on those days. 'I saw my beautiful cousin raped and raped until death must have been the only thing she longed for', one escaped witness wrote.

North of Eishyshok and just outside Vilnius is the town of Ponary, where Germans and Lithuanians massacred between 50,000 and

[1] Yaffa Eliach *There Once Was A World: A 900-Year Chronicle of the Shtetl of Eishyshok* (Boston, 1998).

60,000 Jews, most of them from Vilnius, the 'Jerusalem of Lithuania'. They also murdered a significant number of Poles and Russians. Kazimierz Sakowicz, a Polish journalist, witnessed the murders from a hiding place in his attic. He lived in a cottage in the woods on the outskirts of Ponary, where the Soviets had dug large pits and ditches to hold fuel tanks. When the Germans occupied the area in June 1941 they killed Jews and others there, filling the pits and ditches with corpses. Sakowicz witnessed these killings, not once, but continually from the summer of 1941 to the summer of 1944, when he was himself killed. Sakowicz scratched laconic entries on loose sheets of paper, unsentimentally recording what he saw. He then buried the sheets in sealed lemonade bottles, which his neighbours dug up after the war and turned over to the Jewish Museum in Vilnius; thereafter the sheets of paper lay in the Lithuanian State Archive, tagged 'illegible'. In the course of a lifetime of collecting documents on the extermination of the Jews of Lithuania, Dr Rachel Margolis, a survivor, pieced the extant sheets together and transcribed them. First published in Polish in 1999, the entries in the form of a diary are now available in English and German translations with critical notes and historical introductions.

Sakowicz's *Ponary Diary 1941–1944* forces our imagination of how these killings occurred into new territory. They happened with the help of Lithuanian shooters, often 'striplings of seventeen to twenty-five years' (p. 12),[2] whose brutality and sadism beggar belief. They forced Jews, often blindfolded and usually naked, to the pits where they were then shot, bludgeoned, or stabbed before they fell into the pits. Usually drunk, sometimes sober, the German SS and the Lithuanian shooters carried out the murders now with efficiency, now with cruelty, as if it were sport. They constructed a trampoline over the pit and shot men as they bounced over it. They also staged hunts inside a barbed wire area, and bludgeoned hundreds of children to death with their rifle butts when the ammunition ran out, sometimes throwing the 'whelps' into the pit before they bothered to kill them. As time wore on, and the fate of the Jews in Ponary became known to the Jews of Vilnius and the surrounding area, more and more Jews tried to escape. The massacres began to be drawn out. Shooters chased Jews who fled across fields and into the woods. They

[2] All quotations are from the English-language edition.

also tracked down Jewish mothers who hid their children in piles of clothes. The women begged their executioners, clutching the ankles of the merciless killers; but the Lithuanian shooters smashed the women's heads and threw their bludgeoned bodies into the pit. The pit filled up with corpses and was covered with sand, or left open to be used again the next day. In the open pits, a few wounded Jews survived, and escaped at night. Later, the Germans and Lithuanians shovelled chlorine on to the bodies, and 'those who "jump[ed] up" [were] finished off' (p. 141).

The diary records the killings as they occurred from September 1941 to November 1943. Not all of the sheets have been found, and the gaps give a false impression of respite. The diary also records periods of concentrated murder, such as April 1942, when the Germans liquidated four small ghettos—Swieciany, Mikhalischki, Oszmiany, and Soly—and diverted trains of Jews (who thought they were being sent to labour camps or to the ghettos of Vilnius and Kovno) to the killing pits of Ponary. Sakowicz calls Monday, 5 April 1942 'Judgement Day' (p. 69), as on that day the Germans and Lithuanians killed as many as 4,000 Jews. In an uncharacteristically long description of ten pages, Sakowicz describes how the Lithuanians drove the Jews to the pit and forced them to lie down on the ground; then, separating out a certain number, usually ten, the riflemen shot them, and the Jews fell into the pit. Many tried to run away, but the Lithuanian guards caught almost all of them, beating them savagely before murdering them. Sakowicz tells us of those who lined up and were shot, and those who ran—'a Jewish woman in a beet-red sweater', her child behind her, shouting 'Mama, Mama' (p. 76), or a family, a man with a child in his arms and wife and two teenaged daughters, who were overtaken and killed. The killing had a system, but it broke down into chaos. One Lithuanian shot another by accident. A Jew stabbed a German in the head when the train door was opened. But by the end of the day there was an immense carnage—the bodies of Jewish men, women, and children lying in the pits and strewn over the fields. In Ponary, Sakowicz remarks, the villagers refused to drink water unboiled, fearing that blood had contaminated it.

A market in shoes, trousers, coats, dresses, watches, jewellery, and gold teeth flourished, with the backpacks of the Lithuanian riflemen bulging after each day's work. The riflemen exchanged these

items for money and vodka; it was a brisk trade and everyone in the area took part. 'For the Germans 300 Jews are 300 enemies of humanity', Sakowicz dryly noted, 'for the Lithuanians they are 300 pairs of shoes, trousers, and the like' (p. 16).

Himmler, as is well known, told his SS officers in October 1943 that 'this is a glorious page in our history but it never has been or will be written down'. He sent a *Sonderkommando* to Ponary, consisting of Jewish inmates, to exhume the corpses and burn them, eradicating all traces. But until his death, Sakowicz recorded the murders for posterity with an unsentimental eye. Consequently, and because of the labours of Dr Margolis and the expert editing of Yitzhak Arad, we can now conjure up in unparalleled detail an atrocity that ranks on a scale with Babi Yar (Kiev), Maly Trostinets (Minsk), and Rumbula (Riga). One can only hope that the *Ponary Diary* sparks a discussion in Lithuania similar to that initiated in Poland by the publication of Jan Gross's *Neighbours*.[3] The diary will also prove indispensable for students and teachers trying to imagine the events depicted in the sparse entries of the Jäger report. Sakowicz puts killing where Jäger only recounts numbers.

[3] Jan Tomasz Gross, *Neighbours: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne* (Princeton, 2001).

HELMUT WALSER SMITH is Martha Rivers Ingram Professor of History at Vanderbilt University and director of the Robert Penn Warren Centre of the Humanities. He has published extensively on German history, especially on the relations between religious and ethnic groups. His most recent book, *The Butcher's Tale: Murder and Anti-Semitism in a German Town* (2002), was awarded a number of prizes, among others the Fraenkel Prize for the best work in contemporary history.

BASTIAN HEIN, *Die Westdeutschen und die Dritte Welt: Entwicklungs-politik und Entwicklungsdienste zwischen Reform und Revolte 1959–1974*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 65 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006), x + 334 pp. ISBN-13: 978 3 57880 5. ISBN-10: 3 486 57880 4. EUR. 39.80

Bastian Hein's doctoral thesis is an institutional and party political history of how West Germany's development aid service evolved during the 1960s and early 1970s. After a brief introduction that deals with the geo-political framework of the 1950s, decolonization, the Cold War and, against the backdrop of West Germany's return to the world market, the Hallstein Doctrine (the Adenauer government's political position not to have or to sever diplomatic relations with any state that recognized the GDR), the book's five parts explain the often hesitant development of West German aid for Third World countries. Part one, covering the years 1959 to 1964, shows how inde-cisively the issue was tackled by German politicians and members of important social groups such as the churches. Initially only a small handful of people in the political parties were interested in the topic, while the churches had to learn that development aid meant more than, and was different from, traditional missionary work. Part two deals with the years 1964 to 1969 which Hein calls the 'apologetic period'. For the first time politicians recognized the size of the con-tinuing financial commitments which West Germany faced, while the public began to question these commitments at a time when the 'eco-nomic miracle' was experiencing a first slowdown. These years are perhaps best summed up by Franz Josef Strauß's statement that the Federal Republic had no reason to support Britain and France 'in ful-filling their ex-colonial obligations' (p. 107).

Part three covers the same six years, 1964 to 1969, but deals with what Hein calls the development of an avant-garde in development policy. This describes the imminent sea change in West German development policy which happened as a result of three factors: Third World countries gaining a stronger international voice; a rethinking of development policy within the churches; and a political rethink partly arising from the 'anti-imperialist' ideals and demands of the student movement. In this period West German development aid, after a long and painful struggle, was put on a proper legal foot-ing. This meant, amongst other things, that young men volunteering

for development aid were exempt from military service and, overall, the issue of payment was settled. This process coincided with a major crisis in the Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst, the governmental body in charge of German public development aid, and the growing influence and political persuasiveness of Erhard Eppler, who was to be the new and idealistic Minister for Development Aid after 1969. His aim was to detach West Germany's development aid from the country's foreign and economic policy interests and instead to provide aid on the basis of a more honest, long-term 'policy for peace'. After 1969, as Hein shows in the fourth part of his study, development aid policy became part of the reform agenda initiated by the SPD–FDP coalition government. Here, again, it was the idealism of Eppler, who wanted to move development aid away from aid and towards a 'Weltinnenpolitik' (p. 193), that achieved political emancipation for development aid, at least for a short period. There were three main reasons for Eppler's success: first, his own personality which, for the first time, put some force behind the demands of the ministry; secondly, the abandoning of the Hallstein Doctrine, which forced an overall change in West Germany's foreign and aid policy; and thirdly, the increasing politicization of aid workers abroad, most of whom came out of, or were influenced by, the radical student movement. In its spirit they tried to implement radical forms of democracy within the service and became politically involved in the political affairs of their host countries. Spreading from East Africa, this development soon caused embarrassment for the German government in South America. After the right-wing coups in Bolivia and Chile some of the aid workers openly agitated against the juntas and were arrested.

The fifth part covers the same period, 1969 to 1974, and describes the limits of development aid policy within the German political system. Interestingly, at more or less the same time as Eppler pushed forward and modernized the idea of development aid, counter forces were also at work. Eppler faced increasing resistance to the way he ran his ministry, not only from the opposition CDU, but also from the German foreign office, which did not like anyone operating a kind of 'parallel foreign policy', and from the Bundestag Budget Committee, which regarded many of Eppler's projects as a waste of money. At a personal level, this led to the eventual failure and political dismantling of Eppler, and at the social level, the people interested in development aid retreated into political and social niches. Hein argues that

this resulted in the once idealistic development service being transformed into an increasingly professionalized and sober service. The book ends with a brief summary of events after the oil crisis and the changeover from Willy Brandt to Helmut Schmidt as Chancellor, during which the new man in charge, Egon Bahr, had to accept and cope with the new realities.

Hein's book investigates a previously little researched topic. The strength of the work is in its detailed study of primary sources. The author uses a wide variety of archival material, not only from the various development services and agencies and the churches, but also the minutes of various Parliamentary Committees linked to development aid. Hein draws a reasonably accurate picture of social movements and developments in 1960s Germany, especially the 1968 student movement, and the impact they had on the evolution of West Germany's development aid service. The political parties' archives have hardly been used; this is because of their reluctance to open their files. But given what Hein is able to show with the available material, it is doubtful whether these archives would have added much more information. The only point of criticism is that the analysis of West Germany's foreign and cold war policy falls a bit short in places. However, these better known issues are outside the remit of what is a well-defined and previously very much under-researched topic.

ARMIN GRÜNBACHER is Lecturer in Modern History at the University of Birmingham. His book *Reconstruction and Cold War in Germany: The Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau 1948–1961*, was published in 2004. His current research project is a *Mentalitätsgeschichte* of German industrialists in the Adenauer era.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Chivalric Heroism or Brutal Cruelty—How Violent were the Middle Ages? Conference held at the German Historical Institute London, 22–24 June 2006

How violent were the Middle Ages? English and German medievalists discussed this question at a conference organized by Janet Nelson (King's College, London), Martin Kintzinger (University of Münster), and Hanna Vollrath (Ruhr University, Bochum). In their letter of invitation the organizers suggested that in the context of this conference violence was to be understood as physical violence, that is, the threat and inflicting of physical pain, possibly leading to death. The eleven papers given at the conference can be divided into two groups. The papers in the first group regarded descriptions of violence and cruelty as having a message and often as aiming to arouse emotions in order to convey that message, whereas papers in the second group analysed sources for the information they yield about violence as social practice.

The opening papers given by Miri Rubin (Queen Mary, University of London) and Nicholas Jaspert (Ruhr University, Bochum) belonged to the first group in that they interpreted vivid descriptions of violence and cruelty as a means explicitly chosen to dehumanize the respective perpetrators and create strong emotions of abhorrence and enmity towards them. In her paper on 'Mary, the Jews, and Violence' Miri Rubin argued that the intense depiction of Mary's suffering served to promote the image of the Jews as particularly cruel enemies who would even harm a defenceless woman, while Nicholas Jaspert, speaking on 'The Language of Violence: Christians and Muslims at the Time of the Crusades', suggested that the excessive cruelty attributed to Muslims allowed the crusaders to see themselves as the biblical people of Israel suffering at the hands of enemies, and to assume the role of just avengers. In her paper on 'Propaganda of Violence? The Testimony of Chivalric Literature', Linda Paterson (University of Warwick) analysed high medieval literature written about and for the knightly aristocracy and asked whether it advocated violence as part of chivalric heroism. She found evidence both of the glorification of violence in causes considered 'just', and ambivalence and criticism

when violence was thought to serve 'unjust causes'. She concluded by diagnosing 'a taste for violent fantasy' in medieval insult poetry and visual imagery of obscene vituperation. Jörg Peltzer (Ruprecht Karls University, Heidelberg), speaking on 'Remembering Violence: the Case of the Battle of Seckenheim 1462', also began by distinguishing between 'just' and 'unjust' violence when seeking insights into the contemporary value system by studying the perception and remembrance of violence in war. He found that in the particular case of Seckenheim the victor was careful to create a favourable public *memoria* in which knightly acts of violence were presented as approved tokens of prowess as long as they did not offend against the chivalric code of honour. All four papers argued against taking the descriptions in their particular sources literally, reading them instead as codes which aimed to influence their audiences' judgment.

The papers in the second group presented case studies ranging from the eighth to the fourteenth centuries, dealing with very different social groups. Steffen Patzold's (University of Hamburg) paper on 'Violence in Church and Monastery' looked at violent behaviour in early medieval monastic communities directed against the prescriptions of monastic rules which gave disciplinary power, including the right to order physical punishment, only to the abbot, while monks were enjoined to submission and obedience. Nevertheless, he presented numerous examples of enraged monks maltreating their brethren and their superiors, going as far as mutilation and murder. Monks who took bloody revenge for enchroachments on what they considered their rights could even count on the tacit approval of some monastic historiographers. (As Steffen Patzold was unable to attend the conference at short notice, his paper was read out by Hanna Vollrath). Stephan Baxter (King's College London), speaking on 'Violence and the Late Anglo-Saxon State', argued that unlike on the Continent, in late Anglo-Saxon England the settling of disputes remained the responsibility of public courts, and that violent self-help in settling disputes was rare. This, however, did not make England a haven of peace, as the means of guaranteeing jurisdiction of these courts included the threat and reality of violent coercion. Claudia Zey (University of Zurich) speaking on 'How and Why were Papal Legates Victims of Acts of Violence?' described papal legates in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as exposed to acts of violence such as physical maltreatment, robbery, and imprisonment on the com-

123

mand of kings and lay magnates who opposed the papal claim to juridical primacy in the Latin Church. Political tensions between lay lords and the pope translated easily into acts of aggression against the pope's legates, and more often against lesser papal messengers, although outright murder seems to have been rare. Ingmar Krause (Munich), speaking on 'Violence and Communication—Conflict and Consensus', presented examples from early Capetian France to show how ritual stagings of negotiated settlements helped to avoid violence. Sam Cohn (University of Glasgow) presented the results of his research on popular movements in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, mostly in Italy, France, and Flanders, based on more than one thousand cases. He found that in contrast to what some chroniclers suggest, atrocities committed by rebels were rare, as the rebels mostly attacked property rather than individuals. On the other hand, governments generally abstained from inflicting mass punishments and often entered into negotiated settlements. All this changed from the middle of the fifteenth century onwards when the more efficient modern state used the means available to it for ever more savage repression. John Gillingham (London School of Economics) and Matthew Strickland (University of Glasgow) both dealt with the mutilation and killing of high-status rebels. John Gillingham gave an overview of developments on the Continent and in Britain and Ireland. He pointed to two major shifts, one in the earlier Middle Ages when physical punishment of high-ranking rebels as known since Roman times was abandoned in favour of negotiated settlements, and the other from the fourteenth century onwards when the English, Scottish, and French kings began to stage gruesome executions of barons, even those of royal blood, who had rebelled against the Crown. Matthew Strickland underpinned these findings by discussing the emergence of veritable 'rituals of execution' in the cases of a number of high-ranking nobles during the reign of Edward I, which the king ordered after Robert Bruce's *coup d'état* of 1305.

All papers were followed by lively discussions, which benefitted greatly from the participation of a number of invited guests, and of Susan Reynolds, Frank Rexroth, Felicitas Schmieder, and Petra Ehm-Schnocks, who chaired the sessions. The papers are being prepared for publication.

Hanna Vollrath (Ruhr University, Bochum)

The Holy Roman Empire, 1495–1806. Conference organized by the Modern European History Research Centre in cooperation with the German Historical Institute London and the Austrian Cultural Forum, held at New College, Oxford, 30 August–2 September 2006

In 1863 the University of Oxford awarded the Arnold prize to an essay which, in published form, was to run through sixty-five editions. The author of this popular success was the jurist, historian, and politician James Bryce; the unlikely topic of his essay the history of the Holy Roman Empire. While German historians, besotted with the rise of Prussia and a modern German nation-state, lamented the political weakness of the Old Reich and regarded it as a historical aberration, reading publics on both sides of the Atlantic indulged in the vicissitudes of Imperial history. Almost one hundred and fifty years later the University of Oxford was the venue of another hallmark event devoted to this once much-maligned historical configuration. To mark the bicentenary of the Holy Roman Empire's dissolution, the Modern European History Research Centre in cooperation with the GHIL and the Austrian Cultural Forum (ACF) held what was certainly the largest event of its kind in Britain and one of the most important conferences on the Holy Roman Empire for a number of years.

As R. J. W Evans (Oxford) on behalf of the organizing committee (Robert Oresko, Oxford; David Parrott, Oxford; Lyndal Roper, Oxford; Michael Schaich, GHIL; Hagen Schulze, GHIL; Peter Wilson, Sunderland; Johannes Wimmer, ACF) pointed out in his introductory remarks, the revival of Imperial history over the last forty years necessitated a critical stocktaking. To canvass the progress made in research on the post-medieval history of the Old Reich rather than to concentrate on its end in August 1806 was therefore the main aim of this international conference which brought together forty-five papers in English and German. As they were given in plenary as well as parallel sessions, no participant could listen to all papers.[1] Only the publication of the conference proceedings which is envisaged will give a coherent picture of the many new findings and insights presented in Oxford. What follows, therefore, is of necessity rather

[1] The programme of the conference can be found at:
<http://www.ghil.ac.uk/Conferences/20060830_programme.pdf>.

impressionistic and can only give a flavour of the great variety of themes discussed during the conference at Oxford.

Fittingly, proceedings were started by the doyen of Imperial history, Karl Otmar von Aretin, who, from the 1960s onwards, almost single-handedly put the Holy Roman Empire back on the historical agenda after a long period of neglect and condemnation. In his lecture ('The *Reich*—a State or a Federation?') he posed the question of whether the Reich was a state and came to a very nuanced conclusion. In certain respects, the Reich can indeed be addressed as a state, for example, as far as decisions relating to war and peace or Imperial law were concerned. In political practice, however, the structure of the Reich 'yielded quasi-federal solutions', although, as Aretin stressed, 'it had more of the properties of a state than did the German Federation of 1815'. The debate on the state-like character of the Holy Roman Empire was originally started by Georg Schmidt (Jena), who coined the term *komplementärer Reichsstaat* (complementary Imperial state). In his paper on 'The Old Empire as a State and Nation of the Germans' he elaborated on this theme and stressed in particular that the smaller Empire of the Germans between the Alps and the North Sea or Baltic must be at the centre of any discussion of Imperial statehood. Within its borders 'a specific political culture developed which makes it possible to speak of an Imperial nation'. Since this polity was not based 'on power and expansion, but on lawful freedom, a secure legal system, and a structural lack of capacity for aggression', it is arguably more modern than conceptions of the Empire within the borders of the medieval feudal Reich. These on the one hand imply a notion of Imperial greatness that is hardly compatible with contemporary notions of Europe, and on the other seem to indicate a multi-ethnic community which, however, is not reflected in the sources.

The opening plenary session, which gave rise to a stimulating discussion as to whether the concept of statehood can fruitfully be applied to pre-modern politics, was followed by two parallel sessions which continued the theme of 'The Reich as a State or Federation'. Anton Schindling and Franz Brendle (Tübingen) in a joint paper discussed the problem of 'Religionskriege und Religionsfrieden im Heiligen Römischen Reich'. Based on research carried out in the Tübingen *Sonderforschungsbereich* 'War Experience: War and Society in the Modern Period', this paper demonstrated how religious war-

fare could be contained within the Empire during the Reformation period. By concealing the true, religious motives for war (*dissimulatio*) politicians in the sixteenth century 'kept the door open for a legal settlement of the conflict within the framework of the Imperial system'. Confessional conflicts could be redefined as legal issues which had to be dealt with not by theologians but by lawyers and politicians, as the legal–political settlement of the Religious Peace of Augsburg in 1555 exemplifies. The dissimulation model of the first half of the sixteenth century continued to shape the history of the Reich and was to provide 'an escape route from the devastating Thirty Years War by means of the Peace of Westphalia', a secular religious peace. The Peace of Westphalia also formed the subject of Lothar Höbelt's (Vienna) paper which set out to redefine the significance of the peace settlement. As Höbelt explained, the importance of the Peace of Westphalia can easily be overrated. Neither in constitutional terms nor as a Europe-wide peace settlement did it carry universal weight. To assess its relevance one has to appraise specific outcomes, for example, the replacement of Spanish predominance by French hegemony. The session was brought to a splendid conclusion by Peter Wilson's (Sunderland) re-evaluation of the Thirty Years War as a constitutional crisis. In his eyes a controversy over how an existing constitution should be interpreted was at the heart of the conflict. From this perspective events at the beginning of the war must be seen as a victory of the monarchical view of the constitution while the Danish intervention, for example, can be regarded as an attempt to impose a more moderate interpretation. Equally, the end of the war is best understood as a strengthening of the hierarchical interpretation of the Imperial constitution. There was general acceptance that the Empire needed an Emperor since only the Emperor could guarantee the trust on which the peace settlement of 1648 was predicated. From cause to resolution, therefore, differing views of the constitution were at the centre of the war while religion, to which a key role has often been attributed, was intertwined in the constitutional issue.

The second day of the conference began with two parallel sessions loosely entitled 'Society and Institutions'. While one session concentrated on nobility, the other looked at the higher Imperial courts which, over recent years, have inspired a great deal of research and undergone a change of fortune. Once seen as the epitome of bureaucratic inefficiency and the weakness of the Empire, their role has been

thoroughly revised. Leopold Auer (Vienna) was one of the first to question these stereotypes and to pave the way for a more appropriate understanding of the *Reichshofrat* in particular. 'The Role of the Imperial Aulic Council in the Constitutional Structure of the Old Reich' was the theme of his conference paper which gave a concise overview of the various political affairs which the *Reichshofrat* conducted. He especially stressed the relevance of the Imperial Aulic Council in guaranteeing 'broad access to legal remedies' and 'maintaining the functional effectiveness of the highly complex constitutional mechanism of the Old Reich'. In her paper 'Did the Higher Imperial Courts Act as Mediators?' Sigrid Westphal (Osnabrück) went a step further and outlined the programme for a new institutional history of the Old Empire. Applying recent research on rule and authority in the early modern period which stresses the aspect of mediation between ruler and ruled she cast the higher Imperial courts as mediating bodies between litigating parties. In this perspective, the small number of verdicts issued by the courts, which in the past has been interpreted as a sure sign of the inefficiency of the judicial system, can be read as a measure of success and proof of its ability to bring lawsuits to a satisfying conclusion before the powers of the courts have to be invoked.

The theme of the parallel sessions was fleshed out in the two plenary papers by Susan Karant Nunn (Arizona) and Marc Forster (Connecticut) who both explored ways of researching a social history of the Empire. Karant Nunn, in a memorable lecture ('Did the Holy Roman Empire have a Social History?'), approached the topic by assembling an imaginary committee of historians whose research interests foreshadowed the outlines of a possible social history of the Reich. Among others, she identified the relationship between subalterns and elites, social groups such as lawyers and their mindset, the infrastructure of minorities, human geography, and intellectual history as promising subjects of a synthetic Imperial social history. Marc Forster, by contrast, took Baroque Catholicism as an example and introduced his listeners to the dense sacral landscapes which were created in Catholic parts of the Empire in the century after 1648. By detailing the aspects of Catholic practice—processions, pilgrimages, shrines, the liturgical year—which held the loyalty of peasants he stressed the importance of practised religion for any analysis of the period and warned that social historians neglected it at their peril.

Back in the parallel sessions the more cultural aspects of the topic gained the upper hand. Wolfgang Behringer (Saarbrücken) dealt with 'The Holy Roman Empire as a Communication(s) Universe' based on the Imperial postal system. Charting its history since the sixteenth century, which was characterized in equal measure by periods of decline and rise, he analysed the relationship between core and periphery, pointed out spin-offs such as the emergence of the periodical press, and concluded with the statement that the Imperial post was the most powerful institution in the communications universe of the late eighteenth-century Reich. Post officials dedicated to enlightened discourse were, of course, proud to serve the Holy Roman Empire, but considered themselves primarily as communication specialists and part of a wider international communications elite. On a different note, Markus Völkel (Rostock) dealt with the Holy Roman Empire as an object of historical writing during the early modern period and the problems this caused ('Das historische Bewußtsein vom Heiligen Römischen Reich deutscher Nation, 16.–18. Jahrhundert'). While at the beginning of the period the Empire was of no interest in humanist discourse, from the middle of the century it became increasingly historicized (*historisiert*) and legalized (*verrechtlicht*). The Imperial constitution and individual laws, in particular, grew into the subject of historical and legal study. In the course of the eighteenth century, however, the writing of Imperial history ran into problems. Defined primarily in legal and constitutional terms it could not accommodate the growing fascination with the history of Germany. Imperial history was seen as a deficient form of German history. That is why the main representatives of German history resorted to defining their subject culturally. Turning its back on Imperial history, however, proved to be problematic for the writing of German history since it lacked the element of power. To fill this void nineteenth-century historians chose a new theme around which to organize German history: Prussia. A completely different approach, in turn, was adopted by the last speaker in this session, Kim Siebenhüner (Basel). She addressed the material aspects of Imperial history by investigating the origins of the jewels of emperors and princes ('Woher kommen die Preziosen der Reichsfürsten?'). In three steps she reconstructed the circulation of the gems in Europe, pieced together the trading networks of the merchants, gem cutters, and goldsmiths who were involved in distributing jewels, and, finally, traced their origins back to India.

What emerged from her paper was the '"itinerary" of the jewels, a history of the object that has a geographical dimension'.

The last two parallel sessions of the day were given over to presentations by graduates. Dorothee Linnemann (Münster) introduced the audience to her Ph.D. project on visual representations of diplomatic ceremonial acts in seventeenth-century Europe. Drawing on a variety of prints, tapestries, and paintings she analysed processes of professionalization within the diplomatic corps, strategies of representation, and the construction of idealized communities. Alan Ross (Oxford), on the other hand, pursued a case study in the social and intellectual history of education during and after the Thirty Years War. He focused on the Latin school of Zwickau (Saxony) whose curriculum was caught between the intellectual ambitions of its teachers, published authors and established members of the late-humanist community, and the practical necessities of teaching pupils, the overwhelming majority of whom entered the professions. Masatake Wasa (Oxford), finally, took up recent discussions about the efficiency of the early modern state in his study of 'Rural Tax Evaders: Beer Brewing in Brandenburg, 1660–1700'. His analysis of the Brandenburg tax regime suggests a rather pragmatic, but successful, attempt to collect taxes. The administration was fairly efficient in putting in place a circumspect policy of increasing tax revenues.

The political culture of the Reich was the theme of the next set of parallel sessions on the third day of the conference. While Joachim Whaley (Cambridge) and Dominic Phelps (Blundell's School) discussed aspects of confessional and national identities, and electoral policies on the eve of the Thirty Years War respectively, Jeroen Duindam (Utrecht) and Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger (Münster) both devoted papers to the symbolic realm of politics. Duindam ('The Habsburg Court in Vienna: Kaiserhof or Reichshof?') left his audience in no doubt that the Viennese court was primarily the dynastic court of the Emperor and not an Imperial court. Only on certain occasions did it constitute itself as a *Reichshof*, most conspicuously when the Imperial ceremonial officers such as the *Reichserbschenk* or the *Reichstruchsess* were marshalling ceremonies or the Imperial princes were present. Even then, however, disputes often arose as to whether certain symbolic acts should be interpreted as Imperial or dynastic ceremonies. In a similar vein, Stollberg-Rilinger emphasized the importance of symbolic, outward forms for a proper understanding

of the Imperial constitution despite traditional reservations about seemingly anachronistic rituals, most famously expressed by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in 1803. Taking the example of Imperial investitures she demonstrated instead that even in the eighteenth century, when the princes no longer took part personally in these feudal acts, they could not be done without. Rituals certainly became more fixed and regulated in the course of the early modern period, in particular, under the influence of a process of increasing *Verschriftlichung*. As a consequence the ceremonial language of the Empire often clashed with its political order, but it still performed an essential function highlighting the survival of the *Reich*. The end of Imperial rituals, therefore, also spelled the end of the Empire itself.

The ensuing plenary session began with a wide-ranging lecture by Thomas Kaufmann (Princeton) on 'Centres or Periphery? Art and Architecture in the Holy Roman Empire, 1495–1806'. Taking the general neglect of the artistic production of Central Europe by art historians from outside this area as his starting point, he looked at three broadly different moments in the development of art and architecture in the Reich (1500, 1600, 1700) to confound the notion that buildings and artworks created within this region were peripheral and insignificant. The model of Paris, London, and Rome may not be applicable to the specific situation of the Empire, as he stressed, but the disunity which characterized artistic efforts in the Empire also made for strength. Shifting the emphasis back to political history Thomas Winkelbauer (Vienna) in his lecture described the gradual separation of the Habsburg monarchy from the Holy Roman Empire during the seventeenth century. The former went through a process of internal integration which was visible in such diverse areas as the development of central authorities, the conduct of war, finances, and postal services. Although the Emperors were, of course, still present in the Empire and tried to strengthen their position there, 'from the middle of the seventeenth century, at least as seen from Vienna, the Imperial dignity represented merely a symbolic capital which served to mobilize the resources of the territories and Imperial estates which did not belong to the Habsburg Monarchy for the purpose of building a Habsburg great power and expanding and strengthening the Habsburg Monarchy'.

The relationship between core and periphery which the two plenary speakers had addressed also resurfaced in the parallel sessions

131

that followed them. Four speakers dealt with territories on the fringes of or outside the Empire: Brandenburg–Prussia and Savoy–Sardinia (Sven Externbrink, Marburg), Bohemia and Silesia (Jaroslav Pánek, Prague, and Petr Mat'a, Prague), Saxony and Poland–Lithuania (Adam Perlakowski, Cracow). Connections between the Reich and Bohemia, for example, were rather loose as Pánek stressed. Political interventions in Bohemia by Imperial princes were regarded as unacceptable. Seen from Bohemia the Empire remained a foreign institution. Equally difficult was the relationship between Poland–Lithuania and the Electorate of Saxony. Despite the personal union there was hardly any political cooperation. Saxon ministers were banned from intervening in Poland's internal affairs and the Saxon Estates and the Polish *Sejm* pursued their business separately. As Perlakowski explained in his paper, 'mutual contacts were limited to the person of the king and his court'. The general theme of core and periphery also ran through the plenary lecture by Nicolette Mout (Leiden). She recounted the political relations between the Netherlands and the Holy Roman Empire from the late fifteenth to the early seventeenth century, differentiating, in particular, between the period from 1512 to the treaty at the Imperial Diet of Augsburg (1548) which was intended to put the relationship on a new and permanent footing, and from then to 1609, the beginning of the Twelve Years Truce between the Netherlands and Spain. During the whole period the relationship between the Empire and the Netherlands was fraught with difficulties. The Emperors did not give up their rights to the Netherlands, but never asserted them. The Imperial Diet tried to mediate between the parties during the Dutch Revolt and the Emperor objected to the peace talks between Spain and the Dutch Estates from 1607 as this contravened the Dutch obligations as a part of the Empire, but the Reich never intervened in the Netherlands. At the beginning of the seventeenth century it was obvious that the Netherlands had permanently found their place on the periphery of the Empire.

The same leitmotiv recurred on the morning of the last day of the conference. Six papers in two parallel sessions investigated the political relationship between the core of the Empire and Reichsitalien on the one hand, and a number of states on the borders of the Reich on the other. Reichsitalien was served by two lectures, the first of which was given by Robert Oresko (Oxford/London). He dealt with the different lines of the House of Gonzaga and their bonds with the

Empire. Outlining the role of Imperial investitures, the bestowal of rights to the Italian princes and, in particular, the marriage connections between members of the Gonzaga dynasty and a whole series of Austrian duchesses, he stressed that the history of the Empire cannot be written without giving due consideration to the role of its composite Italian part. The political world of the *Salon des Refusés*, as Oresko memorably called Reichsitalien, was further explored by Blythe Raviola (Turin) in her paper on 'The Imperial System in Early Modern Northern Italy: A Web of Dukedoms, Fiefs, and Enclaves along the Po'. In particular, she drew the attention of her audience to the lacunae in the history of Imperial northern Italy. Neither the relations of the numerous small and medium states in this region to the Empire nor their connections with the Papacy have been investigated to a satisfying degree. The same holds true for the economic repercussions of being part of the Reich and the political language employed when dealing with the Empire. A highly complex political landscape was also canvassed by Rainer Babel (Paris) in his paper on 'Lorraine and the Holy Roman Empire'. As Babel made clear, the Dukes of Lorraine and Bar claimed political sovereignty from the fifteenth century. This claim was recognized by the Empire after much haggling in 1543. The Dukes became independent rulers for most parts of their territory while remaining vassals of the French king and the Emperor for others. Political pressure from France, however, was soon to put this new-found solution to the test. Over the next two centuries Lorraine repeatedly took recourse to the Empire to counterbalance French influence, although Imperial help was never easily forthcoming. Under French control since 1670, the ties between Lorraine and the Empire finally ceased in the eighteenth century.

In the final plenary lecture Heinz Duchhardt (Mainz) introduced the notion of 'system' into the discussion on the Empire. He compared the *Reichssystem*, a concept famously proposed by Volker Press in his structural analysis of the Reich almost a generation ago, with the international system as put forward by Paul W. Schroeder in his book *The Transformation of European Politics, 1763–1848* and asked if there were any overlaps. At first glance the two could not have been more different: while the *Reichssystem* can be described as static and intent on preserving traditions, its opposite number was dynamic and allowed change within certain rules. In addition, the Holy Roman Empire as such did not participate in the international sys-

tem. All this notwithstanding, the two rival German powers of the eighteenth century, Austria and Prussia, created an intersection with the international system. Neither ever became a real great power since they lacked an overseas empire and therefore had to make do with the political opportunities offered by the Empire. Nevertheless, they never showed any real interest in the functioning of the Reich. Ironically, however, as Duchhardt stressed, the international system after 1815 took the shape of the Old Empire and betrayed some of its main traits (self-denying, conservation of the peace). Despite its difference from the *Reichssystem*, the international system had outlived its usefulness by the end of the eighteenth century and had to reorganize by adopting elements from the similarly defunct Imperial system. The price it had to pay for this was high, but at least it guaranteed several decades without war.

Duchhardt's lecture, like all papers during the conference, gave rise to a stimulating discussion. In their entirety they presented a concise overview of the current state of thinking about Imperial history. They amply demonstrated that interest in the Holy Roman Empire has undergone a revival over the last few decades and that past neglect and detestation have given way to a flourishing research culture which, over the last few years, has especially benefited from new approaches such as the history of communications and a new understanding of the history of statehood and authority. This is no mean achievement, as Johannes Wimmer and Andreas Gestrich, the new Director of the GHIL, also stressed in their final remarks.

Michael Schaich (GHIL)

Fifth Workshop on Early Modern German History, co-organized by the German Historical Institute London, the German History Society, the Ludwig Maximilians University in Munich, and the University of Warwick, held at the Ludwig Maximilians University in Munich, 25–26 September 2006

For the first time in its fairly brief history the annual Workshop on Early Modern German History left London and relocated to the Ludwig Maximilians University in Munich for its 2006 meeting in order to deepen the exchange of ideas between British and German historians. On 25 September participants were welcomed by Professor Ferdinand Kramer at the premises of the Institute of Bavarian history, situated immediately next to the Bavarian State Library and Bavarian Central State Archives. In this congenial setting about thirty participants discussed eleven papers by speakers from all over Europe. As with earlier workshops the organizers, Ferdinand Kramer, Beat Kümin (University of Warwick), Michael Schaich (GHIL), and Claudia Stein (University of Warwick), had selected the speakers from a larger number of interested historians who had responded to a Call for Papers issued in spring 2006.

After a brief introduction to the purpose and history of the workshop by Michael Schaich, who also chaired the first session, Julien Demade (Sorbonne) started off proceedings by presenting his ongoing post-doctoral research on 'Grain Prices in Nuremberg in the late Fifteenth and early Sixteenth Centuries'. Employing sophisticated mathematical models he analysed one of the oldest price lists of grain available in Europe and explained its specificities in the context of a feudal society. The cyclicity of cereal prices in Nuremberg was an artificial phenomenon which cannot be explained by a direct link between demand and supply as economic theory would have it, but was the result of the oligolopoly which noble lords enjoyed on the local grain markets. In keeping with the general theme of the first session ('Commodities'), Rengenier C. Rittersma (European University Institute, Florence) shifted attention to the cultural consumption of another, rather more luxurious product at the turn of the Middle Ages and the early modern period: truffles. As part of a wider cultural history of this produce he explored the strikingly different perceptions of truffles north and south of the Alps. Whereas in Italy truffles were considered a delicacy, in the German-speaking world they

were treated with suspicion and attributed with causing ill effects on physical and mental health. The Alps emerged as a 'Trüffeläquator', a cultural dividing line between the northern and southern parts of Europe. The third paper, by Christian Hochmuth (Technical University Dresden), dealt with colonial goods such as tea, coffee, chocolate, tobacco, and sugar and their cultural appropriation in the Saxon capital of Dresden from the late seventeenth to the early nineteenth century. Concentrating primarily on the different ways in which the consumption of coffee was regulated by the authorities and discussed in public, Hochmuth pointed out the problems which early modern societies experienced when confronted with new products from far afield. Contemporaries had difficulty categorizing them and, again, worried about their effects on body and soul. In addition, coffeehouses were seen by local officials as highly dangerous places, while merchants and traders quarreled about who was entitled to sell these goods.

The economic leitmotiv of the first papers to some extent continued into the second session which was chaired by Ferdinand Kramer. Josef Bordat (Technical University Berlin) spoke on the dealings of the South German Welser family and its banking and trading empire in Venezuela. In a critical examination of recent research on the Welser he described how their colonial enterprise derailed after only a short time because of the difficulties of communicating with, and exercising effective control over, agents on the ground. While Bordat's and Hochmuth's papers reflected the growing interest of early modern historians in global economic networks and chains of communication, the following two papers focused on the more narrowly circumscribed realm of the premodern household. Basing her research on a wide range of autobiographical sources, Barbara Kink (University of Munich) introduced her audience to the world of an undistinguished country nobleman in eighteenth-century Bavaria. Despite limited resources, Sebastian von Pemler kept up an aristocratic lifestyle, maintaining a paternalistic relationship with his subjects, cultivating his fellow noblemen, and taking part in courtly festivities. All this was made possible by Pemler's tight control on spending. In this respect he conformed to the ideal of the prudent *Hausvater* (head of the household) while in others his economic dealings diverged from the ideal of the 'ganze Haus' as described most famously by Otto Brunner. Thus, for example, Kink debunked the supposed self-

sufficiency of the household as a myth and highlighted Pemler's extensive interchange with the wider economy. In her paper Inken Schmidt-Voges (University of Osnabrück) was equally critical of the concept of the 'ganze Haus'. For her second book she intends to analyse the category of the 'Hausfrieden' (peace within the household) as a guiding political principle in the eighteenth century. More interested in the 'moral economy' of the 'Hausfrieden' than its legal basis, she questioned common assumptions about the decline of the premodern household and the rise of a modern, bourgeois family in the eighteenth century. Instead she suggested a functional relationship between the two phenomena. According to Schmidt-Voges the notion of the 'Haus' was reconfigured as a central part of modern conceptions of civil society in the late eighteenth century.

After the lunch break the third session, chaired by Beat Kümin, discussed different confessional cultures during the early modern period. It was opened by Katharina Beiergrößlein's (University of Bayreuth) paper on a rather neglected figure of Henrician England, the former Augustinian monk and friend of Martin Luther, Robert Barnes. After the English Reformation he assumed a noteworthy role in diplomatic relations between Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell on the one hand, and the German Protestant princes on the other. Acting as an intermediary in the negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League, he probably also contributed to the discussions conducted by Anglican and Lutheran theologians at the time. It is these two aspects which will be at the heart of Beiergrößlein's doctoral dissertation. Transgressing confessional boundaries was also the topic of Heike Bock's (University of Lucerne) talk on conversions in Reformed Zurich and Catholic Lucerne from the late sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century. By comparing these two cities which were at the forefront of their respective confessional communities in Switzerland we can obtain a clearer picture of what it actually meant to leave one's faith. Then it becomes clear that conversion was not just a change of confession but went hand-in-hand with experiences of social decline and political alienation since it inevitably entailed a physical relocation to a foreign territory. As Bock also stressed, conversions cannot be seen as an indication that confessional barriers were being relaxed. Instead, and contrary to received wisdom, they contributed to consolidating them. Unfortunately the third paper, by Susan Boettcher ('The Conception of the "Other" in Late Sixteenth-

Century Preaching'), which could have extended this discussion had to be cancelled because of illness.

The focus of the workshop shifted yet again for the last session, which was devoted to questions of 'Body and Health' and chaired by Claudia Stein. The three speakers discussed various aspects of the social construction of medical knowledge and illness. In the first paper Mariusz Horanin (University of Göttingen) outlined his doctoral research on the plague in early modern Augsburg. His main aim is to analyse the religious, medical, and social discourses which contemporaries used to define the disease. The plague lends itself to such an investigation as it affected a wide part of the population and thus throws light on sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century perceptions from a range of perspectives. While Horanin is primarily interested in the social construction of illness, Sebastian Pranghofer (University of Durham) focused on the construction of professional identities by anatomists in the Netherlands and German-speaking territories in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Taking the frontispiece of Stephen Blankaart's *Nieuw-hervormde anatomia* (1678) as an example he discussed how visual strategies could be adopted to legitimize the dissection of bodies in the early modern period and, even more importantly, enhance the anatomist's reputation and standing within his own community. Aspects of professional self-legitimization were also at the heart of Gabrielle Robillard's (University of Warwick) talk on midwives. In her case-study on Leipzig she charts the changes in the social position and identity of midwives over the course of the early modern period. By compiling a wide range of data about the practitioners of childbirth she attempts to identify patterns in the socio-economic circumstances of midwifery and the production and transfer of knowledge about the female body and its reproductive functions. As with earlier sessions all papers were followed by lively discussions.

The workshop finished on 26 September with a morning session devoted to the archival raw material of historical research. On a visit to the Bavarian Central State Archives Joachim Wild, the director of the archive, introduced the participants to its vast holdings and discussed future research projects and strategies from the viewpoint of someone who is charged with looking after the written and pictorial records of the past. Afterwards, Petr Kreuz (Prague/Hradec Králové) spoke about the sources for the history of early modern Central

Europe available in Czech archives and the structure of the Czech archival system. This foray into the practicalities of the historian's craft rounded off a successful event which certainly benefited from Munich's *genius loci*.

The sixth workshop on early modern German History will be held on 19 October 2007 at the German Historical Institute London. For further information and to register please contact Michael Schaich (schaich@ghil.ac.uk).

Michael Schaich (GHIL)

Royal Kinship: Anglo-German Family Networks 1760–1914. Conference of the Prince Albert Society and the German Historical Institute London, held at the GHIL, 29–30 September 2006

This conference focused upon and sought to blend the diverse strands of two important and controversial historical topics. The first of these was the nature and development of Anglo-German relations in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries; the second was the role of monarchical institutions and dynastic connections in modern European history. As Karina Urbach (GHIL), the organizer of the conference, explained in an insightful opening lecture which was read out by Keith Robbins (Wales), both individually and collectively these topics raised significant and interesting points for consideration. Some of these were very broad questions that related to the wider implications of these combined topics. For example, it was clearly legitimate, if not essential, to ask whether the close connections between the British royal family and various different German princely houses led to any meaningful or enduring cultural transfer between the nations over which these dynasties reigned. Equally, however, it was also important to consider questions that related to the narrower issue of the impact on individuals of being part of a transnational family network. Did the 'genetic permeability' that allowed considerable intermarriage between British and German royal families create problems of identity for those caught up in the process? Was it the case, for example, that in an era of increasing nationalism and national definition it was a burden to have a dual heritage, or was it possible for these people to forge mental maps that were truly international? These and other related questions were explored over five different sessions, each of which focused on a different facet of the Anglo-German dynastic landscape.

The first session began by setting out the historiographical and contextual underpinnings to Anglo-German dynastic history. In the opening paper, Daniel Schönpflug (Berlin) ranged widely over the question of how dynasties acted and interacted. As he explained in a comprehensive analysis of dynastic marriages, kinship networks could be both inclusive and exclusive. While most royal families sought ties with their fellow princely houses, there were three (the two Serbian dynasties and the Albanian royal family) that never made such connections. Moreover, even royal houses that were

favourably inclined to such bridal networking were not indiscriminate in the practice of it, but were often influenced in such matters by extraneous considerations such as religious affiliation and dynastic prestige. It was also pointed out both in the paper and in subsequent questions that in an almost Newtonian manner, particular dynastic connections could provoke or call into being alternative dynastic networks. Thus, the Hohenzollern family during the reign of Kaiser Wilhelm II, despite its familial ties to the Romanov and British Coburg families, was conscious of being excluded from this circle by a counter-network, the so-called 'Rumpenheimer clique', that united the courts of Hesse, Denmark, Greece, and Britain in a way that seemed designed deliberately to exclude their Prusso-German cousins. The second paper of the first session moved from the general to the particular by considering the case of the Guelphs, a family which from the time of George I to the death of William IV brought Britain and Hanover into a dynastic if not political union. These direct ties, were, of course, severed on the accession of Queen Victoria, who was barred under Salic law from the Hanoverian throne. However, as Torsten Riotte (GHIL) outlined and exemplified, this caesura did not end all ties. As papers in the Royal Archives at Windsor demonstrate, the fate of Hanover continued to be of interest to the British royal family throughout Victoria's reign. The dispossession of the Duke of Cumberland, Victoria's cousin, from the Hanoverian throne posed particular problems for the British branch of the House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, as Victoria's eldest daughter was married into the very dynasty, the Hohenzollerns, that had seized the Hanoverian lands. Problematic questions of family, dynasty, property, and Anglo-German relations were, therefore, all entwined together in this case.

The second session moved the focus to the Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg. Kicking off the topic was a paper by Clarissa Campbell Orr (Anglia Ruskin) which looked in detail at the case of Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz. As a member of a very extensive family—largely and confusingly populated by a plethora of Charlottes and Fredericks—and, thereby, possessing numerous cousins dotted liberally about the European dynastic undergrowth, she was intricately connected to the Continent's many royal houses. As a result, her marriage to George III provides an interesting historical showcase for the importance of one of Europe's more minor princely houses in

cementing dynastic connections between disparate royal courts. The unlikely place that Mecklenburg occupied in the development of the British royal family was further illustrated by Rudolf Muhs (Royal Holloway) in his exploration of Augusta of Mecklenburg, who, as the title of his paper made clear, held the distinction of being 'grand-daughter, cousin and aunt to a Queen of England'. Muhs's paper was not only valuable for providing a useful chronological extension to the ideas showcased by Campbell Orr, it was also highly significant in terms of what it said about identity formation. The subject of his paper, Augusta of Mecklenburg, considered herself British and was excessively proud of being so. This was despite the fact that by almost every obvious criterion—name, place of birth, first language, her extensive and continuing residency in northern Germany, and the infrequency of her visits to Britain and the limited time she spent there—she would more naturally have fitted the designation German. Given the further fact that her political views and social outlook were not just reactionary but so positively anachronistic as to have been untenable in the context of a limited parliamentary monarchy like Britain's, it is almost inexplicable that she should have felt so drawn to her distant British heritage. Nevertheless, the fact that she did so strongly identify with Britain, even to the point of maintaining a correspondence with Britain during the early years of the First World War, highlights the manner in which identity in a transnational family network was as much, if not more, about self-definition than birth or environment.

The focus of the third session was on Prussia and the connections between the Hohenzollerns and the British branch of the House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. Monika Wienfort (Berlin), whose paper centred on the correspondence between Queen Victoria and her daughter, Vicky, the wife of the Prussian Crown Prince (later, briefly, Kaiser Friedrich III), made the case for the political significance of royal marriages in a nineteenth-century context. Noting the reluctance of many academic (as opposed to popular) historians of the modern era to consider, let alone privilege, the history of royalty and dynastic relations, she suggested that the life of Princess Victoria demonstrated that monarchy was still a key issue. Her contentious role in Prussia-Germany, as a bastion of liberal and parliamentary values in the midst of a conservative, authoritarian, and military regime, highlighted and prefigured the tensions in Anglo-German relations that

were to erupt so forcefully during the reign of her son, Wilhelm II. Her regular exchange of letters with her mother, in which Vicky often expressed decidedly British (and critical) views on her adopted land, also showed that tensions could exist between an individual's dynastic obligations, familial duties, personal inclinations, and political affiliations. This situation strongly illustrated the ambiguities and dichotomies in the relationship between dynasty and nationality in the context of a royal marriage. These themes were extended further by the paper presented by John Röhl (Sussex), who drew upon primary documents in the British and German archives to highlight the place of dynastic politics in Anglo-German relations during the era of Wilhelm II. Wilhelm, as Röhl showed, maintained an extensive correspondence with his British relatives. Possibly because of the Kaiser's rather exalted sense of the role of monarchy, these family letters often served a clear political purpose. His numerous epistles to his uncle, King Edward VII, for example, were often designed less to maintain contact with a relative who Wilhelm in fact loathed, but rather were explicitly sent to distract the king, and, by extension, the British government, from the Kaiser's own political ambitions. Thus during various European and global diplomatic crises Wilhelm attempted, by means of the written word, to smooth over Anglo-German political differences by persuading his uncle that Germany's aims were not as aggressive as they appeared. Unfortunately for Wilhelm, Edward VII recognized these letters for what they were—cynical political ploys designed to mask Wilhelm's global hegemonial aspirations—and not only declined to be lulled, but was, if anything, further strengthened in his conviction about the extent of Hohenzollern hostility. Wilhelm's meetings with other 'British' relatives, for example, Prince Louis of Battenberg, were no more successful in this respect. As a result, Röhl's paper made it more than evident that dynastic relationships played a key, if unsuccessful, part in Wilhelm's diplomatic engagement with Britain. This was revealing in terms of what it said about both the Anglo-German political dialogue and Wilhelm's inability to separate the familial and dynastic from the national and political in his cognitive processes and political behaviour.

Following this examination of Prussia, John Davis (Kingston) provided a nuanced overview of the connection between Britain and Coburg. The prism for this was provided, naturally enough, by

Prince Albert. Following his arrival in Britain as the husband and consort of Queen Victoria, Albert maintained an extensive correspondence with his elder brother Ernst, who would become the reigning duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha and head of Albert's house. Albert's letters to his brother are revealing at many levels. First of all, they are family letters and show Albert's extensive interest in the affairs of the House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, the finances of its family, and its international standing and prestige. At another level, however, the letters spell out clearly Albert's continued interest in German affairs and his desire to be involved in their development even after his move to Britain as prince consort to a woman who, in German terms at least, was a foreign sovereign. In part, this was no more than a natural and continued interest in the place of his birth. However, Albert also had a personal vision of Anglo-German friendship that he wished to promote. One means of doing this was through marriage alliances and Albert's letters to his brother have much to say on the importance of marriage in dynastic and political terms. He was opposed, for example, to his brother marrying a Catholic princess on grounds of religious harmony and also opposed marriage to a Russian imperial bride for national reasons. Instead he was eager to promote better Anglo-German understanding, a process he believed he had achieved when he married his eldest daughter to the Prussian crown prince. As we know, this did not ultimately develop as Albert had hoped.

The final session focused on the House of Hesse. Two papers were offered on this topic. One, provided by Jonathan Petropoulos (Los Angeles) provided an extensive overview of the connections between the Hessian royal family and their British counterparts. The paper was wide-ranging chronologically and provided an interesting point of comparison with the role of the Coburg dynasty as previously outlined by John Davis. The other paper, by Matthew Seligmann (Northampton), focused on the particular example of Prince Louis of Battenberg. The offspring of a morganatic marriage between a Russo-Polish countess and a prince of Hesse-Darmstadt, who was born in Austria and forged a career in Britain, he was a true example of a transnational dynastic figure. However, as his time in the Royal Navy showed, this connection could be both an advantage and a hindrance: while to begin with he achieved choice appointments through his royal connections, he soon realized that any hint of

favouritism could damage his prospects and he chose to emphasize merit over title. That this did not save him in 1914 when he had to resign his office because of his German name and heritage was a telling reminder of the greater power of nationalism over dynasty in the context of twentieth-century total war.

The conference concluded with some thoughtful remarks by Franz Bosbach (Bayreuth), representing the Prince Albert Society, and Andreas Gestrich, on behalf of the German Historical Institute. These included observations on the themes raised: Anglo-German relations, dynastic protocol, nationalism, national affiliation, and identity-formation. It was clear that these were fruitful areas where much research of value could be carried out. The current Common Heritage Project, which seeks to evaluate the holdings of the archives at Windsor, Coburg, and Gotha and thereby highlight Anglo-German connections through dynastic interchange is obviously one outstanding example of this. In the wake of this very stimulating and successful conference there are likely to be others and, it is to be hoped, a volume bringing together the papers from this conference.

Matthew S. Seligmann (University of Northampton)

The Dignity of the Poor: Concepts, Practices, Representations. Conference of the GHIL in cooperation with the DFG-funded Collaborative Research Centre 'Strangers and Poor People: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion from Classical Antiquity to the Present Day', University of Trier, held at the GHIL, 7–9 December 2006

In December 2006 the German Historical Institute hosted a conference, organized by its Director, Andreas Gestrich, whose topic was partly inspired by the fact that the First United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty ended in December 2006. The UN sees poverty as a severe infringement of human rights and a violation of human dignity. This interpretation implies new perceptions of poverty and human dignity. It maintains that a certain level of material welfare not only forms the basis for social recognition but is also a prerequisite for other aspects of human dignity such as moral autonomy. Well into the twentieth century, in both Christian and Jewish theology as well as Enlightenment philosophy, human dignity was defined in a much more general way. Jewish and Christian theology based the concept of the dignity of man on his being created in God's image (Genesis 1:27). However, the Christian concept of human dignity always had to take account of the fact that man was a sinner and far from perfect. The status of voluntary poverty in particular was seen as a means of returning to this lost status of divine dignity by following the model of Christ, suffering poverty, and helping paupers.

Many scholars see the Christian notion of human dignity as the basis of the modern concept, while others question this continuity. In German the noun *Menschenwürde* (human dignity) did not even surface before the Enlightenment period in the second half of the eighteenth century. It was then used to describe man's intellectual and moral autonomy and does not seem to have been of any importance in the context of political or religious tracts on poor relief or modern welfare before the late twentieth century. Until then the adjective *würdig* (*dignus*) was used in German poor relief terminology solely to define the deserving poor, that is, those paupers who were found to be of sufficient moral quality to deserve support from public funds.

The conference addressed various issues arising from such observations on semantic changes in the concept of human dignity. It was asked whether Christian teaching contains any terms or criteria com-

plementary to the Christian commandment of charity which conceptualize the idea that there might be a nexus between material and social deprivation and human dignity, as opposed to the medieval theological concept that poverty restores human dignity. Was there, in other words, a modern concept of human dignity *avant la lettre*? If so, what were its components? What did paupers themselves think about their dignity? The conference discussed these questions as topics for semantic analysis, and also investigated their socio-historical dimensions.

The first session dealt with the theological, philosophical, and sociological dimensions of the concept of dignity in relation to poverty. It was opened by Carlos Fraenkel (McGill University, Montreal) with a paper on 'Poverty and Human Dignity in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Intellectual Traditions'. Fraenkel addressed two related questions: (1) Do the intellectual traditions of pre-modern Judaism, Christianity, and Islam contain concepts that resemble what we presently understand as universal human dignity and universal human rights? (2) In particular do they recognize a human right to material security? After a preliminary clarification of the relevant concepts, he argued that the historical forms of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are, for the most part, based on mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion that cannot be reconciled with the universality of the modern notions of human dignity and human rights. In addition, they promote an ideal of obedience to God's will rather than self-determination. The latter, however, is crucial for the notion of human rights. Concerning the practices of charity in the three religious traditions, he argued that they are not based on the recognition of a human right to material security. On the other hand, the assumptions underlying the prophetic ideal of social justice, taken together with the rabbinic view that all possessions ultimately belong to God, do seem to provide a theological foundation for the claim that nobody has an absolute right to property and hence an inherent right to own more than others. In the final analysis, God always remains the owner. Depending on how certain passages in Isaiah are interpreted (Isaiah 58:3 ff., for example), one could go so far as to say that it proposes an egalitarian view according to which all members of the community should have an equal share of both property and freedom. This would, in fact, be more radical than just recognition of a right to material security.

147

Conference Reports

Clemens Sedmak (King's College London) continued this session with a paper on 'Poverty and Human Dignity in Catholic Theology and Social Teaching'. He began with a reference to the 1996 declaration of the papal council 'Cor unum' on 'World Hunger', which is based on a set of fundamental assumptions of Catholic social teaching. It states that hunger poses a threat to human dignity; that avarice must be seen as a violation of Christian respect for the dignity of man and his environment; that human dignity had to be restored after the fall of man; and that the poor can teach the rich to reorientate their lives towards Christian values. The concept of human dignity is at the heart of Catholic social teaching. It is based not only on the concept of man being created in God's image but also on the notion that man is endowed with reason, free will, and the right to exercise this freedom. Catholic social teaching bases its specific definition of human rights as social rights on this concept of dignity. Its central categories of solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good are derived from there. Sedmak concluded with a systematic summary of the advantages and problems of Catholic social teaching. While this provides a coherent system of concepts concerning decent human life and society, it can be criticized for enforcing social inclusion and creating new types of social exclusion.

As a counterpart, Heinrich Bedford-Strohm (Bamberg University) spoke on 'Poverty and Dignity in Protestant Theology and Social Teaching'. He described the development of social teaching in Protestant theology from the Reformation period to present-day thinking. He interpreted Martin Luther's economic ethic, expressed in numerous writings, as a passionate plea against the new developments of early capitalism, based on the biblical option for the poor and natural law (the Golden Rule). Even though Luther's attacks on the economic practices of his time cannot simply be applied to the present challenges of modern global market economies, the underlying ethical impulses, such as a view of human dignity oriented towards the protection of the weak and poor, are highly relevant today. These impulses have strongly influenced Protestant social teaching since the Reformation. The speaker presented a contemporary example of how the Protestant churches have tried to develop a response to poverty honouring this tradition while also speaking to a modern pluralistic society: the Memorandum of the Council of the German Protestant Churches of 2006, 'Just Participation: Empower-

ment for Personal Responsibility and Solidarity'. The speaker described this memorandum as an example of public theology which sees the Christian tradition as a public resource for a commitment to human dignity and, as a consequence, the effort to overcome poverty.

Unfortunately Matthias Koenig (Göttingen University) who had agreed to give a paper on 'Reframing Poverty in Global Human Rights Discourse — Sociological Perspectives' fell ill and could not take part in the conference. His paper would have addressed the fact that the global institutionalization of human rights in the late twentieth century has significantly transformed cultural understandings of poverty and poverty relief. While modern responses to poverty were premised on both the institution of national citizenship with its set of civil, political, and social rights (Marshall) and an international system of states in which economic inequality was addressed by aid to 'development', freedom from poverty is now conceived as the hallmark of inalienable and indivisible human rights, and poverty as a violation of universalistic human dignity. In a sociological perspective, this development can be related to the increasingly global division of labour which, according to Durkheim, should give rise to a 'cult of the individual' and patterns of 'organic solidarity'. However, while there is clear empirical evidence that individualism does indeed form a core component of world culture, with strong isomorphic effects on the reconstruction of citizenship in many countries (Meyer), long-distance identification with suffering strangers and the resulting forms of transnational solidarity still appear to be rather weak. Whether universalistic human rights will provide a viable alternative to the classical modern programme of extending citizens' rights within a just international system of sovereign polities remains to be to seen.

The second session turned from concepts to practices and representations of the dignity of poverty and the poor in medieval and early modern Europe. It began with a paper by art historian Philine Helas (Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome) on 'Idealizing the Beggar's Body — Dignity, Poverty, and Classical Antiquity'. Given the social stigma attached to the 'strong beggar', it is astonishing to find that Italian art between about 1480 and 1560 features figures of beggars that do not display their inability to work through physical incapacity, but reflect models of beauty and virtue from classical antiquity such as the philosopher figure, or the hero. Two fields of discourse

149

obviously come into contact here: first, the discussion of human dignity as an essential element of Italian Humanism, and second, an artistic debate with antiquity and the associated canon of decorum, which fundamentally excluded repulsive figures. The fact that the figure of the beggar could experience such an artistic re-evaluation suggests that actual beggars were not, in principle, excluded from the notion of dignity.

The paper by Sebastian Schmidt (University of Trier) on 'The Dignity of the Poor in Administrative Texts, Legal (*policeywissenschaftliche*) Commentaries, and Welfare in the Early Modern Period' examined the contexts in which 'dignity' and 'poverty' were placed in the administrative texts of the ecclesiastical states of the Holy Roman Empire and in the legal commentaries of the early modern period, and looked at when the various concepts of dignity were transformed into 'worthiness of support', and when not. In contrast to present-day notions of inalienable human dignity associated with the right to social partnership, in the early modern period it was assumed that the 'dignity' of the poor derived from their actions. The poor had no dignity per se; it was something that accrued to them by their behaviour. The administrative texts and legal tracts allow us to distinguish three phases in which particular forms of behaviour were valued differently. In the sixteenth century the dignity of the poor was interpreted largely in terms of moral and religious models, such as Lazarus. Unlike in the Middle Ages, it was regarded as a Christian duty to ensure that support went only to the pious who were unable to work. In the seventeenth century these ideas were expanded by the addition of concepts drawn from the realm of order. The foreign poor were increasingly seen as a threat to peace and security. Itinerant beggars were thus registered in administrative texts as 'worthless riff-raff'. At the end of the seventeenth century, finally, the poor began to acquire a new value as the state's 'human capital'. The dignity of the poor was now measured mainly in terms of the enthusiasm with which they demonstrated their usefulness to the state. Those who were not prepared to be useful were to be trained in work houses and prisons. Forced labour was regarded as a means by which the poor could gain honour and earn social acceptance as worthy members of society. Thus only from the eighteenth century, when institutions to enforce inclusion were set up, did the idea that all the poor deserved support appear in administrative and legal texts.

The topic addressed by Alexander Wagner (University of Trier), 'Legal Practice and the Dignity of the Poor in Early Modern Europe', was closely related to Schmidt's. Wagner's paper dealt with statements concerning the dignity of the poor in legislation and the legal theory of poor relief. Because the legal sources of the early modern period lack a definition of dignity, Wagner used the understanding of human dignity as enshrined in Germany's Basic Law and its impact on the social system as a starting point. The Basic Law contains two fundamental interpretations in this context. One acknowledges human beings for their existence; the other recognizes human achievement. Both ideas can be found in early modern legislation and in the legal theory of Ahasver Fritsch.

Returning to a social historical perspective, Martin Scheutz (University of Vienna) gave a paper on the 'The Concept of Human Dignity in Austrian Court Records on Poverty Crimes'. He began by looking at an early eighteenth-century court case brought against a town herdsman whom the citizens had accused of maltreating and abusing beggars who entered the town. It is difficult to make out whether the citizens were appealing to the herdsman's sense of charity, and it also remains questionable whether, in making this complaint, they actually had the human dignity of the beggar in mind. In general, court documents contain perceptions of the poor as a threat to the sedentary populace, potential (or actual) thieves, or an administrative problem. However, the Christian idealization of poverty also played a central part in the beggars' self-perceptions and the burghers' statements. Peasants often spoke of 'acts of compassion' when they were forced to admit before a court that they had helped a beggar, which was illegal. Among beggars, compassion even seems to have been synonymous with begging itself: a beggar testified before court that, after his foot had been injured by a horse, he had spent eight or nine months 'vagabonding with the compassionate'. Beyond Christian charity, the documents examined contain no trace of other forms of support based on the idea of human dignity.

In his paper, '"A dismal countenance": Paupers and the Self-Presentation of Distress in Eighteenth-Century London' Tim Hitchcock (University of Hertfordshire) explored the physical strategies adopted by the poor of eighteenth-century London in their attempts to wrest a meagre livelihood from the charity of passers-by. Looking at the roles of disability, pregnancy, and gender, the paper

asked how the beggarly poor considered and used their own physical form in their negotiations with a wider audience. In the process it suggested that a fundamental awareness on the part of the poor of the impact of a broken body or swollen belly on better-off Londoners gave beggars a degree of power and authority which served as a form of 'pauper agency'. It concluded by suggesting that the dignity of the poor was located as much in this and other forms of agency as in the material conditions under which they suffered.

The final session of the conference dealt with 'The Dignity of the Poor in the Modern World'. In his paper, '"Poverty need no longer despair": Observations on the Dignity of the Poor in Late Enlightenment Catholic Prayer Books', Bernhard Schneider (University of Trier) analysed ten Catholic devotional and prayer books which were relatively well known at the time and had first been published between 1779 and 1837. In these prayer books poverty is accepted as a given and enduring social reality. In their poverty discourse the prayer books develop a strongly traditional 'theology of poverty' which draws no obvious distinction between various forms of poverty, for instance, between beggars and paupers. All in all, however, an indirect, unspoken presumption seems to prevail that social fringe groups such as beggars are not subsumed under the poor.

Dignity in general, and human dignity in particular, are not key concepts in the Catholic poverty discourse. This is conducted by means of other concepts and metaphors. These develop marked semantics of inclusion by which the poor are recognized as an integral part of the *communitas christiana* and members of the social body. Without actually using the term, the theological discourse attributes dignity to them. In terms of systems theory the functional system of religion/church fulfils its task in the poverty discourse of the prayer books, that of producing sense and meaning. It does so by offering both the poor and the non-poor inclusion, and providing a system-specific standardization that allows this inclusion to take place (piety, satisfaction with one's 'professional status', the practice of brotherly love, etc.). Parallel discourses, however, above all on the complex of 'work', reveal that semantics of exclusion are also present in the Catholic prayer books of the late Enlightenment, which reflect influences of exclusion processes in other functional systems.

Steven King (Oxford Brookes University) turned to the problem of the pauper's own perception of dignity. His paper, '"Think,

Gentlemen, how it would be if yu too ad lost your dignitie": Paupers and the Language and Rhetoric of Dignity in England 1800–1860' used material from a sample of more than 3,000 pauper letters from six English counties to explore the ways in which sick paupers (the group that posed the most moral hazard to officials) used the language and rhetoric of dignity in making their claims for poor relief. The paper argued that the nature of power relations within the Old Poor Law militated against the use, by overseer or pauper, of the exact term 'dignity', though both groups knew the word and its meaning. However, in the moral space created by vague entitlement rules, pauper letter writers and those writing on their behalf appear to have generated and deployed strong yardsticks of dignity. Some of these were role-specific — the inability to provide for one's children as a mother — others were more generalized, ranging from the ability or inability to procure a 'decent burial' through to the ability or inability to provide basic food and clothing to a family. Using pauper letters that are emblematic of the rhetorics of dignity found in the wider sample, the paper argued that the sick poor had a sophisticated understanding of the importance of dignity, and equivalent notions of honesty, civility, making do, and bearing up under adversity, in the relief process.

Kathrin Marx (University of Trier) addressed the problem of 'Deserving and Undeserving Poor from the Perspective of Rural Welfare Administration in Germany (1900–1933)'. In the practice of poor relief administration in small rural villages in the Southern Rhine Province, communal decision-makers subjected applicants for poor relief to an examination of their indigence. The applicants also had to prove, by the conduct of their lives, that they were 'good' and 'deserving' poor who were not to blame for their poverty. In the administrative correspondence the term 'deservingness' was rarely used explicitly. Rather, it was composed of a number of elements, such as ability and, especially, willingness to work, the abuse of alcohol, and sexual behaviour. The deservingness of an applicant was not the main criterion for granting or rejecting poor relief. In the cases investigated an application was never granted because of the applicant's special 'deservingness' unless he or she was indigent. This did not mean, however, that conversely all indigent people received relief. Even in cases of accepted 'indigence', which was not defined by law or in an administrative handbook, applicants could be reject-

153

ed, for example, if the community had run out of funds, or perhaps because applicants did not appear to be sufficiently 'deserving'.

Beate Althammer (University of Trier) presented a paper entitled ' "Poor Brothers" or "Parasites"? The Human Dignity of Beggars in Nineteenth-Century Germany'. As a rule, the poor were not perceived as a uniform group (and this is still true today). Rather, dichotomous attributions shaped the discourse concerning their moral and ethical qualities. Starting from the bad reputation that beggars enjoyed in early modern Europe, the paper examined the part played by the concept of dignity in creating these negative connotations. Drawing upon examples from a number of nineteenth-century German sources, Althammer showed that officials, lawyers, and other experts who had to deal with beggars in the course of their professional lives rarely used the concept of dignity explicitly. However, ideas of human dignity constantly reverberated in their statements. A fundamental change in causal connections must be noted. Until well past the middle of the nineteenth century, the notion that begging was degrading and thus destroyed originally intact individuals was dominant. The biological-medical interpretation that arose around the beginning of the twentieth century, however, turned this argument on its head. Begging was now seen as a symptom of a personality that had already been damaged, evidence of an essential inferiority.

Finally, Stefanie Kugler and Julia Patrut (University of Trier) returned to the topic of representations of dignity. Their paper, 'Outsiders (*innergesellschaftliche Fremde*) and Paupers in the Nineteenth-Century Novella' analysed Wilhelm Raabe's novella *Holunderblüte* as a prime example of the conflicting ideas on the dignity of the poor that were characteristic of the (German) literary discourse on this topic. After giving a systematic overview of the various dimensions of the term 'dignity', they distinguished between the Enlightenment notion of dignity as a personal goal in the development of the individual (Kant, Hegel), and Schopenhauer's sceptical position. They found both these approaches conflictingly intertwined in different characters in Raabe's novella. One protagonist, the Jewish girl Jemima, in her autonomy represented the concept of dignity founded in human nature, which can shine through even in undignified circumstances. The absurdity of making dignity conventional and redefining it as behaviour that conforms to bourgeois majority

society is illustrated in the novella in the person of Hermann, the *Medizinalrat* who, it transpires, has Jemima on his conscience. Hermann, who totally fulfils the role of a dignified citizen, is undignified as a human being. Jemima, on the other hand, who does not fulfil the expectations of an obsequious, perhaps even simple-minded, poor outsider, in fact proves in the end to be dignified. Ultimately, this reveals a whole complex of revaluation, particularly of poor gypsy outsiders, who acquire dignity by not conforming to expectations.

The final discussion summarized various aspects of the papers and the individual discussions in two ways. First, it looked again at the different methodological approaches upon which the different schools of thought concerning the concept of human dignity are based. There is a universalist approach which sees clear continuities from early Jewish and Christian traditions to modern concepts of human dignity, and there is an approach that stresses the discontinuities and changes that occurred especially during the Enlightenment period. The universalist approach concentrates on common elements of definitions of human dignity over time, such as man's endowment with reason and free will, which also implies the possibility that human dignity can be forfeited by man's own behaviour (sin). By contrast, the differentiating approaches stress the inalienability of human dignity and human rights. This is seen as something entirely new and unreconcilable with the older Christian tradition, according to which there can be no human dignity outside the religious framework.

Secondly, the discussion looked again at how this tension between the perception of dignity as a natural endowment, and the religious notion that dignity has to be earned and can be lost through sin opened up a moral, or perhaps moralizing, space in which the social parties had to negotiate their rights and duties. Dignity must be seen, as Jan Eckel (University of Freiburg) put it in the discussion, as a social resource. Religious and philosophical concepts could be seen, to use Stephen Greenblatt's terminology, as cultural formations shaped by 'the circulation of social energy'. In any case, they play a distinct role in this game which is about individual dignity as well as the common good, and in which both sides, the paupers and the wealthy, have their particular capital or currency to influence the outcome.

155

The participants agreed that approaches such as these are fruitful for overcoming the division between conceptual and social history, and that future research on poverty and poor relief should turn more to these dimensions of moral and moralizing negotiations.

Andreas Gestrich (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 paper 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 Indra Sengupta-Frey on 020 7309 2018 or email her on: isengupta@ghil.ac.uk

5 June   Alexander Schunka
          Englisch-preußische Konfessionspolitik in der Korrespondenz Londoner und Oxforder gelehrter Zirkel um 1700

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

12 Dec.   Benno Gammerl
(2006)   Staatsangehörigkeit, Staatsbürgerschaft und ethnische oder 'rassische' Differenzierungen im britischen Weltreich und in Österreich-Ungarn, 1867–1918

30 Jan.   Sebastian Zanke
          Johannes XXII. (1316–34) und Europa: Avignon zwischen Zentrum und Peripherie

6 Feb.   Prof. Eckart Conze
          Jenseits der Erfolgsstory: Überlegungen zu einer anderen Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Noticeboard

13 Feb.   Sonia Schackert
Produktkommunikation und Marke in der Automobilindustrie im internationalen Vergleich

20 Feb.   Florian Altenhöner
'Der Mann, der den Krieg auslöste': Alfred Naujocks (1911–66)

6 Mar.   Julia Tischler
'Big push' for development: Technische Großprojekte und radikale Eingriffe in sozio-ökologische Systeme als Motor für 'Entwicklung': Der Kariba-Staudamm im heutigen Sambia/Sambesi

13 Mar.   Nadine Freund
Weiblichkeit und Westintegration: Theanolte Bähnisch, die 'Stimme der Frau' und der Wiederaufbau Deutschlands im Kontext des Kalten Krieges

13 Mar.   Peter Itzen
Die Church of England und die Konservative Partei nach 1945

20 Mar.   Jakob Hort
Architektur der Diplomatie—zwischen Exklave und öffentlichem Raum: Botschaftsgebäude europäischer Staaten in vergleichender Perspektive 1870–1970

10 Apr.   Dorothée Döpfer
Chile und die Westeuropäer: Ein sozialhistorischer Vergleich deutscher, britischer und französischer Immigration in Chile, 1870–1910

17 Apr.   Bertram Tröger
Britische Wallfahrten 1850–1930

24 Apr.   Agnes Arndt
Zivilgesellschaft, Demokratie und Sozialismus im intellektuellen Transfer der Neuen Linken zwischen West- und Ostmitteleuropa (1968–89)

8 May   Michael Zeheter
          Epidemien und Imperialismen. Eine Umweltgeschichte von
          Infektionskrankheiten in Algerien, Indien und Kanada,
          1815–1923

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 re-
search 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 Ger-
man history or Anglo-German relations. Scholarships are advertised
each year in September on H-Soz-u-Kult and the GHIL's website.
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 ap-
propriate), 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. For the year 2007 the following scholarships have been
awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo-
German relations.

Ph.D. Scholarships
Florian Altenhöner: 'Der Mann, der den Krieg auslöste': Alfred Nau-
jocks (1911–66)
Katharina Böhmer: 'Halbstarke' in Westeuropa: Amerikanisierung und
Gesellschaftswandel in Frankreich, Großbritannien und der Bundes-
republik, 1955–65

Noticeboard

Dorothée Döpfer: Chile und die Westeuropäer: Ein sozialhistorischer Vergleich deutscher, britischer und französischer Immigration in Chile, 1870–1910

Nadine Freund: Weiblichkeit und Westintegration: Theanolte Bähnisch, die 'Stimme der Frau' und der Wiederaufbau Deutschlands im Kontext des Kalten Krieges

Kate Elswit: Dramaturgy of the Body in German Dance Theatre (1915–33)

Jakob Hort: Architektur der Diplomatie—zwischen Exklave und öffentlichem Raum: Botschaftsgebäude europäischer Staaten in vergleichender Perspektive 1870–1970

Peter Itzen: Die Church of England und die Konservative Partei nach 1945

Aaron M. P. Jacobsen: The East-Germanization Process: How 'Resettlers' became 'East' Germans

Peter Kramper: 'Drink beer by the pint, not the litre': Messen, Zählen und Wiegen in Großbritannien 1750–1914

Roshan Magub: Edgar Julius Jung (1894–1934): A Biography

Meryn McLaren: Refugee Camps in West Germany 1945–60: Institutions, Community, Integration

Klaus Nathaus: Die industrielle Produktion von Kultur in ihrer sozialen Einbettung: 'Cultural Industries' in Deutschland und Großbritannien

Markus M. Nöhl: Kulturelle Symboliken und Aneignungen des Automobils in den 1960er Jahren im europäischen Vergleich (1958–74)

Helke Rausch: US-amerikanische Wissenschaftsphilanthropie in Frankreich, Deutschland und Großbritannien in der Zwischen- und Nachkriegszeit (ca. 1920–70)

Sonia Schackert: Produktkommunikation und Marke in der Automobilindustrie im internationalen Vergleich

Thorsten Schulz: Die Sicherheitsdimensionen der internationalen Umweltpolitik in Europa: Grenzen—Möglichkeiten—Tendenzen. Das Beispiel Deutschland, England und USA 1965 bis 1975

Dr Alexander Schunka: Englisch–preußische Konfessionspolitik in der Korrespondenz Londoner und Oxforder gelehrter Zirkel um 1700

Julia Tischler: 'Big push' for development: Technische Großprojekte und radikale Eingriffe in sozio-ökologische Systeme als Motor für 'Entwicklung'. Der Kariba-Staudamm im heutigen Sambia/Sambesi

Bertram Tröger: Britische Wallfahrten 1850–1930

Damien Valdez: Bachofen

Helen Whatmore: Comparative Exploration of the Relations Established between Local Civilian Populations of Western Europe and Nazi Camps Implanted in their Midst

Andreas Willershausen: Die päpstliche Kurie in Avignon als politisches Milieu (1305/9–76)

Sebastian Zanke: Johannes XXII. (1316–34) und Europa: Avignon zwischen Zentrum und Peripherie

Michael Zeheter: Epidemien und Imperialismen: Eine Umweltgeschichte von Infektionskrankheiten in Algerien, Indien und Kanada, 1815–1923

DGIA travel grants

Agnes A. Arndt: Zivilgesellschaft, Demokratie und Sozialismus im intellektuellen Transfer der Neuen Linken zwischen West- und Ostmitteleuropa (1968–89)

Dr Maren Möhring: Ausländische Gastronomie in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Migrations- und konsumhistorische Perspektiven

Dr Raphaela Veit: Quellenstudien zum Qanun fi t-tibb des Ibn Sina (Avicenna)

Mio Wakita-Elis: Die Vermarktung der Kimono-Schönheiten in der japanischen Souvenirfotografie der Meiji-Zeit.

Noticeboard

Postgraduate Students' Conference

The German Historical Institute London held its eleventh postgraduate students' conference on 11–13 Jan. 2007. 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. For the first time the gathering opened with a visit to one of Britain's leading academic institutions, the British Library. Susan Reed, acting head of the German Department, introduced participants to some of the library's immense German holdings. The Institute also presented itself as a research centre for German history in London, and introduced 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. Twenty-three projects in all were introduced in plenary sessions held over two days. As in past years most papers dealt with the twentieth century. Apart from one presentation on the early modern period and two on the nineteenth century, all other speakers had embarked upon projects which concentrate on more or less the last hundred years of German history, in a few cases harking back to the late nineteenth century. In this context, however, it is striking that scholarly interest seems to be fairly evenly spread over all periods of twentieth-century history, with post-Second World War history slightly in the lead. Also conspicuous was the prominence of approaches from cultural history in many of the presentations.

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 2008. 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

Speakers at the 2007 Postgraduate Students' Conference

Daniel Braw (Bielefeld): Faith and Method: Leopold von Ranke and the Religious Foundation of Scientific History

Alison Carrol (Exeter): National and Political Identity in Interwar Alsace

Ruth Easingwood (Newcastle): Being British in Germany: Representations of Britishness in Everyday Life

Kate Elswit: (Cambridge) Dramaturgy of the Body in German Dance Theatre (1914-1933)

Michael Frisch (Cambridge): Technical Consumption, Consumerism and the Electrical Industry in Interwar Germany, 1919–39

Maria Fritsche (Portsmouth): The Reconstruction of Masculinity and National Identity in Austrian Film After the Second World War

Robyn Hall (Nottingham): Operationalising Surprise: The *Abwehr* and the German State, 1918–41

Victoria Harris (Cambridge): Realities and Perception of Prostitution in Germany, 1914–45

Amy Holmes (Johns Hopkins): Contentious Allies: The Peace Movement and the American Military Presence in Germany

Julia von dem Knesebeck (Oxford): The Compensation of Roma Holocaust Victims in Germany Since 1945

Chris Knowles (London): British Occupation of Germany 1945–6

Christoph Laucht (Liverpool): German-Speaking Émigré Atomic Scientists and British Nuclear Culture, 1939–65: The Cases of Klaus Fuchs and Rudolf E. Peierls

Noticeboard

Jan Lemnitzer (LSE): Prussia, Bismarck and Maritime Law of Warfare
Meryn McLaren (Sheffield): Refugee Camps in West Germany 1945–60: Community Building and Integration
Tom Neuhaus (Cambridge): British and German Expeditions to Tibet and the Himalayas, *c.*1890–1953
Siobhan O'Connor (Limerick): German-Speaking Refugees Who Came to Ireland from 1933 to 1945 and Irish Government Policy Toward Them
Christopher Probst (London): Protestant Scholarship, Luther, and 'The Jews' in Nazi Germany: The Case of Heinrich Bornkamm
Alan Ross (Oxford): A Latin School and the Vernacular in Seventeenth-Century Zwickau: A Case Study in the Social History of Education
Hugo Service (Cambridge): The Politics of Nationality and Forced Migration of Germans in Silesia at the End of the Second World War
Matthew Smith (London): Making Sense of the Germans: Britain Debates the 'German Problem', 1945–8
Christiane Winkler (London): Former German POWs and Reintegration Used as Topoi in Public Discourse in East and West Germany from 1945 until Today
Mehmet Yercil (Cambridge): Anatolia as a Zone of Contact and Transculturation in the Ottoman Empire (1875–1914)
Louisa Zanoun (LSE): Between France and Germany: The Question of French Lorraine, 1870–1920

Contact details may be obtained from the GHIL.

Prize of the German Historical Institute London

The German Historical Institute London awards an annual prize for an outstanding Ph.D. thesis on German history (submitted to a British university), British history (submitted to a German university), Anglo-German relations, or an Anglo-German comparative topic. The Prize is 1,000 Euros. In 2006 the prize was awarded to Michael Ledger-Lomas for his thesis, 'The Idea of Germany in Religious, Educational and Cultural Thought in England, *c.*1830–65', submitted to the University of Cambridge.

To be eligible a thesis must have been submitted to a British or German university after 31 Aug. 2006. To apply, send:

~   one copy of the thesis
~   a one-page abstract
~   examiners' reports on the thesis
~   a brief CV
~   a declaration that the author will allow it to be considered for publication in the Institute's German-language series, and that the work will not be published before the judges have reached a final decision

to reach the Director of the German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, by 31 Aug. 2007.

The Prize will be presented on the occasion of the Institute's Annual Lecture in November 2007.

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

Noticeboard

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.

KERSTIN BRÜCKWEH studied history at the University of Bielefeld and Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA. Before joining the GHIL as a Research Fellow in 2007 she worked as an editor for politics and history in Munich. Her main field of interest is the twentieth century. She received an MA for a study of the history of medicine and medical ethics in the USA and wrote a Ph.D. thesis on the history of violence in Germany which was published in 2006 as *Mordlust: Serienmorde, Gewalt und Emotionen im 20. Jahrhundert*. She is now working on a history of opinion polling in Great Britain.

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* (2006). 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 early 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 of ethnic and 'national' stereotypes in medieval Europe. His

most recent publication is *England and the Avignon Popes: The Practice of Diplomacy in Late Medieval Europe* (2005).

MATTHIAS REISS was a Research Fellow at the GHIL from 2002 to 2007. He is the author of *Die Schwarzen waren unsere Freunde: Deutsche Kriegsgefangene in der amerikanischen Gesellschaft 1942–1946*, and his current project is a study entitled 'The Unemployed, Protest, and the Public in Britain since 1870'. He joined the History Department at the University of Exeter on 1 March 2007.

TORSTEN RIOTTE was a Research Fellow at the GHIL from January 2003 to March 2007. While at the Institute he was, with Markus Mößlang, in charge of the Institute's four-volume edition *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*. An essay collection, *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714–1837* (2007), which he edited with Brendan Simms, has recently been published. He has now taken up a new position as lecturer in nineteenth-century European history at the University of Frankfurt am Main.

MICHAEL SCHAICH joined the GHIL in 1999. After completing his MA he became a research assistant in the history department at the University of Munich. His Ph.D. thesis on Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment in Bavaria was published in 2001 as *Staat und Öffentlichkeit im Kurfürstentum Bayern der Spätaufklärung*. He is also the editor (with Jörg Neuheiser) of *Political Rituals in Great Britain, 1700–2000* (2006) and of *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (2007). 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 joined the GHIL in September 2004. She studied history at the University of Calcutta and received her doctoral degree from the University of Heidelberg. She has taught at the universities of Calcutta and Heidelberg (South Asia Institute) and held a research fellowship with the University of Tübingen. Her research interests include the history of encounters between European and non-European cultures, German Orientalism, and British colonialism in India. Her recent publications include *From Salon to Discipline: State,*

University and Indology in Germany, 1821–1914 (2005) and 'Indologie' in *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* (in press). Her current research project is on archaeology, monuments, and sacred space in colonial India.

BENEDIKT STUCHTEY is Deputy Director of the GHIL. His main research interest is presently the history of European imperialism and he has completed his *Habilitationsschrift* on anti-colonialism from the early modern period to the twentieth century 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 boards of *European Review of History. Revue Européenne d'Histoire* and *Storia della Storiografia. History of Historiography*.

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. 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), co-editor of *Birth or Talent? A Comparison of British–German Elites* (2003), and editor of *European Aristocracies and the Radical Right in the Interwar Years* (forthcoming).

Forthcoming Conferences

Anglo-German Mythologies in Literature, the Visual Arts and Cultural Theory. Conference organized by the Centre for Anglo-German Cultural Relations, Queen Mary, University of London, in cooperation with the GHIL, to be held at the Centre for Anglo-German Cultural Relations, 25–27 Apr. 2007

Mythos or myth-making, according to the narratives proposed by both Plato and Aristotle, represents the non-rational mode through which human beings first came to terms with their existence by composing tales and stories about the origins of the universe and the place of human beings within this universe. In this sense the term *mythos* has always encompassed aesthetic forms of representation. With these premisses in mind, this conference aims to address the subject of 'mythologies', both within the specific English and German cultural traditions, and also with regard to Anglo-German cultural relations in general. Topics covered will include theories of myth, the reception of classical myths in modern German- and English-language literature, myths of national identity, and representations of myth in visual culture. Keynote Speakers include Wilfried Barner (Göttingen), Kurt Hübner (Kiel), Christoph Jamme (Lüneburg), and Robert Segal (Lancaster/Aberdeen).

Partisan and Anti-Partisan Warfare in German-Occupied Europe 1939–45. Conference to be held at Glasgow Caledonian University in cooperation with the German Historical Institute London, 21–22 June 2007

In an age of total warfare, as belligerents have sought increasingly not only to defeat their enemies militarily, but also to subjugate and exploit conquered territory, partisan and anti-partisan warfare have assumed increasing importance. They are important not just because they can influence the outcomes of wars but also because they impact on civilian populations and blur the distinction between combatant and non-combatant, raising complex moral questions for those involved. Both effective military measures and securing the popula-

tion's cooperation, or at least acquiescence, are crucial to success in partisan warfare. This conference will examine the forces that shaped the conduct of partisan warfare from the perspective of both occupying forces and partisans in German-occupied Europe during the Second World War.

The conference is an opportunity to present and discuss new research in this field. Papers will address as their theme one or more of the range of factors, and not solely the military ones, that shaped conduct in partisan and/or anti-partisan warfare in German-occupied Europe. Numerous papers analyse the interaction of partisan and/or anti-partisan units with civilian populations, or the conflict from the viewpoint of more than one side.

Religious Communication Networks, 1680–1830. Conference to be held at the German Historical Institute London, 12–14 July 2007

The meaning and importance of communication networks for the constitution of groups and other kinds of social systems has increasingly attracted the attention of historical scholarship. Religious studies, however, have been affected only marginally by concepts of communicative connectedness. This is partly due to the dominance of self-descriptions of religious systems in religious studies. This conference will examine how local, regional, and global communication networks construct religious systems and affect religious semantics during the long eighteenth century. It will approach this topic from four different perspectives: (1) The construction of religious individuals, groups, communities, and movements as the function of communication networks. (2) The emergence of religious institutions, organizations, and bureaucracies from communication networks. (3) The determination, description, and occupation of religious times and spaces in the processes of communicative connectedness. (4) The definition and use of media, forms of interaction, and infrastructures in communication networks.

For further information please contact Professor Andreas Gestrich: gestrich@ghil.ac.uk

National Traditions or International Trends? Reconsidering the 1950s and 1960s as an Orientation Period in West Germany. Conference to be held at University College London, 14–15 Sept. 2007

On 14-15 Sept. 2007 UCL's History Department will host an international conference organized by Friedrich Kießling (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg) and Bernhard Rieger (University College London). The event will consider to what extent processes of consolidating democracy in West Germany in the 1950s and 1960s can be ascribed to 'Westernization' that, as much recent research has argued, coincided with a rejection of various domestic political and cultural traditions. To complement recent findings, we will also investigate how contemporaries reshaped and reclaimed domestic traditions to further the acceptance of a democratic and liberal culture. An analysis of the tensions between rejection and re-appropriation of domestic political, economic, and cultural traditions will advance our understanding of how democratic and liberal concepts came to figure prominently in an evolving collective identity with distinctly West German contours. Bringing together scholars from the United States, Britain, and Germany, the gathering is supported by the Gerda Henkel Stiftung, the Centre for European Studies, the History Department at UCL, the German Historical Institute London, the German History Society, and the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg.

Sixth Workshop on Early Modern German History, to be held at the German Historical Institute London, 19 Oct. 2007

The first workshop ran in 2002 and has now established itself as the principal forum for cross-disciplinary discussion of new research on early modern German-speaking Central Europe. Previous themes have included artistic and literary representations, medicine and musicology, as well as political, social, economic, and religious history. Contributions are welcome from those wishing to range outside the period generally considered as 'early modern', and from those engaged in comparative research on other parts of early modern Europe.

Noticeboard

The day will be organized as a series of themed workshops, each introduced by a panel chair and consisting of two to three short papers and a general discussion. The point of the papers is to present new findings or work-in-progress in summary form, rather than extended detailed discussion. Accordingly, participants are encouraged to keep to 10 minutes, highlight major findings or questions, and indicate how work might develop in the future.

If you are interested in presenting a short paper, please send a short synopsis by 31 May 2007 to:

Prof Peter H. Wilson
Dept. of History
University of Hull
Hull HU6 7RX
p.h.wilson@hull.ac.uk

Dr Michael Schaich
German Historical Institute
17 Bloomsbury Square
London WC1A 2NJ
schaich@ghil.ac.uk

German History Society

The Annual General Meeting of the German History Society will take place on Saturday, 20 Oct. 2007, at the German Historical Institute. In conjunction with the AGM there will be a one-day conference on the theme of 'Food in German History'; speakers will include Beat Kümin (Warwick), Dorothee Brantz (Buffalo), Maren Möhring (Cologne), and Dorothee Wierling (Hamburg). For further details, please contact the Secretary of the German History Society, Dr Annika Mombauer: (a.mombauer@open.ac.uk).

Cosmopolitan Networks in Commerce and Society 1660–1914. Conference to be held at the German Historical Institute London, 6–8 Dec. 2007

The concept of networks as a particular form of (social) interaction and organization has become highly popular in many disciplines over the last two decades. However, the subject has not yet lost its challenges. Network theory has been applied in economic history to explain the contemporary growth of international and global trade. Being actor-oriented and focusing particularly on the coordinating activities of individuals, the network approach can also be used to explain economic and social changes in the early modern period and, therefore, provide a useful framework for studies in long-term developments and comparisons over time.

From the seventeenth century, long-distance trade was organized and managed not only by the large trading companies but increasingly also by individual merchants and their informal commercial networks. This led to the emergence of extensive cosmopolitan trade networks based on family ties, ethnicity, business, or religion. These networks stretched beyond national boundaries and regulations, and were frequently interlinked with networks of other minorities as well as with those of the ruling elites in more than one country. This meant that they often received the support of these states in external as well as domestic matters.

The aim of this conference is to look at the long-term development of the quality and functions as well as structural weaknesses and failures of cosmopolitan networks over time.

Papers that address the following topics are welcomed:
(1) Geographies of transnational trade networks and their dynamics
(2) Strengths and weaknesses of networks
(3) Networks of influence and power

For further information, or to submit an abstract of a paper (up to 500 words) with a short CV by 15 July 2007, please contact PD Dr Margrit Schulte Beerbühl (schulteb@phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de).

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.

Adorno, Theodor W. and Alban Berg, *Correspondence 1925–1935*, ed. Henri Lonitz, trans. Wieland Hoban (Cambridge: Polity, 2005)

Althoff, Gerd, *Heinrich IV.* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesell-schaft, 2006)

Aly, Götz, *Hitlers Volksstaat: Raub, Rassenkrieg und nationaler Sozialis-mus* (4th edn.; Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2005)

Annas, Gabriele, *Hoftag, Gemeiner Tag, Reichstag: Studien zur struktu-rellen Entwicklung deutscher Reichsversammlungen des späten Mittel-alters (1349–1471),* Schriftenreihe der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 68; with a CD-ROM: Verzeichnis der Besucher deutscher Reichsversammlungen des späten Mittelalters, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rup-recht, 2004)

Arnold, John H., *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005)

Auffarth, Christoph, *Die Ketzer: Katharer, Waldenser und andere religiö-se Bewegungen* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Baganz, Carina, *Erziehung zur 'Volksgemeinschaft?': Die frühen Konzen-trationslager in Sachsen 1933–34/37*, Geschichte der Konzentrations-lager 1933–1945, 6 (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2005)

Bald, Detlef (ed.), *'Wider die Kriegsmaschinerie': Kriegserfahrungen und Motive zum Widerstand der 'Weissen Rose'* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2005)

Bald, Detlef, *Die Bundeswehr: Eine kritische Geschichte 1955–2005* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Barkai, Avraham, *Oscar Wassermann und die Deutsche Bank: Bankier in schwieriger Zeit* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Barth, Boris and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds.), *Zivilisierungsmissionen: Imperiale Weltverbesserung seit dem 18. Jahrhundert*, Historische Kulturwissenschaft, 6 (Constance: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 2005)

Barth, Boris, *Genozid: Völkermord im 20. Jahrhundert: Geschichte, Theorien, Kontroversen* (Munich: Beck, 2006)

Barth, Thomas, *Adelige Lebenswege im Alten Reich: Der Landadel der Oberpfalz im 18. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg: Pustet, 2005)

Bauerkämper, Arnd, *Der Faschismus in Europa 1918–1945* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2006)

Baumann, Anette (ed.), *Gedruckte Relationen und Voten des Reichskammergerichts vom 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert: Ein Findbuch*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Höchsten Gerichtsbarkeit im Alten Reich, 48 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004)

Baumann, Anette, Peter Oestmann, et al. (eds.), *Prozesspraxis im Alten Reich: Annäherungen, Fallstudien, Statistiken*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Höchsten Gerichtsbarkeit im Alten Reich, 50 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Baumgarten, Jens, *Konfession, Bild und Macht: Visualisierung als katholisches Herrschafts- und Disziplinierungskonzept in Rom und im habsburgischen Schlesien (1560–1740)*, Hamburger Veröffentlichungen zur Geschichte Mittel- und Osteuropas, 11 (Hamburg: Dölling und Galitz, 2004)

Baumgarten, Klaus-Dieter and Peter Freitag (eds.), *Die Grenzen der DDR: Geschichte, Fakten, Hintergründe* (2nd rev. edn.; Berlin: Edition ost, 2005)

Baycroft, Timothy and Mark Hewitson (eds.), *What is a Nation? Europe 1789–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Becker, Felicitas and Jigal Beez (eds.), *Der Maji-Maji-Krieg in Deutsch-Ostafrika 1905–1907* (Berlin: Links Verlag, 2005)

Benjamin, Walter, *Berlin Childhood around 1900*, trans. Howard Eiland (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006)

Benz, Wigbert, *Paul Carell: Ribbentrops Pressechef Paul Karl Schmidt vor und nach 1945* (Berlin: wvb, 2005)

Bernhard, Patrick, *Zivildienst zwischen Reform und Revolte: Eine bundesdeutsche Institution im gesellschaftlichen Wandel 1961–1982*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 64 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Bevir, Mark and Frank Trentmann (eds.), *Markets in Historical Contexts: Ideas and Politics in the Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Beyme, Klaus von, *Das Zeitalter der Avantgarden: Kunst und Gesellschaft 1905–1955* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Birn, Ruth Bettina, *Die Sicherheitspolizei in Estland 1941–1944: Eine Studie zur Kollaboration im Osten* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006)

Bloxham, Donald and Tony Kushner, *The Holocaust: Critical Historical Approaches* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005)

Bodemann, Y. Michal, *A Jewish Family in Germany Today: An Intimate Portrait* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005)

Bonnell, Andrew G., *The People's Stage in Imperial Germany: Social Democracy and Culture 1890–1914*, International Library of Historical Studies, 35 (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2005)

Borchert, Angela and Ralf Dressel (eds.), *Das Journal des Luxus und der Moden: Kultur um 1800*, Ereignis Weimar–Jena, 8 (Heidelberg: Winter, 2004)

Born, Max, *The Born–Einstein Letters: Friendship, Politics and Physics in Uncertain Times. Correspondence between Albert Einstein and Max and Hedwig Born from 1916 to 1955 with Commentaries by Max Born*, trans. Irene Born (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2005)

Brandt, Willy, *Über Europa hinaus: Dritte Welt und Sozialistische Internationale*, ed. Bernd Rother and Wolfgang Schmidt, Berliner Ausgabe, 8 (Bonn: Dietz, 2006)

Brechenmacher, Thomas, *Der Vatikan und die Juden: Geschichte einer unheiligen Beziehung vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Brechtken, Magnus, *Scharnierzeit 1895–1907: Persönlichkeitsnetze und Internationale Politik in den Deutsch-Britisch-Amerikanischen Beziehungen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, 195 (Mainz: von Zabern, 2006)

Breinersdorfer, Fred (ed.), *Sophie Scholl: Die letzten Tage* (4th edn; Frankfurt/M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005)

Breloer, Heinrich, *Speer und Er: Hitlers Architekt und Rüstungsminister* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2005)

Breloer, Heinrich, *Unterwegs zur Familie Speer: Begegnungen, Gespräche, Interviews* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2005)

Breloer, Heinrich and Rainer Zimmer, *Die Akte Speer: Spuren eines Kriegsverbrechers* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2006)

Brenner-Wilczek, Sabine, Gertrude Cepl-Kaufmann, and Max Plassmann, *Einführung in die moderne Archivarbeit* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006)

Breuel, Birgit and Michael C. Burda (eds.), *Ohne historisches Vorbild: Die Treuhandanstalt 1990 bis 1994. Eine kritische Würdigung* (Berlin: Bostelmann & Siebenhaar, 2005)

Brodocz, André, Christoph Oliver Mayer, et al. (eds.), *Institutionelle Macht: Genese, Verstetigung, Verlust* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Brown, Christopher Boyd, *Singing the Gospel: Lutheran Hymns and the Success of the Reformation,* Harvard Historical Studies, 148 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005)

Brüning, Rainer and Gabriele Wüst (eds.), *Die Bestände des Generallandesarchivs Karlsruhe*, pt. 6: *Bestände des Alten Reiches, insbesondere Generalakten (71–228)*, Veröffentlichungen der Staatlichen Archivverwaltung Baden-Württemberg, 39/6 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006)

Bulisch, Jens, *Evangelische Presse in der DDR: 'Die Zeichen der Zeit' (1947–1990),* Arbeiten zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Darstellungen, 43 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006)

Burschel, Peter, *Sterben und Unsterblichkeit: Zur Kultur des Martyriums in der frühen Neuzeit*, Ancien Régime, Aufklärung und Revolution, 35 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

Buschfort, Wolfgang, *Geheime Hüter der Verfassung: Von der Düsseldorfer Informationsstelle zum ersten Verfassungsschutz der Bundesrepublik (1947–1961)* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Caspary, Gundula, *Späthumanismus und Reichspatriotismus: Melchior Goldast und seine Editionen zur Reichsverfassungsgeschichte*, Formen der Erinnerung, 25 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006)

Charles, Daniel, *Between Genius and Genocide: The Tragedy of Fritz Haber, Father of Chemical Warfare* (London: Cape, 2005)

Chickering, Roger, Stig Förster, et al. (eds.), *A World at Total War: Global Conflict and the Politics of Destruction, 1937–1945*, Publications of the German Historical Institute Washington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Conradi, Peter, *Hitler's Piano Player: The Rise and Fall of Ernst Hanfstaengl, Confidant of Hitler, Ally of FDR* (London: Duckworth, 2005)

Conze, Eckart, Ulrich Lappenküper, et al. (eds.), *Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen: Erneuerung und Erweiterung einer historischen Disziplin* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004)

Czerny, Helga, *Der Tod der bayerischen Herzöge im Spätmittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit 1347–1579: Vorbereitungen, Sterben, Trauerfeierlichkeiten, Grablegen, Memoria*, Schriftenreihe zur bayerischen Landesgeschichte, 146 (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Dahrendorf, Ralf, *Versuchungen der Unfreiheit: Die Intellektuellen in Zeiten der Prüfung* (Munich: Beck, 2006)

Defrance, Corine and Ulrich Pfeil (eds.), *Der Elysée-Vertrag und die deutsch-französischen Beziehungen 1945–1963–2003*, Pariser Historische Studien, 71 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Demandt, Alexander, Andreas Goltz, and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen (eds.), *Theodor Mommsen: Wissenschaft und Politik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005)

Dilly, Heinrich and Holger Zaunstöck (eds.), *Fürst Franz: Beiträge zu seiner Lebenswelt in Anhalt-Dessau 1740–1817* (Halle/Saale: Mitteldeutscher Verlag, 2005)

Dirks, Christian, *'Die Verbrechen der anderen'. Auschwitz und der Auschwitz-Prozess der DDR: Das Verfahren gegen den KZ-Arzt Dr. Horst Fischer* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006)

Döscher, Hans-Jürgen, *Seilschaften: Die verdrängte Vergangenheit des Auswärtigen Amts* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2005)

Dowe, Christopher, *Auch Bildungsbürger: Katholische Studierende und Akademiker im Kaiserreich*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 171 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006)

Dowe, Dieter, Karlheinz Kuba, and Michael Kubina (eds.), *FDGB-Lexikon: Funktion, Struktur, Kader und Entwicklung einer Massenorganisation der SED (1945–1990)*, Arbeitspapiere des Forschungsverbundes SED-Staat, 36 (Berlin: Forschungsverbund SED-Staat, 2005)

Dreesbach, Anne, *Gezähmte Wilde: Die Zurschaustellung 'exotischer' Menschen in Deutschland 1870–1940* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2005)

Durucz, Peter, *Ungarn in der auswärtigen Politik des Dritten Reiches 1942–1945* (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2006)

Eakin-Thimme, Gabriela Ann, *Geschichte im Exil: Deutschsprachige Historiker nach 1933,* Forum deutsche Geschichte, 8 (Munich: m press, 2005)

Eckart, Wolfgang U. (ed.), *Man, Medicine and the State: The Human Body as an Object of Government-Sponsored Medical Research in the Twentieth Century*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, 2 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006)

Ehlert, Hans, Michael Epkenhans, et al. (eds.), *Der Schlieffenplan: Analysen und Dokumente*, Zeitalter der Weltkriege, 2 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006)

Engler, Harald, *Die Finanzierung der Reichshauptstadt: Untersuchungen zu den haupstadtbedingten staatlichen Ausgaben Preußens und des Deutschen Reiches in Berlin vom Kaiserreich bis zum Dritten Reich (1871–1945),* Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin, 105 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004)

Erenberg, Lewis A., *The Greatest Fight of our Generation: Louis vs. Schmeling* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Ernesti, Jörg, *Ferdinand von Fürstenberg (1626–1683): Geistiges Profil eines barocken Fürstbischofs*, Studien und Quellen zur westfälischen Geschichte, 51 (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2004)

Fäßler, Peter E., *Durch den 'Eisernen Vorhang': Die deutsch-deutschen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen 1949–1969*, Wirtschafts- und Sozialhistorische Studien, 14 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Faulenbach, Bernd (ed.), *Zwangsmigration in Europa: Zur wissenschaftlichen und politischen Auseinandersetzung um die Vertreibung der Deutschen aus dem Osten* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2005)

Fauth, Tim, D*eutsche Kulturpolitik im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren 1939 bis 1941*, Berichte und Studien/Hannah-Arendt-Institut für Totalitarismusforschung, 45 (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2004)

Fear, Jeffrey R., *Organizing Control: August Thyssen and the Construction of German Corporate Management*, Harvard Studies in Business History, 45 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005)

Feld, Helmut, *Ignatius von Loyola: Gründer des Jesuitenordens* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Fest, Joachim C., *Der lange Abschied vom Bürgertum: Joachim Fest und Wolf Jobst Siedler im Gespräch mit Frank A. Meyer* (Berlin: wjs, 2005)

Fischer, Erica and Simone Ladwig-Winters, *Die Wertheims: Geschichte einer Familie* (2nd edn.; Berlin: Rowohlt, 2005)

Fischer, Torsten, *Y-a-t-il une fatalité d'hérédité dans la pauvreté? Dans l'Europe moderne: les cas d'Aberdeen et de Lyon,* Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beihefte 187 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006)

Fischer-Seidel, Therese and Marion Fries-Dieckmann (eds.), *Der unbekannte Beckett: Samuel Beckett und die deutsche Kultur* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2005)

Flügel, Wolfgang, K*onfession und Jubiläum: Zur Institutionalisierung der lutherischen Gedenkkultur in Sachsen 1617–1830*, Schriften zur sächsischen Geschichte und Volkskunde, 14 (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitäts-Verlag, 2005)

Fohrmann, Jürgen (ed.), *Gelehrte Kommunikation: Wissenschaft und Medium zwischen dem 16. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005)

Frahm, Klaus, *Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas*, ed. Stiftung Denkmal für die Ermordeten Juden Europas (Berlin: Nicolai, 2005)

Francini, Esther Tisa, *Liechtenstein und der internationale Kunstmarkt 1933–1945: Sammlungen und ihre Provenienzen im Spannungsfeld von Flucht, Raub und Restitution*, Veröffentlichungen der Unabhängigen Historikerkommission Liechtenstein Zweiter Weltkrieg, Studie 4 (Vaduz: Chronos Verlag, 2005)

Frank, Isnard Wilhelm, *Lexikon des Mönchtums und der Orden* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005)

Frank, Niklas, *Meine deutsche Mutter* (2nd edn.; Munich: Bertelsmann, 2005)

Franz, Eckhart G. and Hildegard John (eds.), *Nachlass Ludwig Bergsträsser (1883–1960): Abteilung O 21*, Repertorien des Hessischen Staatsarchivs Darmstadt, 50 (Darmstadt: Hessisches Staatsarchiv, 2005)

Franz, Eckhart G., *Das Haus Hessen: Eine europäische Familie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005)

Frei, Norbert, *1945 und wir: Das Dritte Reich im Bewußtsein der Deutschen* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Freigang, Christian and Jean-Claude Schmitt (eds.), *Hofkultur in Frankreich und Europa im Spätmittelalter*, Passagen, 11 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005)

Frevert, Ute and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt (eds.), *Neue Politikgeschichte: Perspektiven einer historischen Politikforschung*, Historische Politikforschung, 1 (Frankfurt/M.: Campus, 2005)

Freytag, Nils (ed.), *Wunderwelten: Religiöse Ekstase und Magie in der Moderne* (Munich: Fink, 2006)

Friedler, Erich, Barbara Siebert, and Andreas Kilian, *Zeugen aus der Todeszone: Das jüdische Sonderkommando in Auschwitz* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005)

Fulbrook, Mary, *The People's State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005)

Gaus, Günter, *Was bleibt, sind Fragen: Die klassischen Interviews*, ed. Hans-Dieter Schütt (Berlin: Ullstein Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005)

Gazinski, Radoslaw et al. (eds.), *Staatsarchiv Stettin: Wegweiser durch die Bestände bis zum Jahr 1945,* trans. Peter Oliver Loew, Schriften des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, 24 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

Gehler, Michael and Wolfram Kaiser (eds.), *Transnationale Parteien-kooperation der europäischen Christdemokraten: Dokumente 1945–1965* (Munich: Saur, 2004)

Gerwarth, Robert, *The Bismarck Myth: Weimar Germany and the Legacy of the Iron Chancellor*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005)

Geschichte der Stadt Dresden (Stuttgart: Theiss), i: Karlheinz Blaschke and Uwe John (eds.), *Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Dreißig-jährigen Krieges* (2005); ii. Reiner Gross and Uwe John (eds.), *Vom Ende des Dreißigjährigen Krieges bis zur Reichsgründung* (2006); iii. Holger Starke and Uwe John (eds.), *Von der Reichsgründung bis zur Gegenwart* (2006).

Glootz, Tanja Anette, *Alterssicherung im europäischen Wohlfahrtsstaat: Etappen ihrer Entwicklung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus, 2005)

Gniss, Daniela, *Der Politiker Eugen Gerstenmaier 1906–1986: Eine Biographie*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 144 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2005)

Görtemaker, Heike B., *Ein deutsches Leben: Die Geschichte der Margret Boveri 1900–1975* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Goschler, Constantin, *Schuld und Schulden: Die Politik der Wiedergut-machung für NS-Verfolgte seit 1945*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts, 111 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005)

Göse, Frank, *Rittergut – Garnison – Residenz: Studien zur Sozialstruktur und politischen Wirksamkeit des brandenburgischen Adels 1648–1763*, Veröffentlichungen des Brandenburgischen Landeshauptarchivs [Potsdam], 51 (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2005)

Gotto, Bernhard, *Nationalsozialistische Kommunalpolitik: Administrative Normalität und Systemstabilisierung durch die Augsburger Stadtverwaltung 1933–1945*, Studien zur Zeitgeschichte, 71 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Graf, Friedrich Wilhelm (ed.), *'Geschichte durch Geschichte überwinden': Ernst Troeltsch in Berlin*, Troeltsch-Studien, NS 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006)

Grant, Oliver, *Migration and Inequality in Germany 1870–1913*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005)

Gregor, Neil, *How to Read Hitler*, How to Read (London: Granta Books, 2005)

Greif, Gideon, *We Wept Without Tears: Testimonies of the Jewish Sonderkommando from Auschwitz* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005)

Greschat, Martin, *Protestantismus in Europa: Geschichte, Gegenwart, Zukunft* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005)

Greyerz, Kaspar von and Kim Siebenhüner (eds.), *Religion und Gewalt: Konflikte, Rituale, Deutungen (1500–1800)*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 215 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006)

Griep, Hans-Joachim, *Geschichte des Lesens: Von den Anfängen bis Gutenberg* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2005)

Grohmann Ingrid et al. (eds.), *Die Bestände des Sächsischen Staatsarchivs Leipzig*, Veröffentlichungen der Sächsischen Archivverwaltung. Reihe A: Archivverzeichnisse, Editionen und Fachbeiträge, 5, 2 vols. (Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag in Kommission, 2004)

Grünbacher, Armin, *Reconstruction and Cold War in Germany: The Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (1948–1961)*, Modern Economic and Social History (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

Gruner, Wolf, *Widerstand in der Rosenstraße: Die Fabrik-Aktion und die Verfolgung der 'Mischehen' 1943* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2005)

Haag, Lina, *Eine Handvoll Staub: Widerstand einer Frau 1933 bis 1945* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005)

Häberlein, Mark and Christof Jeggle (eds.), *Vorindustrielles Gewerbe: Handwerkliche Produktion und Arbeitsbeziehungen in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, Irseer Schriften, NS 2 (Constance: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004)

Hahn, Hans-Werner and Dieter Hein (eds.), *Bürgerliche Werte um 1800: Entwurf, Vermittlung, Rezeption* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Hamann, Brigitte, *Winifred Wagner: A Life at the Heart of Hitler's Bay-reuth*, trans. Alan Bance (London: Granta Books, 2005)

Hanuschek, Sven, *Elias Canetti: Biographie* (Munich: Hanser, 2005)

Havemann, Nils, *Fußball unterm Hakenkreuz: Der DFB zwischen Sport, Politik und Kommerz* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2005)

Haverkamp, Eva (ed.), *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Hebräische Texte aus dem mittelalterlichen Deutschland, 1 (Hanover: Hahn, 2005)

Hebel, Stephan (ed.), *Alltag in Trümmern: Zeitzeugen berichten über das Kriegsende 1945* (Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005)

Hechberger, Werner, *Adel im fränkisch-deutschen Mittelalter: Zur Anatomie eines Forschungsproblems*, Mittelalter-Forschungen, 17 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2005)

Hefty, Julia, *Die Parlamentarischen Staatssekretäre im Bund: Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte seit 1967*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 145 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2005)

Heidenreich, Bernd, Hans-Christof Kraus, et al. (eds.), *Bismarck und die Deutschen* (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2005)

Heimann, Thomas, *Bilder von Buchenwald: Die Visualisierung des Antifaschismus in der DDR (1945–1990)*, Zeithistorische Studien, 28 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Heitzer, Horst Walter, *Zwangssterilisation in Passau: Die Erbgesundheitspolitik des Nationalsozialismus in Ostbayern 1933–1939*, Passauer historische Forschungen, 13 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Hellyer, Marcus, *Catholic Physics: Jesuit Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Germany* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005)

Hempenstall, Peter J. and Paula Tanaka Mochida, *The Lost Man: Wilhelm Solf in German History*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Südsee. Reihe B: Forschungen, 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005)

Henke, Klaus-Dietmar (ed.), *Die Dresdner Bank im Dritten Reich*, 4 vols. (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Hermand, Jost, *Freundschaft: Zur Geschichte einer sozialen Bindung* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Hesse, Christian, *Amtsträger der Fürsten im spätmittelalterlichen Reich: Die Funktionseliten der lokalen Verwaltung in Bayern-Landshut, Hessen, Sachsen und Württemberg 1350–1515*, Schriftenreihe der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 70 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005)

Heumos, Peter (ed.), *Europäischer Sozialismus im Kalten Krieg: Briefe und Berichte 1944–1948*, Quellen und Studien zur Sozialgeschichte, 20 (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2004)

Hinterthür, Bettina, *Noten nach Plan: Die Musikverlage in der SBZ/DDR. Zensursystem, zentrale Planwirtschaft und deutsch-deutsche Beziehungen bis Anfang der 1960er Jahre*, Beiträge zur Unternehmensgeschichte, 23 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006)

Hintze, Otto and Hedwig Hintze, '*Verzage nicht und laß nicht ab zu kämpfen . . .': Die Korrespondenz 1925–1940*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich, Schriften der Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte, NS 17 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2004)

Hirschinger, Frank, '*Gestapoagenten, Trotzkisten, Verräter': Kommunistische Parteisäuberungen in Sachsen-Anhalt 1918–1953*, Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung, 27 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005)

Hoeres, Peter, *Krieg der Philosophen: Die deutsche und die britische Philosophie im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Hohls, Rüdiger, Iris Schröder, and Hannes Siegrist (eds.), *Europa und die Europäer: Quellen und Essays zur modernen europäischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2005)

Holfter, Gisela (ed.), *German-Speaking Exiles in Ireland 1933–1945*, German Monitor, 63 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006)

Hölscher, Lucian, *Geschichte der protestantischen Frömmigkeit in Deutschland* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Hosfeld, Rolf, *Operation Nemesis: Die Türkei, Deutschland und der Völkermord an den Armeniern* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2005)

Hull, Isabel V., *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005)

Hülsen-Esch, Andrea von (ed.), *Inszenierung und Ritual im Mittelalter und Renaissance*, Studia humaniora, 40 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2005)

Hürter, Johannes, *Hitlers Heerführer: Die deutschen Oberbefehlshaber im Krieg gegen die Sowjetunion 1941/42*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 66 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Hürtgen, Renate, *Zwischen Disziplinierung und Partizipation: Vertrauensleute des FDGB im DDR-Betrieb* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Jahn, Bruno (ed.), *Die deutschsprachige Presse: Ein biographisch-bibliographisches Handbuch*, 2 vols. (Munich: Saur, 2005)

James, Harold, *Family Capitalism: Wendels, Haniels, Falcks, and the Continental European Model* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006)

Jarzebowski, Claudia, *Inzest: Verwandtschaft und Sexualität im 18. Jahrhundert*, L'Homme Schriften, 12 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Jens, Inge and Walter Jens, *Katias Mutter: Das außerordentliche Leben der Hedwig Pringsheim* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 2005)

Jud, Ursina, *Liechtenstein und die Flüchtlinge zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, Veröffentlichungen der Unabhängigen Historikerkommission Liechtenstein Zweiter Weltkrieg, Studie 1 (Vaduz: Chronos Verlag, 2005)

Kaplan, Marion A. (ed.), *Jewish Daily Life in Germany, 1618–1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Kärkkäinen, Pekka, *Luthers trinitarische Theologie des Heiligen Geistes*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz. Abteilung für abendländische Religionsgeschichte, 208 (Mainz: von Zabern, 2005)

Karner, Stefan, Barbara Stelzl-Marx, et al. (eds.), *Die Rote Armee in Österreich: Sowjetische Besatzung 1945–1955*, Veröffentlichungen des Ludwig Boltzmann-Instituts für Kriegsfolgen-Forschung, Sonderband, 2 vols. (Graz: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Kempowski, Walter, *Im Block: Ein Haftbericht, Mit zweiunddreißig Bildnotizen des Verfassers* (Munich: Knaus, 2004)

Kessler, Harry Graf, *Das Tagebuch*, vi. *1916–1918*, ed. Günter Riederer and Christoph Hilse (Stuttgart: Cotta, 2006)

Keßler, Mario (ed.), *Deutsche Historiker im Exil (1933–1945): Ausgewählte Studien* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2005)

Kiep, Walther Leisler, *Brücken meines Lebens: Die Erinnerungen* (Munich: Herbig, 2006)

Kieseritzky, Wolther von (ed.), *Der Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund 1964 bis 1969*, Quellen zur Geschichte der deutschen Gewerkschaftsbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert, 13 (Bonn: Dietz, 2006)

Kiessling, Friedrich and Gregor Schöllgen (eds.), *Bilder für die Welt: Die Reichsparteitage der NSDAP im Spiegel der ausländischen Presse*, Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, Beiheft 61 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Kießling, Simon, *Die antiautoritäre Revolte der 68er: Postindustrielle Konsumgesellschaft und säkulare Religionsgeschichte der Moderne* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Kittner, Michael, *Arbeitskampf: Geschichte, Recht, Gegenwart* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Kochavi, Arieh J., *Confronting Captivity: Britain and the United States and their POWs in Nazi Germany* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005)

Koestler, Arthur, A*ls Zeuge der Zeit: Das Abenteuer meines Lebens*, trans. Franziska Becker (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2005)

Kohnle, Armin (ed.), *Das Vermächtnis Kaiser Karls V.: Die politischen Testamente* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005)

Kolb, Eberhard, *Der Frieden von Versailles* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Koller, Heinrich, *Kaiser Friedrich III.: Gestalten des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005)

König, Mareike and Rainer Ohliger (eds.), *Enlarging European Memory: Migration Movements in Historical Perspective*, Francia, Beiheft 62 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2006)

Kössler, Till, *Abschied von der Revolution: Kommunisten und Gesellschaft in Westdeutschland 1945–1968*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 143 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2005)

Kottje, Raymund, Bernd Moeller, et al. (eds.), *Ökumenische Kirchengeschichte*, i: Martin Ebner, *Von den Anfängen bis zum Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006)

Kracauer, Siegfried, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima (rev. and expanded edn.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004)

Krämer, Gudrun, *Geschichte des Islam* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Krauss, Sylvia (ed.), *Nachlässe im Bayerischen Hauptstaatsarchiv: 1800 bis heute*, Bayerische Archivinventare, 53 (Munich: Generaldirektion der Staatlichen Achive Bayerns, 2005)

Kreitzer, Beth, *Reforming Mary: Changing Images of the Virgin Mary in Lutheran Sermons of the Sixteenth Century*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Kremer, Karl Heinz, *Johann von den Birghden 1582–1645: Kaiserlicher und königlich-schwedischer Postmeister zu Frankfurt am Main*, Presse und Geschichte. Neue Beiträge, 15 (Bremen: edition lumière, 2005)

Kröger, Bernward, *Der französische Exilklerus im Fürstbistum Münster (1794–1802)*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für europäische Geschichte Mainz. Abteilung für abendländische Religionsgeschichte, 203 (Mainz: von Zabern, 2005)

Krohn, Claus-Dieter (ed.), *Kindheit und Jugend im Exil: Ein Generationenthema*, Exilforschung, 24 (Munich: ed. text + kritik, 2006)

Kuchler, Christian, *Kirche und Kino: Katholische Filmarbeit in Bayern (1945–1965)*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 106 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006)

Kugeler, Heidrun, Christian Sepp, and Georg Wolf (eds.), *Internationale Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Ansätze und Perspektiven*, Wirklichkeit und Wahrnehmung in der Frühen Neuzeit, 3 (Hamburg: Lit Verlag, 2006)

Kühn, Dieter, *Schillers Schreibtisch in Buchenwald: Bericht* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 2005)

Kunz, Norbert, *Die Krim unter deutscher Herrschaft (1941–1944): Germanisierungsutopie und Besatzungsrealität*, Veröffentlichungen der Forschungsstelle Ludwigsburg der Universität Stuttgart, 5 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005)

Laak, Dirk van, *Über alles in der Welt: Deutscher Imperialismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Landsman, Mark, *Dictatorship and Demand: The Politics of Consumerism in East Germany* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005)

Laube, Reinhard, *Karl Mannheim und die Krise des Historismus: Historismus als wissenssoziologischer Perspektivismus*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 196 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004)

Laudage, Johannes, *Die Salier: Das erste deutsche Königshaus* (Munich: Beck, 2006)

Laudage, Johannes, Lars Hageneier, and Yvonne Leiverkus, *Die Zeit der Karolinger* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006)

Lauter, Anna-Monika, *Sicherheit und Reparationen: Die französische Öffentlichkeit, der Rhein und die Ruhr, 1919–1923*, Düsseldorfer Schriften zur neueren Landesgeschichte und zur Geschichte Nordrhein-Westfalens, 74 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2006)

Library News

Leggewie, Claus and Erik Meyer, *'Ein Ort, an den man gerne geht': Das Holocaust-Mahnmal und die deutsche Geschichtspolitik nach 1989* (Munich: Hanser, 2005)

Leide, Henry, *NS-Verbrecher und Staatssicherheit: Die geheime Vergangenheitspolitik der DDR*, Analysen und Dokumente, 28 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005)

Leiverkus, Yvonne, *Köln: Bilder einer spätmittelalterlichen Stadt* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Lepenies, Wolf, *The Seduction of Culture in German History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006)

Lewerenz, Susann, *Die Deutsche Afrika-Schau, 1935–1940: Rassismus, Kolonialrevisionismus und postkoloniale Auseinandersetzungen im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland*, Afrika und Europa, 3 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 2006)

Livi, Massimiliano, *Gertrud Scholtz-Klinik: Die Reichsfrauenführerin. Politische Handlungsräume und Identitätsprobleme der Frauen im Nationalsozialismus am Beispiel der 'Führerin aller deutscher Frauen'*, Politische Soziologie, 20 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2005)

Lussy, Hanspeter and Rodrigo López, *Finanzbeziehungen Liechtensteins zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, Veröffentlichungen der Unabhängigen Historikerkommission Liechtenstein Zweiter Weltkrieg, Studie 3, 2 vols. (Vaduz: Chronos Verlag, 2005)

Luttenberger, Albrecht P. (ed.), *Katholische Reform und Konfessionalisierung*, Freiherr vom Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe. [Reihe B:] Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte der Neuzeit, 17 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006)

MacCarthy, John A., Walter Grünzweig, et al. (eds.), *The Many Faces of Germany: Transformations in the Study of German Culture and History. Festschrift for Frank Trommler* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004)

Maissen, Thomas, *Verweigerte Erinnerung: Nachrichtenlose Vermögen und Schweizer Weltkriegsdebatte 1989–2004* (2nd edn.; Zurich: Verlag Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 2005)

Manthey, Jürgen, *Königsberg: Geschichte einer Weltbürgerrepublik* (Munich: Hanser, 2005)

Markner, Reinhard, Monika Neugebauer-Wölk, et al. (eds.), *Die Korrespondenz des Illuminatenordens*, i: *1776–1781* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005)

Marx, Barbara (ed.), *Kunst und Repräsentation am Dresdner Hof* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2005)

Marxer, Veronika, *Liechtensteinische Industriebetriebe und die Frage nach der Produktion für den deutschen Kriegsbedarf 1939–1945*, Veröffentlichungen der Unabhängigen Historikerkommission Liechtenstein Zweiter Weltkrieg, Studie 2 (Vaduz, Chronos Verlag, 2005)

Massey, Doreen, *For Space* (London: Sage, 2006)

Matthäus, Jürgen and Klaus-Michael Mallmann (eds.), *Deutsche, Juden, Völkermord: Der Holocaust als Geschichte und Gegenwart. Konrad Kwiet zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Veröffentlichungen der Forschungsstelle Ludwigsburg der Universität Stuttgart, 7 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006)

Matzerath, Josef, *Adelsprobe an der Moderne: Sächsischer Adel 1763 bis 1866. Entkonkretisierung einer traditionalen Sozialformation*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 183 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006)

Meier, Christian, *From Athens to Auschwitz: The Uses of History*, trans. Deborah Lucas Schneider (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005)

Melis, Damian van and Henrik Bispinck (eds.), *'Republikflucht': Flucht und Abwanderung aus der SBZ/DDR 1945 bis 1961. Veröffentlichungen zur SBZ-/DDR-Forschung im Institut für Zeitgeschichte*, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, Sondernummer (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Menninger, Annerose, *Genuss im kulturellen Wandel: Tabak, Kaffee, Tee und Schokolade in Europa (16.–19. Jahrhundert)*, Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte, 102 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004)

Mertens, Lothar, *Rote Denkfabrik? Die Akademie für Gesellschaftswissenschaften beim ZK der SED*, Studien zur DDR-Gesellschaft, 10 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004)

Michels, Eckard, *Von der Deutschen Akademie zum Goethe-Institut: Sprach- und auswärtige Kulturpolitik 1923–1960*, Studien zur Zeitgeschichte, 70 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Midelfort, Hans Christian Erik, *Exorcism and Enlightenment: Johann Joseph Gassner and the Demons of Eighteenth-Century Germany*, Terry Lecture Series (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005)

Milosch, Mark S., *Modernizing Bavaria: The Politics of Franz Josef Strauß and the CSU, 1949–1969*, Monographs in German History, 15 (New York: Berghahn, 2006)

189

Moraw, Peter and Rudolf Schieffer (eds.), *Die deutschsprachige Mediävistik im 20. Jahrhundert*, Vorträge und Forschungen /Konstanzer Arbeitskreis für mittelalterliche Geschichte, 62 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2005)

Mühlhausen, Walter, *Friedrich Ebert 1871–1925: Reichspräsident der Weimarer Republik*, ed. Stiftung Reichspräsident-Friedrich-Ebert-Gedenkstätte (Heidelberg) and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Berlin/ Bonn) (Bonn: Dietz, 2006)

Müller, Jürgen, *Der Deutsche Bund 1815–1866*, Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, 78 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Müller, Michael, *Canaris: Hitlers Abwehrchef* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2006)

Mullineux, Andy and Eva Terberger, *The British Banking System: A Good Role Model for Germany?* An Anglo-German Foundation Report, 2006, 1 (London: Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society, 2006)

Münkel, Daniela and Jutta Schwarzkopf (eds.), *Geschichte als Experiment: Studien zu Politik, Kultur und Alltag im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Festschrift für Adelheid von Saldern* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2004)

Nelson, Arvid, *Cold War Ecology: Forests, Farms, and People in the East German Landscape, 1945–1989*, Yale Agrarian Studies Series (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005)

Nolte, Cordula, *Familie, Hof und Herrschaft: Das verwandtschaftliche Beziehungs- und Kommunikationsnetz der Reichsfürsten am Beispiel der Markgrafen von Brandenburg-Ansbach (1440–1530)*, Mittelalter-Forschungen, 11 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2005)

Oberkrome, Willi, *'Deutsche Heimat': Nationale Konzeption und regionale Praxis von Naturschutz, Landschaftsgestaltung und Kulturpolitik in Westfalen-Lippe und Thüringen (1900–1960)*, Forschungen zur Regionalgeschichte, 47 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

O'Brien, Mary-Elizabeth, *Nazi Cinema as Enchantment: The Politics of Entertainment in the Third Reich,* Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture (2nd impr.; Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2006)

Otterness, Philip, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004)

Overesch, Manfred, *Der Augenblick und die Geschichte: Hildesheim am 22. März 1945* (Hildesheim: Olms, 2005)

Panofsky, Erwin, *Korrespondenz 1910 bis 1968*, iii. *Korrespondenz 1950 bis 1956* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006)

Patel, Kiran Klaus, *Soldiers of Labor: Labor Service in Nazi Germany and New Deal America, 1933–1945*, trans. Thomas Dunlap, Publications of the German Historical Institute Washington, DC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Paulmann, Johannes (ed.), *Auswärtige Repräsentationen: Deutsche Kulturdiplomatie nach 1945* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Paxton, Robert O., *The Anatomy of Fascism* (London: Allen Lane, 2004)

Plath, Christian, *Konfessionskampf und fremde Besatzung: Stadt und Hochstift Hildesheim im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation und des Dreißigjährigen Krieges (ca. 1580–1660)*, Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, 147 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2005)

Plesakov, Konstantin, *Stalin's Folly: The Secret History of the German Invasion of Russia, June 1941* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2005)

Plöckinger, Othmar, *Geschichte eines Buches: Adolf Hitlers 'Mein Kampf' 1922–1945*, Veröffentlichung des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Pollack, Marko and Doreen Bombitzki (eds.), *Vorläufiges Findbuch zur Abteilung X: 'Internationale Verbindungen' des Ministeriums für Staatssicherheit der DDR, Abteilung Archivbestände der BStU*, Archiv zur DDR-Staatssicherheit, 8 (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005)

Postel, Verena (ed.), *Arbeit im Mittelalter: Vorstellungen und Wirklichkeiten* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006)

Prior, Robin and Trevor Wilson, *The Somme* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 2005)

Pufendorf, Astrid von, *Die Plancks: Eine Familie zwischen Patriotismus und Widerstand* (2nd edn.: Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2006)

Radkau, Joachim, *Max Weber: Die Leidenschaft des Denkens* (Munich: Hanser, 2005)

Ranzmaier, Irene, *Germanistik an der Universität Wien zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus: Karrieren, Konflikte und die Wissenschaft*, Literaturgeschichte in Studien und Quellen, 10 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005)

Rau, Kurt, *Augsburger Kinderhexenprozesse 1625–1730* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Rawlings, Helen, *The Spanish Inquisition*, Historical Association Studies (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006)

Reichardt, Sven and Armin Nolzen (eds.), *Faschismus in Italien und Deutschland: Studien zu Transfer und Vergleich*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus, 21 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005)

Reiss, Tom, *The Orientalist: Solving the Mystery of a Strange and Dangerous Life* (New York: Random House, 2005)

Reuß, Eberhard, *Hitlers Rennschlachten: Die Silberpfeile unterm Hakenkreuz* (Berlin: Aufbau Verlag, 2006)

Reuveni, Gideon, *Reading Germany: Literature and Consumer Culture in Germany before 1933*, trans. Ruth Morris (New York: Berghahn, 2006)

Ringer, Fritz, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004)

Rogge, Jörg, *Die deutschen Könige im Mittelalter: Wahl und Krönung*, Geschichte kompakt (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006)

Rösgen, Petra (ed.), *Bilder und Macht im 20. Jahrhundert: Begleitbuch zur Ausstellung im Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 28. Mai bis 17. Oktober 2004, und im Zeitgeschichtlichen Forum Leipzig, 26. November 2004 bis 28. März 2005*, exhibition catalogue (Bielefeld: Kerber, 2004)

Rousso, Henry (ed.), *Stalinism and Nazism: History and Memory Compared*, trans. Lucy B. Golsan et al. (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 2004)

Rubinstein, William D., *Genocide: A History* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2004)

Ruff, Mark Edward, *The Wayward Flock: Catholic Youth in Postwar West Germany, 1945–1965* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005)

Rüpke, Jörg, *Zeit und Fest: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Kalenders* (Munich: Beck, 2006)

Schirach, Richard von, *Der Schatten meines Vaters* (Munich: Hanser, 2005)

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang, *Entfernte Verwandtschaft: Faschismus, Nationalsozialismus, New Deal 1933–1939* (Munich: Hanser, 2005)

Schlemmer, Thomas (ed.), *Die Italiener an der Ostfront 1942/43: Dokumente zu Mussolinis Krieg gegen die Sowjetunion*, documents trans. from the Italian by Gerhard Kuck, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, 91 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Schmidt, Helmut, *Auf dem Weg zur deutschen Einheit: Bilanz und Ausblick* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 2005)

Schmidt, Sebastian and Jens Aspelmeier (eds.), *Norm und Praxis der Armenfürsorge in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 189 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006)

Schmitt, Carl, *Tagebücher Oktober 1912 bis Februar 1915*, ed. Ernst Hüsmert (2nd edn.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005)

Schmölders, Claudia, *Hitler's Face: The Biography of an Image*, trans. Adrian Daub (Pennsylvania, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)

Schoeps, Julius H., Karl E. Grözinger, and Gert Mattenklott (eds.), *Moses Mendelssohn, die Aufklärung und die Anfänge des deutsch-jüdischen Bürgertums*, Menora, 16 (Hamburg: Philo, 2006)

Schön, Theodor von, *Persönliche Schriften*, i. *Die autobiographischen Fragmente*, ed. Bernd Sösemann and Albrecht Hoppe, Veröffentlichungen aus den Archiven Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 53,1 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006)

Schöne, Jens, *Frühling auf dem Lande? Die Kollektivierung der DDR-Landwirtschaft*, Forschungen zur DDR-Gesellschaft (Berlin: Links Verlag, 2005)

Schorn-Schütte, Luise (ed.), *Das Interim 1548/50: Herrschaftskrise und Glaubenskonflikt*, Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, 203 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2005)

Schubert, Werner and Hans Peter Glöckner (eds.), *Nachschlagewerk des Reichsgerichts: Gesetzgebung des Deutschen Reichs*, (Frankfurt/ M.: Lang), i. *Kaiserzeit 1: Haftpflicht-, Börsen-, Versicherungs- und Kriegsnotrecht* (2005); ii. *Kaiserzeit 2: Gewerblicher Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht* (2005); iv. *NS-Zeit: Beamten-, Anerben-, Arbeits-, Patent- und Aktienrecht sowie Sonderrecht für die Juden* (2006)

Schulte, Jan Erik (ed.), *Konzentrationslager im Rheinland und in Westfalen 1933–1945: Zentrale Steuerung und regionale Initiative* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005)

Schulte, Regina (ed.), *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500–2000* (New York: Berghahn, 2006)

Schulz, Günther (ed.), *1949–1957: Bewältigung der Kriegsfolgen, Rückkehr zur sozialpolitischen Normalität*, Geschichte der Sozialpolitik in Deutschland seit 1945, 3 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, 2005)

Scott, Tom, *Town, Country, and Regions in Reformation Germany*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2005)

Skinner, Quentin, *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002–5)

Souza Moraes, Luís Edmundo de, *Konflikt und Anerkennung: Die Ortsgruppen der NSDAP in Blumenau und in Rio de Janeiro,* Dokumente, Texte, Materialien/ Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung der Technischen Universität Berlin, 57 (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2005)

Springer, Matthias, *Die Sachsen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004)

Steiner, André (ed.), *Überholen ohne einzuholen: Die DDR-Wirtschaft als Fußnote der deutschen Geschichte?* (Berlin: Links Verlag, 2006)

Steinweis, Alan E., *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006)

Stieber, Gabriela, *Die Briten als Besatzungsmacht in Kärnten 1945–1955*, Das Kärtner Landesarchiv, 31 (Klagenfurt: Verlag des Kärntner Landesarchivs, 2005)

Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR im Bundesarchiv (ed.), *Partei und Staat in der DDR* (Munich: Saur), pt. 1: *Die Akten aus dem Büro Walter Ulbricht* (2004); pt. 2: *Die Akten aus dem Büro Erich Honecker* (2005); pt. 3/1: *1946–1952* (2005); pt. 3/2: *1953–1960* (2006)

Stoll, Ulrike, *Kulturpolitik als Beruf: Dieter Sattler (1906–1968) in München, Bonn und Rom*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 98 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005)

Story, Joanna (ed.), *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005)

Strizek, Helmut, *Geschenkte Kolonien: Ruanda und Burundi unter deutscher Herrschaft*, Schlaglichter der Kolonialgeschichte, 4 (Berlin: Links Verlag, 2006)

Szpilman, Wladyslaw, *Der Pianist: Mein wunderbares Überleben*, trans. Karin Wolff (10th edn.; Berlin: Ullstein, 2005)

Tenfelde, Klaus and Hans-Christoph Seidel (eds.), *Zwangsarbeit im Bergwerk: Der Arbeitseinsatz im Kohlenbergbau des Deutschen Reiches und der besetzten Gebiete im Ersten und Zweiten Weltkrieg*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für soziale Bewegungen. Schriftenreihe C: Arbeitseinsatz und Zwangsarbeit im Bergbau, 2 vols. (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2005)

Timmermann, Heiner (ed.), *Agenda DDR-Forschung: Ergebnisse, Probleme, Kontroversen*, Dokumente und Schriften der Europäischen Akademie Otzenhausen, 112 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2005)

Timmermann, Heiner, Sergej A. Kondraschow, et al. (eds.), *Spionage, Ideologie, Mythos: Der Fall Richard Sorge*, Dokumente und Schriften der Europäischen Akademie Otzenhausen, 113 (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2005)

Tooze, Adam J., *The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy* (London: Allen Lane, 2006)

Topography of Terror Foundation (ed.), *The 'House Prison' at Gestapo Headquarters in Berlin: Terror and Resistance 1933–1945* (Berlin: Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, 2005)

Tresp, Uwe, *Söldner aus Böhmen: Im Dienst deutscher Fürsten: Kriegsgeschäft und Heeresorganisation im 15. Jahrhundert*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 19 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004)

Ullmann, Hans-Peter, *Der deutsche Steuerstaat: Geschichte der öffentlichen Finanzen vom 18. Jahrhundert bis heute* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Ulrich, Bernd, *Stalingrad* (Munich: Beck, 2005)

Ungváry, Krisztián, *The Siege of Budapest: One Hundred Days in World War II*, trans. Ladislaub Löb (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005)

Vinzent, Jutta, *Identity and Image: Refugee Artists from Nazi Germany in Britain (1933–1945),* Schriften der Guernica-Gesellschaft, 16 (Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2006)

Wagner, Patrick, *Bauern, Junker und Beamte: Lokale Herrschaft und Partizipation im Ostelbien des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Moderne Zeit, 9 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005)

Walgenbach, Katharina, *'Die weisse Frau als Trägerin deutscher Kultur': Koloniale Diskurse über Geschlecht, 'Rasse' und Klasse im Kaiserreich* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 2005)

Wapnewski, Peter, *Mit dem anderen Auge: Erinnerungen 1922–1959* (2nd edn.; Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 2005)

Watzka, Carlos, *Vom Hospital zum Krankenhaus: Zum Umgang mit psychisch und somatisch Kranken im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, Menschen und Kulturen, 1 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Weber, William (ed.), *The Musician as Entrepreneur, 1700–1914: Managers, Charlatans, and Idealists* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2004)

Wenzke, Rüdiger (ed.), *Staatsfeinde in Uniform? Widerständiges Verhalten und politische Verfolgung in der NVA*, Militärgeschichte der DDR, 9 (Berlin: Links Verlag, 2005)

Westermann, Edward B., *Hitler's Police Battalions: Enforcing Racial War in the East* (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2005)

Wette, Wolfram (ed.), *Schule der Gewalt: Militarismus in Deutschland 1871–1945* (Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005)

Willich, Thomas, *Wege zur Pfründe: Die Besetzung der Magdeburger Domkanonikate zwischen ordentlicher Kollatur und päpstlicher Provision 1295–1464*, Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, 102 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005)

Willimowski, Thomas, *Stefan Lorant: Eine Karriere im Exil* (Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Berlin, 2005)

Winstel, Tobias, *Verhandelte Gerechtigkeit: Rückerstattung und Entschädigung für jüdische NS-Opfer in Bayern und Westdeutschland*, Studien zur Zeitgeschichte, 72 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Winter, Jay, *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006)

Wirsching, Andreas, *Abschied vom Provisorium 1982–1990*, Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 6 (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2006)

Wirth, Peter, *Grundzüge der byzantinischen Geschichte* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006)

Wittmann, Rebecca, *Beyond Justice: The Auschwitz Trial* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005)

Wolf, Hubert (ed.), *Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation: Grundlagenforschung 1814–1917*, 6 pts (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005)

Wolf, Stephanie, *Erfurt im 13. Jahrhundert: Städtische Gesellschaft zwischen Mainzer Erzbischof, Adel und Reich*, Städteforschung. Reihe A: Darstellungen, 67 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005)

Wolfrum, Edgar, *Die 50er Jahre: Kalter Krieg und Wirtschaftswunder* (Darmstadt: Primus, 2006)

Wolfrum, Edgar, *Die geglückte Demokratie: Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2006)

Zeitz, Katharina, *Max von Laue (1879–1960): Seine Bedeutung für den Wiederaufbau der deutschen Wissenschaft nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg*, Pallas Athene, 16 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006)

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)

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)

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, 2005)

Vol. 59: Thomas Wittek, *Auf ewig Feind? Das Deutschlandbild in den britischen Massenmedien nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Vol. 60: Hans-Christof Kraus, *Englische Verfassung und politisches Denken im Ancien Régime: 1689 bis 1789* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Vol. 61: Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, *Deutsche Kaufleute in London: Welthandel und Einbürgerung (1660–1818)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)

Vol. 62: Dominik Geppert, *'Pressekriege': Öffentlichkeit und Diplomatie in den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen, 1896–1912* (Munich: Oldenbourg, forthcoming 2007)

Vol. 63: Florian Altenhöner, *Kommunikation und Kontrolle: Gerüchte und Städtische Öffentlichkeiten in Berlin und London 1914–1918* (Munich: Oldenbourg, forthcoming 2007)

Vol. 64: Renate Held, *Deutsche als Kriegsgefangene in Großbritannien im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, forthcoming 2007)

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 Century* (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)

Michael Schaich (ed.), *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 2007)

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

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 (ed.), *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (New York: Berghahn, 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)

BRITISH ENVOYS TO GERMANY

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)

Markus Mößlang, Torsten Riotte, and Hagen Schulze (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866,* vol. 3: *1848–1850*, Camden Fifth Series, 28 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2006)

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 Constitutio*n (London, 1995)

Otto Gerhard Oexle, *The British Roots of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* (London, 1995)

Research on British History

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)

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* (London, 2004)

2004   Anthony J. Nicholls, *Always Good Neighbours — Never Good Friends? Anglo-German Relations 1949–2001* (London, 2005)

2005   Jürgen Osterhammel, *Europe, the 'West', and the Civilizing Mission* (London, 2006)

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

Bulletin *Index, 1979–1996* (London, 1996), plus supplement for the years 1997–2001