

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Bulletin



General Editor Andreas Gestrich

Editors Angela Davies
Jane Rafferty

Jochen Schenk
Michael Schaich
Markus Mösslang

German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square,
London WC1A 2NJ

Tel: 020 7309 2050

Fax: 020 7404 5573

e-mail: ghil@ghil.ac.uk

Homepage: www.ghil.ac.uk

Opening hours of the Institute Library:

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday 10.00-17.00

Thursday 10.00-20.00

Enquiries should be directed to the Librarians

Tel: 020 7309 2019/2022

The *GHIL Bulletin* appears twice each year
and is available free on request

ISSN 0269-8552

Cover design: Lucy Schönberger
Photograph: John Goldblatt

German Historical Institute London

Bulletin

Volume XXXI, No. 2

November 2009

CONTENTS

Article

- Ideas of Justice in the Foundation of the German Old Age Pension System (Ulrike Haerendel) 3

Review Articles

- The Origins of the Protestant Past: Recent Works on the Historiography of Early Modern Germany (C. Scott Dixon) 29
Britain, Berlin, German Unification, and the Fall of the Soviet Empire (Colin Munro) 50

Book Reviews

- Ingrid Baumgärtner and Hartmut Kugler (eds.), *Europa im Weltbild des Mittelalters: Kartographische Konzepte* (Florin Curta) 81
Michael Borgolte, Juliane Schiel, Bernd Schneidemüller, and Annette Seitz (eds.), *Mittelalter im Labor: Die Mediävistik testet Wege zu einer transkulturellen Europawissenschaft* (Nora Berend) 88
Claudia Garnier, *Die Kultur der Bitte: Herrschaft und Kommunikation im mittelalterlichen Reich* (Jonathan R. Lyon) 92
Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (eds.), *Frankland. The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson* (Hans-Werner Goetz) 95
Ulrike Grassnick, *Ratgeber des Königs: Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherideal im spätmittelalterlichen England* (Jürgen Sarnowsky) 100
Jonathan B. Durrant, *Witchcraft, Gender and Society in Early Modern Germany* (Ralf-Peter Fuchs) 107
(cont.)

Contents

Susanne Friedrich, <i>Drehscheibe Regensburg: Das Informations- und Kommunikationssystem des Immerwährenden Reichstages um 1700</i> (James van Horn Melton)	111
Johann Gustav Droysen, <i>Historik: Texte im Umkreis der Historik (1826–1882)</i> (Andreas Gestrich)	115
Wolfram Pyta, <i>Hindenburg: Herrschaft zwischen Hohenzollern und Hitler</i> ; Jesko von Hoegen, <i>Der Held von Tannenberg: Genese und Funktion des Hindenburg-Mythos</i> (Conan Fischer)	119
Jane Caplan (ed.), <i>Nazi Germany</i> (Bernhard Gotto)	131
Thorsten Diedrich, <i>Paulus. Das Trauma von Stalingrad: Eine Biographie</i> (Eckard Michels)	135
Karen Bayer, <i>'How Dead is Hitler?'</i> <i>Der britische Starreporter Sefton Delmer und die Deutschen</i> (Florian Altenhöner)	142
Sandra Chaney, <i>Nature of the Miracle Years: Conservation in West Germany, 1945–1975</i> (Willi Oberkrome)	145
Conference Reports	
Seventh Workshop on Early Modern Central European History (Michael Schaich)	148
Re-Imagining Democracy 1750–1850: Government, Participation, and Welfare in German Territories (Michael Schaich)	153
The City as a Stage for Reform: Britain and Germany, 1890–1914 (Carl Philipp Schuck)	156
Local Histories, Global Heritage, Local Heritage, Global Histories: Colonialism, History, and the Making of Heritage (Indra Sengupta)	162
South Asian Experiences of the World Wars: New Evidence and New Approaches (Indra Sengupta)	167
Noticeboard	170
Special Announcement	
Refugee Voices	178
Library News	
Recent Acquisitions	184

ARTICLE

IDEAS OF JUSTICE IN THE FOUNDATION OF THE GERMAN OLD AGE PENSION SYSTEM

Ulrike Haerendel

The first German law on invalidity and old age pensions in 1889 was important not only as a basis of the welfare state, but also as a step towards the development of parliamentarianism within the framework of the constitutional monarchy.¹ The main works on the history of the old age pension system in Germany therefore concentrate on the process of its foundation, the political conflicts accompanying the birth of the institution, and the principles on which its regulations were based.² The political significance of the law and the history of its birth have to some extent obscured the fact that the regulations

¹ Many studies of the parliamentary proceedings and decision-making process which led to the passing of the law are listed in Ulrike Haerendel, *Die gesetzliche Invaliditäts- und Altersversicherung und die Alternativen auf gewerkschaftlicher und betrieblicher Grundlage*, Quellensammlung zur Geschichte der deutschen Sozialpolitik 1867 bis 1914 (series hereafter cited as Quellensammlung), 2nd section, vol. 6 (Mainz, 2004).

² Some important works: Christoph Conrad, *Vom Greis zum Rentner: Der Strukturwandel des Alters in Deutschland zwischen 1830 und 1930* (Göttingen, 1994); Ulrike Haerendel, *Die Anfänge der gesetzlichen Rentenversicherung in Deutschland: Die Invaliditäts- und Altersversicherung von 1889 im Spannungsfeld von Reichsverwaltung, Bundesrat und Parlament* (Speyer, 2001); Joachim Rückert, 'Entstehung und Vorläufer der gesetzlichen Rentenversicherung', in Franz Ruland (ed.), *Handbuch der gesetzlichen Rentenversicherung: Festschrift aus Anlass des 100jährigen Bestehens der gesetzlichen Rentenversicherung* (Neuwied, 1990), 1-50; Hans-Peter Benöhr, 'Gesetzgebungstechnik: Eine Bestandsaufnahme nach den Verhandlungen von 1881 bis 1889 zu den Sozialversicherungsgesetzen', in Manfred Harder and Georg Thielmann (eds.), *De iustitia et jure: Festgabe für Ulrich von Lübtow zum 80. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1980), 699-725; Hans-Peter Benöhr, 'Verfassungsfragen der Sozialversicherung nach den Reichstagsverhandlungen von 1881 bis 1889', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Germanistische Abteilung*, 97 (1980), 94-

Article

were based on ideas about the order of society which were closely debated by politicians. How far, for example, should state intervention replace individual responsibility? Should all citizens have the same rights to social security, or should differences be made according to need or any other criteria? One of the most interesting fundamental questions of this kind was the question of justice. How could the new system be set up in such a way as to produce justice, and what sort of justice should this be?

While there is an extensive literature on the history of social ideas,³ it is usually not related to the political and institutional analyses of social policy studies,⁴ and even less to ideas not directly linked to the policy sphere. Apart from the religious sphere, justice can be thought of only in social relations, but as an idea it cannot be directly connected with a particular period, or with any specific political or other system. It is a regulative, infinite idea, 'a heritage of humankind',⁵ first influentially systematized by Aristotle. Many other thinkers, from the scholastic tradition to the defenders of natural rights, have followed him. Politically of great influence were the American and the French revolutions of the late eighteenth century with the declarations of human rights that they produced: 'In them, and under the significant influence of modern natural law, fundamental notions of justice are defined in juridico-institutional form and guaranteed as rights of freedom with regard to the state.'⁶ But

163; and, recently, E. P. Hennock, *The Origin of the Welfare State in England and Germany, 1850–1914* (Cambridge, 2007), 182 et seq.

³ See the comprehensive work by Helga Grebing (ed.), *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen in Deutschland: Sozialismus – Katholische Soziallehre – Protestantische Sozialethik. Ein Handbuch* (2nd edn., Essen, 2005).

⁴ A volume recently published in the Quellensammlung series to some extent furnishes this missing link. It presents the basic ideas of the protagonists of social policy, ranging from liberal social reform to socialism and conservatism. See Ralf Stremmel et al., *Grundfragen der Sozialpolitik in der öffentlichen Diskussion: Kirchen, Parteien, Vereine und Verbände*, Quellensammlung, 1st section, vol. 8 (Mainz, 2006).

⁵ See Otfried Höffe, *Gerechtigkeit: Eine philosophische Einführung* (3rd edn., Munich, 2007), 9.

⁶ Fritz Loos and Hans-Ludwig Schreiber, 'Recht, Gerechtigkeit', in Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhard Kosselleck (eds.), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, 8 vols. (Stuttgart, 1972–97), v. 231–311, at 280.

not until the middle of the nineteenth century was justice explicitly connected with the social field, by Catholic philosophers of the Risorgimento. The idea of social justice was then taken up by Catholic social reformers and liberal thinkers such as the Utilitarians, while Marx and his followers preferred to stick to less abstract and more political concepts.⁷ Of course, the early socialist thinkers, especially Proudhon, also defended the ideals of justice, but Marx's political claims were based on the theory of historical materialism, which argued that the normative political sphere was dependent on the actual development of the productive forces. An indefinite, utopian idea like that of justice had no place in this cosmos.⁸ Nevertheless, the term 'justice' entered the sphere of social politics in Germany by way of bourgeois and Catholic social reform, and seemed to provide an adequate answer to the 'social question'. In the view of these reformers, the state was obliged to help workers in the name of justice.⁹ As an answer to the many facets and symptoms of the social question, social justice could be used in many small sub-areas, not to define a whole new social order like communism, but to represent the search for solutions to different problems such as insufficient incomes,¹⁰ or the poverty of widows.¹¹ In the case which concerns us here, we are also talking about a part of the bigger social question: the unresolved problem of old and invalid workers, for whom an argument was also put under the flag of social justice.

It is important to emphasize that the idea of justice was not an abstract notion separated from the actual political debate, but was present in almost all competing concepts in the debates and quarrels. I shall therefore focus on three different aspects of justice in this article. First, I shall look at the kinds of ideologies on which the different concepts of justice were based. In the first section, the different parties

⁷ On the history of 'social justice' see Christina Hakel, *Soziale Gerechtigkeit: Eine begriffshistorische Analyse* (Vienna, 2005).

⁸ Loos and Schreiber, 'Recht, Gerechtigkeit', 296–9.

⁹ See Christoph Moufang (Catholic politician), 'Die soziale Frage', *Quellensammlung*, 1st section, vol. 8, no. 24.

¹⁰ See Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler 'Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zu Religion und Sittlichkeit', *Quellensammlung*, 1st section, vol. 8, no. 15: 'For human work to receive an adequate income is a demand of justice and Christianity' (at 87).

¹¹ See Höffe, *Gerechtigkeit*, 85.

Article

which represented the idea of social justice in this context will briefly be presented and situated in the political landscape. Their ideological development and position during the 1880s will be outlined in order to show the grounds on which their respective ideas of social justice were founded. Secondly, the meaning of justice will be analysed in historical context. What kind of justice were the authors of the bill referring to? What was the state of thinking about social justice when it entered the realm of social insurance?

Every discourse has its own social and cultural place and particular preconditions.¹² The third and fourth sections of this article will examine the policies connected with the discourse on justice. The term 'justice' was often used to underline the substantive importance of a particular policy and to legitimize it. Thus justice was also an idea that helped to form party positions and unite parliamentary deputies behind a particular political act. This was the case not only for special regulations such as the contributions system, but also for the idea of old age insurance in general. The notion of justice helped to bring forward this innovative idea, which could not be legitimized by experience. Old age insurance in general thus depended on ideas such as justice to make it attractive and adoptable.¹³

I. *Party Ideologies and Justice*

The social programme went onto the parliamentary agenda at the beginning of the 1880s, a period of unstable coalitions for the Bismarck government after the dissolution of the alliance with the National Liberals. After the elections of 1881 the left-wing Liberals were in a strong position in the Reichstag, with more than one-quarter of the mandates. They lost ground in 1884 and faced a disaster in the 'cartel elections' of 1887. Left-wing Liberals found it difficult to play an oppositional role and formulate real alternatives to government policy, and this was true in particular of the field of social insur-

¹² See Philipp Sarasin, *Geschichtswissenschaft und Diskursanalyse* (Frankfurt am Main, 2003), 34.

¹³ See M. Rainer Lepsius, 'Interessen und Ideen: Die Zurechnungsproblematik bei Max Weber', in id., *Interessen, Ideen und Institutionen* (Opladen, 1990), 31–43, at 38.

ance.¹⁴ This weakness created favourable conditions for the passage of the Old Age Pensions Bill because throughout the whole legislation process, the left-wing Liberals could not gain more than sporadic support for their fundamental criticism of the principle of state insurance. But what came to be known as the 'cartel' – an alliance between the two conservative parties and the National Liberals – was a precarious coalition which did not guarantee majorities for every bill put to the vote. When the parliamentary debate on old age pensions started in 1888, it soon became clear that there was a relatively strong faction within the conservative parties – and also among the National Liberals – that was not willing to support the government course. Bismarck and even the Emperor, it seems, therefore took all necessary steps to convince these critical parliamentary deputies.¹⁵ Yet they were not able to win back all their members. After all, it was the Catholic Centre Party which had the casting vote. Only because a minority of the parliamentary group that was, on principle, reluctant, supported the bill, was it finally passed in May 1889.¹⁶ The fact that Social Democrats did not support the bill was a logical consequence of the oppositional role into which they had been forced by the anti-socialist legislation still in place at the time, and of their fundamental and unsuccessful criticism during the legislation process.

We shall now look at the positions of the political parties, starting with those that, on principle, supported the Old Age Pension Bill. In 1883–4 the National Liberals had returned to Bismarck's domestic policies, hence also accepting the social security programme.¹⁷ It now seemed to them a clear advantage that a protective state would lure

¹⁴ See Wolther von Kieseritzky, *Liberalismus und Sozialstaat: Liberale Politik in Deutschland zwischen Machtstaat und Arbeiterbewegung (1878–1893)* (Cologne, 2002), 297–307.

¹⁵ See *Quellensammlung*, 2nd section, vol. 6, pp. xlv, xlvi, and no. 135.

¹⁶ The law was put to the vote on 24 May 1889. A total of 185 voted in favour of the Bill: 75 National Liberals; 64 Conservatives; 29 members of the Reichspartei (liberal conservatives); 13 members of the Centre Party (plus 3 from Alsace-Lorraine); and 1 left-wing Liberal. A total of 165 voted against: 11 National Liberals; 7 Conservatives; 4 members of the Reichspartei; 78 members of the Centre Party (plus 14 from Alsace-Lorraine); 31 left-wing Liberals; 10 Social Democrats; and 10 members of the Polish Party.

¹⁷ See Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte 1866–1918*, ii. *Machtstaat vor der Demokratie* (2nd edn., Munich, 1993), 330.

Article

workers away from Social Democracy.¹⁸ Therefore they abandoned the classical liberal position of supporting self-help and the voluntary principle, and committed themselves to a strong state. 'The aim of this legislation can only be achieved if the state makes insurance compulsory, and only the state can do this', declared one of their speakers, Hermann Gebhard.¹⁹ For most National Liberals this was a fairly new position. Even when they were cooperating closely with Bismarck during the 1870s National Liberals had generally clung to the old liberal values, rejecting state intervention in the 'natural' mechanisms of the market.²⁰ At that time, however, the question of social reform had not really been tested. Of course, there were exceptions. In the late 1860s, the National Liberals Friedrich Hammacher and Fritz Kalle had voted for old age insurance funds to be organized by local government or big business.²¹ Kalle, a businessman, then developed his plan further and came quite close to the old age insurance programme that was conceived by the Department of the Interior many years later. He proposed a broad compulsory insurance scheme not restricted to industrial workers. It was to be financed by contributions paid by employers and employees, and provide pensions conforming to local income levels, with funds based on a regional structure. In 1874 Kalle presented his plan at the second general assembly of the main association for social reform, the Verein für Sozialpolitik, where he found that this was still a minority position, even among liberal social reformers like himself.²²

¹⁸ See Holger J. Tober, *Deutscher Liberalismus und Sozialpolitik in der Ära des Wilhelminismus: Anschauungen der liberalen Parteien im parlamentarischen Entscheidungsprozeß und in der öffentlichen Diskussion* (Husum, 1999), 46.

¹⁹ Gebhard speaking in the Reichstag, 18 May 1889, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages* (hereafter cited as *Stenographische Berichte*), VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1815.

²⁰ See Nipperdey, *Machtstaat*, 321, 322.

²¹ See Kieseritzky, *Liberalismus*, 314. For the activities of Hammacher see further document no. 7 in Florian Tennstedt and Heidi Winter, *Altersversorgungs- und Invalidekassen*, Quellensammlung, 1st section, vol. 6 (Mainz, 2002).

²² Wilfried Rudloff, 'Politikberater und Opinion-Leader? Der Einfluss von Staatswissenschaftlern und Versicherungsexperten auf die Entstehung der Invaliditäts- und Altersversicherung', in Stefan Fisch and Ulrike Haerendel (eds.), *Geschichte und Gegenwart der Rentenversicherung in Deutschland: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Entwicklung und vergleichenden Einordnung der Alterssicherung*

Let us return to the discussions of the 1880s and the political parties supporting the bill. The general debate on the pension bill in December 1888 was used by party speakers to set out their positions. The words of Otto von Helldorf-Bedra, speaker of the Conservative parliamentary party, were remarkable because they point to the discourse on justice:

It is a question of changing the nature of salaries, of ensuring that they provide security for times of invalidity and old age . . . In doing so we compensate for an injustice, the injustice that for a long time we have accepted developments in working-class conditions that have driven some workers into poor relief because their salaries do not take into account circumstances that should naturally have been considered in accordance with a proper Christian and human understanding.²³

Helldorf here pointed to a fundamental problem. Under the rule of a capitalist market economy, industries reduced working relations to a mere exchange of manpower for salary. Salaries did not reach levels that would compensate for periods of unemployment, illness, or invalidity. At this time, social insurance had already come into existence. It was starting to fill the gap between salaries based only on the market price for work, and the real cost of human work augmented by the above-mentioned life risks. Up to this point, however, the process of externalizing²⁴ social costs, of passing them to social insurance systems, had been implemented only for illness and accidents at work. What was now at stake, as Helldorf's words made clear, was not only the setting up of old age and invalidity funds, but moral acceptance of the fact that the risks of old age and invalidity were

im Sozialstaat (Berlin, 2000), 93–119, at 98. See also Lil-Christine Schlegel-Voß and Gerd Hardach, 'Die dynamische Rente: Ein Modell der Alterssicherung im historischen Wandel', *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 90 (2003), 290–315, at 291. The authors stress that Kalle's plans already contained the idea of the 'dynamic pension'.

²³ Von Helldorf speaking in the Reichstag, 7 Dec. 1888, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 179.

²⁴ See Hans F. Zacher, 'Grundtypen des Sozialrechts', in id., *Abhandlungen zum Sozialrecht*, ed. Bernd Baron von Maydell and Eberhard Eichenhofer (Heidelberg, 1993), 257–78, at 261.

Article

part of working life and that therefore solutions had to be furnished in this sphere. This, in the eyes of Helldorf and other Conservatives, could only be achieved by a strong, educational state; responsibility would not be accepted voluntarily by the mass of workers and employers.

On the other hand, sections of the Conservative Party rejected such far-reaching intervention by the state, although on the influential carrot-and-stick principle, they might well have accepted it for industrial workers in order to lure them away from Social Democracy. Yet they clearly rejected the notion of state intervention for certain groups of workers. First, this was the case for domestic employees and agrarian workers. Conservative agrarians, for example, insisted on the 'good old' patriarchal tradition of the squire taking care of his old servants and workers. Why should the state offer pensions to workers who could still be used to do certain jobs on the farm when there were not enough labourers anyway? In the Reichstag, the agrarians painted a picture of labourers, old but still fit for work, just 'sitting outside their houses', 'smoking pipes', and doing nothing because their pension made this possible.²⁵ In the end, these exaggerations did not prevent the pension programme from being extended to include agrarian workers, but the Conservatives certainly supported the predominant view that the biggest danger of this legislation was to give 'too much'. And they led to the adoption of the paragraph allowing part of pensions to be paid out in kind in cases where people had been used to receiving part of their wages in kind.²⁶

These Conservatives did not want legal regulations to replace welfare and personal relationships. They were forgetting that for a long time industrialization, the rural exodus, and an increase in seasonal work had been loosening the ties that had kept rural society together. And the countryside had never been an ideal place for servants to grow old in. Research on this topic has shown that former domestic and farm workers were among the poorest and most neg-

²⁵ See Jens Flemming, 'Sozialpolitik, landwirtschaftliche Interessen und Mobilisierungsversuche', in Fisch and Haerendel (eds.), *Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 71-92, at 75.

²⁶ Para. 13, in Robert Bosse and Erich von Woedtke, *Das Reichsgesetz betreffend die Invaliditäts- und Altersversicherung: Vom 22. Juni 1889* (Leipzig, 1890), 251.

lected members of rural society.²⁷ However, retaining their patriarchal convictions, the Conservatives formed a coalition with the majority of the Centre Party, which, to quote Baron Hertling, feared that 'all individual social activity will be absorbed by the unique, oppressive power of the state'.²⁸ While the majority of the Centre Party deputies followed this line, with only a minority accepting the government's proposal for social reform, two parties strictly opposed the bill, namely, the Social Democrats and the left-wing Liberals.

Seen as the 'enemy of the Reich', Social Democracy was not, in principle, prepared to support any of Bismarck's constructive efforts in domestic policy. Nevertheless, not only members of the reformist wing, but also the 'revolutionaries' decided not to insist on fundamental opposition. Instead they resolved to fight for substantial improvements for their clientele, who were mostly skilled workers. 'Without budging one inch from our principles, we are, given the actual circumstances, able to support bills which promise a substantial improvement in the situation of the working people.'²⁹ It was Paul Singer who made this statement, a member of the 'revolutionary' wing around the party leader, August Bebel.³⁰ Of course, the representatives of labour did not see any chance of a 'substantial improvement' in the bill concerned, and as the debate unfolded it was not necessary for them to change their attitude of rejection because they were defeated on almost every motion during the legislation process. For example, they did not succeed in establishing a lower age limit for the receipt of old age pensions, which was one of their main concerns. As workers aged 70 were extremely rare, their representatives advocated an entitlement age of 60. The Social Democrats had further concerns relating to higher pensions with

²⁷ See Siegfried Becker, 'Junger Dienstknecht—alter Bettler', in Gerd Göckensjan (ed.), *Recht auf ein gesichertes Alter? Studien zur Geschichte der Alterssicherung in der Frühzeit der Sozialpolitik* (Augsburg, 1990), 158–80.

²⁸ Hertling speaking in the Reichstag, 29 Mar. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1090–3. For more details on the position of the Centre Party see Karl O. von Aretin, *Franckenstein: Eine politische Karriere zwischen Bismarck und Ludwig II.* (Stuttgart, 2003), 263–80.

²⁹ Singer speaking in the Reichstag, 30 Mar. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1129.

³⁰ On Singer's political approach see Ursula Reuter, *Paul Singer (1844–1911): Eine politische Biographie* (Düsseldorf, 2004).

Article

higher state subsidies, provision for widows, administrative functions for the workers in the insurance bureaucracy, and fewer chances for the administration and the employers to control the working lives of the insured. They at least partly succeeded in this regard, forming a coalition with the Liberals. The bill provided for the introduction of a booklet into which employers were to paste a confirmation of their workers' employment. These booklets would reveal an individual's whole working 'career', including periods of work in plants known for strikes and so on. A compromise, accepted by the Social Democrats as a 'real improvement', was the use of cards (instead of booklets), which had to be replaced each year and handed in to the insurance agencies.³¹ While reducing employers' chances to exert control, the provision in practice led to more bureaucratic expenditure, emphasizing the negative reputation of the 'paste law' (*Klebegesetz*). Apart from this success, which was achieved by the National Liberals not the Social Democrats (who were excluded from the commission), the Social Democrats suffered one defeat after another and therefore, in the end, voted against the bill.

In a way the left-wing Liberals were even more opposed to the bill than the party of labour, but for different reasons. They wanted state intervention only where it was inevitable, and for them, provisions for invalidity and old age belonged to the classical field of private, not state, initiative. In their view, if there were to be invalidity funds at all, they would have to be based on self-administration, the voluntary principle, and worker participation. Their social concern was mostly for widows. Here, indeed, they felt the need for state intervention but, as a small parliamentary group with no strong supporters, they could not change the priority given to workers in the concept of social insurance. The Department of the Interior had decided at an early stage that there was no money to provide for widows and that this issue would have to be postponed. This was generally accepted by the Bundesrat and the Reichstag without great debate, but the left-wing Liberals made an effort to obtain more help for widows.³² In doing so, they also spoke in favour of a group widely neglected in the legislation process, not only in the 1880s, but until after the Second

³¹ Session of the Reichstag, 11 Apr. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1490–4.

³² See Marlene Ellerkamp, 'Die Frage der Witwen und Waisen', in Fisch and Haerendel (eds.), *Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 189–208.

World War, namely, women. In 1889 a Liberal, Heinrich Rickert, advocated more respect for the social concerns of women: 'The female sex is not represented in the Reichstag, it cannot propose petitions . . . but how are they treated here! . . . just because women have no other means of making themselves felt than through us, it is a duty of honour and respect that we change these tough, even fierce, regulations concerning women.'³³ In neglecting the question of widows, the legislator, in Rickert's eyes, was putting the social question the wrong way. What worried the worker most, he argued, was concern for his wife and children, not his own fate in old age. After his death his wife would not get 'a single penny of what he had contributed to his whole life long. This, gentlemen, you call justice, this you call a measure of social policy according to the motto "Love your brothers!" Well, gentlemen, the question is, which brothers are addressed by your sympathy.'³⁴ And, we could add, which sisters are left out. Rickert here posed the question of social justice, which leads us to our main section, the debate on social justice in the legislation process.

II. *What was Meant by Social Justice?*

In the debates about the German welfare state, its modernization, rebuilding, or dismantling, 'justice' is one of the concepts used in an inflationary way. 'Justice of efficiency' stands against 'justice of needs'; 'the justice of the market' stands against 'the justice of equality'.³⁵ The German language makes it easy to create the most imaginative compounds with the word 'justice'. A concept such as *Besitzstandsgerechtigkeit* for example—the justice of the owner's rights—may make us wonder whether this still has anything in common with the original meaning of social justice.³⁶ Although these examples are

³³ See Barbara Fait, 'Arbeiterfrauen und -familien im System sozialer Sicherheit', *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 1 (1997), 171–205, at 190.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ For the differentiation of concepts of justice see Lutz Leisering, 'Eine Frage der Gerechtigkeit: Armut und Reichtum in Deutschland', *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 18/99, 10–17.

³⁶ On the other hand, owners' rights are an important barrier to the dismantling of the welfare state. See Hans F. Zacher, 'Der gebeutelte Sozialstaat in der wirtschaftlichen Krise', *Sozialer Fortschritt*, 33 (1984), 1–12, at 6.

Article

taken from the modern discourse about justice in the welfare state, they remind us that we have to look very carefully at the concept of justice that was actually being used in the discussions of the 1880s.

Another premiss needs to be added. Of course, Bismarck's Empire did not subscribe to the principles of social equality or justice, but practised a more or less unrestrained capitalism, which meant that the labour movement and social reformers were left to fight for better living conditions and a larger share of the national income for the working class. The contribution of the political and economic elites to social reform was mostly indirect, as Bismarck himself put it, when he said in the Reichstag: 'If there were no Social Democracy, and if the masses did not fear it, the mediocre progress we have so far made in social reform would not exist either . . . And in this respect being in awe of Social Democracy is quite useful for those who otherwise feel no sympathy for their poor compatriots.'³⁷ While democratic societies try to provide basic liberties and fair opportunities for everyone and normally have an institutional structure which also supports the tendency to social equality,³⁸ the German Reich strove for neither political nor social equality. On the contrary, it is clear that 'the established societal and academic system had ignored the great question of the time: the question of justice in a developed industrial society'.³⁹ Under these circumstances, we need to look for justice not in the sense of total social equality, but for a liberal concept of relative justice at most.⁴⁰ This means that, if social reform was not intending to sweep away capitalism itself, it at least wanted to improve the living conditions of all citizens in a fair system compatible with the ruling logic of the market.

³⁷ Speech in the Reichstag, 26 Nov. 1884, in *Die gesammelten Werke*, Friedrichsruher Ausgabe (2nd edn., Berlin, 1929), xii. 495–512, at 498.

³⁸ See Wilfried Hinsch, *Gerechtfertigte Ungleichheiten: Grundsätze sozialer Gerechtigkeit* (Berlin, 2002), 21.

³⁹ See Gerhard Dilcher, 'Das Gesellschaftsbild der Rechtswissenschaft und die soziale Frage', in Klaus Vondung (ed.), *Das wilhelminische Bildungsbürgertum: Zur Sozialgeschichte seiner Ideen* (Göttingen, 1976), 53–66, at 61.

⁴⁰ See Diether Döring, 'Leitvorstellungen der Politik der sozialen Sicherung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Geschichte der Rentenversicherung', in Siegfried Blasche and Diether Döring (eds.), *Sozialpolitik und Gerechtigkeit* (Frankfurt, 1988), 214–57, at 216–19.

Simply the fact that politicians were thinking about finding a fair system with 'just' criteria of distribution carried weight, apart from responses that were found to the problems in question. By speaking about justice, politicians reflected on the social question and were stimulated not only to think about the pension system itself, but to see the issue of care for old people in a more general way. Most remarkably, this was the case when the fundamental principles of old age provision were still at stake, before the politicians entered the realm of legislative details. In 1879, for example, a parliamentary committee discussed the introduction of old age pension funds, mainly who should be involved, and whether participation should be compulsory or voluntary. The advocates of a compulsory and contributory insurance scheme declared that it would lead to 'a more just distribution of the costs of production'. 'Where social or private assistance had to pay the subsistence costs of industrial workers who had lost their income because of age or invalidity, a shift took place, transferring part of the costs to people who were not involved at all. But it was a claim in the name of justice that this part should also be financed by the proceeds of work, through contributions by employers and paid workers.'⁴¹

This statement, quite similar to one made some years later by a Conservative, Helldorf (quoted above), makes it clear that in the sphere of early social policy, justice was perceived as a question of the distribution of goods and burdens. For a number of reasons, the simplest being the closure of the Reichstag in 1879, the committee's vote in favour of compulsory insurance for industrial workers did not result in further political action.⁴² By the late 1880s, when the introduction of old age insurance was a subject of parliamentary debates, the basic questions had already been determined by the Department of the Interior's drafts and the contributory insurance schemes that had been set up in the areas of health and industrial accidents. To the parliamentarians it was clear that there would be a compulsory insurance scheme, though who should be included in it was a matter of dispute. And while it was clear that contributions

⁴¹ Quotation from the report of the eighth committee, 26 June 1879, in *Stenographische Berichte*, IV. Legislaturperiode, II. Session 1879, Print no. 314, at 1759.

⁴² See *Quellensammlung*, 1st section, vol. 6, p. xxxi.

Article

would be paid, the distribution of the burden between employers, workers, and perhaps the state was still negotiable. These changes in the agenda show that the discourse on distributive justice had not ended, but that its focus had narrowed. It was no longer a question of 'whether', but of 'how'. The burdens and benefits of the new institution were to be divided between different groups, but who was to be charged how much, and who was to receive what? Thus thinking in categories of justice within the logic of insurance turned into a thinking in categories of equivalence.

III. *Justice as Fairness:*⁴³ *the System of Contributions and Benefits*

When the Reichstag discussed the foundation of old age and invalidity insurance in 1888–9, the principles of a contributory insurance scheme were hardly questioned. Most deputies now accepted the necessity of old age and invalidity insurance, and were willing for the funds to be based on contributions paid by employers and workers. But, unsurprisingly, it was the question of the pension system's contributions and benefits that led to the most intensive discussion of social justice. Who was to pay how much for the pension system, and who would receive the benefits, and up to what amount? Would it be fair if everybody paid the same and got the same, or should a difference be made according to efficiency, need, or other criteria?

The Department of the Interior had, at first, intended to treat all contributors and recipients alike, as this would be the 'easiest and most convenient way in practical terms'.⁴⁴ 'The same', in fact, meant that women were to pay and receive two-thirds of the tariffs established for men; and invalidity pensions were to be differentiated according to the length of time the insured person had paid into the fund. This kind of planning provoked numerous critical comments from both the public and experts. Albert Schäffle for example, political economist and former Minister for Trade in Austria, referred to it as 'naked egalitarianism' (*kahle Gleichmacherei*). 'The same contributory and pension tariff is imposed on every worker, without regard to whether he is skilled or unskilled, a foreman or helper, a mechanic or

⁴³ This phrase, of course, refers to John Rawls's theories on justice.

⁴⁴ See Bosse and Woedtke, *Reichsgesetz*, 91.

spinner.⁴⁵ Additional criticisms followed and the Department of the Interior finally had to admit that it would not be fair if industrial workers or, in general, workers in regions with a high cost of living, received the same as agrarian workers in the countryside, where the cost of living was lower. It was not concern about pensioners in high-cost areas, who probably would not be able to afford to live there, that made the officials change their minds. This problem was simply solved by advising future pensioners 'to live in the countryside, and thereby contribute to an increase in the size of the rural population and provide the country with their remaining capacity to work, ensuring a higher turnover'.⁴⁶ What really worried the officials, however, was the fact that pensions might be close to the very low wages paid especially in the east of the German Reich (an argument which is often heard concerning unemployment benefits today). This disproportionality might have been seen as an incentive to give up work and simulate invalidity, especially in the agricultural sector which was facing economic crisis anyhow. These concerns led legislators in the Department of the Interior not only to change the concept of flat pensions to a differentiated system, but also to keep the rates generally low, as had been the case in the first draft. 'It is a fact borne out by experience that the number of people claiming their right to a pension grows in proportion with the increase in pensions, whereas lower pensions support efforts, desirable from the public point of view, to work as long as possible.'⁴⁷

While the idea of differentiated pensions provided common ground between the Department of the Interior, outside experts, and Bundesrat and Reichstag deputies, questions of detail caused problems. At first the legislators worked out a system based on regional differences in wage levels, using statistics already available on 'the wage normally paid to day-labourers in each place' (*ortsüblicher Tageslohn gewöhnlicher Tagearbeiter*). On the basis of these differences, they defined five classes into which the insured were grouped. Depending on the class, contributions were to be paid in the form of different coupons, and pensions were to be calculated on the basis of the num-

⁴⁵ See Quellensammlung, 2nd section, vol. 6, no. 70.

⁴⁶ See 'Main features' ('Grundzüge') of workers' old age and invalidity insurance, in Bosse and Woedtke, *Reichsgesetz*, 11–35, at 31.

⁴⁷ See Bosse and Woedtke, *Reichsgesetz*, 88.

Article

ber and class of coupons. It is not surprising that the Bundesrat, formed by the governments of the German states, approved of a system based on regional differences and accepted the concept without great debate.⁴⁸ But the Reichstag held intense discussions on the topic, and here many arguments based on 'justice' were used.

Those in favour of the most radical concept of equality were not, as might be supposed, Social Democrats, but Conservatives. To them, 'equality' meant that all workers should get used to a very low-level pension. The only reason for introducing a pension system at all, they argued, was to avoid poverty in old age, and that is why benefits should by no means be related to living standards acquired during the period of active work, but should function in the same way as poor relief. These proposals, said a Conservative, Wilhelm von Flügge, were 'the most just'. 'Any form of classification will alter the basis of the law. To protect from misery is the only intention of the law; no more and no less shall be done.'⁴⁹ And his colleague Oskar Hahn added: 'This law should not provide for the higher living standard which some classes of the work force have got used to.'⁵⁰ National Liberals saw it just the other way round. Gustav Struckmann, for example, said: 'The impression that we are dealing with a law to improve poor relief should be avoided. The working class is not just composed of a large, undifferentiated mass; distinctions within it must be taken into account. It is important that workers who are better off can receive a higher pension because they have contributed at a higher rate.'⁵¹ Struckmann was therefore strictly in favour of wage classes. Here we closely approach the liberal concept of social reform, inspired by the notion that workers should be integrated into civil society and have a chance to demonstrate efficiency and aspire to higher positions within the market system, just as much as other members of society.⁵² This 'model solution' to the social question ori-

⁴⁸ For the decision-making process in the Federal Council see Haerendel, *Anfänge*, 63–75.

⁴⁹ Flügge in the session of the sixth commission, 31 Jan. 1889, in Bundesarchiv Berlin, R 101 no. 3138, 183.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 184.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² On this point also see the Liberal Swiss critic Platter, who, before the Department of the Interior changed its position, wrote in an article: 'Why

ented by the middle classes was typical of nineteenth-century liberalism. It was shared by National Liberals and left-wing Liberals, but with different consequences.⁵³ As the quotations show, the liberal idea of 'justice of efficiency' was contrasted with the Conservative egalitarian position, where justice with regard to the working classes implied an absence of poverty, but not a system of distribution along certain criteria. And what was the position of Social Democracy?

Because they were not represented on the commission, Social Democrats did not participate in the detailed planning of the system of contributions and benefits. But when the full assembly met, they clearly expressed their refusal to accept the Conservative concept. 'We have no sympathy for flat pensions; we are no friends of such a downwards-pointing egalitarianism. You always blame us for our egalitarianism, but if you act like this, you will not get our support; indeed we prefer egalitarianism pointing upwards.'⁵⁴ But while preferring the concept of classes to that of flat pensions the Social Democrats nevertheless voted against the system of contributions and benefits, for two reasons. First, they thought that the burden would be too heavy for people on low incomes. They therefore suggested that the state should pay the contributions of the classes on low incomes.⁵⁵ This is not surprising for a socialist party, but what is more thought-provoking is that the Social Democrats were mostly concerned about the bad position of well-paid workers in the system. This, of course, was because their main supporters were skilled workers, for whom they considered the pensions to be much too low.

does a state which offers its ministers and officials totally different pensions from its border staff and night patrolmen officially make it a rule that, when it comes to pensions for workers who have worked for society for forty-eight years without a break, it makes no difference whether they earned 2,000 or 500 Marks per annum?' J. Platter, 'Die geplante Alters- und Invalidenversicherung im Deutschen Reich', *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik*, 1 (1888), 7-42, at 22.

⁵³ See Rainer Koch, 'Liberalismus und soziale Frage im 19. Jahrhundert', in Karl Holl, Günter Trautmann, and Hans Vorländer (eds.), *Sozialer Liberalismus* (Göttingen, 1986), 17-33.

⁵⁴ Grillenberger speaking in the Reichstag, 6 Apr. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1348.

⁵⁵ See Grillenberger speaking in the Reichstag, 5 Apr. 1889, *ibid.* 1318.

Article

Social Democrats therefore wanted pensions to be calculated on the basis of actual income. They feared 'injustice' for workers earning, to quote Grillenberger, between 1,500 and 1,800 Marks, who would receive a pension of only perhaps 300 Marks because of the system of income classes.⁵⁶ It was, indeed, true that such a pension largely neglected living standards, and that it was generally not enough to live on. This, ultimately, was also true of the highest pension class, which could receive up to 448 Marks p.a. in the very unlikely event that they had contributed for fifty years.⁵⁷ Yet the average salary in industry was 711 Marks in 1890, and constantly growing.⁵⁸

The majority of the Reichstag accepted the concept put forward by the legislators, who were uneasy about the financial consequences of this new institution and did not want to grant 'too much'. Pensions were only meant to be an additional contribution towards survival without an income, or a reduced one. Of course, this was not acceptable to many of the future recipients, who pointed out in petitions to the Reichstag that the main reason for this new law had been to prevent workers having to accept discriminating poor relief. 'But if he is still dependent on public assistance in order not to starve with his family, if he is still dependent on the charity of others and on begging, then the law will not achieve its purpose.'⁵⁹

The liberal concept of a 'justice of efficiency' was passed in the Reichstag, but the classes did not stay grouped in the way that the legislators and the members of the Bundesrat had worked out. The new classes defined by the Reichstag were based on wage differentials, not the places where people worked.⁶⁰ To simplify the system,

⁵⁶ Ibid. 1319: 'you must admit that it is better not to leave room for such an injustice, but to take the actual salary as a basis.'

⁵⁷ For the figures see Michael Nitsche, *Die Geschichte des Leistungs- und Beitragsrechts der gesetzlichen Rentenversicherung von 1889 bis zum Beginn der Rentenreform* (Frankfurt am Main, 1986), 493–5.

⁵⁸ Walther G. Hoffmann, Franz Grumbach, and Helmut Hesse, *Das Wachstum der deutschen Wirtschaft seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1965), 468–71.

⁵⁹ Petition of Hanover workers loyal to the King, quoted by Paul Singer speaking in the Reichstag, 12 Apr. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1536.

⁶⁰ For the legislation process concerning contributions and benefits, see Haerendel, *Anfänge*, 111–25.

which was complicated enough, workers were allocated to one of four classes, depending on their membership of a certain health insurance fund. The health insurance funds defined 'normal wages' for their workers and these were also considered when grouping workers for invalidity and old age insurance. The reduction to only four classes defined by 'normal wages' weakened the concept of differentiation and thus also the logic of efficiency. However, to calculate contributions and pensions on the basis of individual salaries seemed too complicated and would make too great a demand on the future administration of this new institution.

The concept of a 'justice of efficiency' or, in the language of insurance, 'logic of equivalence', was further complicated by a regulation that meant workers from the lower classes got a higher proportion of their wages as a pension than the members of the upper wage classes.⁶¹ The majority of the commission saw this regulation as more just⁶² because it was especially advantageous to unskilled workers and women, who would potentially draw on public assistance. A philosophical justification can be found in John Rawls's 'difference principle' (part of his theory of justice), which states that differences in the distribution of social goods are allowed as long as they offer the least advantaged the greatest benefit.⁶³ As the Secretary of the Interior, von Boetticher, put it: 'For the state governments the aim in the sense of social policy is the main concern, rather than precise mathematical and insurance-related considerations. Therefore they do not much care whether contributions exactly correspond to benefits.'⁶⁴ Placing the idea of social justice above the justice of efficiency normally prevailing in the system, commission members developed the idea of setting up a basic pension consisting of a state subsidy of 50 Marks and an invariable sum of 60 Marks. These 110 Marks remained a stable part of each pension, while the sums added depended on wage class and the length of time contributions had been paid into the insurance fund. The result was that after only five

⁶¹ Ibid. 122-3.

⁶² John Rawls puts it thus: 'Justice is prior to efficiency and requires some changes that are not efficient in this sense.' John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (London, 1971), 79-80.

⁶³ Ibid. 75 et seq. See Döring, 'Leitvorstellungen', 216-17.

⁶⁴ Von Boetticher in the session of the commission on 8 Apr. 1889, in Bundesarchiv Berlin, R 101 no. 3139, 362-3.

Article

years of contributing, pensions did not differ much, regardless of whether payments were made in the first or the fourth class (114 or 140 Marks p.a.). Differences became much more significant after fifty years of contributing, when it was possible to receive a pension of between 162 and 448 Marks, depending on wage class.⁶⁵ Not all members of the commission approved of this adjustment. Schrader, a left-wing Liberal and Hitze, a member of the Centre Party, for example, defended the 'better-off workers' whom they saw as disadvantaged by this system, which put them almost at the same level as unskilled labourers after a short period of contributing.⁶⁶ But the majority defended the social component: 'It cannot, indeed, be overlooked that . . . at the beginning, pensions approach one another and that there is injustice against the upper wage classes in favour of the lower ones; but later on this problem of injustice will gradually vanish, and in the end, as well as on average, it will hardly be felt.'⁶⁷

Moreover, the advantages for the members of the lower wage classes should not be overestimated, as the first class in particular contained a large concentration of women who would never receive any benefits. A large percentage of them left the insurance scheme after the birth of children, and worked in the home or in non-insurable jobs.⁶⁸ As Hitze, a member of the Centre Party, pointed out, womens' contributions in their younger years paid for the others, and that represented the real 'injustice'.⁶⁹

IV. *Justice and the State Subsidy*

Justice was a problem not only of fair contributions and benefits, but was also discussed with reference to the state subsidy. The state sub-

⁶⁵ See Nitsche, *Geschichte des Leistungs- und Beitragsrechts*, 493–5.

⁶⁶ See session of the commission (n. 64), 361–2.

⁶⁷ Report of the commission in the session of the Reichstag, 12 Apr. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1526.

⁶⁸ See Ulrike Haerendel, 'Geschlechterpolitik und Alterssicherung', *Deutsche Rentenversicherung*, 62 (2007), 99–124.

⁶⁹ Hitze in the session of the Reichstag, 12 Apr. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1529. Hitze did not argue for substantial improvements concerning women, but suggested that they should have a wage class of their own with very low contributions.

sidy, which had been part of the concept right from the start, was the last relic of Bismarck's older idea of paying the insurance from tax revenue. For some parliamentary deputies the state subsidy was the main problem of the new institution, because the state was intervening directly in social matters. An Alsatian deputy, Winterer, expressed their concern:

In our view, providing for invalid and aged workers is a matter for those who are involved, employers and employees; it is not a direct concern of the state and the tax-payers. [Through the permanent subsidy] the state accepts an obligation that it has never recognized in this form before and which is not fixed; along with the tax-payer, the state becomes directly involved in, and committed to, the question of providing for aged workers. In short, it accepts a totally new position in the social realm. It is not content with protecting the law and the poor, but more or less wants to become the overall patron.⁷⁰

This was an exaggeration, of course, but Winterer expressed the fears of Catholics and left-wing Liberals that the state, having opened the door to state subsidies, would be held responsible for all social problems and claims. 'If it is once accepted that all the poor and feeble, all those defeated by the struggle for existence, should be fed by the Treasury, what reply is there to the statement that this could be done much better and more justly if the better-off paid more, or if means hitherto provided for other purposes were allocated exclusively to working people?'⁷¹ As we can see, the claim for justice was also feared as leading to the state becoming an omnipotent 'welfare state', restricting individual liberties and taking over the responsibilities of society. Additionally, left-wing Liberals pointed out that with the system of indirect taxes, the new burdens of the pension law would mostly hit the low income classes, whereas the well-to-do would profit from the easing of the cost of poor relief.⁷²

⁷⁰ Winterer speaking in the Reichstag, 4 Apr. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1263.

⁷¹ *Kölnische Volkszeitung und Handelsblatt*, no. 44, 14 Feb. 1889 (morning edn).

⁷² See Schrader in the session of the commission, 25 Jan. 1889, in Bundesarchiv Berlin, R 101 no. 3138, 139-45.

Article

The counterposition was put by Bismarck himself, who wanted the state to pay the full cost of the insurance. He saw it as a national task which, at least in the long run, had to be addressed by the whole of society and paid through the national income.⁷³ It was not only his interpretation of social justice that led to this position, but also the wish to make the Reich responsible for welfare.⁷⁴ The other government representatives did not want to go as far as Bismarck, having realistic concerns that the Reich budget, unable to afford the new institution, would be driven into debt. Nevertheless, they saw the state as responsible for taking an active part in a system which the state itself had made obligatory for a large part of the population. As the burden of poor relief would certainly decrease as a result of the law, it was only fair that the state should contribute to the new insurance.⁷⁵

Among the majority who held this view, however, there was a debate on how the state subsidy should be composed. The legislators had stipulated that each party—employers, employees, and the state—should pay one-third of the total contributions. But then Count Adelman, a member of the minority of the Centre Party who supported the law, had a better idea. Why not let everybody have the same share of this blessing? Was it fair that people with higher pensions because they earned more got more money from the state than those receiving lower pensions because of their low wages?⁷⁶ A majority of the commission found it more just to define the state subsidy as an invariable sum of 50 Marks for each pension. Injustice could be avoided, they argued, by a uniform distribution of the state subsidies between all pensioners.⁷⁷ It is interesting that this time, the argument in favour of justice of equality prevailed. Apparently the logic of the market, the principle of efficiency, did not apply where tax money was concerned.

⁷³ See *Quellensammlung*, 2nd section, vol. 6, no. 43 (Bismarck's vote on the 'Grundzüge', 11 Sept. 1887).

⁷⁴ See Michael Stolleis, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Rechts in Deutschland*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1992), ii. 455 et seq.

⁷⁵ Bosse and Woedtke, *Reichsgesetz*, 99.

⁷⁶ e.g. for a pension of 120 Marks p.a. the state subsidy was one-third of this sum: 40 Marks. But for a pension of 360 Marks, the state subsidy was 120 Marks, three times as much as in the lower pension.

⁷⁷ Bosse and Woedtke, *Reichsgesetz*, 282.

V. Conclusion

If we attempt to place our special discourse on justice, it is quite clear that it was the product of a period of transition. A modern view on externalizing social costs, welfare as a state task, and insurance as an obligation for everyone was imminent, but it was by no means self-explanatory or shared by everyone. Perhaps the most important condition for the success of the pension programme was that, in general, the National Liberals adopted this new view. Bismarck mostly interpreted the agenda for the Kaiserreich in this way too, but concerning rural life, for instance, he still spoke with the patriarchal agrarians, not wanting the state to intervene in social affairs. For them, the social question was only a matter of industrialization; they focused on the problem in the cities and in industry.⁷⁸ At the same time, they constructed a harmonious rural world without any class conflicts – one which had never existed, and especially not in the second half of the nineteenth century. The Social Democrats, on the other hand, used the debates on the pension programme to elaborate on the problems of capitalism, class struggle, and so on. But they also made constructive efforts to achieve real social improvements for their clientele. For them, the social question was to be resolved not only by a future revolution, but also by present-day reforms. This will to reform and to find a solution to a very pressing and apparent problem – the poverty of the aged and invalids – could also be observed among members of other political parties. It may seem that the left-wing Liberals sometimes did not want to achieve social reforms, and tried to stop any state support, for example. But this only reveals a different view of the social question. Like many Catholics, they wanted solutions to be reached by society itself, without constraints, bureaucracy, or ‘too much’ state interference.

These different views meant that the term ‘justice’ was used in many different ways. Of course, during parliamentary debates there was no philosophical discussion of Aristotle’s principles of justice. The discourse was limited to the practical implications of distributive justice, and was therefore more in the tradition of the Roman juridi-

⁷⁸ See Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998), 210: ‘Where the countryside tended to mask its poverty, the great cities concentrated it, flaunting economic misery even as they cordoned it off.’

Article

cal and normative conclusions on justice than of Greek philosophical thinking.⁷⁹ This also meant that the discourse did not aim to find a final and exact definition of justice in the context of pensions policy, but saw finding a solution to a real social conflict as the main task. This integrative function of justice was often referred to, since a more general view, seemingly avoiding special party interests, could be claimed in the name of justice. When Gebhard, a National Liberal, for example, pleaded for the 'regulations to be implemented as diligently and precisely as possible', he argued as follows: 'I claim that this lies at the heart of all parties; since it applies to everyone, may the law otherwise be regarded as a blessing or a curse, its regulations will be administered equally and justly for all.'⁸⁰

Of course, as we have seen, the overall 'neutrality' of justice was an illusion; there was no basic justice under which all interests could be united. Justice was a discursive construction which took shape only in the process of law-making. It was first used to form party positions and then as a means of unifying the majority of the Reichstag behind political compromises and practical solutions. This was very clear in the design of the system of contributions and benefits. Some Conservatives highly contested the differentiated system right to the very end of the parliamentary discussion because they feared it would make agriculture, with its low salaries, even less attractive.⁸¹ But the government was depending on the Conservatives to pass the bill, so it denounced the Conservative (agrarian) position as promoting 'inequality' and 'injustice',⁸² while its system, it claimed, stood for 'justice'. The question is not whether the system of income classes was really more just than the idea of flat pensions. It is merely interesting that a majority in the Reichstag, and even among the Conservative parties, accepted this sort of differentiation as a means of establishing a fair and just system. The method estab-

⁷⁹ See Herfried Münkler and Marcus Llanque, 'Die Frage nach der Gerechtigkeit', in eid. (eds.), *Konzeptionen der Gerechtigkeit: Kulturvergleich – Ideengeschichte – Moderne Debatte* (Baden-Baden, 1999), 9–19, at 10–12.

⁸⁰ Session of the Reichstag, 20 Nov. 1889, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, V. Session 1889/90, 397.

⁸¹ See the Prussian member of the Reichspartei, Holtz, at the third reading, *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1794–8.

⁸² See the speech by the member of the Bundesrat, Freiherr von Marschall, *ibid.* 1325.

lished to record payment of contributions demonstrated the 'justice' of the system to those who had to pay for it: 'Each worker for whom the weekly proof is pasted knows that with this stamp his pension will grow.'⁸³ Liberal speakers pointed to this advantage of a process often denounced as bureaucratic and fuzzy. The procedural techniques of the 'paste law' justified the system itself because they represented the binding agreement between the individual and the institution and guaranteed a reward in the future. And while Niklas Luhmann's famous concept of 'legitimization through process'⁸⁴ was actually coined for juridical and political proceedings,⁸⁵ it also seems to apply to these methods of insuring people.

We have seen that the notion of 'justice of efficiency' dominated the discourse and won over the egalitarian position where justice meant help in the case of utmost misery. The fact that the liberal concept of justice prevailed, of course, also meant that 'justice of needs' was widely neglected by the newly established pension system. As a result, poor relief never became obsolete in the history of the German pension system because there were always some pensioners who were not able to live on the pension. By paying contributions according to a certain wage category, workers provided for pensions reflecting their income during their working life. People without salaries and the self-employed were excluded from the system. We have seen, however, that the justice of efficiency became tangled in at least two ways. First, a 'social factor' was introduced to change the principle of strict equivalence to one that gave a little more to the less advantaged. And secondly, a state subsidy not only challenged the social security system hitherto based solely on contributions, but also established the principle of equality within the system. A prominent National Liberal supporter of the pension law, Franz Armand Buhl, explained why the majority had voted for these regulations, changing the character of the law: the chance to establish greater social jus-

⁸³ Reichsrat Buhl with reference to Count Adelman speaking in the Reichstag, 12 Apr. 1889, *ibid.* 1534.

⁸⁴ Niklas Luhmann, *Legitimation durch Verfahren* (2nd edn., Darmstadt, 1975).

⁸⁵ Cf. an interesting approach to pensions using Luhmann's theory. Lars Kaschke, 'Kommission für "Rentenquetsche"? Die Rentenverfahren in der Invalidenversicherung und die Bereisung der Landesversicherungsanstalten 1901-1911' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Bremen, 1997).

Article

tice had motivated them. 'Even if we do not intend to pass a law that is absolutely correct in the sense of insurance, we do have to strive to create a just law, a just law which is seen as such by the workers.'⁸⁶

⁸⁶ Buhl speaking in the Reichstag, 12 Apr. 1889, in *Stenographische Berichte*, VII. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session 1888/89, 1535.

ULRIKE HAERENDEL wrote this article at the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Social Law in Munich, and now works at the Protestant Academy of Tutzing. The author of *Die gesetzliche Invaliditäts- und Altersversicherung und die Alternativen auf gewerkschaftlicher und betrieblicher Grundlage* (2004), she has been working on the old age pension system in Germany for some years.

REVIEW ARTICLES

THE ORIGINS OF THE PROTESTANT PAST: RECENT WORKS ON THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF EARLY MODERN GERMANY

C. Scott Dixon

MATTHIAS POHLIG, *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit und konfessioneller Identitätsstiftung: Lutherische Kirchen- und Universalgeschichtsschreibung 1546–1617*, Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Neue Reihe 37 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), xiii + 589 pp. ISBN 978 3 16 149191 7. €99.00

ALEXANDRA KESS, *Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of History*, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), xii + 245 pp. ISBN 978 0 7546 5770 5. £60.00

MATTHEW McLEAN, *The Cosmographia of Sebastian Münster: Describing the World in the Reformation*, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), viii + 384 pp. ISBN 978 0 7546 5843 6. £65.00

GEOFFREY LUKE DIPPLE, *'Just as in the Time of the Apostles': Uses of History in the Radical Reformation* (Kitchener, Ont.: Pandora Press, 2005), 324 pp. ISBN 1 894710 58 4. \$US 33.50 (paperback)

The early modern period was a time of radical innovation in the writing and reading of history. Throughout Europe, scholars began to pull the common threads of the *ars historica* together into meaningful patterns using the methods we have come to think of as modern. As Anthony Grafton has remarked, this was the period when history emerged 'as a comprehensive discipline that ranged across space and time, and as a critical discipline based on the distinction between primary and secondary sources'.¹ All aspects of the past fell subject to this new critical spirit. Common assumptions relating to place and time were examined and re-examined by intellectuals in disciplines

¹ Anthony Grafton, *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), 33.

Review Articles

ranging from history to philology, genealogy, chorography, numismology, antiquarianism, and even early shades of anthropology. So, too, with reference to the sources. Scholars started to purge their texts of the artifice and invention of the rhetoricians, for instance; from this point forward, all historical speeches that lacked direct proofs, or indeed even historical plausibility, were purged. In order to pass muster, historical testimony had to have dates that collated with other sources, technical and linguistic characteristics appropriate to the author and the age, a clear and present internal consistency, and viable horizons of expectation. Only then could it serve as the basis for a work representative of this new 'hermeneutical discipline'.²

Much of this innovation emerged from within the ultramontane republic of letters. But Germany had its early modern practitioners as well, men such Reiner Reineccius (1541–95) and David Chytraeus (1530–1600), who borrowed freely from the techniques of the southern scholars. Of course, there were differences in approach, emphasis, and style. The German fascination with genealogy, for instance, was largely a national trait, and it may have had something to do with the need to impose a sense of continuity on an imperial past lacking any obvious native sense of order or sequence.³ Beyond this, however, was the more crucial issue of faith. Unlike the Italian humanists, German historians had to contend with the intense reli-

² Ibid. 1–45, the quotation at 32. Standard works on early modern German historiography include Ulrich Muhlack, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Humanismus und in der Aufklärung: Die Vorgeschichte des Historismus* (Munich, 1991); Geoffrey Dickens and John M. Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Oxford, 1985); Gustav Adolf Benrath, 'Das Verständnis der Kirchengeschichte in der Reformationszeit', in Ludger Grenzmann and Karl Stackmann (eds.), *Literatur und Laienbildung im Spätmittelalter und in der Reformationszeit* (Stuttgart, 1984), 97–109; Klaus Wetzell, *Theologische Kirchengeschichtsschreibung im deutschen Protestantismus 1660–1760* (Gießen, 1983), 1–209; Notker Hammerstein, *Jus und Historie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Denkens an deutschen Universitäten im späten 17. und im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1972); Emil Clemens Scherer, *Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten: Ihre Anfänge im Zeitalter des Humanismus und ihre Ausbildung zu selbständigen Disziplinen* (Freiburg, 1927), 175–273.

³ On the search for genealogical order at the territorial level, see Thomas Fuchs, *Traditionsstiftung und Erinnerungspolitik: Geschichtsschreibung in Hessen in der frühen Neuzeit* (Kassel, 2002).

gious fragmentation that overwhelmed the German lands and ultimately set the confessional groupings on different intellectual trajectories. Few disciplines were spared the effects of this Christian infighting, but the art of history was particularly affected, for it quickly emerged as one of the main forums for the shaping of religious identity.

All of this is well known. Modern historians have long noted the role played by the Reformation in the rewriting of the European past. The classic statement remains that of Pontien Polman, who was one of the first to trace the effects of the confessional imperative on the art of history. Recently, Irena Backus has challenged Polman's (largely) negative assessment, speaking instead of 'the creative role of history in the Reformation era as a decisive factor in the affirmation of confessional identity'.⁴ Yet both scholars are in agreement that religion was central to the shaping of the historical imagination and that this was especially true in the German lands. But identifying the role of religion does not answer all questions relating to effect. Exactly how did the first historians of Protestant Europe go about rewriting the past? To what extent did the confessional divisions influence perceptions? What place did religion assume in the minds of the first few generations of historians working within this newly crafted 'hermeneutical discipline'? These are questions that have recently been raised by historians working on the *ars historica* in early modern Germany.

With the appearance of Matthias Pohlig's *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit und konfessioneller Identitätsstiftung*, we now have an extremely meticulous and judicious study of the question of influence. Working within the framework of the confessionalization thesis, the influential paradigm developed in large part by his *Doktorvater* Heinz Schilling (the other main exponent being Wolfgang Reinhard), Pohlig examines the relationship between Lutheranism and the rise of a distinct type of confessionalized (Lutheran) historiography between 1546 and 1617. This is a step beyond the approach of Polman or Backus, for *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit* does not just look for the evidence of religious bias and trace it back to its author. Pohlig's aim is to

⁴ Pontien Polman, *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du 16e siècle* (Gembloux, 1932), 540-3; Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden, 2003), 5.

Review Articles

recreate the profile of a distinctly Lutheran *Geschichtskultur* and situate it within the motives, arguments, genres, methods, and historical forces that shaped historiographical discourse. By way of examining a range of individual texts—some well-known, some fairly obscure—the work pursues a number of general issues relating to the confessionalization process and the writing of history. How was historical perception affected by religious developments? To what extent may we refer to a distinctly Lutheran approach to the past? Was it an individual or a collective sense of identity? What was the relationship between this confessional memory and the actual historical record? What Pohlig is really after is the more internal, subjective side of confessionalization—the inner sense rather than the infrastructure—and the work does discuss some related concepts at the outset, such as confessional culture (*Konfessionskultur*) and the formation of confessions (*Konfessionsbildung*), that have touched on this theme in other contexts.⁵ But for the most part the analysis remains firmly within the frame of confessionalization, and, indeed, in large part the book is a subtly conceived inquiry into the strengths and weaknesses of the concept.

Much of *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit* is devoted to defining and delineating the concepts, terms, methods, and genres common to the discipline of history in the early modern period. In the discussion of the relationship between church history and universal history, for instance, Pohlig is careful to point out that there were no clear lines of demarcation between the two. Universal history, which dealt with the past from creation onward, necessarily had a strong providential dimension to it. Nor was political history ever entirely free of divine influence. And yet the first Lutheran historians went to great lengths to draw distinctions between the secular and the spiritual. The basic correlation was clear: one sphere was concerned with earthly order and the other with salvation. Lutheran thinkers were able to problematize this dilemma by adapting the idea of the two kingdoms or playing up the differences between Law and Gospel, thus in essence projecting a theological schema onto the past. But the lines between the secular and the spiritual remained very hard to draw.

⁵ See the discussion in Thomas Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur: Lutherischer Protestantismus in der zweiten Hälfte des Reformationsjahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 2006), 3–26.

The most exacting theorist in this respect was Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560). As early as his reworking of the *Chronicle* of Johannes Carion (1499–1537), by way of an ‘intensive theologization’ (‘intensive Theologisierung’, p. 179) of Carion’s work, Melanchthon had managed to bring both the political and the prophetic into a thematic framework. He did this by adopting the Danielic scheme for the unfolding of universal history and the threefold *domus Eliae* scheme for church history (which postulated the following trajectory: before the Law, under the Law, after the Law) and thus situated politics and religion in their separate spheres.⁶ Other types of historical works, such as the influential chronologies of Johannes Funck (1518–66) and Leonhard Krentzheim (1532–98), maintained the same sort of format. None of this, however, was emphatically ‘Lutheran’ in its approach. It was lightly coloured with evangelical thought, but it was not yet the basis of the Protestant invention of tradition that would emerge in the church histories of the second- and third-generation reformers. And it is to this type of confessionalized history that Pohligh turns in the second half of the book.

The central dilemma facing the first Protestants was how to find space for their church within the Christian story. One method, as Pohligh points out in the discussion of Luther (1483–1546), was to focus on the charismatic aspects of history, to argue that divine intervention had effected a sudden change through a prophetic figure. But the more conventional method was to locate the faith within a deep historical continuity.⁷ Early practitioners of this method, scholars such as Kaspar Hedio (1494–1552) and Robert Barnes (1495–1540), did this by arguing that the Catholic Church had fallen away from an original archetype and that it was the reformers who represented pure Christianity. Names once found on indices of medieval heretics were now among the lists of saints and scholars of proto-Protestantism, while the main figures of Roman Catholic history – starting with the pope – were held liable for the decline of the Church

⁶ Cf. Arno Seifert, *Der Rückzug der biblischen Prophetie von der neueren Geschichte: Studien zur Geschichte der Reichstheologie des frühneuzeitlichen deutschen Protestantismus* (Cologne, 1990).

⁷ A common approach in most Protestant cultures. For England, see Daniel R. Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500–1730* (Cambridge, 2003) and *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000).

Review Articles

and cited as examples of its corruption, spuriousness, and greed. In the early stages it was largely a moral argument, a demonstration of outward decline. Only with the added theological impulse provided by Melancthon, who spoke of the continuity of the Church and its teachers (*doctores Dei*), did the discourse begin to develop the idea of a continuum ingredient to the Lutheran faith.

The leading exponent of this approach was Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520–75), and it was his *Catalogus testium veritatis* (1556), the ‘most influential treatment of the continuity problem’ (301), that provided the main archetype.⁸ No work could match the *Catalogus* for the depth of its research; but even more important was Flacius’ ability to fix the premise of a continuum around the idea of the true witnesses of the faith (*testes veritatis*) while integrating the three main Lutheran ‘genres’ – martyrology, church history, and antipapalism – into the mix. As influential as the *Catalogus* was, however, it was never able to overcome its inner tensions. Balancing the ideas of decline and continuity, as Pohlig points out at the end of the discussion (pp. 338–41), was a difficult task, and to a certain extent the sheer adaptability of both the idea of a continuum and the history of the *testes veritatis* undermined its profile as a purely Lutheran discourse. By the seventeenth century, as the number of witnesses and martyrs accumulated, and as theologians grew wary of the revelatory qualities of profane history, the influence of the *Catalogus* began to wane.

In the final section of the book Pohlig turns to look at the influence of the confessionalization process on other types of historical texts. Beginning with the popular genre of calendars and almanacs, the analysis once again breaks down the literature into its fields and sub-fields and reaches the same sort of conclusions as those in the earlier discussion of universal histories and chronologies. In most works, such as the publications of Paul Eber (1511–69) and Michael Beuther (1522–87), there was no marked theological content beyond the evangelical basics; and, indeed, most of the texts would have been (and were) thought suitable for Catholic consumption. These works were effective as a means of establishing important dates and figures – the relatively indiscriminate *memoria* of confessional identity – but there

⁸ Recent works include Arno Mentzel-Reuters and Martina Hartmann (eds.), *Catalogus und Centurien: Interdisziplinäre Studien zu Matthias Flacius und den Magdeburger Centurien* (Tübingen, 2008); Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the Survival of Luther’s Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002).

was no substantial or consistent instrumentalization of the faith.⁹ Only with the church calendars, such as those by Kaspar Goldtwurm (1524–59), do we encounter a reworking of the past that can be considered a form of religious self-fashioning; but even here, there was no systematic theological shaping. So, too, with the Lutheran commentaries on the Apocalypse, which is discussed in the final chapter-length analysis of the book. Exegesis of this sort allowed plenty of scope for antipapalism and the privileging of Lutheran notions of the End of Days. But the modern reader looks in vain for any consistent or uniform ‘confessionalized’ reading of the past.

Few of the conclusions reached at the end of *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit* will come as unexpected to readers versed in Reformation historiography. There were degrees to which texts or genres were suitable for the fashioning of a religious identity (their *Konfessionalisierbarkeit*), and we should not be surprised by this, for the traditions and parameters of the *ars historica* did not just vanish in the face of the Protestant advance. The Ciceronian model so popular with the humanists, for instance, retained its appeal even after the reformers began to write about the past. Thus with reference to the two central questions raised at the outset of the work (namely, was there a distinctly Lutheran type of history and did it contribute to the making of confessional identity?), Pohlig is careful to point out that both answers require qualification. In some genres, such as church history or the flood of martyrologies, it was fairly easy to set a Lutheran stamp on the work, and one of the main strengths of *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit* is its ability to demonstrate how a confessionalized (Lutheran) viewpoint fed into the narrative. In other works, however, such as universal history or the popular calendars and almanacs, the confessional discourse was less effective at fashioning a sense of identity, and this leads Pohlig to describe the general relationship between faith and history in fairly ambiguous terms.

But this is the point: it was not a question of extremes, fully confessionalized historiography versus resilient genres. As Pohlig

⁹ Susan Boettcher, ‘Von der Trägheit der Memoria: Cranachs Lutheraltarbilder im Zusammenhang der evangelischen Luther-Memoria im späten 16. Jahrhundert’, in Joachim Eibach and Marcus Sandl (eds.), *Protestantische Identität und Erinnerung* (Göttingen, 2003), 47–69; Thomas Fuchs, ‘Protestantische Heiligen-memoria im 16. Jahrhundert’, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 267 (1998), 587–614.

Review Articles

writes: 'Between both poles lies a series of different intersections between the inherent logic of historiography and confessional utilization, which itself has been informed by the religious profile of the individual author as well as preliminary decisions relating to genre' (p. 507). The great value of *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit* is the skill and learning with which Pohlig investigates this middle ground. Throughout the work, he establishes a conceptual framework for understanding the works (and his application of the Two Kingdoms concept to Lutheran historiography is an example of this), and then, by way of a detailed reading of the primary and secondary materials, reveals the voices, tensions, and ambiguities in the texts themselves. This book should be the starting point for any scholar who is interested in the making of the Lutheran, and indeed the Protestant, past.

The very title of the work by Alexandra Kess, *Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of History*, evokes an approach different from that in *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit*. Both books work from the premise that Protestants used history synchronously as a polemic, a form of justification, and a means of self-fashioning; but unlike Pohlig's array of narratives and metanarratives, Kess focuses on one author and one particular 'vision' of Protestant history: the work of the so-called 'father of Reformation history', Johann Sleidan (1506–56).¹⁰ Kess's purpose is to revisit the primary materials in order to write a new narrative of Sleidan's life and to apply the insights to a (re)reading of the *Commentaries* (1555).¹¹ Owing to the importance accorded to Sleidan in Protestant historiography, this is more than just intellectual biography: it is a contribution to our understanding of the Protestant vision of history *tout court*. By way of a nuanced exercise in historical reconstruction, Alexandra Kess has provided Reformation historians with a book that sheds light on Sleidan as well as the composition of the *Commentaries* and its later reception.

Sleidan's claim to be the founding father of a uniquely Protestant type of history does not rest on theological foundations. What historians tend to claim instead is that he was the first historian to write a history of the Reformation using modern hermeneutical tech-

¹⁰ Coined by Donald R. Kelly, 'Johann Sleidan and the Origins of History as a Profession', *Journal of Modern History*, 52 (1980), 573–98.

¹¹ In its original Latin title: *De Statu religionis et reipublicae Carlo Quinto Caesare Commentarii* (Strasbourg, 1555).

niques.¹² Sleidan approached the sources with a critical eye and recognized the need to go beyond established narratives and write histories based on archival materials. Certainly, Sleidan drew on a wide range of primary documents while compiling the *Commentaries*, including the public decrees and private papers in the archives of Hesse, Saxony, and Strasbourg (which were just a fraction of the materials he wanted to access). And like many historians educated in Humanist scholarship, he believed that primary source materials of this kind, because of their proximity to the events they describe, reflected a greater degree of historical truth than second-hand testimony or subsequent annotations. Sleidan made this point at the outset of the work, drawing the reader's attention to the range of primary materials that have been consulted during its composition, 'the faith of which can justly be called into question by no man' (p. 92).

In terms of the philosophy of history, however, the work was less innovative. It was Protestant to the extent that it adopted the general ellipsis of decline and renewal, with the Reformation, as initiated by Luther, being the sudden moment of Christian rebirth at the end of a long dark night of decay. And in the *Commentaries*, as in other publications, Sleidan worked within the Danielic four-kingdoms framework, which remained a standard Lutheran approach until well into the seventeenth century. But his interpretation was not informed by theology to any substantial degree. In general, Sleidan's reliance on religious or providential explanations for his depiction of the recent past was less marked than his recourse to the secular dimensions of historical cause-and-effect. Indeed, his recognition of the role of politics in the religious history of the sixteenth century made him unique among the first generation of Lutheran historians. It is one of the reasons why scholars consider the *Commentaries* to be a work, as Kess puts it, 'teetering on the brink of modern historiography' (p. 116).

¹² This had emerged as a commonplace in the nineteenth century, though not all historians thought it made for good history. Theodor Paur, for instance, in his *Johann Sleidans Commentare über die Regierungszeit Karls V. historisch-kritisch betrachtet* (Leipzig, 1843), 57 had this to say: 'Im Ganzen genommen findet das eigentlich Thatsächliche wenig Platz in den Commentaren: den Hauptinhalt bilden die Verhandlungen, der gegenseitige Austausch von officiellen Schriften' (Generally speaking there is little place for actual historical realities in the *Commentaries*. Negotiations make up the main substance, the mutual exchange of official documents).

Review Articles

The final chapters of *Johann Sleidan* take up the important issue of reception. The Latin edition of the *Commentaries* sold well when it first appeared and German translations followed in quick succession. It was reprinted and updated right up to the beginning of the seventeenth century. And yet it does not seem to have spawned many direct imitators in the German lands. Not until the seventeenth century, in the massive source-based works of Friedrich Hortleder (1579–1640) and Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626–92), do we see such a concern with the truth-function of archival sources.

In contrast, of particular interest is Kess's final chapter on Sleidan's reception in France. Published by Jean Crespin (1520–72) in a French translation within a year of its appearance, the *Commentaries* proved an instant success. There were sixteen editions between 1556 and 1566, as well as numerous unauthorized versions and forgeries. Unlike the German lands, where Sleidan's work had few immediate imitators, in France it was quickly adopted as a model. Though not mentioning Sleidan in the body of the text, Pierre de la Place (1520–72) borrowed freely for his own *Commentaires* of 1565. Theodore Beza (1519–1605) praised the excellence of Sleidan's research techniques, while Jean Bodin (1529/30–96) went so far as to cite the *Commentaries* as an example of sound methodology in the *Methodus*, his own synthesis of the historian's craft. Of course, not all French scholars sung his praises. Florimond de Raemond (1540–1601) took him to task for his confessional bias, his polemics, and his distortion of the sources, while Simon Fontaine, who derived more from Johannes Cochleaus (1479–1552) than Sleidan for his anti-Protestant *Histoire catholique de nostre temps* (1558), does not seem to have considered his work theological enough to warrant lengthy refutation. Instead he granted him the damning praise of being so popular in Catholic France, 'that not many were interested in a refutation of his work' (170). Even later in the century, as Catholics began to engage the Protestant histories more directly, they did not shy away from gathering their facts from Sleidan.¹³

Of course, being irenic during the age of confessionalization was not counted among the virtues. And this was especially true if the person thought to exemplify this trait was also the first official histo-

¹³ On the making of French religious identity, see Alain Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France au XVIe siècle: essai sur la vision gallicane du monde* (Paris, 2002), 27–53.

rian of Protestantism. It was for this reason that some Lutherans distanced themselves from Sleidan's work. His very impartiality, his very fidelity to the truth-claims of the original sources, raised doubts about his commitment to the cause. Coupled with this was his cosmopolitan approach to the recent past—a way of seeing the world that, as Kess suggests, had much to do with his years in Strasbourg—and this, too, must have seemed suspect in the eyes of some of the reformers of Saxony and Hesse, who were inclined to think that history had become a private matter between themselves and God. But if Sleidan was not 'Protestant' enough to repel the historians of France, and if his historiography was not evangelical enough to represent a radical break with the Catholic reading of the past, and if much of his methodology and frameworking, such as his Danielic pattern and his light touch of providentialism, were standard Lutheran fare, and if his *Commentaries* had such a modest impact within the lands of Lutheran Germany that the first serious engagement with his text did not emerge until the seventeenth century—if all of this is true, why then is Sleidan considered the father of Reformation history?

Essentially, the answer seems to be pride of time and place. As the official historian of the Schmalkaldic League, Sleidan was the first official chronicler of Protestantism. The only other early Protestant historian to exercise an influence analogous to that of Sleidan was Melancthon; but the *Commentaries*, because it balanced light touches of confessionalism with fairly open debts to Alsacian Humanism, was always likely to attract a much wider readership in the south.¹⁴ Moreover, because of its judicious and extensive use of the source materials, the *Commentaries* emerged not only as the first Protestant monument to the (modern) historian's craft, but also as a record of historical events so sound and broad-based that it provided the factual foundation for Protestant narratives until the historians of Pietism and Enlightenment began to dismantle the past.¹⁵ Until that happened, the *Commentaries* continued to exercise an influence upon church historians, Protestants and Catholic alike. It was a unique work of history, written by a man caught up in a unique flow of

¹⁴ Pohlig, *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit*, 161.

¹⁵ C. Scott Dixon, 'Faith and History on the Eve of Enlightenment: Ernst Salomon Cyprian, Gottfried Arnold, and the *History of Heretics*', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 57 (2006), 33–54.

Review Articles

events, both of which have been captured and analysed with considerable skill by Kess.

Different in kind to the work of Sleidan was the universal history of Sebastian Münster (1489–1552), the polyhistor of Basel. In *The Cosmographia of Sebastian Münster*, Matthew McLean embarks on a close reading of the 1550 Latin edition of the *Cosmographia* in order to shed light on both its author and the context of its composition. This is not an easy task. Like the texts he published, Münster was encyclopaedic. He was a leading Hebraist and grammarian, *inter alia* a student of mathematics, geography, horticulture, viticulture, astronomy, and chronometry, a reluctant theologian, and one of the most influential historians (or topograph-historians) of his age. Fittingly, McLean begins his study with a biographical overview, and it is clear from the outset that both Münster and his works have little in common with the historico-theological synopses that emerged in the orthodox Lutheran heartlands of Germany. More harmonizer and hoarder than synthesizer or theoretician (as McLean describes him), Münster was everything that historians such as Flacius were not.

Chapter two provides a historical survey of cosmography from the age of Ptolemy and Strabo to the topograph-historians of the sixteenth century. Two schools in particular were important in the shaping of Münster: the mathematical or geophysical approach of Ptolemy and the descriptive or anthropocentric approach of Strabo. Münster worked within both traditions; and indeed, as is pointed out in later chapters, the *Cosmographia* owed its lasting importance and interest to its skill at interfusing the two.¹⁶

Having surveyed the intellectual landscape, McLean's analysis shifts from the genealogy of ideas to their utilization. As proto-nationalists such as Conrad Celtis (1459–1508) set out to recover the history of the German peoples in projects like his unfinished *Germania Illustrata*, geography and history assumed an important functional and symbolic role in the cultural imagination of the northern Renaissance.¹⁷ This explains the sudden fascination with chorography, a discipline which set out to effect, as McLean puts it, 'a description of place across time' (p. 95). It also explains why ambi-

¹⁶ On this theme in general, see Frank Lestringant, *Mapping the Renaissance World: The Geographical Imagination in the Age of Discovery* (Berkeley, 1994).

¹⁷ See now Christopher S. Wood, *Forgery, Replica, Fiction: Temporalities of German Renaissance Art* (Chicago, 2008).

tious scholars turned to cosmology, for while it was conceptually and methodologically similar to chorography, it was many times bigger in scale and intent. Münster thus belonged to a living tradition—Celtis, Aegidius Tschudi (1505–72), Johannes Stumpf (1500–77), Joachim Vadian (1484–1551), Simon Grynaeus (1493–1541), and Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) are just a few of the other prominent names associated with the craft. And they all began to chart the world according to the coordinates of a ‘dechristianised *Weltbild*’ being reshaped by the ongoing revolutions in thought. The result was a geometrical and mathematical conceptualization of space, a world made up of longitudes and latitudes, trapezoid projections, and astronomical points, which began to press out a medieval cosmos based on history, myth, and religion (p. 129). Moreover, as McLean notes near the end of his survey, we must not forget the surrounding social, cultural, and technological setting: the very mutability of the present was pressing out the past (p. 133).

Particularly fascinating are the sections in chapter three that deal with the composition of the *Cosmographia*. In preparing the work, Münster travelled extensively, gathering sources, reports, and personal correspondence, visiting libraries and ruins, transcribing genealogies and tomb inscriptions. But he also relied on the research of others. By drawing up a forensic template and posting it to local worthies and scholars, he was in effect able to rely on a huge intelligence-gathering service. Many of the detailed cityscapes in the work, some of which have street-level verisimilitude, are testimony to this local knowledge.¹⁸ Moreover, as the horizon of the work moved beyond the German lands, so too did the reach of his correspondence. The result was an encyclopedia of general knowledge designed to satisfy the intellectual demands of ‘every species of scholar and layman’ (p. 192).

The organizing logic of the *Cosmographia* was linear: it unfolded as if it were a peregrination or pilgrimage of the world. Methodologically, as well, the work moved: Münster begins with geography, but the analysis soon contracts into sections devoted to chorography, etymology, history (genealogical and political), and ethnography. Nor

¹⁸ On the cities’ growing historical awareness, see Susanne Rau, *Geschichte und Konfession: Städtische Geschichtsschreibung und Erinnerungskultur im Zeitalter von Reformation und Konfessionalisierung in Bremen, Breslau, Hamburg und Köln* (Hamburg, 2002).

Review Articles

was there a singular style of analysis or an exclusive notion of what type of information was worthy of inclusion. Münster did not always make a distinction between the truth-claims of the sources he used. In his approach to topography and ethnology, for instance, the rationale seems to have been to assemble as much detail as possible in the expectation that the sheer weight of information would tip the balance in favour of truth. In his use of history, he drew freely on a wide range of sources, from classical accounts and medieval chronicles to contemporary reports, travel diaries, and universal and regional histories. Granted, while citing them he spoke of the need for the reader to be wary of historical testimony, to compare and collate and check the validity of sources. Yet at the same time he was willing to include apocrypha, urban myths, cautionary tales, and even short accounts of misbirths and miracles. Throughout the *Cosmographia*, Münster moved freely between facts and curiosities, thick descriptions and aery anecdotes, scientific knowledge and common knowledge. In fact, as McLean notes, he tended to be more 'scientific' when faced with the unknown. Topics that were overly familiar or well-sourced seem to have dulled his critical senses (p. 263).

And yet, for all the seeming arbitrariness of his hoarding and assemblage, Münster did not think that history was random. In the final chapter, McLean treats of the deeper convictions that underwrote the *Cosmographia*. Due perhaps to a sense that the world, in all of its mounting complexity, was drifting apart, Münster tended to emphasize the need for unity and harmony. In large part this was projection, an attempt to 'rechristianise a worldview which had been blanched of its moral content since the late medieval world had gained a continent, regained Ptolemy's *Geography*, and the printing press had spread the knowledge of mariners and explorers throughout European society' (p. 282). This same impulse to harmonize carried over to his musings on religion. Münster, the Rabbinic scholar, had a tolerant cast of mind, generally treating Jewish and Catholic history with a sense of detachment (at worst he recycled platitudes) and integrating influential figures from the past, such as Charlemagne, into his narrative, even when they were considered long-term standard-bearers of the papacy. There was more than a hint of pansophism *avant la lettre* in his approach to scholarship, and in particular his belief that the acquisition of knowledge would lead to virtue, justice, and order regardless of cultural or confessional association.

But there was a deeper logic as well. While the *Cosmographia* did not have much to say about the *Endzeit*, there is no doubt that his sense of history was coloured by a strong sense of providentialism. It is revealed, for instance, in Münster's stress on the intellectual and technological progress so apparent in his own day. Favouring the moderns over the ancients was in large part a means 'of bringing [his readers] to marvel at where they stood, and how they had come to be there' (p. 312). And the purpose was not just to cast light on the native ingenuity of man. Despite Münster's seeming conversion to the 'mathematicisation of nature', a very powerful undercurrent of providentialism remained. All of human history (and indeed all of natural history) is interpreted against the backdrop of a 'sacred topography' that sees the hand of God in human affairs and expects the reader to draw the proper Christian conclusions.¹⁹ This was the moral imperative of the text: 'if we prove unfaithful to our lord', he wrote, the German Empire will fall, just as Egypt, Greece, and Rome had fallen in previous ages.

Understanding Münster and his *Cosmographia* requires a deft touch, for this was not a historian who ordered his analysis around hard dichotomies. Although an open convert to Protestantism and a man whose essential purpose was to reveal the workings of the divine, the *Cosmographia* was largely free of confessional bias; although a hoarder and a harmonizer, and a historian who considered all aspects of the secular and the spiritual within his province, he was in search of an essential spiritual truth, some trace of the *philosophia christiana* that unites all human knowledge; though an accomplished Hebraist, he was more interested in the lexical than the theological; and although a proponent of the mathematical and scientific, he was equally at home in the descriptive and the anthropocentric – and he did not balk at the anecdotal, the mythical, or the fantastical if it said something about the past. In *The Cosmographia of Sebastian Münster*, McLean manages to hold all of these attributes in balance and present the reader with the story of a unique thinker in dialogue with a very complex intellectual world. It is a thoughtful and probing work, full of interesting asides and arresting turns of phrase, and it reminds

¹⁹ On a similar accommodation in Dutch natural philosophy, see Eric Jorink, *Het Boeck der Natuere: Nederlandse geleerden en de wonderen van Gods schepping, 1575–1715* (Leiden, 2007).

Review Articles

us of just how many histories went into the making of the Protestant past.

Reference to the idea of histories in the same sentence that speaks of *the* Protestant past raises additional questions relating to faith and history. To this point, the vast majority of the discussion has gravitated around the works of Protestant historians within the magisterial tradition—Melancthon, Sleidan, and Flacius, to name just the principal authors. They may not have shared the same theological convictions, but all could agree that the history they were setting out to write was the record of the True Church in historical time. But there was another Protestant reading of the Christian past that challenged the historicism of the magisterial tradition.

The radicals, as Geoffrey Dipple illustrates in *Just as in the Time of the Apostles*, had a conception of the Christian past that parted company with both the Lutheran and the Reformed approach. But not as much as is generally thought. Traditionally, modern scholars have thought of the radical histories as representative of an uncompromising primitivism, a cast of mind that was rooted in the radical desire to recover the purity of New Testament religion. The most influential study of this historiographical tradition has been the work of Franklin H. Littell, and the main aim of Dipple's work is to rethink the extent to which the radicals harkened back to a formal (or formalized) model of apostolic Christianity.²⁰ Was there a common perception of the early Church among the radicals? If so, was it a shared perception or did it vary from group to group? And more to the point: to what extent did it borrow from the humanist and the magisterial historiographical traditions?

The idea that the Church was on a steady slope of decline was a medieval commonplace, and it was easily integrated into both the Humanist and the magisterial narratives of Christian history.²¹ Only the *terminus a quo* varied: Erasmus alluded to it in his Basel edition of Jerome, but without fixing a date; Beatus Rhenanus and Ulrich von Hutten (1488–1523) identified the starting point as the onset of scholasticism in the high Middle Ages; Luther also blamed the scholastics, though he also looked further back to the sixth and sev-

²⁰ Franklin H. Littell, *The Anabaptist View of the Church: A Study in the Origins of Sectarian Protestantism* (Boston, 1958).

²¹ Robert L. Wilken, *The Myth of Christian Beginnings: History's Impact on Belief* (New York, 1972), 104–18.

enth centuries and the rise of the papacy; while Zwingli (1484–1531), much more representative of the magisterial thinkers later in the century, traced the decline as far back as the fourth century. But the point to make, as Dipple does, is that there was no fixed agreement as to when the rot set in. As he writes, ‘the historical visions of sixteenth-century reformers were not static concepts directing reform agendas from the outset. Instead, they evolved as reforming agendas developed’ (p. 57). Few modern historians would challenge this suggestion as applied to the magisterial thinkers; where Dipple moves beyond traditional assumptions, however, is with his contention that the radicals were just as pragmatic and dialogic when it came to the writing of the history of their own faiths. Contra Littell, there was no apostolic formula or paradigm that fed into the shaping of the radical tradition. They too wrote history on the hoof.

Much of *Just as in the Time of the Apostles* is devoted to a close study of the main figures of the radical tradition in order to bear out this point. It begins with a look at the early reforming activities of Andreas Karlstadt (1480–1541) and Thomas Müntzer (1468–1525), and one of the main strengths of the investigation is its contextualization of Dipple’s contention that the radical vision of the past was shaped in a close dialogue between Scripture and circumstance. As he writes with reference to Karlstadt’s sense of the past, a close look at the details ‘indicates the primacy of lived experience in dictating its outlines’ (p. 67). Historiographically, Karlstadt went down the same path as Luther. Initially, his reassessment of history resulted in a critical reevaluation of Roman Catholic authority: he rejected the infallibility of the popes and councils, questioned the validity of canon law, and condemned medieval scholasticism. But as his own standing in the Reformation movement became more precarious, and as his search for religious purity became more biblical and categorical, his vision of the past took on a more critical tone. While working to resurrect the true apostolic church in Orlamünde on the basis of his reading of the New Testament, he reached further and further back into the Christian past to locate the origins of decline. Müntzer did the same thing. From Zwickau to Prague to Allstedt: each stage of Müntzer’s career as an evangelical clergyman was progressively circumscribed (from his perspective); as a consequence, at each stage of his career, Müntzer the historian became progressively radical. And again, as Dipple observes with reference to Karlstadt, it was not

Review Articles

due to a preconceived normative vision of an apostolic church. The only guide was an 'apostolic plumb line' that could be tailored to meet historical circumstance. Granted, there was the timeless reality of the Spirit, a presence beyond human history that was manifest in the 'spirit-filled' congregations of the New Testament. But beyond this, neither Müntzer nor Karlstadt had a fixed model of church history in mind (pp. 71-96).

By suggesting that the radical vision of the Christian past was just as derivative and contextual as the magisterial tradition, Dipple is challenging the assumption, common since the work of Littell, that the Anabaptist movement was based on a *sui generis* 'primitivist' view of history, one that was much more literal, and in a sense much more logical, than the magisterial variant. Dipple argues in contrast that the radical vision was a contingent creation. Turning to the rise of the Swiss Brethren, he sees the same play of exegesis and experience behind the historical understanding of the evangelical Anabaptists as in the Saxon radicals. Conrad Grebel (1489-1526), for instance, made repeated calls for a return to the 'true way' of Christ, and he was able to identify what he saw as the proper rites by referring his opponents to Scripture. But there was no overarching historical framework behind his vision of primitive Christianity. The same can be said for Balthasar Hubmaier (1485-1528). He, too, made appeals to the primitive church, but it was only in the course of the ongoing dialogue over baptism and the Lord's Supper that he began to piece together the foundations for his claims, an exercise that 'evolved in tandem with his reforming program' (p. 137) and often sent him searching for proofs of apostolic purity in non-scriptural sources.

Even more surprising, perhaps, is the fact that this degree of dialogue and contingency was true of the master narratives as well, a point Dipple makes in his study of *The Hutterite Chronicle*. Certainly there were constant appeals to New Testament precedents that invested the faith with its historical claims to truth. The rejection of pedo-baptism and community of goods are just two examples of this cast of Biblicism. But aside from this, especially at the beginning, there was only a sketchy historical vision, and the Hutterite narrative that would emerge in the following century was the work of many hands. Dipple sums up nicely with the observation that, in the first instance, the radical vision of the past was hermeneutical rather than

teleological: it was a response to theological circumstances that required a historical defence (pp. 168–9).

The final chapters address the place of history in the thought of the Spiritualists. Though often considered ahistorical in their approach to Christianity, Spiritualists such as Kaspar von Schwenckfeld (1489–1561) and Sebastian Franck (1499–1542/3) often utilized the past in order to illustrate the workings of the Spirit. Most seem to have agreed on some basic points: that the decline of the Church began after the death of the apostles; that the subsequent institutionalization and orthodoxy of the faith gradually pressed out the Spirit and opened the doors to ‘creatureliness’; and that there was no unbroken continuity running from apostolic Christianity to the so-called witnesses of the faith of later ages. Beyond this, however, there was no typical Spiritualist valuation of history, save that there was a general recognition that it could be useful as a method of teaching religion. In his *Chronica* (1531), for instance, Franck spoke of the pedagogical value of history. Not only could it serve as a helpmeet for those who were weak or uncertain in faith, but it was the most ‘human’ of all means available for tracing the remnants of the True Church. Indeed, for many, the brief history of the apostolic church was in essence a divine concession to human weakness—the one fleeting moment when the invisible church was visible on earth.²²

‘*Just as in the Time of the Apostles*’ ranges widely, covering a broad spectrum of radical thought and moving with very sound footing through the historiographical landscape. And yet there is a common thread running through the text, and this is the idea that there was a pragmatic and dialogical element to the early histories of the radical tradition. As Dipple remarks, ‘like their reform plans, their understandings of history tended to be vague and nebulous at the outset, but gradually coalesced in the course of dialogue’ (p. 252). Through a close reading of the actual histories of the various communities and their leading figures, Dipple has traced the making of the radical sense of the Christian past. And he has illustrated that it was not as straightforwardly deductive and primitivist as much of the scholarship suggests. No less than the magisterial tradition, the radical tradition wrote their histories in a dialogue with contemporary events. In part, their works were ‘mirrors to reflect contemporary abuses’; in

²² See now Jean-Claude Colbus, *La Chronique de Sébastien Franck (1499–1542): vision de l’histoire et image de l’homme* (Berne, 2005).

Review Articles

part, they were the justification for sacramental or liturgical teachings; and in part, they were the projections of a normative vision of New Testament Christianity. But they were never wholly one or the other, and they were no less the product of their times than the histories of Flacius or Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75).

Where does all of this new research place early modern German historiography on the path toward the modern hermeneutical discipline mentioned at the outset of this review? Clearly, there were historians working in the German lands who were just as sophisticated with reference to sources and methodology as the humanists in Italy and France. Nor was the general interest in the past, the culture of historical inquiry, any less intense. Indeed, because of the place of religion in the historical narratives and the need to establish an idea of ecclesial origins, the concern with the past in the German lands was probably more intense than in any other part of Europe. And the results were impressive: by the seventeenth century, German Protestants had a corpus of works that had overturned Catholic history and plotted their own unique trajectories of the past. And while some scholars laboured to fill out these providential narratives, others took to the established genres, such as universal history, political history, chorography, and cosmology, and worked the Protestant vision into their texts. This was true of radicals like Franck, polyhistorians like Münster, magisterial thinkers like Sleidan, and leading Lutheran theologians like Melanchthon and Flacius. Moreover, as all four works under review make clear, each was writing history in order to help the reader place the developments of the present in the proper light. Perhaps this was the foremost trait of German historiography during the confessional age: that because it was so closely bound up with contemporary issues, and so deeply concerned with imminent developments, it was constantly rewriting itself.

C. SCOTT DIXON is Senior Lecturer in European Studies (History) at Queen's University Belfast. His research examines the development of confessional identity in early modern Europe, especially in Germany, and the history and historiography of Protestantism.

Origins of the Protestant Past

Among his publications are *The Reformation and Rural Society* (1996, paperback 2002); *The Reformation in Germany* (2002); and two volumes of collected essays: *The Protestant Clergy of Early Modern Europe*, co-edited with Luise Schorn-Schütte (2003), and *The Histories of Charles V: Nationale Perspektiven von Persönlichkeit und Herrschaft*, co-edited with Martina Fuchs (2005).

**BRITAIN, BERLIN, GERMAN UNIFICATION,
AND THE FALL OF THE SOVIET EMPIRE**

Colin Munro

PATRICK SALMON, KEITH HAMILTON, and STEPHEN ROBERT TWIGGE (eds.), *Berlin in the Cold War 1948–1990: Documents on British Policy Overseas*, Series III, Vol. VI (London: Routledge, 2008), 128 pp. ISBN 978 0 415 44870 3. £75.00

PATRICK SALMON, KEITH HAMILTON, and STEPHEN ROBERT TWIGGE (eds.), *German Unification 1989–1990: Documents on British Policy Overseas*, Series III, Vol. VII (London: Routledge, 2009), 592 pp. ISBN 978 0 415 55002 4. £90.00

Introduction

The contribution of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office's (FCO) historians to commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the peaceful (except in Romania) revolutions in central and Eastern Europe that not only precipitated the fall of the Soviet empire and unification of Germany, but also contributed to the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself, consists of two volumes of Documents on British Policy Overseas (DBPO). One, on Berlin in the Cold War was published in 2008 and has been reviewed by Roger Morgan in the journal *International Affairs*.¹ The other, on Britain and the unification of Germany, was published in September 2009. Both volumes were launched at an FCO conference in London on 16 October. The selected documents (in handsomely produced hardback books with a DVD for the *Berlin in the Cold War* volume) cover the Berlin blockade (1948–9), the building of the Berlin Wall (1961), the preceding Berlin crises initiated by Nikita Khrushchev's public ultimatum to end the military occupation of Berlin (November 1958), the fall of the Wall (November 1989), the unification of Germany (October 1990), and preparations for the summit meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) (November 1990) that closed down the Cold War by

¹ *Annual Report of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*, 85 (2009), 639–40.

adopting the Charter of Paris for a New Europe. The historians Patrick Salmon, Keith Hamilton, and Stephen Twigge have made a judicious selection, although they might have covered more extensively the 1970–2 negotiations on Berlin, Germany, and Ostpolitik to which Britain made a major contribution. The documents selected include short messages that give the flavour of how ministers and officials deal with crises, and longer term reflective analyses and policy recommendations. There are pithy, revealing marginalia such as, ‘at least we’ve got him off unification’—by Charles (now Lord) Powell, the Prime Minister’s foreign affairs Private Secretary commenting on 12 December 1989 on a letter of 5 December from Sir Christopher Mallaby, ambassador in Bonn, about future political and security arrangements in Europe. In fact Sir Christopher was careful to warn his readers, also in this letter, that the wishes of people in the German Democratic Republic (GDR), and the Soviet ‘bottom line’ might lead to early unification.²

The excellent summaries and two prefaces give a lucid, incisive account of how British ministers and diplomats handled the ‘German question’ from the early days of the Cold War until it was answered by unification in 1990. Although the Soviet Union’s departure from the Allied Control Council in Berlin in March 1948 confirmed that the wartime alliance between Britain, France, the United States, and the Soviet Union was at an end, their Quadripartite Rights and Responsibilities (QRR) for Berlin and Germany as a whole, within its frontiers of 1937, were extinguished only by unification in 1990. Throughout this period successive Labour and Conservative governments gave consistent public support for the establishment of one unified liberal democratic German state until Mrs (as she then was) Thatcher attempted to thwart unification in the autumn of 1989. This review article will take some of the newly edited sources as a starting point and combine them with other material and personal experience of British policy on Germany, East–West relations, and European integration, gained not least during service as Deputy Head of the British Mission in East Germany from 1987 to 1990. The article highlights some of the main positions and problems of British, German, French, American, and Soviet policies towards German unification.

² Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 65.

Review Articles

British Government Policy on Germany (1946–89)

In 1946 Foreign Office legal advisers certified that as a consequence of the Allies' declaration of 5 June 1945, Germany as a state and German nationality still existed. In January 1948 Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin stated in the House of Commons that 'the UK stood for a united Germany, not a dismembered or divided Germany'.³ Prime Minister Attlee announced in Parliament on 1 March 1948 that Britain's aim was 'to bring Germany back into the family of nations, unified on a democratic basis as Western civilisation understands the term'.⁴ Later that year, as the blockade of Berlin got under way, Bevin insisted, again in Parliament, that 'the UK was still in favour of the economic and political unity of Germany, established on proper principles—genuine freedom of speech, real liberty of the person, and unhampered movement of men and goods throughout Germany'.⁵ The legal and political positions were set out in Article 7 of the *Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany* which came into force when the occupation ended in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) (but not Berlin) in 1955. This treaty obligation, which was also the formal position of NATO on the German question, is worth quoting in full because the Prime Minister was accused of breaking it in 1990:

The Signatory States are agreed that an essential aim of their common policy is a peace settlement for the whole of Germany, freely negotiated between Germany and her former enemies, which should lay the foundation for a lasting peace. They further agree that the final determination of the boundaries of Germany must await such a settlement. Pending the peace settlement, the Signatory States will co-operate to achieve, by peaceful means, their common aim of a re-unified Germany enjoying a liberal-democratic constitution, like that

³ Foreign and Commonwealth Office (hereafter FCO), *Selected Documents on Germany and the Question of Berlin, 1944–1961*, presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (London, 1961), 103.

⁴ Quoted from Adolf M. Birke, *Britain and Germany: Historical Patterns of a Relationship* (London, 1987), 26.

⁵ FCO, *Selected Documents on Germany*, 103.

Britain, Germany, and the Fall of the Soviet Empire

of the Federal Republic, and integrated within the European community. The Three Powers will consult with the Federal Republic on all matters involving the exercise of their rights relating to Germany as a whole.⁶

This position was confirmed repeatedly by the UK and NATO during the Berlin crises of 1958–61, with increasing emphasis on self-determination.⁷ From 1961 onwards the British government had an additional reason for supporting the objective of a reunified Germany. Britain needed German support for its aim of joining what is now the European Union. The British position found its clearest expression in a speech by the Foreign Secretary in October 1972 during President Heinemann's state visit:

Cooperation to which we have grown accustomed, has shown its worth in two great fields of endeavour. Your country has taken the lead, as it was bound to do, in the task of seeking reconciliation with your eastern neighbours, and in particular Eastern Germany. We have, I hope, shown a proper and well merited confidence in your country's efforts to make progress in this field. If, as we desire, the Ostpolitik succeeds, the people of our continent can look forward to a happier and fuller life than they have known in this century. But we can only carry conviction with others if we can act from the conviction of unity among ourselves. Last week in Paris, Herr Scheel and I saw the dedication with which the heads of government present at the [EC] summit, notable among them the German Chancellor, were working to that end. No amount of logic will make up for a lack of political will. The summit showed that the necessary political will does exist to make a success of the enlarged Community, and to forge a united Europe. In this adventure, Germany's membership and Germany's partnership is central to success. You and I, and many in this banqueting hall, can record, and with complete satisfaction: Ger-

⁶ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 144.

⁷ Thus NATO foreign ministers concluded in May 1960 that 'the solution of the problem of Germany can only be found in reunification on the basis of self determination'. See FCO, *Selected Documents on Germany*, 429.

Review Articles

many and Britain started this century in discord. We enter its last quarter in total trust.⁸

In 1973 the FCO legal advisers certified in the context of establishing diplomatic relations with the GDR that Britain did not regard Germany as having split into two sovereign states. The British political commitment to German unity was also confirmed in Parliament by Lady Tweedsmuir in February 1973.⁹ And again in the joint declaration by the Prime Minister and Chancellor Kohl, issued after their summit at Chequers in May 1984, in which Mrs Thatcher confirmed 'the conviction of successive British governments that real and permanent stability in Europe will be difficult to achieve so long as the German nation is divided against its will'.¹⁰ This summit approved a progress report on bilateral relations and appointed 'coordinators' to take things forward.

FRG Government Policy

In 1986, during his state visit to Britain, President von Weizsäcker reaffirmed the Germans' commitment to overcoming the division of their country by overcoming the division of Europe. The EU would always be more than a Common Market for the German people. The concept, associated in particular with Willy Brandt's adviser Egon Bahr, who developed it after the Wall went up in 1961, was that to have any chance of changing the reality of the status quo, first this reality had to be accepted, however unpleasant it was. Once the division of Germany was acknowledged, ways and means would be found to diminish its worst effects—the imprisonment of 17 million

⁸ Quoted from Adolf M. Birke and Hermann Wentker (eds.), *Deutschland und Rußland in der britischen Kontinentalpolitik seit 1815*, Prince Albert Studies, 11 (Munich, 1994), 150.

⁹ FCO, *Selected Documents on Germany*, 4.

¹⁰ 'The Heads of Government reaffirmed the importance of the United Kingdom's rights and responsibilities relating to Berlin and Germany as a whole. The Prime Minister reaffirmed the conviction of successive British Governments that real and permanent stability in Europe will be difficult to achieve so long as the German Nation is divided against its will.' See Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, p. ix.

Britain, Germany, and the Fall of the Soviet Empire

Germans in a neo-Stalinist state—and, in the longer term, to overcome it. Implementing this policy of ‘change through rapprochement’ required building up relationships of trust and confidence with unpleasant autocrats who, so German reasoning went, alone were capable of improving the lot of ordinary people in that part of Germany. Moreover, the FRG aimed to establish at least normal diplomatic relations with Germany’s former enemies in the east, notably with Poland. The Germans argued that they sought to achieve a European Peace Order that was stable in that force was excluded, dynamic in the sense that they sought peaceful evolutionary change in central and Eastern Europe, and provisional until the German nation had regained its unity through free self-determination. This Ostpolitik was consistent with NATO doctrine, as set out in the Harmel report of 1967,¹¹ of sustaining strong Western defences while also pursuing détente with the Soviet Union and its allies where possible. Willy Brandt, then Foreign Minister in the Grand Coalition, moved forward rapidly after his election as Chancellor in October 1969 to negotiate treaties with Poland and the Soviet Union, accepting realities such as the Oder-Neisse frontier between Poland and, *nota bene*, the GDR, and renouncing force as a means for change. Brandt also progressed swiftly in establishing contacts with the GDR, which the FRG was now willing to accept as a state but not as a foreign country. Initially, his dynamism gave rise to concerns in London, Paris, and Washington that the Germans might cut deals with the Soviet Union and the GDR that would prejudice Western interests in the German question, erode Allied rights in Berlin, and even imperil the NATO alliance, if the Soviet Union were to hold out the prospect of reunification in exchange for neutrality.

The Quadripartite Agreement (QA) and Associated Questions

The answer to this conundrum was to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on preserving QRR and defusing tension over Berlin. Soviet ambitions for a conference on European security that should confirm existing borders (including the one that divided Germany) as unalterable, meant that Moscow, too, had an interest in removing

¹¹ FCO, *Britain in NATO: The First Six Decades* (London, 2009), 88.

Review Articles

Berlin as a source of East–West tension. On the Western side there was also interest in arms control negotiations (Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions, MBFR) to reduce the preponderance of Soviet conventional forces threatening NATO. *Berlin in the Cold War* contains brief chapters on Berlin divided 1959–61 and Berlin reunited 1988–90.¹² The introduction to the latter skates over negotiations involving the two German states, Berlin, the three Western Allies, and the Soviet Union that lasted for nearly three years, from early 1970 until the end of 1972. The foreign ministers of the three Western Allies and the FRG considered that they needed a group, the Bonn Group, in which their views on all the issues raised by the FRG's Ostpolitik, impending negotiations with the GDR, Berlin, and Soviet ambitions for a European security conference, could be coordinated. For these negotiations, coordinated by the Bonn Group, the FCO deployed an exceptionally talented team, the members of which all later reached very senior positions in the Diplomatic Service, with the exception of Sir Christopher Audland, who became Deputy Secretary General of the European Commission. They were ably led by the ambassador in Bonn, Sir Roger Jackling, who had an acute legal mind. The negotiations produced: a Quadripartite (France, Soviet Union, UK, USA) Agreement (QA) signed on 3 September 1971; Inner-German arrangements agreed in December 1971; a Final Quadripartite Protocol bringing everything into force on 3 June 1972; and, finally, a public Quadripartite Declaration by the Four Powers on 9 November 1972, making clear that entry of the two German states into the United Nations would in no way affect QRR. Ten days later Brandt, the 'peace chancellor', won a decisive victory at elections to the Bundestag. The QA was the basis of these achievements. It secured notable improvements in the lives of West Berliners, and it kept the German question open. It fulfilled a NATO precondition for starting in 1972 negotiations with the Soviet Union on European security that produced the CSCE Final Act in Helsinki in 1975. Without it, the Bundestag would not have ratified in 1972 the treaties negotiated with Poland and the Soviet Union in 1970. The QA was, moreover, indispensable for the establishment of a *modus vivendi* between the two German states and their admission to the United Nations. On this basis the theory of promoting change through rap-

¹² FCO, *Selected Documents on Germany*, 75–8 and 97–100.

Britain, Germany, and the Fall of the Soviet Empire

prochement could be tested in practice without prejudicing QRR which, in international law, covered the whole of Germany within its 1937 frontiers. *Berlin in the Cold War* certainly would have benefited from a separate chapter on these negotiations, the most important and successful since the Soviet Union had walked out of the Allied Control Commission for Germany in 1948.

Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher

Although the story of attempts by the British Prime Minister Thatcher to thwart unification has been recounted in many memoirs including her own, *German Unification* in particular contains fascinating and illuminating detail that will be new to many readers. The FCO's historians have received permission to publish records of Mrs Thatcher's many encounters with Bush, Gorbachev, Mitterrand, and her own officials that would in the past have been kept firmly under lock and key for at least thirty years. I was the Deputy Head of Mission at the British Embassy to the GDR in East Berlin from 1987 to 1990. As such, I had the impression that as the collapse of the GDR gathered momentum in the autumn of 1989, the Foreign Secretary and officials in London were failing to impress on the Prime Minister that a popular revolution was taking place that presented Britain, which had consistently supported unification under the right conditions for over forty years, with a historic opportunity to secure a central leading position in the new Europe that was taking shape. However, according to the French record, the Prime Minister told Mitterrand on 1 September 1989 that it would be 'intolerable if there was a single currency and Germany reunified as well'.¹³ Here then, is the nub of the problem. Although Mrs Thatcher's reservations, if not her outright opposition, to unification were indeed shared initially by Gorbachev and Mitterrand, although not by Bush, she was isolated in rejecting greater European integration, especially the proposed single currency which was Mitterrand's answer to the question of how to accommodate a larger and more powerful Germany within the European family. Her doubts about the sincerity of German commitment to NATO only added to the problem. She did have an ally

¹³ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 26n.

Review Articles

in Charles Powell, who was knowledgeable about Germany. But on the related issues of German and European unity, the Prime Minister was at odds with the UK's principal allies, France, Germany, and the USA, and with most of her senior ministers and advisers. Her response to the German revolution of 1989 is an example of hubris leading to nemesis, which arrived in November 1990. The Prime Minister learned of her impending removal from office by the Conservative Party while attending the CSCE conference in Paris that ended the Cold War, one month after Germany had become one country, as foreseen in the Convention on Relations Between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic.

Central Europe in 1989

The rapid collapse of the GDR can only be understood in the context of burgeoning democracy in Poland and Hungary, and Soviet acquiescence in these developments. On 6 February Solidarity and the communist Polish United Workers Party began Round Table discussions which produced an agreement on 5 April to hold elections that would be at least partly free. Solidarity became a legitimate political party on 17 April and won an overwhelming victory at elections on 4 June, the day of the Chinese communist crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrators in Beijing. On 19 August President Jaruzelski invited Tadeusz Mazowiecki, a Solidarity activist, to form a government. Mazowiecki's non-communist government was approved by the Polish parliament on 12 September, two days after the Hungarian decision to allow all East Germans to travel freely to the West.

Although East Germans could not express their political preference in free and fair elections until March 1990, until 13 August 1961 they had been able to vote with their feet. The Wall was built to stop the exodus of mostly young and well-educated people that threatened the viability of the German part of the Soviet empire. It amounted to a humiliating verdict on the failings of Moscow's satraps in East Berlin. But East Germans were allowed to visit Warsaw Pact countries such as Hungary because these had unpublicized bilateral agreements (concluded in 1969 in the case of the GDR and Hungary) to prevent unauthorized travel by each other's 'citizens' to the West. By 1989, however, Hungarians could travel freely to the West. On

11 January the Hungarian parliament proclaimed that the 1956 uprising had been a popular rebellion and voted for a multi-party system. On 11 February the Central Committee of the communist Hungarian Socialist Workers Party followed suit, and on 3 March Prime Minister Miklos Nemeth informed Gorbachev in Moscow of Hungary's intention to dismantle its section of the Iron Curtain, which no longer served any Hungarian purpose. Although Nemeth warned Gorbachev that the SED Politburo would react very negatively, the latter indicated that this was a Hungarian matter. As long as he was in charge there would be no repeat of 1956. Gorbachev seems not to have grasped the implications of this momentous decision. Hungarian army and border troops began work on 2 May, followed by a well-publicized (on West German TV) ceremony involving the Austrian and Hungarian foreign ministers on 27 June. The GDR holiday season was by now well under way, and soon the exodus via Hungary was reaching pre-Wall levels. In August the Hungarians terminated unilaterally the 1969 agreement with the GDR, a step regarded by the SED Politburo as high treason and betrayal. On 10 September 1989 the Hungarians decided to allow free travel to the West for East Germans, thus restoring the status quo ante 13 August 1961. One year later, on 12 September 1990, the unification treaty was signed.

Although Warsaw Pact ambassadors in East Berlin were conservative apparatchiks, their deputies were professional diplomats who had spent most of their careers in German-speaking countries and were, especially in the case of Poland, Hungary, and the Soviet Union, strongly in favour of the movement towards democracy in central and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Polish and Hungarian interest in British experience of the State Treaty negotiations which restored Austrian independence on a basis of neutrality in 1955, and a readiness to share information on the travails of the SED Politburo with Western colleagues, suggested that an unreformed GDR, surrounded by democracies, and no longer defended by Soviet Union forces, might not survive for long. Yegor Ligachev, one of Gorbachev's sharpest conservative critics in the CPSU Politburo, did provide support for Honecker during his visit to East Berlin in mid September 1989. But he did not meet Krenz, whom the Russians were eyeing up as Honecker's successor. And the Soviet embassy once told me that Ligachev's visit had been concerned solely with 'agriculture', the only dossier for which he was formally

Review Articles

responsible in the Politburo after Gorbachev had demoted this hard line opponent of glasnost and perestroika. Among the GDR's neighbours, only the Czechoslovak communist leadership still supported the old men in East Berlin. But they would be swept away by the Velvet Revolution in mid November 1989, at the very moment when demonstrators in East Germany stopped proclaiming that they were *the people* ('Wir sind das Volk') who wanted to reform the GDR, and started proclaiming that Germans in East and West were *one people* ('Wir sind ein Volk') whose ambition was early unification.

Unification. The Prelude: April to (8) November 1989

German Unification takes up the story in April when two new German ambassadors arrived in London as neighbours in Belgrave Square. Neither Joachim Mitdank nor Hermann von Richthofen expected that within a matter of months the GDR would be faced with an existential crisis. Nor did Sir Nigel Broomfield, the British ambassador in East Berlin, although his despatch of 20 April records most of the factors that were about to unleash it: the ring of democracies that might be completed by Czechoslovakia; the popular desire for unity with West Germany; the impossibility of using nationalism to hold the GDR together; economic weakness; and the tremendous desire for free travel which had been stimulated greatly by the concessions wrung out of Honecker during his visit to the FRG in 1987.¹⁴ The embassy underestimated – and would continue to underestimate until late September 1989 – the ability of an indigenous East German reform movement to put pressure on the regime. The embassy judged that the long-standing practice of deporting dissidents to West Germany combined with the efficiency and omnipresence of state security would enable the regime to retain control; a judgement that seemed to have been confirmed by the relatively muted public response to blatant fraud at local elections in early May. Sir Nigel did speculate on an 'Austrian' solution, but only in the distant future, because it seemed inconceivable that the Soviet Union would soon cease to regard the existence of the GDR in the Warsaw Pact as a strategic necessity.

¹⁴ Ibid. no. 2.

A meeting in Moscow during the period 17 to 23 May of the (West) Berlin-based Political Club, a German-language think tank that focused on relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and the German question, brought divided Soviet counsels on Germany into sharp relief. The meeting got under way as Gorbachev's visit (15–18 May against the backdrop of pro-democracy demonstrations in Beijing about to be brutally suppressed) to China was drawing to a close. Participants who had visited the Baltic states en route to Moscow reported popular aspirations there to leave the Soviet Union and join the European Community, arguing that there were bound to be repercussions for the GDR. Not so, thundered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs hardliners. Meanwhile Poles, Hungarians, and supporters of Gorbachev were indicating during coffee breaks—a month before Gorbachev's remarkable visit to West Germany—that it was time for the old men in East Berlin to catch the tide of history. I was asked privately if Britain's support for reunification was actually as solid as its public statements implied.

It was East German official support for the brutal suppression of the Chinese pro-democracy movement on Tiananmen square between 3 and 5 June, combined with Horst Teltschik's personal assessment of the GDR as 'potentially the most explosive country', that prompted Sir Patrick Wright (the FCO's most senior official) to ask the Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC) to look at the GDR in some detail.¹⁵ The embassy in East Berlin advised that while East Germans were profoundly dissatisfied with their lot, the situation did not seem as potentially explosive as it did to Teltschik. The embassy was also preoccupied with preparations for a visit, planned for early July, by the Foreign Secretary. The difficult question was what Sir Geoffrey (now Lord) Howe should say about the February 1945 bombing of Dresden, a city which his GDR hosts wanted to include in the programme. In the event, this visit was cancelled when Sir Geoffrey was sacked by the Prime Minister on 24 June. *German Unification* includes no documents on the situation in East Germany in July and August. As the exodus via Hungary gathered pace, Honecker was taken ill on 8 July at the Warsaw Pact summit in Bucharest, which revoked the Brezhnev doctrine. He would not reappear in public until the eve of

¹⁵ Ibid. no. 4. The results of the JIC's labours have not been released for publication.

Review Articles

the fortieth anniversary celebrations in early October. The GDR was leaderless in its hour of crisis. The tipping point in this crisis was the Hungarian decision on 10 September to allow free travel to the West by all East Germans, thus propelling the German question on to the international agenda. Sir Christopher Mallaby reported that Teltschik was 'still peddling the line that the GDR was in a highly precarious state and that explosions were possible at any time'.¹⁶ My judgement that 'if both ideology and the economy began to crumble, reunification might become unavoidable' provoked consternation in London, where officials were already wrestling with the Prime Minister's opposition to such a development.¹⁷

In taking stock after the GDR's fortieth anniversary celebrations, attended by Gorbachev on 6–7 October, but before the fall of Honecker on 18 October, Sir Nigel Broomfield judged that a 'watershed had been reached. We should look urgently at the broader and longer term implications of the German question, and try to identify a solution between the present situation and reunification.'¹⁸ This advice was based on developments in East Germany at the time. Massive demonstrations in Leipzig and other cities culminated in about one million people on the Alexanderplatz in East Berlin on 4 November calling for reform of the GDR, which should become a German Sweden.¹⁹ There was intense antipathy towards the ruling Socialist Unity Party (SED) including towards its new leader, Egon Krenz, who had praised the Tiananmen square massacre in June. Moreover, during October the SED had attempted to stem the exodus by banning visa-free travel to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and people were gripped by something approaching panic that they were again about to be imprisoned. The most unwise decision of all, however, had been to insist that trains carrying would-be emigrants released from the West German embassy in Prague should transit East German territory. Sealed trains evoke the most dreadful memories in central Europe. The promise to rescind these travel restrictions on 4 November was too little too late – another example of the SED's inability to keep pace with, let alone get out in front of, events.

¹⁶ Ibid. no. 9.

¹⁷ Ibid. no. 10.

¹⁸ Ibid. nos. 17 and 18.

¹⁹ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *Berlin in the Cold War*, no. 396.

The sacking of the Foreign Secretary, and the resignation on 26 October of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Nigel Lawson, were precipitated by the two men's disagreement with the Prime Minister over Britain's approach to a European Economic and Monetary Union (EMU). Both favoured UK membership of the Exchange Rate Mechanism, something to which the Prime Minister and her personal economic adviser Alan Walters were bitterly opposed. The Chancellor's resignation forced the Prime Minister to move John Major from the FCO (where he had succeeded Sir Geoffrey Howe) back to the Treasury. Her leadership and judgement were thus being severely tested on two issues—German unification and European integration—in both of which Germany, led by Chancellor Kohl, would play a decisive role. Contrary to the advice of officials such as Sir John Fretwell (FCO Political Director) to 'put the German question at the centre of the British policy agenda',²⁰ the Prime Minister argued in a conversation with Sir Christopher Mallaby on 1 November that Britain, France, and the Soviet Union would remain opposed to German reunification and that it was 'Germany's role in Western Europe rather than central Europe which should be the more pressing concern'. British diplomacy should focus on enlisting the Germans' support against the proposed Social Charter, bringing home to them the dangers inherent in Delors' plans for EMU, pressing discreetly for a revaluation of the German mark, and urging the Germans to reduce governmental aid and other subsidies.²¹

The day after Sir Christopher's talk with the Prime Minister, I met Vladimir Grinin, Counsellor and number three at the Soviet Embassy, to take stock after Krenz's first visit to Moscow as SED leader. Grinin argued that 'the movement to reunification could gather unstoppable momentum before sufficient trust between NATO and members of the Warsaw Pact had been developed to make this an acceptable development'.²² However, so long as Gorbachev remained in charge, the Soviet Union would not prevent it. Grinin displayed no confidence in Krenz's ability to slow down what would indeed become 'unstoppable momentum' after the fall of the Wall, one week later. Just before Schabowski, the SED Politburo member responsible

²⁰ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 23.

²¹ *Ibid.* no. 29.

²² *Ibid.* no. 31.

Review Articles

for Berlin, made his fateful announcement about free travel at an early evening press conference on 9 November, Sir Christopher advised the new Foreign Secretary Douglas (now Lord) Hurd, to make a public statement of the British position on the German question during his visit to Bonn scheduled for 15 November, including not only as its main point the right of the German people to self-determination, but also 'willingness to accept reunification if that is the way things go'.²³

Unification: The End Game Begins

The documents selected for the period from the fall of the Wall on 9 November until Chancellor Kohl announced his ten-point plan on 28 November convey vividly not only revolutionary events that none of those witnessing them had expected to occur in their lifetime, but also the difficulty of devising policy to keep pace with them.²⁴ Their significance in terms of answering the German question was captured best by Willy Brandt, Governing Mayor of West Berlin in 1961, who said that 'what belonged together can now grow together'. Soviet policy was, as Sir Rodric Braithwaite, British ambassador in Moscow, put it, 'being overrun by events, out of date, incoherent and shot through with potentially dangerous inherent contradictions'.²⁵ But it seemed to strike a chord in No. 10 Downing Street. The British Prime Minister told the Soviet ambassador that she had 'clearly understood Mr Gorbachev's insistence during their talks in Moscow [on 23 September] that, while the countries of Eastern Europe could choose their own course in their domestic affairs, the borders of the Warsaw Pact must remain intact'. However, according to the Russian record made by Gorbachev's adviser Chernayev, it was the Prime Minister who said that:

Britain and Western Europe are not interested in the unification of Germany. The words written in the NATO commu-

²³ Ibid. no. 35.

²⁴ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *Berlin in the Cold War*, nos. 401-14; eid. (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 40.

²⁵ Ibid.

niqué may sound different, but disregard them. We do not want the reunification of Germany. It would lead to changes in the post-war borders and we cannot allow that because such a development would undermine the stability of the entire international situation, and could lead to threats to our security.²⁶

These observations, and the Prime Minister's argument that the first priority was to establish genuine democracy in East Germany, suggest that the Russians were right to believe they would have an ally in keeping 'reunification off the agenda'. Sir Michael Burton, Minister and Deputy Commandant in the British Military Government (BMG), and Igor Maxymichev (Deputy Head of the Soviet embassy in East Berlin) agreed on this point over lunch on 14 November.²⁷

Reporting of calls for reunification from East Berlin was sparse until the embassy was invited by the FCO on 24 November, when the Prime Minister was meeting President Bush in Camp David, to break silence by assessing reports in the British press that demonstrators were losing patience with intellectuals intent on reforming the GDR, and were calling increasingly for unification.²⁸ Meanwhile, the Prime Minister was reported as saying during her visit to the USA that the borders of the Warsaw Pact were 'inviolable', a proposition that went down badly in Germany, where the dominant slogan at the Monday demonstrations in Leipzig and elsewhere since 20 November had been 'Germany—united Fatherland'. Nor do these volumes record an important Soviet démarche on 21 November. Nikolai Portugalov, an expert on Germany in the CPSU Central Committee International Relations Department who had often been used by the Soviet leadership to drop hints that the division of Germany might not be immutable, told Teltschik at the Chancellery in Bonn that in the medium term the Soviet Union 'could give the go ahead to a German confederation, whatever form it took'. In his memoirs Teltschik records being 'galvanized' by this démarche.²⁹ It suggested that Gorbachev had lost all confidence in the ability of first Krenz and

²⁶ Ibid. no. 26n.

²⁷ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *Berlin in the Cold War*, no. 410.

²⁸ Eid. (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 56.

²⁹ Horst Teltschick, *329 Tage: Innenansichten der Einigung* (Berlin, 1991), 44.

Review Articles

now Hans Modrow, who had taken over as Prime Minister on 18 November (while EC heads of government met in Paris), to hold the GDR together as a going concern. Modrow was, in fact, already talking to the West Germans about a new treaty relationship between the two states and making increasingly desperate appeals for economic assistance. Things had indeed moved on since the Foreign Secretary had been reassured in Bonn on 15 November that the Germans, too, wanted to keep reunification off the agenda. On that day in London the Prime Minister had summed up discussion in cabinet: 'although Western governments had taken a formal position since 1955 in favour of East German self-determination, German reunification should not be treated as an immediate issue. Governments should take due account of the implications of the present turn of events for President Gorbachev.' She added, for good measure, that 'a single European currency was no answer to these wider changes'.³⁰

The FCO historians have selected one document which sets out more accurately and succinctly than any other the position in mid November.³¹ Jonathan Powell, a member of the FCO's Policy Planning Staff and the brother of Charles Powell, reported on a conference focused on the German question that he had attended in West Berlin from 15–17 November. The people of the GDR all 'demanded unification in their hearts'. The key factor would be the economy. Nobody believed that 'the Russians were seriously concerned by the prospect of confederation. Falin and others had indicated that reunification was acceptable. The four powers should do nothing until the Germans had decided what they wanted to do. The answer to the German question was one state, one people, one capital (Berlin). The general view seemed to be that this could come about very fast.' A Four Power Conference excluding the Germans—something to which both the Prime Minister and the Russians were attracted—should be avoided 'like the plague'. Powell added that 'unless the Russians speak up we will be unable to convince the Germans that it is they who are stopping reunification. Gorbachev could well render our plodding policy academic with a headline catching initiative at Valletta [where he was due to meet Bush in early December].'³² As it

³⁰ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 49.

³¹ *Ibid.* no. 56.

³² *Ibid.*

turned out, the Americans moved first. On 29 November Secretary of State James Baker issued a statement on four principles that should 'guide the *unification* process'. The Americans had dropped 'reunification' to avoid suggestions that the new united German state would be a reincarnation of its aggressive nationalist predecessors.³³

Officials, such as Jonathan Powell, who sought to persuade the Prime Minister to base British policy on the unstoppable momentum towards unification, as opposed to attempts to delay it, had support from William (now Lord) Waldegrave, Minister of State responsible for European affairs. Not only did Waldegrave bring great intellectual capacity to bear on these issues; he also provided continuity, as the post of Foreign Secretary passed in rapid succession from Geoffrey Howe to John Major and then Douglas Hurd. He minuted on papers for the Prime Minister submitted by the new Political Director on 8 January that he was 'not against sensible tactics in relation to No. 10, but if ever there was a time when the Office should present the stark truth about what is likely to happen, and should avoid feeding illusions, that time is surely now. Most important of all, in view of what I believe to be the unstoppable desire for full reunification in the GDR, an attempt to delay it like this will make the GDR ungovernable.'³⁴ Waldegrave was also to be proved right on a question to which the Germans themselves had not so far found an answer. It would indeed be possible to secure Soviet agreement to a unified Germany remaining in NATO. The Foreign Secretary's minutes to the Prime Minister, both before and after his visit to East Berlin and the GDR from 22–24 January, confirm that he agreed with his Minister of State about unification.³⁵ Moreover, he told the Prime Minister on 26 January that he was not in favour of using transitional arrangements as a means of slowing down unification, a proposition which she had put forward in an interview with the *Wall Street Journal* on 25 January. This put Britain in 'the position of the ineffective break, the worst of all worlds'.³⁶

The French, meanwhile, in the Foreign Secretary's words, were playing a 'very canny game', always careful to avoid surfacing their

³³ Ibid. no. 76.

³⁴ Ibid. no. 87.

³⁵ Ibid. nos. 99 and 106. No. 107 contains a detailed report.

³⁶ Ibid. no. 108.

Review Articles

reservations about unification in public.³⁷ It is described astutely by Charles Powell in his record of the Prime Minister's meeting with President Mitterrand at the European Council Meeting in Strasbourg on 8 December. Mitterrand echoed, and even reinforced all the Prime Minister's strictures about the Germans in general and Kohl in particular. But he was careful to add that 'in practice there was not much Gorbachev could do. He could hardly move his divisions forward. We did not have many cards. The USA did not have the will. All that could be done was to have a four power meeting. German unification would happen. We were on the threshold of momentous events.'³⁸ Mitterrand insisted at a further meeting with the Prime Minister on 20 January that 'France would recognise and respect the reality of the desire of the Germans for unity. It would be stupid to say no to reunification.'³⁹ The Prime Minister disagreed. Britain and France did at least have the means to slow things down, if only they were prepared to use them. On the evidence of these two meetings, the French were not so prepared.

In his valedictory despatch on 6 December Sir Nigel Broomfield concluded that 'the question of German unity is now actual. It could become operational at any time over this winter if there is a breakdown in law and order or an economic collapse.'⁴⁰ Chancellor Kohl evidently agreed. There is no separate record in either book of his visit to Dresden (brought forward to 19 December to precede Mitterrand's visit to East Berlin and the GDR on 20–21 December), but by his own account this was the moment when Kohl decided that 'the regime was finished and unification was coming'.⁴¹ I recall his speech in front of the ruins of the Frauenkirche, destroyed by Allied bombing in February 1945, as a skilful piece of oratory that calmed people down by promising them that their aspiration for unity would be fulfilled, provided that they displayed discipline and patience. On the return flight, informal planning for German Economic and Monetary Union (GEMU) began.

Sir Nigel added in his valedictory despatch that the movement to unification was a German process over which even close allies had

³⁷ Ibid. no. 45.

³⁸ Ibid. no. 71.

³⁹ Ibid. no. 103.

⁴⁰ Ibid. no. 66.

⁴¹ Helmut Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1982–1990* (Munich, 2005), 1020.

little influence. But a framework was needed for settling external aspects. The Poles were now alarmed by the unwillingness of Kohl (who had interrupted a visit to Poland when the Wall fell) to enter into a new treaty commitment recognizing their western frontier. Kohl argued that both existing German states had already concluded treaties with Poland recognizing the Oder-Neisse frontier. A new treaty could only be concluded after unification by a democratically elected government. Kohl also had party political calculations in mind. He expected to have to contend both with an SPD-dominated East Germany on his left flank, and calls from the right-wing Republikaner for Germany to be unified within its 1937 frontiers including Silesia, Pomerania, and East Prussia at the Bundestag elections scheduled for late 1990. The solution would be to re-establish the forum of the four powers with rights and responsibilities for Berlin and Germany as a whole, together with the two German states. The Germans were initially most reluctant to agree to a forum which for them had unfortunate echoes of the 1959 Geneva conference when their representatives had been consigned to a separate 'children's table' (*Katzentisch*).⁴² Indeed, this forum got off to a bad start with a meeting, which had been requested by the Russians, of the ambassadors of the Four Powers (without the Germans),⁴³ who allowed themselves to be photographed outside the old Allied Kommandatura building located in West Berlin. The Germans were thus not entirely reassured by their allies' assurances that their purpose at this meeting would be to discuss with the Russians Berlin Air Services (only British, French, and US aircraft could serve West Berlin), a subject that did require attention in view of the common German travel area to be established on 1 January 1990.⁴⁴ The precursor to the common travel area was the ceremonial reopening of the Brandenburg Gate, the quintessential symbol of Germany's division, on 22 December and boisterous celebrations there on New Year's Eve.⁴⁵ These events reminded me of President von Weizsäcker's aphorism that so long as the Brandenburg Gate remained closed, the German question would remain open.

⁴² Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *Berlin in the Cold War*, p. 77.

⁴³ Eid. (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 73.

⁴⁴ Eid. (eds.), *Berlin in the Cold War*, p. 109.

⁴⁵ Ibid. nos. 419-23.

Unification Achieved

In late January and the first half of February, events took a decisive turn. On 28 January Modrow announced that GDR elections which had been scheduled for 6 May would be brought forward to 18 March. On 30 January Gorbachev announced at a press conference with Modrow in Moscow that he recognized reunification would take place. The FCO learned on 2 February that the West Germans had already prepared a draft unification treaty.⁴⁶ On 5 February the Federal Government decided, much to the initial consternation of the governor of the Bundesbank, to announce immediate plans for GEMU without waiting for the GDR elections on 18 March.⁴⁷ Patrick Eyers, the new British ambassador in East Berlin, commented that this move could stave off 'collapse into chaos' but that 'the west Germans would run the country'.⁴⁸ On 13 February, at a meeting in Ottawa convened originally to discuss 'Open Skies', an agreement was reached to establish a forum including the Four Powers and the two German states, to handle the external aspects of unification.⁴⁹

The Prime Minister had chosen not to sum up at a meeting of the full cabinet on 1 February. The Foreign Secretary's conclusions that 'the United Kingdom was well placed to set the broad policy framework for the months ahead: the United Kingdom had supported the principle of self determination for Germany for many years', were formally correct.⁵⁰ Britain was a full member of NATO, the EC, one of the Four Powers, and a CSCE participant. But they left out of the account the damage that had already been done both to Britain's international reputation, especially in Germany, and to its ability to influence events, by the Prime Minister's hostility to unification, which was well and truly out in the open after her interview with the *Wall Street Journal* published on 26 January 1990. In it, she had stated that 'if German Unification went too fast, it could have the disastrous effect of toppling Gorbachev. It would in any case disrupt the

⁴⁶ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 120.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* no. 123.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* no. 132.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* no. 145.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* no. 114.

economic balance within the EC where Germany already dominates.⁵¹

The documents selected for the last eight months preceding Germany's unification on 3 October illustrate admirably two strands in the British contribution. It was British officials, including the FCO's legal advisers working in close harmony with their German counterparts, who devised practical solutions to innumerable problems in winding up QRR, such as the role and status of foreign, including Soviet, forces, that were both technically complex and politically sensitive. The Americans were behind the curve, preoccupied mainly with avoiding a treaty that would have to be submitted to the Senate for ratification.⁵² There was outstanding, even visionary, work on future European security. It was the British diplomat Brian Crowe, leader of the British delegation at the preparatory negotiations, who invented the title of the concluding document of the CSCE summit in Paris which brought the Cold War to a close: 'The Charter of Paris for a New Europe.' But this work was carried out against a backdrop of continuing ructions over German and European unity that culminated in the sacking of Nicholas Ridley from the cabinet on 14 July (two weeks after GEMU), for expressing views on German and European unity widely believed to represent the Prime Minister's own.⁵³ Ridley described European Monetary Union as a 'German racket designed to take over the whole of Europe' in an interview with the *Spectator* that was illustrated with a cartoon depicting Ridley adding a Hitler moustache to a poster of Chancellor Kohl.⁵⁴ At the same time, publication in the *Independent on Sunday* and *Der Spiegel* of Charles Powell's record of the Prime Minister's seminar with historians, held on 24 March at Chequers to prepare for her summit meeting with Kohl and the annual British-German Königswinter conference in Cambridge at the end of the month, reinforced these perceptions. It was clear from this record, reprinted with associated correspondence in the appendix to *German Unification*, that it was the Prime Minister, not the historians or her Private

⁵¹ Elizabeth Pond, *Beyond the Wall: Germany's Road to Unification* (Washington, 1993), 157.

⁵² Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 174.

⁵³ *Ibid.* no. 217.

⁵⁴ Nicholas Ridley's interview with the *Spectator* was published on 14 July 1990, p. 9.

Review Articles

Secretary, who thought that the Germans' 'abiding characteristics' included 'angst, aggressiveness, assertiveness, bullying, egotism, inferiority complex and sentimentality'. Charles Powell concluded that the 'weight of evidence and the argument favoured those who were optimistic about life with a united Germany'. The optimists evidently included all those present at the seminar, except the Prime Minister herself.

The atmosphere for the summit was soured by a public spat over Poland's western border. On 26 March Sir Christopher Mallaby was summoned by Teltschik who reported Kohl's 'shock and amazement' that the Prime Minister should have told *Der Spiegel* that she had heard him say at the European Council in Strasbourg on 8 December that he 'did not recognise the current frontiers', and that previous assurances on this subject had been 'overturned by the German courts'.⁵⁵ Kohl arrived in Britain a couple of days later, buoyed up by the victory of the CDU-dominated Alliance for Germany in the GDR elections on 18 March, and peeved by the Prime Minister's latest interview.⁵⁶ The stage was set for a remarkable gala dinner at the Königswinter conference. Prime Minister and Chancellor were seated, rather like Thai royalty, on one side of an elevated table, overlooking conference participants, and separated by Sir Oliver Wright, a previous ambassador to the FRG. In his after-dinner speech Kohl, who seemed to me to be enjoying himself, paid tribute to those who had made the present transformation of Europe possible, including Winston Churchill, Michael Gorbachev, and those who had sustained the Königswinter forum for forty years. The Prime Minister congratulated Kohl on his election victory, and acknowledged that Germany's aspiration for unity would soon be realized. However, she displayed no enthusiasm for it at a separate meeting with representatives of the new political forces in East Germany who had been invited to the conference. In her speech, she recalled British support for Germany over the years since the end of the war. But her main themes were the issue (still to be resolved) of a united Germany's place in NATO and the future role of the CSCE. The Prime Minister gave a preview of the ideas that she had encouraged officials to develop for the forthcoming summit. There should be new provi-

⁵⁵ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 181.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* no. 176.

sions on the importance of democratic elections, the rule of law, human rights, the market economy, arms control, and machinery for crisis management and political consultations. The provisions of the Helsinki Final Act (1975) that borders could be changed, but only peacefully and by agreement, should be reconfirmed. All of these would find their way into the Charter of Paris for a New Europe. Hermann von Richthofen recalls that the two leaders did eventually manage to clear the air with some humorous recollections of a joint visit to military manoeuvres on the Lüneburg Heath, and that at the summit meeting 'all the bad feeling had dissipated'.⁵⁷

The West Germans had been unwilling to include East German officials in discussions of either internal or external aspects of unification until the GDR had held democratic elections. Now there could be rapid progress on both tracks. Their objective was to achieve unification before the CSCE summit in late November and all-German elections to the Bundestag in early December. While Ridley and the Chequers seminar were grabbing headlines in Britain and Germany, Kohl and Genscher were meeting Gorbachev and Shevardnadze in the Caucasus, where they secured Soviet agreement to a united Germany remaining in NATO. Moreover, in the final settlement QRR would be lifted, obviating the need for a treaty to end formally the Second World War. In the Foreign Secretary's view, this brought about 'a sea change in the negotiations and put us firmly in the end game'.⁵⁸ On 23 August the Volkskammer voted for unity on 3 October via Article 23 of the FRG's Basic Law which provided that it 'would apply in other parts of Germany after their accession'. The whole process was wound up in Moscow on 12 September, albeit not without the last-minute dramas that accompany epoch-making negotiations. These included the inevitable media incident to sustain German suspicion of the British as spoilers. It was not a case now of Germans ignoring Russian sensitivities: they were, according to a poorly written article in the *Guardian* on 7 September,

⁵⁷ See German Embassy London Press release of 24 Feb. 2009, 'An Ambassador in the Annus Mirabilis of German Reunification', published at <http://www.london.diplo.de/Vertretung/london/en/02/Kanzlei_und_Residenz/An_Embassy_in_Belgrave_Square/Annus_Mirabilis_Reunification_Seite.html>, accessed 8 Sept. 2009.

⁵⁸ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 219.

Review Articles

'getting too close to Moscow'. Sir John Weston provides a description of this incident and others in the final hours of this marathon that is graphic, erudite, and entertaining, concluding with a quotation from T. S. Eliot's *Four Quartets*, published in 1944: 'you are not the same people who left that station or who will arrive at any terminus.'⁵⁹

Comment and Analysis

On 19 January 1989 Erich Honecker stated that 'the Wall will remain in fifty and also in 100 years, if the reasons for its existence have not been removed'. He had in mind, above all, that it had been built to preserve the GDR as a communist state in the Warsaw Pact. In 1993 the former Soviet diplomat and expert on Germany Valentin Falin testified on oath at the trial of former GDR Defence Minister Heinz Kessler, who stood accused of command responsibility for deaths at the inner German border. On 9 November 1989 the GDR leadership had consulted the Soviet ambassador about their plans to 'end the present border regime'. Only when Ambassador Kochemasov had received written instructions from Moscow that this was an 'internal GDR matter', was the way clear for Schabowski to make his fateful announcement. Falin, who had been responsible for Germany in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) from 1959 to 1971, had been called as a witness, because it was Kessler's contention that the Wall had been built at Soviet behest. East German border guards had been obeying Soviet orders in shooting people. Falin's further testimony indicated that Khrushchev had not been greatly concerned by mass emigration and economic collapse. He had been preoccupied with military matters and West Berlin, which he perceived as an espionage centre and 'cheap atom bomb' in the heart of the socialist camp. The MFA had warned Khrushchev against trying to expel the Western Allies and turn West Berlin into a 'free city', because that could have meant war. Nonetheless Ulbricht, Khrushchev, and other Warsaw Pact leaders agreed that something had to be done. Although Falin testified that planning for the Wall bore all the hallmarks of work by the Soviet General Staff, he could not resist a sly dig at the Soviet Union's

⁵⁹ Ibid. no. 238.

erstwhile ally. The GDR border regime had been an example of the 'German tendency to perfection'.⁶⁰

Several conclusions can be drawn from Falin's testimony. First, the Russians were convinced that the Western Allies were genuinely committed to their role as 'Protecting Powers' in Berlin. Their military and civil presence had real credibility, providing a sound basis for the 1970-2 negotiations. Second, a European security conference could only take place if the Soviet Union was prepared to make some further concessions on Berlin and links between the two German states. Third, by November 1989 the Soviet Union had higher priorities than preservation of the communist system in central and Eastern Europe, although it would take another couple of months until Gorbachev was prepared to acknowledge publicly that without the communist system and the Wall, German unification was unavoidable. Fourth, the situation had changed dramatically since June 1987, when President Reagan had received a dusty answer to his call on Gorbachev, in a speech in front of the Brandenburg Gate, to 'tear down the Wall'.

The SED leadership for its part was aware, right from the beginning in the late 1940s, that without a rigid communist structure and Soviet insistence on the continuing division of Germany, the GDR had no future. Therefore it never allowed even a glimmer of the political and social reforms that took place in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, or indeed in the Soviet Union itself. A publication in 1988 by the Berlin-based All-German Research Centre for Economic and Social Questions entitled 'Glasnost and Perestroika also in the GDR?' deals essentially with economic matters.⁶¹ Meanwhile, Romanian-style nationalism and ostensibly independent foreign policy of the type purveyed by Ceausescu were out of the question. The SED leadership were also acutely aware of the dangers inherent in West German promotion of change through rapprochement, but their ever increasing economic dependence on West Germany limited the scope for strict demarcation (*Abgrenzung*), according to the precepts of the 1974 constitution, which had defined the GDR ideo-

⁶⁰ All quotations from Falin are taken from *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 30 July 1993, no. 174, p. 4.

⁶¹ Forschungsstelle für gesamtdeutsche wirtschaftliche und soziale Fragen (ed.), *Glasnost und Perestrojka auch in der DDR* (Berlin, 1988).

Review Articles

logically as a 'socialist state of workers and farmers'. West Germans were, in fact, extremely reticent about supporting political and social change, not only in the GDR but also in countries such as Poland. They tended to put the emphasis in the CSCE process on dialogue at the state level, and between think tanks and academic institutions which were, of course, under state supervision in the case of Warsaw Pact countries. In this way they could pursue two important objectives. First, they could avoid giving communist leaders pretexts for accusing them of being ugly German revisionists, gradually removing their sense of insecurity. Second, the network of contacts developed by institutions such as the Berlin Political Club, combined with increasing economic and trade links, enabled the Germans to spot early possible changes in the Soviet position on the German question. By the late 1980s the Germans were very well informed indeed about Hungary and Poland. The prosperous, peaceful, democratic FRG had become a pole of magnetic attraction for people in central and Eastern Europe, especially for Germans imprisoned in the GDR. The fears of post-communist leaders such as Mazowiecki about Kohl's position on Poland's western border suggest that this was, for Germans, the right approach. A country such as Britain could be much bolder in promoting peaceful evolutionary political change in the Warsaw Pact, a policy which had been pursued assiduously by Margaret Thatcher and Sir Geoffrey Howe after Gorbachev's accession to power.

SED leaders were also vain, arrogant, over confident in the security of their position, and dismissive of glasnost and perestroika. Had not Marx been a German? Honecker personally craved the prestige of visits to major Western powers, to the FRG above all. The Soviet Union had frustrated his plans for a visit in 1984 at a time of tension between East and West. But after Gorbachev had switched the lights to green, Honecker was received in September 1987 with every conceivable honour and respect, by captains of industry, politics, and culture alike. It was not a 'state' visit because Honecker was received on an even higher level than protocol prescribed for leaders of foreign countries. But the one major concession that the West Germans extracted from him was to prove the catalyst that accelerated the GDR's demise: the agreement to greatly expanded opportunities for people below pensionable age to visit West Germany on family business. A veritable industry sprang up as people discovered an urgent

desire to attend the birthdays of distant relatives. Those without relatives or obliged to stay behind were resentful. Honecker's notion that capitalist and socialist Germans were like fire and water was wrong. There were hardly any socialist Germans who could be described as true believers. The preface (p. ix) to *German Unification* refers to a paper on the implications of this visit prepared by the FCO's Policy Planning Staff after Honecker's visit. It seemed that something was afoot in Germany. Soviet rule would end one day, probably by the middle of the next century, and 'perhaps much sooner'.⁶² The authors came in for some criticism for having gone beyond the planners' usual remit, which was to look five, or at the most ten years ahead. In fact their prediction was reasonable at the time. Gorbachev aimed to reform the Soviet system, preserve, even strengthen the Soviet Union, and secure the loyalty and support freely given of the Soviet Union's allies in the Warsaw Pact. He thought that history might answer the German question in a hundred years.

The major public failure of British policy occurred in November 1989. After the fall of the Wall had placed unification firmly on the international agenda the Prime Minister summed up discussion in cabinet in that 'although Western governments had taken a formal position since 1955 in favour of East German self-determination, German reunification should not be treated as an immediate issue'.⁶³ Until mid November public British policy, based on strong support for self-determination, was in tune both with what Germans in East and West said they wanted, and with the approach of Britain's American and French allies, although there should have been greater emphasis on Britain's long-standing support for unification under the right conditions.

Agreement in December 1973 between the FRG and Czechoslovakia to treat the 1938 Munich agreement as non-existent removed the last major obstacle to normalization of relations between the FRG and Germany's former enemies in central and Eastern Europe.⁶⁴ The

⁶² Foreign and Commonwealth Office Archives 1987 RS021/3/5/87, 'Planning Paper: The German Question and Europe'.

⁶³ Salmon, Hamilton, and Twigge (eds.), *German Unification*, no. 49.

⁶⁴ Treaty on Mutual Relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic signed in Prague on 11 Dec. 1973

Review Articles

way was clear for signature of the Helsinki Final Act (HFA) on 1 August 1975. The Soviet Union failed to secure its objective of a substitute peace treaty that would confirm frontiers in Europe as unalterable. The first of the HFA's ten Principles says that participating states 'consider that their frontiers can be changed, in accordance with international law, by peaceful means, and by agreement'.⁶⁵ Much ink has been spilled over the years on the contribution made by the human rights provisions (the third 'basket') of the HFA to the peaceful revolutions of 1989. But in terms of German unification its first principle was vital. The Soviet leadership were aware of this at the time, but conceded the point on the grounds that they would never agree to frontier change. The Prime Minister was carefully briefed on the implications of HFA for German unification

Six reasons for this British policy failure can be identified. First, the Prime Minister had been impelled by her fear, suspicion, and ignorance of the Germans, combined with animosity towards Kohl and Genscher, to make a personal, decisive break with policy on the German question that Britain and its NATO allies had sustained for forty years in all international fora, unsupported by any advice from experts such as her personal foreign affairs adviser, Sir Percy Cradock. Moreover, she communicated her views to Gorbachev on 23 September, and sought to attribute them to him. The Prime Minister's lack of subtlety and guile served her, and Britain, badly on this occasion. Second, there was a tendency in London to pay insufficient attention to statements such as that by Professor Otto Reinhold, President of the GDR Academy of Sciences, who had said in September 1989 that a capitalist GDR would have no reason for existing alongside a capitalist FRG.⁶⁶ Third, the Prime Minister misread Mitterrand and Gorbachev, believing that they would be at least

http://untreaty.un.org/unts/1_60000/26/15/00050707.pdf, accessed 10 Sept. 2009. According to Article 1 the parties 'consider the Munich Agreement of 29 September 1938 as null with regard to their mutual relations in terms of this treaty'.

⁶⁵ 'Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States', reprinted in *Selected Documents Relating to Problems of Security and Cooperation in Europe 1954-77*, Cmnd 6932 (London: HMSO, 1977), 228.

⁶⁶ Reinhold gave an interview to the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on 14 Sept. 1989. He said: 'what right to exist would a capitalist GDR have alongside a capitalist Federal Republic? None of course'.

effective brakes on the process. Fourth, the Prime Minister, unlike Britain's allies, thought in traditional terms of the European balance of power. If Germany was becoming more powerful, Britain would have to balance it by drawing closer to France and the Soviet Union. Fifth, she believed that the rapid rush to unification could destabilize Gorbachev who might be replaced by a hard-liner in the mould of Yegor Ligachev (who tried to bolster Honecker in September 1989), bringing the whole process of liberalization in central and Eastern Europe to a halt. This was indeed her best argument. But it is surprising that she did not pay more attention to the Americans, who were confident that the Soviet Union would in the end permit a united Germany to remain in NATO. Sixth, and most important of all in terms of subsequent developments, the Prime Minister failed, like many of Britain's political leaders from Messina to Maastricht, to understand the dynamics of European integration and place Britain at the centre of it, a failure compounded by belief that Britain could continue to 'punch above its weight'. The link which Germans made between uniting Europe, overcoming its division, and thus overcoming the division of Germany, was widely regarded in Britain as a woolly theoretical concept, not the basis for sound practical policy. Mitterrand, on the other hand, had decided to turn this concept to France's and Europe's advantage by forcing the pace on EMU.

In 1972 Britain led by Prime Minister Heath and the FRG led by Chancellor Brandt were united in their approach to Berlin, the wider German question, European integration, and East-West relations – the total trust to which the Foreign Secretary referred during the state visit of President Heinemann in late October of that year. This trust was reflected in warm German appreciation of the British negotiating team lead by Ambassador Jackling. Shortly after the successful conclusion of the Berlin negotiations Britain acceded to the European Communities. Britain, France, Germany, and the USA had combined their efforts, judging correctly what could be achieved in negotiations with the Soviet Union, with impressive results. The position in 1989 was very different. The Prime Minister did not trust the Germans. She misread the French and the Russians. She was disappointed by the Americans. She tried to hold up European integration, the external issue that would precipitate her downfall. The lesson must surely be that successful British policy in Europe should be based not on adversarial politics and the balance of power, but on trust and

Review Articles

partnership with other members of the EU, including, of course, Germany.

In writing this review article, COLIN MUNRO has drawn on his personal experience as Deputy Head of Mission in East Berlin from 1987 to 1990; Private Secretary to the late Lord Blaker, Minister of State dealing with East–West relations from 1979 to 1980; Desk Officer for the Federal Republic of Germany in the FCO’s Western European Department (WED) from 1983 to 1984; Deputy Head of WED from 1985 to 1987; and Consul General in Frankfurt from 1990 to 1993. Since then he has been working on these issues from the wider perspective of European security. His final post in the Diplomatic Service was as Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) from 2003 to 2007.

BOOK REVIEWS

INGRID BAUMGÄRTNER and HARTMUT KUGLER (eds.), *Europa im Weltbild des Mittelalters: Kartographische Konzepte, Orbis mediaevalis, Vorstellungswelten des Mittelalters*, 10 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), 330 pp. + 47 colour and 8 black-and-white in-text figures. ISBN 978 3 05 004465 1. €69.80

In 2006 a group of scholars gathered at the National Germanic Museum in Nuremberg for an interdisciplinary symposium. Ingrid Baumgärtner and Hartmut Kugler have edited the perspectives of that group for this volume, which considers topics from Ptolemy to the 1500s, focusing in general on the idea of Europe as a geographical, cultural, and political entity. Despite a relatively rich literature concerning medieval maps, almost nothing exists on this topic relating to the concept of Europe as a whole. This collection of fifteen studies in three languages (German, French, and English) represents a first step in filling that gap for both students and scholars. Although the individual selections succeed to varying degrees and no collection can cover every topic, most are quite good and the volume has a unity and coherence not always found in collected essays.

What provides the inspiration and gives coherence to this volume is the notion of Europe as a 'recall concept' (*Abrufbegriff*) introduced by Bernd Schneidmüller in his studies on the medieval construction of Europe. The theme of recalling (to memory) works best for the first three groups of essays dedicated to representations, Europe and the East, and frontiers respectively. It fades in the essays of the final section, which discusses 'paradigms'. Ingrid Baumgärtner opens the volume with the fundamental question which almost all contributions appear to have attempted to answer: 'An welcher Vergangenheit orientiert sich die Zukunft Europas?' (By which past does the future of Europe orient itself?). The concept of Europe advanced in the early twenty-first century by the European Union has its roots in the medieval debates surrounding the boundaries of the European continent—whether geographical (on the Don/Tanais, later on the Ural Mountains) or cultural (Christianity or urbanism). Baumgärtner

Book Reviews

rejects Jacques Le Goff's idea that Europe was born out of the Carolingian Empire and even goes so far as to raise doubts about the role of Christianity as a typical feature of the European identity (p. 10). This appears to be an echo of the 'anaemic European constitution cooked up by Valérie Giscard d'Estaing' (p. 267), which a Canadian contributor to the volume (Andrew Gow) views as a proof that being European is not just a matter of shared voltage and road or railway connections. Baumgärtner presents the work of J. B. Harley as fundamental for the 'spatial turn' in the study of ancient maps as texts or combinations of text and images. Such a novel approach, according to Baumgärtner, makes possible a wide range of comparisons between maps and literary texts which inform some of the most recent contributions to the field, such as Robert Stockhammer's study of 'power and lust in maps and literature'.¹ Unlike pictures, maps are 'read', but the textual information inserted into maps cannot be read in a linear trajectory, such as that of literary texts. Maps are therefore 'models of cultural processes'. Until about 1600, they did not serve as means for orientation or communication of information necessary for orientation, but as a 'social process' through which political and cultural constructions of the past and of the present may be combined to reach a specific audience (p. 19).

The fundamentals of the medieval concept of Europe, as transmitted by manuscripts of Ptolemy's *Geographike hyphegesis*, are analysed by Alfred Stückelberger in the essay opening the first section, 'Representations' (Repräsentationen), which concerns the representation of the European continent on medieval maps, especially on *mappae mundi*. On the basis of a new manuscript discovered in 1927 in the library of the Topkapı Museum in Istanbul, Stückelberger suggests reading the medieval perception of the European continent backward to Ptolemy's efforts to find useful lines of demarcation for Europe to the north and, especially, to the east. Where did Europe end and Asia begin? Ever since Herodotus, the boundary had been set on the Tanais/Don. However, Ptolemy viewed that river as flowing from northwest to southeast, and springing from the interior of 'Sarmatia'. With no clear boundary in the north, Asia was thus artificially separated from Europe along the 64th meridian. That few

¹ Robert Stockhammer, *Die Kartierung der Erde: Macht und Lust in Karten und Literatur* (Munich, 2007).

embraced Ptolemy's solution may be due to the fact that his work was discovered only in the early fourteenth century in Byzantium by Maximos Planoudes. Later in that same century, Manuel Chrysoloras brought the first manuscript of Ptolemy's work to Florence, where it was translated into Latin in 1405. Stückelberger observes that Ptolemy's world view influenced all subsequent world maps well into the 1500s.

Hartmut Kugler, like Stückelberger, makes the representation of Europe central to the mnemonic device created by Lambert of St Omer's *Liber Floridus*, the first map showing political boundaries demarcating the kingdom of France from the Holy Roman Empire. This is in sharp contrast to contemporary representations of Europe on the Hereford or Ebstorf Maps, or on the so-called Isidore Map now in the State Library in Munich. What made Lambert's map unique is the representation of the eastern parts of the continent as the fingers of a hand (with Italy as the thumb). The underlying idea is that the peoples and regions of Europe were in *dextera Domini*, with a disposition exactly matching that of the organization of the Roman Church. Kugler argues that Lambert's 'Europe hand' fits well into the Flemish cultural and political milieu of the late eleventh and first half of the twelfth century, namely, with the circumstances of the First Crusade.

But it is the central, northern, and eastern regions of the continent that made the medieval concept of Europe problematic. Patrick Gautier Dalché examines the way in which, beginning with the twelfth century, the conceptual map of Europe 'grew' to include the pagan or 'schismatic' regions to the north and to the east—Scythia, Germania, Dania, and Norweia. Shortly after 1200, Gervase of Tilbury knew of Ungaria, Pollonia, and Livonia. A little later, Bartholomew Anglicus distinguished between Sambia and Semigallia, a sign of a much more detailed knowledge of the Baltic region. The Mongol invasion of 1241 and the subsequent diplomatic activity aiming at the same time to prevent a new onslaught and to harness the Mongol power for the political and military goals of the Crusade opened even further the horizons on the eastern and northeastern frontiers of Europe. The medieval notion of Europe, Dalché contends, was never 'purely geographical': 'Le texte géographique médiéval révèle donc une prise de conscience croissante de l'appartenance contradictoire à l'Europe de ces espaces' (p. 79).

Book Reviews

Ingrid Baumgärtner extends Dalché's remarks to the analysis of the image of Europe on the *mappae mundi* of Beatus of Liébana and of Ranulf Higden, dated to the eighth and late fourteenth century respectively. The surviving copies of the Beatus maps (dated between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries) inscribe Europe in a world oriented according to the location of Paradise, but divide it into areas, the size and role of which go back to Late Roman provinces. By contrast, the Higden maps—oval, almond-shaped, or circular (T-shaped)—strongly emphasize the centrality of Anglia, in addition to a number of other locales, such as Brindisi, the main Apulian port for launching the crusading expeditions to the Holy Land. Baumgärtner's conclusion is worth citing in full: 'At no point were medieval maps authoritative reproductions of a clearly presented physical space. Rather, they were variable signifiers, constantly renewing themselves, which made clear a constant change of awareness in dealings with the (European) space.'²

The second section of the volume treats Europe and the East. Paul D. A. Harvey examines the representation of Europe and the Holy Land on medieval *mappae mundi*. He reminds us that most early, so-called 'Jerome maps' of Palestine appear in the early thirteenth century at the end of a manuscript of St Jerome's works. The large number of maps of Palestine dated to the subsequent centuries reveals a considerable interest in the geography of the Holy Land. Harvey counts this interest as an expression, not a result, of the Crusades. Andreas Kaplony focuses on the representation of Europe on an Islamic map of the eleventh-century *Book of Curiosities*. The document is, in fact, what Edward S. Kennedy and Mary H. Kennedy called a 'diagrammatic map', similar to that included in Ibn Hawqal's tenth-century *Geography*. Most typical for such maps is the elongated shape of mountain ranges and the rounded, rectangle-shaped, or square-shaped islands and bays, with cities as red dots and roads as straight lines. Muslim geographers had no use for the ancient concept of Europe, which they replaced with a 'small continent' to the west of the Bosphorus and to the north of the Mediterranean Sea. Since they

² 'Mittelalterliche Karten waren zu keinem Zeitpunkt autoritative Reproduktionen eines klar vorgegebenen physischen Raumes, sondern variable, sich ständig erneuernde Bedeutungsträger, die einen kontinuierlich Bewusstseinswandel im Umgang mit dem (europäischen) Raum verdeutlichen', p. 132.

had more interest in the 'Roman Empire' (*Mamlakat ar-Rūm*), Arab geographers also included Anatolia in 'Europe', while at the same time excluding both Spain and Sicily.

Looking at Europe as a whole, Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken examines two *mappae mundi* drawn in southern Italy c.1320, the map in Paulinus Minorita's *Chronologia magna* and the Douce map. While the Douce map is devoid of any inscription (an anomaly for the genre of *mappa mundi*), that of Paulinus Minorita shows a number of innovations, such as the representation of the Caspian as an enclosed sea or the exaggerated size of the Horn of Africa, which point to the influence of contemporary portolan charts. However, unlike those charts, which are concerned primarily with coastal regions, the map of Paulinus shows a number of features in the interior, which are otherwise known from other *mappae mundi*, such as the *Liber Floridus* examined by Hartmut Kugler in a previous essay. Paulinus' Europe is centred upon the Mediterranean. By contrast, the Douce map appears to place the centre of Europe somewhere in the Middle East, perhaps under the influence of Islamic map-making.

The essays in the third section, 'Grenzziehungen und Grenzerfahrungen' (Drawing Borders and Border Experiences), move away from emphasizing the representation of Europe on world maps and focus instead on the internal organization of the map area reserved for the European continent. Thus Evelyn Edson explains why the north-eastern regions of Europe were, as late as the mid fifteenth century, associated with Dacia and Gothia known from much earlier sources. She shows in particular why the issue of defining the north-eastern regions of Europe was tied to the equally problematic boundary between Europe and Asia. However, Edson is wrong on a number of details. For example, the Ural Mountains are not as low as surmised (p. 179), for the highest altitude (1,895 m) is Mount Narodnaia in the Nether-Polar Urals. The Dacians of Antiquity were not of Scythian (p. 179), but of Thracian origin, and the Permians on Fra Mauro's *mappa mundi* are not Lapps (p. 187), but most likely Komi-Permiaks. To believe that Jordanes got his information on the early history of the Goths from oral tradition (p. 181) simply shows a complete ignorance of Walter Goffart's elegant demonstration to the contrary. Similarly, Patrizia Licini focusing on European and Ottoman landmarks from a mid fifteenth-century portolan chart assumes that thirteenth-century Europeans labelled Gog those nomads who, in

Book Reviews

their own language, called themselves Gök Türk (the Blue Turks). She offers no evidence that the language of the sixth- to seventh-century nomads in Eurasia was known in thirteenth-century Europe (p. 213). Equally far-fetched is the attempt to date the portolan chart on the basis of a Greek cross on top of the dome-shaped tower representing Moscow, which Edson interprets as evidence of the successful bid for independence of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1458, in the aftermath of the Council of Ferrara (p. 215). In fact, the autocephalous status of the Church of Russia was not recognized until 1589.

Stefan Schröder, who examines descriptions in pilgrim accounts of the marginal areas of Europe, concludes that boundaries are rarely mentioned, while the entire Mediterranean is viewed as a frontier region separating Europe from Africa. Margriet Hoogvliet warns the reader that to say that medieval cartographers saw their own continent, Europe, as normative for the rest of the world is simply to project postcolonial awareness into an era that had no idea of such a concept (p. 239). Europe, in fact, had its own 'exotic' facet for medieval map-makers. Hoogvliet examines the 'wonders of Europe' which became very popular especially during the sixteenth century and concludes that Europe was perceived as superior to other continents not only because of its prosperity and favourable natural circumstances, but also because of its wonders.

In the last section of the volume, 'Paradigmen' (Paradigms), the focus shifts again to the use of maps for a variety of political and practical goals. Andrew Gow's interest in Fra Mauro's mid fifteenth-century *mappa mundi* informs his provocative sketch of the ways in which Eurocentrism worked in Renaissance Europe. More than any other essay in this volume, Gow's is wrought with serious problems, many of which are the result of the presentist fallacy of his approach. He views the inscription *Europa*, which Fra Mauro placed on his *mappa mundi* on the eastern coast of the Adriatic as 'an omen of current developments in Montenegro, Croatia, and Slovenia' (p. 261). Leaving aside the fact that Slovenia is a member of the European Union, it remains unclear precisely what developments could have thus been predicted by Fra Mauro. Equally questionable is the condescension of statements such as 'Clearly Europeans and post-Europeans such as I have always felt that something, someplace, or someone else, someone non-European, begins somewhere where

Cartographic Concepts of Medieval Europe

Russia trails off to the east' (p. 263). Whether or not such a perception of Russia is widespread in Alberta (Canada), Europeans living in Romania, Poland, or Bulgaria are unlikely to agree with Andrew Gow's (or his son's) idea of Europe, which they would probably dismiss as arrogant.

Piero Falchetta explores the use of portolan charts in European navigation and concludes, somewhat surprisingly that, because such charts were not the result of the application of a general theory of space, nautical treatises (such as that by Benedetto Cotrugli, a fifteenth-century Ragusan merchant turned scholar) rarely if ever describe the use of portolans. The final essay by Martina Stercken makes a case for Europe as a political and cultural space in which Albrecht von Bonstetten and Konrad Türost positioned their notion of the fifteenth-century Swiss confederation.

Clearly the volume is a treasure trove for students of the idea of Europe; there is also much to interest historians of medieval maps and map-making. The book does not cover all possible topics evenly or well. The history of the Byzantine perception of 'Europe', the role of linguistic boundaries, and of the Catholic-Orthodox divide in East Central Europe lack full consideration. If the collection itself has limits, they lie in the neglect of the comparative dimension to this story of 'cartographic concepts'. The volume offers no conclusion, but its contents show clearly that current scholarship on the idea of Europe in the Middle Ages is not only alive, but very expertly served.

FLORIN CURTA has been Professor of Medieval History and Archaeology at the University of Florida since 2007. He is the author of *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, c. 500-1250* (2006) and *The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700 A.D.* (2001, paperback 2007), and editor of, among others, *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages: Avars, Bulgars, Khazars, and Cumans* (2008).

MICHAEL BORGOLTE, JULIANE SCHIEL, BERND SCHNEIDEMÜLLER, and ANNETTE SEITZ (eds.), *Mittelalter im Labor: Die Mediävistik testet Wege zu einer transkulturellen Europawissenschaft*, Europa im Mittelalter, 10 (Berlin: Akademie, 2008), 595 pp. ISBN 978 3 05 004373 9. €69.80

This volume contains the summary of the first results reached by a group of researchers (organized in a so-called Priority Programme) working on the integration and disintegration of cultures in medieval Europe. This ongoing six-year programme was inspired by current issues: the authors highlight the need to understand the present and prepare for the future of Europe. In order to do this, the medieval roots of European civilization are revisited. The researchers problematize the issue of European unity and European identity in a historical perspective. Their aim is to show that Europe never had a unified culture, that a plurality of cultures always existed in Europe. They therefore propose to look at processes of integration and disintegration as dynamic forces shaping and reshaping identities. The three monotheistic religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) are particularly pinpointed as crucial in both processes: they were the most important integrating factors but at the same time they also engendered resistance and difference.

At the same time, the volume also demonstrates a new form of collaboration: joint research and writing. The format was inspired by internet-based groups such as Wikipedia. All the chapters in the book are the outcome of common work by several people together, who could exchange information and rework the texts on the internet. The result is something between a monograph and an anthology, rather than a collection of loosely-related articles. All the articles form part of one of three working groups, and each group situates the articles within the larger context. The various themes treated in each section are explicitly linked together in either a preface or a conclusion to the sections. The research is interdisciplinary, including historians, art historians, archaeologists, linguists, philosophers, and many others, with young scholars from various fields working together.

The first group (T. Haas, A. Hammer, M. Mersch, U. Ritzerfeld, J. Schiel, S. Seidl, A. Seitz, M. Tischler, J. Zimmermann) worked on medieval perceptions of difference and different perceptions. Relations to 'the Other' have been explored in cultural anthropology

Integration and Disintegration in Medieval Europe

and medieval history, with a special focus on definitions and the drawing of boundaries between oneself and others. This section contains an exploration of the perception of differences in intercultural contact, particularly regarding the Mendicant Orders. The examples used are the writings of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure, of the Dominican missionary Ricoldo of Monte Croce, and the Franciscan Church of S Caterina in Galatina in Apulia. In this way, theological, philosophical, and normative texts as well as perceptions of differences in missionary practice, and their expression through buildings in competition with the Greek church and Islam are brought together and compared. While Thomas Aquinas is shown to have had an integrative approach, leading to intellectual innovation, Ricoldo of Monte Croce focused on differences and drew boundaries, strengthening the feeling of 'us' vs. 'them'. In architecture, it was possible to integrate artistic forms of another cultural sphere from the past. The process through which a clearer self-image emerged in interaction is thus traced on many levels. Strategies in inter-religious contact between Christendom and Islam are analysed through the examples of crusader chronicles, twelfth-century Christian theology, and exegesis on Islam from the Iberian peninsula, a contact zone between the two religions, and thirteenth-century Latin world chronicles' views on Muhammad. The articles demonstrate that the medieval authors focused inwards, on Christians, rather than on an endeavour to produce real interaction with adherents of another religion. This was true whether their aim was the construction of a collective identity for the crusader armies, the edification or strengthening of Christians in a common identity, or the integration of information about another religion into the European corpus of knowledge. The final section focuses on hagiographical and courtly texts, and how they produce difference, through such diverse issues as the beauty of the saints and representations of pagans.

The second group (R. Barzen, V. Bulgakova, L. Güntzel, F. Musall, J. Pahlitzsch, D. Schorkowitz) analysed contacts between cultures and cultural exchange. After a discussion on methodologies and theoretical aspects of work on cultural exchange, which draws on sociology and anthropology, five case studies are presented. The topics treated here range widely, from the transfer of knowledge through the example of Maimonides, to the expulsion of the Jews from France and England (as an extreme form of the disintegration of cultures).

Book Reviews

The latter study also demonstrates how religious discourse on usury was linked to the exercise of power as much as to the interaction between religious groups. These essays highlight the significance of looking at the intersection of knowledge and religion not just between various cultures, but also within each culture. The other three cases all concern minority religious groups in another cultural context: Orthodox Christians in Jerusalem under Mamluk rule, thirteenth-century Islamic-Christian cultural contacts under the Seldjuks in Sugdaia in the northern region of the Black Sea, where Anatolian Turks interacted with the local majority Greek Christian population, and Pechenegs in Rus' tradition. The real interaction of Kievan Rus' with steppe nomads in the contact zone between the two cultures was different from Kievan representations, which focused on demarcation. The authors pinpoint the conversion of Rus' to Christianity as a turning point that triggered a quick change in perceptions and a disintegrative process.

The third group (W. Deimann, T. Foerster, S. Gerogiorgakis, H. Hiltmann, K. P. Jankrift, C. Jochum-Godglück, D. König, Ş. Küçük Hüseyin, J. Rüdiger, A. Schorr, H. Wels) investigated violence in the context of cultures. The authors explicitly discuss the topicality of the subject. This is the longest and richest section of the book, consisting of several subdivisions concerning both *violentia* and *potestas*. There are examples of integrative and disintegrative violence, medieval theories and norms of the use of violence, violence and naming patterns, violence and disputes, sex and violence, the role of violence in constructions of ideal personalities, and episodes of conquest and massacres illustrative of great violence. The individual studies include often lengthy quotations accompanied by a German translation. They treat a wide variety of different topics, from Aristotelian definitions to effeminacy in Saxo Grammaticus, from the plunder of Rome in 410 to Jan Hus.

Each section is supplemented by a bibliography and illustrations and photographs accompany the texts that concern art history. The volume represents an interesting new beginning. The Priority Programme continues, and the researchers will, I hope, produce other fruitful syntheses.

NORA BEREND is Senior Lecturer in Medieval History at the University of Cambridge and Fellow of St Catharine's College. Her main

Integration and Disintegration in Medieval Europe

research interest is in medieval history, especially social and religious history, c.1000–c.1300. She is the author of *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims and 'Pagans' in Medieval Hungary c.1000–c.1300* (2001, awarded the Gladstone Prize for non-British history by The Royal Historical Society); co-editor (with David Abulafia) of *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices* (2002); and editor of *Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus' c.900–1200* (2007).

CLAUDIA GARNIER, *Die Kultur der Bitte: Herrschaft und Kommunikation im mittelalterlichen Reich*, Symbolische Kommunikation in der Vormoderne: Studien zur Geschichte, Literatur und Kunst (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008), x + 455 pp. ISBN 978 3 534 21956 8. €79.90

This book provides scholars with a detailed study of a significant but underappreciated aspect of royal court culture in the Middle Ages: the making of requests to—and by—the king. Garnier researched and wrote this work, her *Habilitation*, while at the University of Münster. There, she served as an assistant to Gerd Althoff, one of the most eminent medieval historians working in Germany today, and Althoff's influence on this project is clear throughout the book. His own decades-long interest in the topics of conflict resolution, ritual, and forms of political communication are all of central importance to the methodology Garnier employs here.

Garnier organizes her work chronologically and discusses a wide array of materials produced between the sixth and the sixteenth centuries. After an opening chapter that serves as a brief introduction, chapter 2 focuses on the Frankish period and the culture of making requests at the courts of the Merovingian and Carolingian rulers. In chapter 3 Garnier turns her attention to the Ottonian and Salian kings and emperors of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Chapter 4 concerns pleas at the Staufen imperial court. The final two chapters have the later Middle Ages as their subject; chapter 5 examines the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries while chapter 6 explores the Habsburg court of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Finally, in chapter 7, Garnier offers a synthesis of her findings.

Not surprisingly, given the author's attempt to cover a millennium of European history in fewer than four hundred pages, some periods and incidents are scrutinized in much greater detail than others. Merovingian-era petitions and requests receive fewer than five pages of attention in the second chapter before Garnier shifts her focus to a lengthy analysis of Carolingian court culture. There is also a noticeable gap in the study between the Salian and Staufen rulers; neither King Lothar III (1125–38) nor Conrad III (1138–52) is referenced in the work. In contrast, Garnier offers detailed discussions of petitions and requests surrounding Emperor Henry IV's actions at Canossa in 1077, Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa's dispute with

Duke Henry the Lion in the later 1170s, and Emperor Charles IV's interactions with the imperial princes in 1355–6 after his return from Rome.

Garnier's tendency to emphasize certain periods and events more than others is partly the result of the uneven distribution of the surviving evidence across the centuries of medieval history. But she also chooses to dedicate significant attention to a small number of sources she finds especially interesting. Thus, the early eleventh-century chronicler Thietmar of Merseburg is the focus of close analysis in chapter 3, as are a series of well-known manuscript illuminations of the emperors Otto III and Henry II. Similarly, a fourteenth-century illuminated manuscript of the Golden Bull receives detailed explication in one extended portion of chapter 5. In many cases, these lengthy discussions of individual sources are the strongest sections of the book because Garnier slows down her narrative and provides the necessary context to understand these key pieces of evidence in a rich and nuanced fashion.

Throughout the work, Garnier identifies several key points of continuity in the 'Kultur der Bitte' across the Middle Ages. She argues, for example, that the making of requests was always a hierarchically-structured form of communication and that, as a result, the social status of both parties shaped the nature of the plea as well as the response. Similarly, the setting of any given petition consistently played an important role in how that petition was received; a request made to the king in front of the magnates at a gathering of the imperial court was fundamentally different from a request made to the king in the presence of only one or two other people. The non-verbal components of petitions were also significant elements of this court culture during the entire period under investigation; for that reason, Garnier focuses a great deal of attention on the formalized and ritualized act of kneeling in several of her chapters.

Despite these points of continuity, the story Garnier tells here is generally one of change across the medieval millennium. For example, while it was acceptable for Ottonian and Salian rulers to cry and prostrate themselves before their magnates, such behaviour had become inappropriate for kings by the end of the twelfth century. Other traditions emerged in the later Middle Ages that had no clear precedents in earlier centuries. By the 1300s, it was commonplace for kings, at the time of their coronations, to make a special type of

Book Reviews

request to religious institutions, asking them to accept into their communities specific individuals chosen by the ruler (*ius primariorum precum*). The most important development Garnier discusses, however, is the increase in written petitions from the twelfth century onwards; according to the author, this is a trend that is especially noticeable in the context of vassals' requests to do homage to the kings and emperors. Thus, while a broadly-defined 'Kultur der Bitte' was a constant from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries, the nature of that culture experienced significant changes.

On the whole, this is a well-written book that presents a compelling account of petitions and requests made to and by medieval rulers. In its discussion of this specific topic, the work is very successful. From a broader perspective, however, it must be said that none of Garnier's conclusions significantly alters the established grand narrative of medieval German kingship. She provides here a very familiar account of the development and transformation of sacral conceptions of kingship between the ninth and twelfth centuries; indeed, there is nothing especially novel in her argument that there was a shift in royal ideology from Christian mercy to stern justice between the early and central Middle Ages. It is also unsurprising to find Garnier arguing that the nature of petitions and requests at the royal court changed as a result of the shifting dynamic between the emperors and princes, especially in the wake of the collapse of the Staufen dynasty. Similarly, her emphasis on written forms of requests from the twelfth century onwards conforms to much broader trends identified by other historians concerning the increased production of written administrative and legal instruments from the 1100s onwards. This book is therefore not transformational, but it nevertheless offers much of value to scholars interested in medieval political culture.

JONATHAN R. LYON is Assistant Professor of Medieval History at the University of Chicago. His current research concerns the impact of sibling relationships on the political strategies of the German nobility during the Staufen period (1138–1250). His publications include 'Fathers and Sons: Preparing Noble Youths to be Lords in Twelfth-Century Germany', *Journal of Medieval History*, 34/3 (2008), 291–310.

PAUL FOURACRE and DAVID GANZ (eds.), *Frankland. The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), xvi + 340 pp. ISBN 978 0 7190 7669 5. £55.00

There can be no doubt that Jinty Nelson (in some places the editors deliberately retain her official name, Janet) is among the most creative, inspiring, and influential living historians of the Early Middle Ages. Everybody loves her charming amiability and admires her ingenious, sometimes provocative, but always profound challenges to former research. Her extensive and in many respects pioneering work is well respected. It is therefore not surprising that a conventional *Festschrift* might have exceeded all practical bounds. The editors of this volume, written in her honour on the occasion of her 65th birthday, were therefore well advised when they decided to include only a limited number of selected essays on a particular theme which gives the book—with an ambiguous title!—a strong coherence. In their introduction the editors present a warm-hearted appreciation of Jinty Nelson as a colleague and of her wide-ranging work focused on human interaction, ritual and politics, gender aspects of medieval history, and the politics and culture of the Carolingian period, in particular, the reign of Charles the Bald. If Charles has made some headway towards rehabilitation against the contempt of earlier researchers, then this is largely thanks to Jinty Nelson. It is also worth mentioning that the authors represented in this volume are a mixture of established and younger medievalists.

The fifteen essays in the volume focus on either Frankish history or its influence on Britain (or vice versa), and each of them addresses a different, and mostly new, aspect. Alice Rio ('Charters, Law Codes and Formulae') discusses the different significance of the three genres of legal sources mentioned in the title, casting interesting glances at the history of research and emphasizing the importance of the *formulae*. It may be significant for our own approaches that *formulae* have required new attention over the last few years since they are a witness to the adaptation of Roman legal and literate structures, especially in non-Roman regions. *Formulae* form the link between law codes and charters at a regional as well as practical level, revealing how laws were adopted and adjusted in practice. This inspiring essay may, however, overemphasize their difference from charters repre-

Book Reviews

senting 'the real world', as most *formulae* were based on 'real' charters. Susan Reynolds ('Compulsory Purchase in the Earlier Middle Ages') deals with a neglected topic, the taking of land, especially church lands, for public use. Although there is not much evidence for expropriation, it is documented long before the twelfth century and thus cannot be seen as a consequence of the reception of Roman law. Alan Thacker ('Gallic or Greek? Archbishops in England from Theodore to Ecgberht') pursues the development of church structures (metropolis, archbishopric, and pallium) in the West and compares it with developments in England. He shows that Gregory the Great's plans for church organization were not successful because of the restructuring efforts of the Greek archbishops: Gregory's personal grant of the pallium ceded to Theodore's concept of the high authority of his office. This concept was taken up again by Bede who, however, also revived Gregory's plan for a separation of the twelve bishops subject to Canterbury from the four bishops of Northumbria. As a result, the English archbishops had a much stronger position than their equivalents on the Continent until Willibrord and Bonifatius introduced the English model there.

Paul Fouracre, one of the volume's editors ('Forgetting and Remembering Dagobert II: The English Connection'), applies recent approaches to 'memory culture' to an almost forgotten Merovingian king. On the one hand he discusses the role of the 'Vita Wilfredi', which did not have much influence on the Continent, and, on the other, the development of research. Thus Fouracre gives an instructive lesson on the historian's dependence on his evidence and on attempts by medieval elites to conceive of their past. David Ganz, the second editor, gives his essay a general title ('Some Carolingian Questions from Charlemagne's Days'), which conceals a codicological analysis of ms. BNF lat. 4629, a collective manuscript on laws, capitularies, and formulas, and an edition and translation of a dialogue based on the manuscript without emendations. Thus he not only delivers some insights on the ideas of ethics and virtues, physical beauty, sin, and women in Carolingian times, but also suggests that the simple Latin of the text may reflect the conversations at Charlemagne's court, which we know of from Einhard.

Matthew Innes ("Immune from Heresy": Defining the Boundaries of Carolingian Christianity) deals with reproaches of heresy at the time of Saint Boniface. At the council of Soissons in 744, such accusa-

tions were made against the priests Adalbert and Clemens, who had taught that confessions were not necessary because God knew all the sins. Discussing this topic in detail, the author draws our attention to a fact so far ignored: Boniface's fear of heresy in the final stage of Christianization and the language of heresy in the sources: 'heretification was not a viable strategy, for it potentially threatened the integrity and identity of Church and kingdom.' At the same time, the controversy over wrong belief shows that 'the Franks had indeed become immune from heresy'. Paul Kershaw ('English History and Irish Readers in the Frankish World'), in a similarly interesting approach, analyses the reception of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* on the Continent. He takes the example of the use made of this work by Sedulius Scottus and the Bern manuscript, which ignored the Old English but considered issues related to the presence of the Irish in Britain. Thus Bede was used to teach Italians about British history. Rachel Stone ('In Search of the Carolingian "dear lord" ') compares lordship in France and England in order to show that, despite the different traditions of research in Britain, France, and Germany, there are, in fact, common traditions, including an emotional attachment to a (dead) lord, the ideal of loyalty (as in *Dhuoda* and *Nithard*), and a political ideology of lordship.

Simon MacLean ('Making a Difference in Tenth-Century Politics: King Athelstan's Sisters and Frankish Queenship') underlines the difference in political marriages between the Anglo-Saxon and the Frankish kingdoms in the ninth century, when Charles the Bald's daughter Judith was married to Aethelwulf, and the tenth century, when Aethelstan married three of his daughters to Frankish kings and princes. The author emphasizes the role of these queens, while family ties as such were rather fragile. He confirms the impression, well known since the work of Pauline Stafford and Amalie Föbel, that 'queenship' was not a fixed institution, but a shifting concept, while family commemoration formed a key part of the queen's role. Theo Riches ('The Carolingian Capture of Aachen in 978 and its Historiographical Footprint') inquires not into the events of 978 (the seizure of Aachen by the West Frankish king, Lothar) but into the historiographical narrative, refuting Hartmut Hoffmann's conclusion concerning Richer's incompetence in using classical texts. A comparison of different sources reveals that the authors had distinct perceptions and, diachronically, a decrease in the importance of place (the sym-

Book Reviews

bol of Charlemagne's reign) in favour of a rising interest in people, their motives, and feelings of honour and shame. Sarah Hamilton (*Abvoluimus uos uice beati petri apostolorum principis: Episcopal Authority and the Reconciliation of Excommunicants in England and Francia c.900–c.1150*) deals with rites of reconciliation that, despite a vast amount of research on rituals, have so far been neglected. A comparison between the absolution given in France and England and a synopsis of the main texts reveals that the ritual had similar procedures, but different prayers and localities. Moreover, the Frankish rites concentrate on the authority of the bishop (submission of the excommunicant), whereas the English bishops absolve in their own name, often several sinners at the same time. John Gillingham (*Fontenoy and After: Pursuing Enemies to Death in France Between the Ninth and Eleventh Centuries*) is also concerned with a neglected question, namely, what happened after battles when negotiations failed. The battle of Fontenoy between Louis the Pious's sons may be evidence that even Christian enemies were pursued and killed (Nithard and the other contemporary sources remain silent on this, but suggest at least a feeling of guilt on the part of the victors). It was not until the eleventh century that a shift towards more merciful treatment by taking prisoners instead of killing the enemy seemed to indicate a change. Undoubtedly this question needs further analysis.

Stephen Baxter ('The Death of Burgheard Son of Ælfgar and its Context'), on the background of the Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England project directed by Jinty Nelson, attempts to shed light on a man (Burgheard), of whom all we know, from a later charter, is that he died on returning from Rome in 1061. It seems, however, that of the twelve Burgheards mentioned in Domesday Book, ten had possessions in Buckinghamshire and can be identified as the same person: the son of Ælfgar. Apparently Burgheard had travelled to Rome to seek papal support for his rights in Lincolnshire. Although the conclusions necessarily remain hypothetical ('a matter of managing doubt and balancing probability'), they give a good impression of the value of prosopographical studies. David Bates ('The Representation of Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Norman Royal Charters') emphasizes the significant office of the two Mathildas, whose roots lie in Carolingian times. (Thus queenship has here become an office.) The essay makes a convincing contribution on queenship, charters, and Anglo-Norman relations.

Finally, Wendy Davies ('Franks and Bretons: The Impact of Political Climate and Historiographical Tradition on Writing their Ninth-Century History'), surveying the nineteenth- and twentieth-century historiography on Brittany and Bretons in the ninth century, illustrates its dependence on political judgements. In the nineteenth century Brittany's independence was emphasized, while in the twentieth, Carolingian penetration was stressed. This shift supported the process of Brittany becoming a part of France. Historiography, therefore, contributes to the political environment. The volume is concluded by a list of Jinty Nelson's publications and a *Tabula gratulatoria*.

All the essays range within the theme of this *Festschrift*. Almost all of them touch on Jinty Nelson's favourite topics, often in combination with the author's own special field. But each of them provides a new and often surprising theme, and fresh perspectives and insights. In total, they offer us not only a valuable collection of essays on 'Frankland' and Franco-Anglo-Saxon relations, but also pay tribute to a worthy colleague who is herself one of the greatest authorities in this field. To borrow from David Ganz's words and *hommage* to Jinty Nelson, despite the authors' own talents and skills: 'they do honour to a scholar who makes us all feel less talented.'

HANS-WERNER GOETZ is Professor of Medieval History at the University of Hamburg. He has published widely on many aspects of medieval history, including *Leben im Mittelalter vom 7. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert* (6th edn., 2002), which has been translated into Italian, Japanese, English, and Chinese, and *Europa im frühem Mittelalter 500–1050* (2003).

ULRIKE GRASSNICK, *Ratgeber des Königs: Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherideal im spätmittelalterlichen England*, Europäische Kulturstudien: Literatur-Musik-Kunst im historischen Kontext, 15 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004), xii + 471 pp. ISBN 978 3 412 06304 7. €59.90

Mirrors of princes (*Fürstenspiegel*)¹ play an important part in the political theory of the late Middle Ages. Their aim was to ensure that princes behaved in accordance with fixed norms so that rulers would approach the ideal of rule which these texts defined. The first medieval texts of this sort date back to Carolingian times, when they had a strongly biblical orientation. The genre experienced a strong revival in the twelfth century with John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, although this was not yet a mirror of princes in the strict sense of the term. From the thirteenth century a growing number of texts of this sort were created in order to dispense advice for the education of young princes (*De regimine principum*). The most widespread, widely read and translated text of this sort in the late Middle Ages was that written by Giles of Rome (Ägidius Romanus) in 1277-9. The number of translations into various vernaculars reveals a widespread interest, even if its actual influence on political action remains largely unclear.

The work under review here, a Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of Münster in the field of English language and literature, examines this question taking late medieval vernacular English mirrors of princes as an example. The older texts of this sort were written in Latin, including the *Speculum regis Edward III*, probably dating from around 1330, attributed to William of Pagula. It is no coincidence that the first vernacular texts were created in a literary context, where the use of Middle English early gained special significance. Thus in one of the two stories of the *Canterbury Tales* that he himself narrates, Geoffrey Chaucer offers a mirror of princes in prose. Building on a work by Albertanus of Brescia, Chaucer places a negative example at the heart of his text, a ruler who will not take advice. This text was also read separately from the *Canterbury Tales*. John Gower then integrated a mirror of princes into the central seventh

¹ The term 'mirror of princes' (*Fürstenspiegel*) describes a particular genre of admonitory writings providing young princes in particular, and secular rulers in general, with guidance on conduct, ethics, and the discharge of office.

book of his *Confessio Amantis*, written from 1386 on the suggestion of King Richard II. A later version was dedicated to Henry Bolingbroke (the future Henry IV). In line with the thrust of the whole work, it focuses on the virtues (and vices), of which truth, generosity, justice, clemency, and purity or chastity are introduced as virtues becoming a ruler.

These two are among the seven vernacular mirrors of princes which Ulrike Grassnick has chosen to form the basis of her work, as is the first real Middle English mirror of princes, *The Governace of Kings and Princes* by John Trevisa, a translation of the work of Giles of Rome commissioned by Thomas Lord of Berkeley and written between 1388 and 1392. Unlike the Latin original, Trevisa's translation was not widely disseminated, and it hardly deviates from the original.

The other texts central to the study are Thomas Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*, John Lydgate's (and Benedict Burgh's) *The Secrees of Old Philisoffres*, Sir Gilbert Hay's *The Buke of the Gouvernance of Princis*, and George Ashby's *Active Policy of a Prince*. Hoccleve's singular mirror of princes, written between 1410 and 1413 for the future Henry V, is among the best known texts of the English late Middle Ages, and more than forty-three manuscripts of it are still extant today. By contrast, the tract completed by Benedict Burgh after John Lydgate's death is only a translation of the *Secretum Secretorum* which, ostensibly a letter from Aristotle to Alexander the Great, derives from an Arabic original dating from the tenth century. The Middle English translation by Burgh and Lydgate was not the only one, but attracted some attention among the aristocracy of the late fifteenth century. The work by Gilbert Hay, too, is a reworking of the *Secretum Secretorum*. Along with related works, it dates from before 1456 and was commissioned by William Sinclair, Earl of Orkney and Lord Chancellor under James II of Scotland. George Ashby's work, finally, was probably written around 1470 for Henry VI's heir, Edward of Lancaster, who was killed in the battles against Edward IV. Building explicitly on older models, it concentrates on the ruler's political actions.

While these texts have, to differing degrees, already been studied, they are treated together for the first time here. The heterogeneity of the sources selected – two chapters of literature, three translations (of two different originals), and two 'original' mirrors of princes –

Book Reviews

requires a methodological approach to hold it all together. Grassnick offers a dual approach, as it were. On the one hand, as a medievalist, especially from Münster, she sees these texts as examples of a pragmatic written culture, and refers to the definition by Hagen Keller and Franz Worstbrock who establish the link between human actions and the forms of writing that serve this or make knowledge available. On the other hand, she uses Pierre Bourdieu's theory and the New Historicism to analyse the models of action by rulers which are presented in the Middle English mirrors of princes. She interprets English society of the later Middle Ages as a social space which, in terms of Bourdieu's cultural sociology, is shaped by various classes, their *habitus* and cultural capital, and for which the relevant political and literary fields can be discerned in each case. The author applies this to mirrors of princes in order to show both to what extent the political and literary field gave rise to these writings, and how they, in turn, affected the political and literary field. 'This makes a close examination of the aim of the mirror of princes possible. By capturing models of rulers' actions in writing, they wanted to create a particular personality structure with a specific *habitus*. Thus the image of the ideal ruler is both a construction of the texts and a reflection of the dominant system of values and norms that can only be created and transmitted via negotiations in the literary and political field' (p. 39).

The structure of the book takes account of this dual approach. The introductory section, making up roughly one-third of the volume, starts by explaining the theoretical basis relatively fully. It provides a history of mirrors of princes, both in general and in late medieval England in particular, describes the individual texts in detail, and places them in context. This is followed by a brief initial comparative examination of 'Production and Reception in the Literary Field' referring to the authors' common social background and their dependence on their respective ruling houses, and an evaluation of the evidence, reproduced in the Appendix (pp. 344-90), of which rulers, members of the aristocracy, and burghers owned which texts of this sort in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. According to this, 156 manuscripts can be identified, of which only 65 were in Middle English. The rest, so far as we can tell, were in Latin (45) or Middle French (17). Not surprisingly, the incidence of ownership of texts increased significantly among rulers, aristocracy, and burghers in the fifteenth century, but not among the clergy, while the increase is

clearer among the aristocracy and burghers than among kings. Middle English texts predominated among the aristocracy and burghers, while the clergy preferred Latin mirrors of princes, and among rulers language preference was more balanced. Rulers might own up to five or six manuscripts, while others, with the exception of three burghers, mostly owned only one. Grassnick is aware that this tells us little about the actual reception of the texts (especially as the acquisition of the *Canterbury Tales* or the *Confessio Amantis* could reflect interests other than in the theory of rule). Thus she points to demonstrable personal or familial relations between various owners (sometimes associated with passing on the manuscript), but they do not allow her to say anything about how the texts were discussed. Ultimately, she can make only the very general statement that in late medieval England, ownership of the relevant books was 'remarkable, so that we can assume that the texts had some relevance in the literary and political field' (p. 126).

The core of the book (making up about half of its length) consists of five thematic chapters which analyse and reflect on the sources with the help of the theoretical basis outlined. The fourth, quite detailed chapter deals with models of rulers' action; the fifth demonstrates that the ideals developed in the text are not tied to the situation they are presented in; the sixth reflects on the model of virtues and vices; the seventh analyses 'Middle English mirrors of princes in the literary and political field' (p. 237); and the eighth looks at the significance of the norms which were developed for political praxis, taking as an example the case of Richard II's deposition in 1399.

The chapter on models of rulers' action adopts the contemporary structure of political theory, based on the work of Aristotle (ethics, economics, politics). It treats the prince in turn as a person, as the head of the family, and as a ruler, explicitly and implicitly invoking the model of vice and virtue. The broadly defined catalogue of virtues makes clear that the authors saw virtue as essential for good acts on the part of a king. Kings and princes needed to beware of vices, but also had to eat well and lead a healthy life. Their behaviour within marriage and towards their children was dictated by the desire to show how exemplary they were and to secure their rule. Also essential was economic security, intended to prevent too great a burden being placed on their vassals. In the realm of politics, reference was made to the example of predecessors who had ruled in an

Book Reviews

exemplary fashion, to the significance of good royal functionaries and advisers, and to the role of the ruler in making and implementing laws. He was to try to preserve peace at home and abroad, but also had to be prepared for war. In the discussion of all these questions, Grassnick insists that they were not tied to their particular situation, although to different degrees. In other words, there was mostly a small spatial concretization or temporal tie to a specific situation. This meant that 'the recipients were able adequately to apply the instructions for action in a specific situation only after an independent interpretation' (p. 188), which could explain the success of the mirror of princes as a literary genre. However, Grassnick surely goes too far when she deduces from this that 'action in the literary field (reception) shapes action in the political field (the rulers' acts)' (p. 188), for it was precisely the general nature of the instructions that considerably reduced their influence on concrete political action.

The fact that the mirrors of princes were largely separated from their concrete situation is also a theme of the next chapter. Chapter five starts with the use of *exempla*, which, in the sense defined by Peter von Moos, are understood as isolated nexus of events with a specific literary function. In mirrors of princes they have a constant, didactic function, but also open up the possibility of implicitly criticizing the ruler. Specific references to everyday politics are the exception, even though the current situation may have had some influence on the texts, and at the very least, many of the ruler's potential partners are addressed. That is why Grassnick rightly distinguishes her study from works that tease out the concrete references of mirrors of princes. Rather, she stresses that the character of this genre is based 'precisely on the overriding, transsituational validity of the models of rulers' actions, and on the construction of an ideal ruler' (p. 208). This is also shown by the central role played by the model of virtues and vices, which is treated in chapter six. Rather like the contemporary catalogues of virtues and vices, mirrors of princes are concerned to give guidance on virtue and virtuous action. Rulers, because of their prominent position, have a special duty: as models, they should be more virtuous than others.

To justify anchoring this genre in the 'literary and political field' Grassnick, in chapter seven, initially points to the growing significance of the royal advisers in the political debates of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, while the authors of mirrors of princes func-

tioned as 'unofficial' advisers and could by no means write their texts 'autonomously'. This certainly limits the applicability of Bourdieu's concepts to the late Middle Ages. The problem will be illustrated in what follows by taking the example of two texts embedded in a narrative and fictional context, the relevant part of John Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and the *Canterbury Tales*. Grassnick here emphasizes the expanded spectrum of interpretation that made greater effectiveness possible. But the insight gained here, namely, that the norms of ideal behaviour on the part of the ruler constructed on the basis of an exchange between the different social groups allow us to draw conclusions about the king's politics, also applies to the other texts. The authors of mirrors of princes could thus voice criticism of the ruler without running too great a risk, a privilege usually reserved for status groups and institutions.

To be sure, even the example of Richard II's rule and deposition, discussed in the final, eighth chapter, does not offer a real point of reference for the concrete effectiveness of the genre. After Grassnick reminds us of the mirrors of princes of Richard's time and introduces the ideas of political theory held by Richard and his advisers against the background of his politics, she investigates the connection between the arguments for his deposition and the theoretical approaches. In the end, she finds no evidence that one or more of the texts of this genre could have served as a model, and takes recourse to Bourdieu's concept of *habitus*. The similarity between the arguments and the political theory 'reflects the *habitus* of the protagonists of 1399 and of the authors of mirrors of princes, thus clarifying the contingencies and possibilities of action in the literary and political field of late medieval England' (p. 324). According to this, the new ruler, Henry IV, needed 'symbolic capital' in order to secure his position. He therefore reverted to the values and norms generally acknowledged by political theory, without drawing upon the full spectrum of possible arguments made available by mirrors of princes. The concluding part, which sums up Grassnick's findings, rightly points in this context to the annals and chronicles which can also be classified as part of a pragmatic culture of writing. They convey similar models and ideas to mirrors of princes, and would repay comparison with this genre.

This study, which is not based on unpublished materials, but draws on a rich stock of sources and literature and contains a name

Book Reviews

and subject index, is not entirely free of minor errors and misunderstandings, for example, in assigning the Good Parliament to the reign of Richard II (p. 237), in the difference in usage between the 'body natural' and the 'body politic' (p. 317), and in the Latin quotation on p. 308. Similarly, the typography, especially in setting italics, is not entirely successful. Nonetheless, it can be said that, on the whole, the author's methodological meticulousness, interpretative caution, and close analysis of mirrors of princes in Middle English are impressive. Grassnick cannot be held responsible for the paucity of specific substance in the texts and their conservatism in sticking to tradition even at times of political crisis, or for the limited opportunities to draw conclusions about the historical background. Rather, this volume provides a profound, theory-based interpretation of mirrors of princes in Middle English which calls for comparisons with other regions and with other genres, and is in itself an important reference work.

JÜRGEN SARNOWSKY has been Professor of Medieval History at the University of Hamburg since 1996. He is editor of *Mendicants, Military Orders, and Regionalism in Medieval Europe* (1999), and author of, among many others, *Macht und Herrschaft im Johanniterorden des 15. Jahrhunderts: Verfassung und Verwaltung der Johanniter auf Rhodos, 1421–1522* (2001), *England im Mittelalter* (2002), and *Der Deutsche Orden* (2007).

JONATHAN B. DURRANT, *Witchcraft, Gender and Society in Early Modern Germany*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions: History, Culture, Religion, Ideas, 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), xxvii + 288 pp. ISSN 1573 4188. ISBN 978 90 04 16093 4. €99.00. US \$129.00

Were the neighbours of witches good neighbours? So far historiography has tended to answer this question in the negative. The thesis that witchcraft persecutions essentially originated in the conflicts of early modern society has dominated research in recent decades. Witchcraft trials are seen as an expression of social tension and an attempt at crisis management against the background of a Little Ice Age, which is held responsible for food shortages and epidemics. Within the framework of these interpretations, the neighbours of victims generally play an inglorious part. They want the witch to die, and are often prepared to accuse or denounce those who are suspected.

Jonathan B. Durrant, too, places early modern society at the centre of his investigation. But for him, the neighbours of the victims of persecution in the prince bishopric of Eichstätt are not the enemies of the men and women under suspicion. They do not push forward the trials with their accusations, and have no fear at all of the putative witches. Rather, they are inclined to help those under arrest.

The main sources for Durrant's study of witchcraft trials in the prince bishopric of Eichstätt are the surviving records of interrogations held in this territory. The book begins, however, with a thorough review of the entire source material on witchcraft trials, giving the reader a detailed impression of the extent of the persecutions. From 1590 to 1631, between 240 and 273 people were suspected of witchcraft, about 87 per cent of them women. Three phases can be identified in the persecutions. The first lasted from 1590 to 1592; the second can be dated to 1603; and the author regards the period from 1617 to 1631 as the third. This is the one his investigation focuses on. The persecutions during this phase were concentrated around the town of Eichstätt, and 182 people were arrested, of whom 175 were executed. In total, Durrant assumes that between 217 and 256 executions took place over a period of forty years.

Right at the start of his study, Durrant makes it clear that he does not consider the persecutions in the prince bishopric as attributable to social tensions. While he does not deny, in principle, that the Little Ice Age influenced the phenomenon of witchcraft trials, the material

Book Reviews

he investigated does not yield a direct connection. Most of the victims were not arrested on the basis of accusations of malicious witchcraft, and few neighbours testified against them as witnesses. Rather, people who had already admitted their guilt accused them of being at witches' gatherings with them.

For Durrant, the trials were clearly the work of the authorities, a claim which places the territorial ruler, Prince Bishop Johann Christoph von Westerstetten, firmly under the spotlight. Ultimately, Durrant argues, the crucial factor was Westerstetten's desire to anchor Catholic piety in his territories. Like the witchcraft persecutions in the princely prebend (*Fürstpropstei*) of Ellwangen, which Westerstetten had ruled since 1603, the persecutions in the prince bishopric of Eichstätt formed part of a counter-Reformation reform programme. Durrant suggests that Westerstetten's Jesuit education at the University of Ingolstadt had had a considerable influence on his aim of eliminating witchcraft in the territory under his control.

It has long been known in the research that Ingolstadt was a centre for those who advocated persecution. The author's argument, however, is provocative in that he sees the mass persecutions throughout the Empire as a whole as a Catholic project. In asking about the overriding significance of Catholicism for the waves of persecution, Durrant revives a discussion that was conducted with great bitterness in the nineteenth century, but has long since been put to rest in the research. In this framework, the Bavarian-Wittelsbach impetus, which was felt in southern Germany, but also in western Germany, in the electorate of Cologne, for example, was again of particular importance: the prince bishopric of Eichstätt, like other Franconian prince bishoprics, is described as a buffer zone for the Dukes of Bavaria who wanted to protect their territories from the damaging influence of reform.

In the chapter on the conditions under which witchcraft persecutions took place, we therefore find out more about the introduction of Jesuits to the territory after Westerstetten was installed as bishop. With their help, Durrant suggests, a programme of thoroughgoing confessionalization was put into motion, hostile to Lutheranism, impious lifestyles, and witchcraft all at the same time. Against the background of official and clerical strategies to combat religious delinquency, Durrant looks at the apparatus involved. He tracks down the persecuting bureaucracy in the prince bishopric of

Eichstätt, and uncovers the room for manoeuvre that was used to fulfil the tasks which had been set.

Durrant draws his evidence that the witchcraft persecutions were embedded in a programme of Catholic confessionalization from court records, in particular, the interrogation lists which posed questions not only about participation in witches' Sabbaths, but also about sexual misbehaviour such as adultery. These interrogation lists and the answers given to the questions are central to the book because the author takes them as his starting point for an examination of contemporary society. He sees it as 'a relatively stable community characterized by social cohesion rather than disruption' (pp. 126–7), which came under increasing pressure from the authorities, who criminalized the people's sexual behaviour and their excessive drinking on festive occasions.

In this context, the descriptions of witches' Sabbaths given by the accused appear as if in a distorting mirror, reflecting their meetings with neighbours at weddings and other festivities. Broken by imprisonment, torture, and interrogations, the accused ultimately tried to tell their interrogators the stories that they wanted to hear. In order to make them plausible, they used their memories of the festivities that they had taken part in. Thus they incriminated neighbours – not their enemies, but usually good neighbours – as accomplices. This also explains why women mainly named other women. Neighbourly ties were stronger between members of the same sex than with members of the opposite sex.

Durrant's view that the offence of witchcraft was essentially constructed through suggestive questions and that the interrogators' expectations formed part of the confessions is shared by many researchers. To be sure, the question arises as to whether it would have been possible to consult other sources as a control in order to test the argument that social conflict and everyday quarrels played no part in the Eichstätt witchcraft persecutions. While Durrant frequently draws on the work of Rainer Walz to compare his results, he has not, it seems, checked what sources that reflect everyday quarrels exist in the localities under investigation. These could include, for example, the records of civil actions brought against people for slander and other forms of defamation.

Nonetheless, Durrant has presented an interesting book that will provoke discussion. In particular, the question arises as to how to

Book Reviews

interpret the numerous court records in which detailed descriptions are given of witchcraft and witches' Sabbaths. Durrant's study demonstrates once again that these sources leave a great deal of room for interpretation. In essence, it is undisputed that those under suspicion of witchcraft ultimately had to invent narratives that satisfied the authorities' desire for persecution. But the question of to what extent these descriptions depict the real, everyday life of these people is left even further open by this work.

RALF-PETER FUCHS is a *Privatdozent* in the Department of History at the University of Munich. His main research interests are historical anthropology, historical criminology, witchcraft, gender history, the imperial chamber court (*Reichskammergericht*), and the history of the Thirty Years War. His numerous publications include *Um die Ehre: Westfälische Beleidigungsprozesse vor dem Reichskammergericht (1525–1805)* (1999); *Hexenverfolgung an Ruhr und Lippe: Die Nutzung der Justiz durch Herren und Untertanen* (2002); and, ed. with Arndt Brendecke and Edith Koller, *Die Autorität der Zeit in der Frühen Neuzeit* (2007). A large study entitled *Ein 'Medium' zum Frieden: Die Normaljahrsregel und die Beendigung des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* is in preparation.

SUSANNE FRIEDRICH, *Drehscheibe Regensburg: Das Informations- und Kommunikationssystem des Immerwährenden Reichstages um 1700*, Colloquia Augustana, 23 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2007), 656 pp. ISBN 978 3 05 004204 6. €59.80

The Immerwährender Reichstag (Permanent Imperial Diet), the subject of Susanne Friedrich's revised Augsburg dissertation, met from 1663 until 1803. Unlike previous imperial diets, which were ad hoc assemblies usually convened in response to military exigencies, the Immerwährender Reichstag was a standing consultative body that met permanently (as the name suggests) to deal with matters relating to the Holy Roman Empire's internal and external affairs. For the first time the diet had a fixed location, in the south German imperial city of Regensburg, where principalities able to afford the expense maintained permanent embassies. Foreign powers like France, England, and Holland also sent ambassadors to Regensburg, which by 1700 had become a major diplomatic hub. Paradoxically, although the role of the diet within the empire itself declined owing to the failure to bring about any significant reform of the Holy Roman Empire, the institution acquired new importance on the broader European stage as a venue for building alliances, gathering intelligence, and conducting public relations campaigns. Regensburg became the nodal point of an international public sphere, or what Britain's ambassador to the diet in 1688 called a place where 'all publique affaires that are transacted in Christendom are known and carefully examin'd'.

Friedrich explores the expanding networks of information and communication that accompanied the diet's evolution from representative assembly to diplomatic entrepôt. Her study reflects current scholarly interest in the communicative dimensions of political culture under the Old Regime. Underlying this perspective is the recognition that however much early modern regimes may have deemed secrecy vital to the interests of the state, the exigencies of state-building ultimately had the opposite effect. Chronic warfare and colonial rivalries created a burgeoning demand for political information in the form of newspapers and broadsheets. Expanding bureaucracies generated ever more information, the flow of which in turn accelerated through the development of more efficient postal services. The growth of courts expanded the range of those with access to political information, from high-ranking diplomats and ministers privy to

Book Reviews

state secrets, down to subaltern clerks and servants willing to pass on information gleaned from the letters and conversations of superiors. Absolutism, as scholars like Andreas Gestrich and Michael Schaich have shown, did not lessen the volume of available information but increased it.

Nowhere was this sphere of publicity more evident than in the Holy Roman Empire, with its multiplicity of semi-autonomous principalities. Grounding her study in extensive archival research, mostly from German territorial archives, Friedrich illuminates the dense networks of communication radiating from the Regensburg diet and its deputies. Its published resolutions, decrees, and memoranda, she argues, were only the tip of the iceberg. As a venue for gathering and communicating diplomatic information, the diet fostered an insatiable demand for political knowledge in the form of newsletters, newspapers, private correspondence, pamphlets, and broadsides. The role of the Estate deputy broadened accordingly. Not only was he to represent the interests of his principality through formal votes, resolutions, and petitions; his task increasingly evolved into one of gathering and communicating vital information through informal conversations, private visits, eavesdropping at parties and receptions, and the regular perusal of newspapers.

This dual role called for a range of skills, cognitive as well as social. Most deputies were university educated, and some degree of juridical training was necessary to function effectively in the legalistic world of imperial institutions. The ability to comport oneself with appropriate dignity at the diet's innumerable (and to foreign observers, interminable) ceremonial occasions was also important. Such rituals, argues Friedrich, may have seemed tedious and time-wasting to critics, but they were crucial to the 'choreography' and communication of power relations in the empire. In his dealings with other emissaries, a deputy also had to know how to strike the delicate balance between dissimulation and sincerity, concealment and confidence-building requisite for any successful diplomat. Above all, he had to know how to weigh critically the extensive and often conflicting information he received, whether in the form of rumours, the clandestine reports of paid informers, or the plethora of newspapers and newsletters circulating in the city. Through a careful and subtle reading of letters between deputies and their superiors, Friedrich does a good job of reconstructing the *habitus* of Regensburg

diplomats and the skills they needed to serve their employers effectively.

Much of her book is devoted to microstudies of three imperial Estates. Each represented one of the diet's three 'colleges': Bavaria the electors, Ansbach the imperial princes, and Augsburg the imperial cities. The author's intent is to show the range of communicative practices and subcultures that made up the diet, but the result is tedious and repetitive. Most of chapter 5, more than a hundred pages with 651 footnotes (!), is taken up with these case studies, which could have served their purpose much more effectively had they been distilled into a section half the size. The vast amount of detail obscures more than illuminates, and more impatient readers may be tempted at this point to put the book aside.

That would be a pity given the insights that follow in chapter 6, which surveys the various media to which diplomats at the Regensburg diet turned for their information. Friedrich is especially illuminating on newsletters and their networks of correspondents, long a murky topic despite the format's crucial importance as a source of information for both governments and private individuals. She also gives a detailed analysis of how German newspapers reported on the diet, using examples from places like Hamburg, Altona, Berlin, and Munich. She supplements her account with a discussion of other printed formats, such as periodicals and published compendia of imperial and territorial laws, which were aimed at a narrower readership but played an important role in the circulation of political information. Overall the author makes a convincing case for the role of the Regensburg diet in creating a political public sphere—one that was already visible by 1700 and not, as the traditional Habermasian model would have it, first in the 1770s. This insight is not in itself new, as we know from Gestrich's work. But Friedrich is the first to explore systematically the importance of the Regensburg diet for this process, and in this respect her study is a valuable contribution.

JAMES VAN HORN MELTON is Professor of History and German Studies at Emory University. Among his numerous publications are *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling*

Book Reviews

in Prussia and Austria (1988, paperback 2002) and *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (2001). He is currently working on a book entitled *Migrations of Conscience in the Old World and the New: From Alpine Valley to Colonial Lowcountry, 1733–1761*.

JOHANN GUSTAV DROYSEN, *Historik: Texte im Umkreis der Historik (1826–1882)*, ed. Peter Leyh and Horst Walter Blanke, vol. 2 in 2 parts (Stuttgart: frommann-holzboog Verlag, 2007), xxiii + 712 pp. ISBN 978 3 7728 1123 4. €334.00

Johan Gustav Droysen's course of lectures on the methodology of historical studies, commonly known in Germany as his *Historik*, was certainly a landmark in the development of history as an academic discipline. Dry as some parts of this text might seem to modern students, at the time this was one of Droysen's most successful and popular courses. He gave it no fewer than seventeen times, first in 1857 at Jena University, his second academic position after Kiel, and then at Berlin where he held a chair of history from 1859 to his death in 1884.

Unlike many of his other lectures, Droysen never published a complete version of his introduction to the methodology of academic historical research and historiography. In 1858 he published a shortened version of this lecture course under the title *Grundriß der Historik* (outline of historical methodology), which appeared in several slightly expanded editions over the next few decades. However, it was not until 1937 that his grandson, Rudolf Hübner, attempted to edit the full text of this lecture course. This edition has always been criticized as not very satisfactory, and it was Peter Leyh who in 1977 published the 1857 version of the lecture course as the first volume of this critical edition of Droysen's *Historik*. The third volume will provide the critical edition of its final version. Horst Walter Blanke has announced the imminent appearance of this most welcome publication.

The two volumes which are the subject of this review present us with texts drawn partly from manuscript sources, and partly from some of Droysen's contemporary publications. They shed fresh light on Droysen's development as an academic historian and teacher, and help to contextualize the development of his methodological approach and his philosophical and political background. On the basis of Peter Leyh's work, Blanke, a leading expert on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historiography and the academic teaching of history in Germany, has provided an exemplary edition of fifty texts from the whole of Droysen's academic life, from his enrolment as a student of philology and philosophy at Berlin in 1826 to his final

Book Reviews

years as an academic teacher there in the early 1880s. Blanke's commentaries on these texts are exhaustive and, in themselves, often a mine of information and contextualization.

What do these texts show? Blanke does not restrict himself to purely methodological works, but opens up a wider spectrum. He has chosen primarily programmatic introductions to lecture courses in which Droysen states his understanding of the nature and purpose of academic historiography. However, there are also letters to his sister, book reviews, and other documents. Droysen's achievements have been disputed since Wilfried Nippel's critical biography was published to commemorate the 200th anniversary of Droysen's birth in 2008.¹ Nippel portrayed Droysen primarily as a fairly opportunistic academic and a right-wing liberal advocate of the German nation-state dominated by Prussia which, at least from 1867, he put above the quest for liberty. Nippel's portrayal of Droysen has been criticized as too one-sided. The texts published by Blanke paint a somewhat different picture, although this is, of course, also the result of the restricted and very particular interest of Blanke's selection of sources.

A remarkably condensed example of many of Droysen's main topics and targets can be found in the introduction to his first lecture course on ancient history, which he gave in 1838, then still a *Privatdozent* at Berlin University. The first paragraph deals with the classic question: 'what is history?' Droysen makes it clear in his second sentence that an exclusively positivistic approach looking solely for past facts is 'boring, endless and will not produce any results'. For him, history is the 'memory of mankind about itself and its own development', and 'only the important and significant facts which are decisive for future developments (*epochemachend*) are worth being retained by [collective] memory' (pp. 96-7). History is the interpretation, not the presentation, of facts, and historiography has to look for the big changes and their underlying principles.

In his quest for the big structural changes in societies Droysen stands very much in a Hegelian tradition. 'The content of history', he says in the same lecture, 'is the struggle of the intellect (*Geist*) for a conscious understanding of its innate freedom, which is the exercise and realization of freedom itself' (p. 99). This exercise and realization

¹ Wilfried Nippel, *Johann Gustav Droysen: Ein Leben zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik* (2008).

of freedom presupposes societies and/or states whose internal affairs are regulated by law. It is only in the early priestly states that, according to Droysen, we find 'the beginning of freedom and of history', and its highest realization is found in the infinite freedom purveyed by Christianity where Christ has overcome the law (p. 100). In contrast to Europe, Droysen maintains, China and India never went beyond the first stages of development.

Early courses like these on ancient history already emphasize two of the topics which run through Droysen's work: freedom and the nation-state. Although Droysen frequently questioned the uncritical admiration of classical antiquity in German scholarship and school teaching, his concept of development remained Eurocentric, and in true Hegelian fashion, he saw the Christian, European nation-state as the fulfilment of history. Freedom, he believed, could only be realized within the framework of a society regulated by laws. It is interesting to read in the introduction to his 1842 lectures on the anti-Napoleonic wars, the *Freiheitskriege*, how Droysen struggled with the Burkean problem of rational versus traditional law. On the one hand he criticizes the French Revolution for having destroyed accustomed law traditions; on the other, he defends the right of the present not to return to the old system of privileges.

The only really historical right, the only viable result of historical formative power, is the present. The present is the great result of criticism which history has permanently exercised; it would be ahistorical and arbitrary not to acknowledge this criticism. However drastically rational law dealt with the laws and privileges, it would be no less drastic if these privileges of old times tried to push their way back into the present on the basis of historical right which we know to have been wrong (pp. 289-90).

Thus Droysen, like so many other German liberals, tended to be ambivalent about the possibilities of and justifications for constitutional change, and some of the ambiguities of his own political standpoints before and after the 1848 revolution.

These political ambiguities, which can be found in a number of the published texts, do not, however, devalue Droysen's importance for the development of methodology and the teaching of history at

Book Reviews

German universities. It is precisely because interpretation is the main duty of the historian that he (Droysen opens all his lectures with 'Meine Herren') has to be careful about the quality and reliability of his sources. The systematic thinking about and classification of historical sources runs through all of Droysen's lectures, and in the first lecture on ancient history mentioned above, we can already see the systematic structure of the *Historik* appearing. In his lecture course on German cultural history ('Deutsche Culturgeschichte') of 1841 we also recognize how much Droysen has widened the scope of historical research and relevant sources, including not only literature, art, and science, but also sources on economic and social history, and under the heading *Sittlichkeit*, the history of mentalities and everyday life (p. 279).

One of the main achievements of Droysen's theoretical reflections on historiography was his anti-Rankean notion that all historiography was necessarily bound by a certain perspective on the part of the researcher, deriving from the changing cultural contexts of remembering the past. Whether Droysen used this insight, for example, to distort facts to make them fit his picture of the Prussian-German nation-state (as Nippel suggests in his biography) can be debated. It is clear, however, that Droysen was at the beginning of methodological and epistemological reflections on historiography rather than at their end. These beginnings, however, should not be belittled. Reading the texts edited by Blanke, one is surprised by how many of the questions raised by Droysen, directly or indirectly, are still the topic of contemporary theoretical and methodological debate. We can only thank Horst Walter Blanke for this careful selection and critical edition of texts documenting the formation of Droysen's *Historik*, and look forward to the final volume of this enterprise.

ANDREAS GESTRICH is Director of the German Historical Institute London and Professor of Modern History at the University of Trier. His main research interests are the history of the family, childhood, and youth; the history of poverty and poor relief; media history; and the social history of religious groups. His publications include *Absolutismus und Öffentlichkeit: Politische Kommunikation in Deutschland zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts* (1994), and *Vergesellschaftung des Menschen: Einführung in die Historische Sozialisationsforschung* (1999).

WOLFRAM PYTA, *Hindenburg: Herrschaft zwischen Hohenzollern und Hitler* (Munich: Siedler, 2007), 1,117 pp. ISBN 978 3 88680 865 6. €49.95

JESKO VON HOEGEN, *Der Held von Tannenberg: Genese und Funktion des Hindenburg-Mythos*, *Stuttgarter Historische Forschungen*, 4 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2007), xii + 475 pp. ISBN 978 3 412 17006 6. €54.90

Biography, particularly that of great historical figures, imposes a particular structure on the past both in terms of events and understanding, and so it is with Wolfram Pyta's exhaustive and engaging study of President and Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg. A serving lieutenant at the battles of Königgrätz/Sadowa (1866) and Sedan (1870), and regimental representative at the proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles, Hindenburg thereafter enjoyed a successful and varied military career which included service in the Great General Staff, at the Prussian War Ministry, as an army corps commander, and as a lecturer in tactics at the Military Academy in Berlin. Here he brought his appreciation of the relationship between technological progress and modern warfare to bear as well as his admiration for the American Confederate general, Robert E. Lee. While commander of the IV Army Corps in Magdeburg he had also engaged with the city's bourgeois civilian establishment, so developing an appreciation of the wider political sensitivities of the city's population. However, Social Democracy and its aspirations were not acceptable to Hindenburg and nor would they ever be. The organic political and moral national community rather than the measured pursuit of sectional interests defined his vision of politics from an early stage.

He was considered as Schlieffen's successor in 1906, but passed over and thereafter retired early with the rank of general in March 1911. He chose to settle with his wife in Hanover, where he had been stationed following its annexation by Prussia in 1867 and developed a deep affection for its people and cultural life. All of this belied his East Elbian, Junker roots and confirmed that he was considerably more than a soldier pure and simple.

Even this 'more than respectable career', as Pyta dubs it, had almost been cut short at Königgrätz when a bullet struck his helmet, but spared him any further damage. And the outbreak of war in August 1914 did not immediately promise him further advancement, for he was unable to persuade Moltke to use him in any capacity. It

Book Reviews

was pure happenstance that changed all this and transformed the story, as Pyta tells it, of a successful military officer, devoted husband, and much-loved father into that of a definitive actor on the historical stage. Contrary to German expectations, the Russian armies mobilized swiftly and invaded a thinly-defended East Prussia while the main German forces were fully engaged in France. Hindenburg's intervention and role at this point is the stuff of historical legend, but as Pyta and Jesko von Hoegen demonstrate, the legend rested on a carefully and deliberately crafted myth, rather than on Hindenburg's substantive contribution to the series of stunning German military victories on the Eastern Front.

Hindenburg's concrete military achievements were certainly thin. The destruction of an entire Russian army at the Battle of the Masurian Lakes in late August 1914 occurred thanks to the strategic aplomb of Max Hoffmann and the operational brilliance of Erich Ludendorff, who had already distinguished himself during the seizure of Liège. The two were the architects first of the victories in East Prussia and thereafter, alongside August von Mackensen, of the campaigns that eventually destroyed the Russian army and delivered Germany final victory in eastern Europe. But Hoffmann later fumed and Ludendorff lashed out in impotent rage against the towering reputation their work had somehow lent Hindenburg. This Hindenburg myth rapidly transcended the military and transformed the Field Marshal from a latter-day Blücher into a man of Bismarckian stature, who encapsulated the essence of German nationhood and came even to overshadow the reigning head of state, Kaiser Wilhelm II. Hoffmann's memoirs were far from complimentary towards Hindenburg and, when taking junior officers on tours of the East Prussian battlefields after the war, he was wont to point theatrically at a small cottage and declare that Hindenburg had slept there before the battle, during the battle, and after the battle. In fairness to Hindenburg he had also found time to organize the evacuation of his ancestors' mortal remains from the family vault at Neudeck, which lay in the path of the advancing Russians. Later, during the winter of 1915-16, Hindenburg had pursued his great love of hunting to the exclusion of matters military while Ludendorff busied himself organizing the defence and administration of the conquered territories of Lithuania, Belarus, and north-eastern Poland. This was pretty much in accordance with the High Command's

expectations. Hindenburg had been given command of the Eighth Army in August 1914 precisely because his notorious lack of dynamism would lend the more junior Ludendorff a free hand in operational matters.

The construction of the myth that paved the way for Hindenburg's career as a Weimar politician and thereafter, as Pyta argues, as its deliberate and determined gravedigger, therefore lies at the core of both authors' works and, given the military realities, is demanding of an explanation. Von Hoegen's study is based on his doctoral dissertation, which he completed under Pyta's supervision, so it is unsurprising that the two authors agree on the big issues and that much of their narrative overlaps significantly. That said, Pyta structures his exhaustive account more directly around the life and times of Hindenburg himself, whilst the ultimate focus of von Hoegen's study rests on the reception of the Hindenburg myth in the public domain, particularly in the press. To this extent the works are complimentary. If von Hoegen's bears the tell-tale hallmarks of a reworked doctoral study and Pyta's the assurance and urbanity of a master historian, both are engaging and valuable contributions to our understanding of earlier twentieth-century Germany.

For all his indifference to operational matters, Hindenburg proved focused and energetic when it came to securing his public reputation and endowing it with Herculean qualities. Whilst the High Command controlled and rationed news to excess, journalists found that the titular commander first of the Eighth Army and then of the Eastern High Command (OberOst) was always willing to make time for extensive interviews during which he stressed the scale and quality of 'his' military achievements. The public sensed correctly that the 1914 campaign in the west had been at best a job half done which lacked spectacular victories, but events in East Prussia compensated. Hindenburg appealed to deep-rooted German sensitivities regarding Russia which had been heightened by rumours of widespread Russian atrocities during their short-lived invasion of East Prussia, and his dubbing of the first great victory as 'Tannenberg' (a nearby village) took memories back to the defeat of the Teutonic Knights at the hands of the Polish king at the same Tannenberg/Grünwald in 1410. That defeat, Hindenburg held, had finally been redeemed with the expulsion of the latter-day Slavonic threat, the Russians, from Germany.

Book Reviews

With Hindenburg's media reputation secured and periodically reinforced by fresh interviews, he and his family circle, notably his wife Gertrud, turned to propagating his visual image through commissioned works by notable portrait painters. These portraits demanded lengthy sittings by Hindenburg, promoted field marshal in 1915, even as Ludendorff and Hoffmann fought the war. The resulting works attracted widespread popular acclaim and it did not stop there. Prints of the major portraits were churned out in varying size and quality, allowing households each to have their own Hindenburg portrait, a saviour figure resting on the hearths of great villas and millions of simple working-class homes alike. And as von Hoegen notes, it went beyond portraiture. Food products and household goods came to bear his name as Germany's war hero came to compensate for the essential anonymity of modern mechanized warfare.

The Emperor, both authors concur, lacked the gravitas and quiet reassurance that Germany yearned for and the avuncular Hindenburg, the 'strategic genius', filled this gap. He was not a man of grand manners and could put the simplest citizen, or the youngest admirer sent to deliver the great man a bunch of flowers, completely at their ease. He was said to possess a *Volkstümlichkeit*, a popular touch for which the German aristocracy was hardly famous and which served to round off his growing charismatic appeal. The media presented him as the guarantor of ultimate victory and the government and military came to understand that he had become an indispensable rallying point, a symbolization and personification of Germany itself in the midst of an increasingly desperate war.

Hindenburg, however, was not content to remain a symbolic figurehead. The history of Falkenhayn's dismissal as Commander in Chief in 1916 is well known, as is Hindenburg's appointment as his successor, with Ludendorff still in tow to deal with the practicalities of war. Likewise his career as Commander in Chief, which rapidly extended to involvement in the economy and significant control over civil government, will be familiar to most readers. Even the chancellorship eventually became his rather than the Kaiser's gift, in practice at least. For both authors Hindenburg's perception of his wider wartime political role and the substance that underlay this is of particular significance. From a relatively early stage in his military career Hindenburg had, as we saw, come to regard an organically integrat-

ed and united society as an imperative; a durable *Volksgemeinschaft* which would transcend the pursuit of sectional interests through political parties. In this regard the Marxist SPD appeared especially suspect, but Hindenburg was no more prepared explicitly to identify with the political right. When supporters of a victorious peace, who were simultaneously opponents of constitutional reform, created the Fatherland Party in 1917, Hindenburg refused to have his name attached to the organization as the 'Hindenburg Party'. It was confined to advocating a 'Hindenburg Peace' which the Field Marshal himself had repeatedly characterized as outright victory rather than mere survival.

As Pyta argues, he had embraced the notion defined by Max Weber as charismatic leadership, so according with a German collective susceptibility to embrace this mould of national saviour. Or as von Hoegen puts it, perhaps slightly mischievously, Hindenburg had become the 'Übervater der Nation' who combined the idealized stock virtues of bourgeois and soldierly Germany. If Hindenburg actively promoted such an image and role, von Hoegen confirms that the process was very much a two-way one as individuals and sections of society imposed their own idealized vision of the charismatic leader onto the figure of Hindenburg.

All of this left the Kaiser in a difficult position. Hindenburg's appeal was vital to the war effort and his authority might one day even serve to shelter the monarchy should a disappointing peace settlement prove necessary (and Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg had tried in vain to get Hindenburg to underwrite a compromise peace in 1916). He had also become a dangerous rival to the monarchy itself. Matters came to a head in late 1917 as the army command and foreign office clashed over the peace terms to be imposed on the defeated Russians. The former's maximalist demands contrasted with foreign office plans to use a moderate eastern settlement as an opening gambit for peace talks with the western allies. The Kaiser sided with the more moderate line as a furious Hindenburg demanded a direct role in civil policy. Wilhelm II refused and Pyta argues that only Trotsky's abrupt suspension of peace talks (at which the Russians were, indeed, offered reasonable terms) averted open constitutional conflict in Germany. Hostilities resumed and thereafter the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk delivered Hindenburg the harsh settlement he yearned for by default.

Book Reviews

This should have been the trigger for Hindenburg's nemesis. His, or more accurately Ludendorff's resolve to use reinforcements from the east to break the Allies in the west during early 1918 and so secure outright victory failed. Both authors explore the processes and perceptions that allowed Hindenburg not merely to survive impending military defeat unscathed, but actually to enhance his political credit as a disaster partly of his own making unfolded. For one thing Ludendorff's twilight existence under Hindenburg's shadow had, ironically, come to an end during the great spring offensive of 1918. As von Hoegen notes, press coverage depicted this military adventure as the brainchild of both commanders, bringing the respected but disliked Ludendorff into the public gaze at the worst possible moment. During the autumn he took the rap for the final collapse whilst the much loved Hindenburg escaped direct blame. The revolution of 1918 consolidated Hindenburg's reputation, whereas Ludendorff was sacked at the insistence of the new civilian government on 26 October for undermining peace negotiations. Responsibility for the defeat and even for the army's meddling in civil politics was now heaped entirely on the former Quartermaster General as Hindenburg washed his hands of his former partner. Ludendorff always regarded this as an act of outright personal betrayal which was compounded by a whispering campaign, sustained personally by Hindenburg, that characterized Ludendorff as a man crippled by his own shredded nerves. The war effort, so Hindenburg's version of history asserted, had been held together by the unflappable, self-assured Field Marshal.

Hindenburg continued to show the same flexibility and ruthlessness as he played an instrumental role in the abdication of the Kaiser on 9 November. Wilhelm II was always to resent bitterly Hindenburg's part in engineering his flight into lifetime exile in the Netherlands, even if the Field Marshal was careful to shelter behind senior colleagues, notably Groener, at this critical moment. Betrayal of his Emperor, to whom he had sworn personal loyalty, remained a potential Achilles heel for Hindenburg throughout his remaining years. From time to time monarchist circles tried, unsuccessfully, to pin the blame for the Kaiser's demise on the Field Marshal, but as with the fabrication of his wartime mythological status, Hindenburg proved adept at engineering history to his advantage.

In any case, the public at large was less concerned and Hinden-

burg's willingness to remain at the head of the army during the sometimes stormy transition from monarchy to republic earned him praise even from Social Democratic circles as a man of the utmost integrity who had put duty to nation above political partisanship. All at once Hindenburg's reputation as a true servant of Germany and a man above the tangled web of day-to-day politics was secured. He had remained at his post for long enough to guarantee his reputation, yet his resignation hard on the heels of the Versailles Treaty dissociated him from the deeply unpopular peace settlement. A post-war Reichstag enquiry into the reasons for Germany's defeat had serious questions to ask of the wartime leader, particularly with regard to the 1917 U-boat campaign that had turned the United States against Germany, but massive public displays of adulation and support in parliament from the political right rendered the enquiry harmless. Indeed, Hindenburg turned the tables on the republicans by endorsing publicly the spurious claim that the home front, and not least organized labour and the supporters of a compromise peace, had undermined the war effort and so stabbed the armed forces in the back.

Whilst the political right toyed with notions of putting Hindenburg up for president of the new republic against the Social Democratic leader Friedrich Ebert, the Field Marshal continued to eschew any notion of party political partisanship and so turned down these early approaches. Behind this lay a personal agenda that is central to the rest of Pyta's narrative and finds reflection in the post-war media's reception of Hindenburg as detailed by von Hoegen. Pyta regards Hindenburg's deeply-held belief in the political virtues of the *Volksgemeinschaft* as central to his agreement finally to stand for the presidency in 1925. As von Hoegen observes, the liberal press in particular welcomed the new President's capacity to reconcile republicans and monarchists within the new constitutional order. For the latter he could serve as an acceptable alternative to the Kaiser, whilst even the Social Democratic press was soon reassured by his 'correctness' and capacity for political compromise.

That said, his efforts to enhance the role of his office at the expense of parliament during the early 1930s and, finally, his conscious and deliberate endorsement of Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist movement in the months following Hitler's appointment as Chancellor are widely understood. Pyta dismisses entirely any notion that Hindenburg was significantly influenced by any third

Book Reviews

party before deciding to offer Hitler the chancellorship and is equally dismissive of the notion that the President's advanced age in any way impinged on his intellect or distorted his powers of judgement right up to the final fortnight of his life. Von Hoegen demonstrates how ruthlessly Hitler and the NSDAP instrumentalized and ultimately appropriated Hindenburg's charismatically-founded reputation in the months following January 1933, not least at Potsdam on 31 March 1933, but the characterization of Hindenburg as a 'nützlicher Idiot' appears, from a reading of Pyta's argumentation, to be wide of the mark.

Pyta traces events during the early 1930s, from the appointment of Brüning as Chancellor through to that of Hitler in painstaking detail, so reprising what is particularly familiar territory for historians of modern Germany. As President, Hindenburg had always accentuated the need for legal propriety. He respected the laws and usages of the republic from the outset and during the 1920s was also persuaded by his foreign minister, Gustav Stresemann, of the need for cautious revisionism and compromise in foreign policy. His endorsement of the Young Plan in this spirit earned him brickbats from Hugenberg's DNVP in particular. Similarly, the political right did not shy from heaping criticism on the President during Brüning's chancellorship (1930–2) when for Conservatives he appeared far too even-handed in his dealings with the various groupings across Germany's political landscape.

However, Pyta emphasizes throughout the centrality of *Volksgemeinschaft* to all Hindenburg's actions and decisions. Initially this did not accord the National Socialists any decisive role in the future, but once electoral logic had made National Socialist support indispensable for any legal change to the constitution, Hitler's prospects of high office improved dramatically. The problem remained of how legally to transform the Reichstag from a parliament where the individual parties held sway to a body subordinate to a government of 'national solidarity'. This government would be appointed directly by the President, purportedly in the interests of the perceived national whole, securing a system of authoritarian rule underpinned by plebiscitary acclamation of a kind advocated by the contemporary constitutional theorist Carl Schmitt.

Hindenburg was forced to accept the paradoxes of political life to secure his own political survival prior to Hitler's appointment. The

‘valuable national forces’ that had a role within his *Volksgemeinschaft* stretched from the Liberal parties, through political Catholicism to the Conservatives and, finally, the National Socialists. However, this putative bloc was torn by internecine strife and seemingly irreconcilable differences which left the President dependent on Social Democratic goodwill first to conduct parliamentary business on any terms and also to deliver up the votes that saw him defeat Hitler in the 1932 presidential election. His myopic view of the SPD, shared by many of his influential peers, was a fateful condition which, if he had considered matters more dispassionately, flew in the face of his personal dealings with Social Democratic leaders during the Weimar era. No Socialist leader abused him or made demands of him comparable with the spasmodic outburst of vitriol hurled at him by Joseph Goebbels among others. However, the Nazis claimed to represent the national whole, ultimately to encapsulate it, whereas the SPD in addition to its Marxist pedigree had, from the days of the revolution if not before, accepted its place and role within an open liberal parliamentary order—the very order Hindenburg abhorred.

In Pyta’s estimation, the leading players during the final months of Weimar, whether Hugenberg, von Papen, or von Schleicher, had more than an inkling of who Hitler was and what National Socialist rule would mean. Hitler’s popular support did have to be instrumentalized, but only to expedite their own monarchist or authoritarian agendas, rather than to hand him the keys to the front door. For Hindenburg the problem with Hitler, such as it was, centred on the crass discrepancy in their military rank and also on Hitler’s Austrian origins, for the President had never forgiven the Dual Monarchy its lamentable military performance during the Great War. However, in the days and weeks following Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor his confidence in Hitler grew to the point where he could perceive National Socialism as the legitimate embodiment of his personal notions of *Volksgemeinschaft*. Just as the Field Marshal had once dispatched his Emperor into the political and constitutional wilderness, he had dispensed ruthlessly with the services of his closest political allies and confidantes on the road to the Third Reich. First Brüning had been bundled from office in May 1932 and then von Papen was marginalized equally brusquely during early 1933 as each in turn became surplus to Hindenburg’s political requirements.

Book Reviews

The sound and fury of the National Socialist revolution of 1933 is densely researched terrain, but it emerges from Pyta's meticulous account how closely Hindenburg identified with Hitler's early initiatives, choosing to slip increasingly into the political background and leave his Chancellor to get on with the business of day-to-day government. The March 1933 Reichstag election results and the ensuing Enabling Act allowed Hitler to govern independently of the Reichstag, which accorded entirely with Hindenburg's hopes and expectations. This may have sidelined the President as much as parliament, but at no time did Hindenburg appear to question or regret this. Hitler was careful to leave him in ultimate command of the armed forces for his lifetime, and the President for his part was happy explicitly to sanction the purge of the SA and the murder of individual Conservative opponents of the Nazi regime in June-July 1934. The former Chancellor Kurt von Schleicher was among the dead, but his once deep friendship with Hindenburg ultimately counted for nothing. Only von Papen and the Stahlhelm leader Duesterberg may, perhaps, have owed their lives to Hindenburg's personal intervention.

Hindenburg died on 2 August 1934 after a chronic illness suddenly became critical and laid him low. He had taken care to complete his political testament which combined earlier biographical writings with claims that his toleration of Weimar and its key policies had always been no more than a veil for the creation of a German *Volksgemeinschaft*. Papen had helped him draft the final section of the testament, which effectively endorsed the NSDAP and Hitler as the worthy encapsulation of all he had sought since 1919. He would go to his grave, he declared, with every confidence in the future of the fatherland. The testament was handed to Hitler on 14 August and published two days later. A private letter to Hitler, never to be published, concerned the monarchy and its possible restoration, but Hindenburg had not pressed the point. It was of secondary importance to him at best and in effect he endorsed Hitler as the next head of state. The NSDAP put this elevation in Hitler's office to a plebiscite, with Goebbels exploiting to the full the contents of the late President's testament. His son, Oskar, broadcast to the nation endorsing Hitler's succession as in accordance with his father's wishes and, as von Hoegen observes, effectively excluding the monarchy from public discussion. Hitler, Oskar von Hindenburg declared, was com-

pleting his father's work. In a 90 per cent turnout, 90 per cent supported Hitler's appointment as head of state, now dubbed Führer rather than the parliamentary-sounding president.

Pyta's entire work is expertly crafted to avoid the wisdom of hindsight and to allow his readership to reach its own conclusions. Hindenburg does not come over as an entirely unsympathetic figure, particularly in his private life, and at times, especially during the Great War, his circumstances verged on the comical as he enjoyed lengthy hunting expeditions, his daily siestas, his media initiatives, and the sittings for his various portraits even as Germany's senior military commanders struggled to bring a desperate war to a successful conclusion. The adulation of the Field Marshal in the light of such modest achievements certainly exasperated Hoffmann and Ludendorff, and Hindenburg's defence that he and he alone would take the rap should military failure ensue proved hollow in 1918. By then Germany's military chief had become a consummate political operator. The later part of Pyta's biography, however, paints Hindenburg in an increasingly shocking light to the point where Hitler's rise to power and consolidation of his dictatorship threaten to become more the work of the President than the Nazi leader himself. If biographers of Hitler must see things differently, Pyta makes a full and convincing case to this effect, even if von Hoegen stresses more fully the Nazis' instrumentalization of Hindenburg's reputation and aura.

That said, history is full of maybes that should be given some limited houseroom in order to avoid an overstated determinism or the construction of over-ambitious, even reductionist teleologies. Stresemann's early death was a major and unanticipated blow against the republic—the economic blizzard of 1929–32 a more predictable disaster. Perhaps the parliamentary republic's fate was sealed by 1930, as many leading authorities have argued. Hitler's success was, however, less inevitable, and as late as 1932 many influential contemporaries had no inkling of the impending disaster. This, then, returns us to the concluding chapters of Pyta's work. By 1930 at the latest a more authoritarian Germany was certainly on the cards. Whether the state would have assumed a Bonapartist flavour, perhaps something vaguely comparable with the early French Fifth Republic under Charles de Gaulle or, possibly, seen the establishment of a regency and then the monarchy as many Conservatives

Book Reviews

preferred, must remain the stuff of conjecture. It would be overblown to lay the full responsibility for Hitler at Hindenburg's door, and neither author suggests such a thing. However, Pyta in particular argues convincingly that once the German electorate had done the initial damage, Hindenburg's role in producing Hitler as the desirable escape route from Weimar was crucial, even indispensable and, finally, anything but accidental. Thereafter, as von Hoegen observes, Tannenberg may have remained 'his' victory and his role as midwife of the Third Reich may have been acknowledged, but the Hindenburg myth itself became superfluous to the National Socialists, succeeded by a leadership cult crafted around Hitler himself.

CONAN FISCHER is Professor of European History at the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow. He has published extensively on the history of inter-war Germany, his more recent works including *The Rise of the Nazis* (2nd edn., 2002) and *The Ruhr Crisis 1923–1924* (2003). He is currently completing *Europe between Democracy and Dictatorship, 1900–1945* (forthcoming 2010).

JANE CAPLAN (ed.), *Nazi Germany*, The Short Oxford History of Germany (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 326 pp. ISBN 978 0 19 927686 8 (Hardback) £50.00. ISBN 978 0 19 927687 5 (Paperback) £16.99

The book under review here is not just another introduction to the history of National Socialism. The series in which it is published aims to provide 'a concise, readable, and authoritative point of entry' to German history from the nineteenth century to the present. The list of contributors to this volume does justice to this ambitious undertaking, assembling as it does all the relevant English-speaking scholars of National Socialism with one significant exception. Ian Kershaw, probably the best-known researcher on the Nazi regime and author of the standard biography of Adolf Hitler, is not among them.

In purely formal terms, the essays fulfil the promise held out by the series—at around twenty-five pages each, they are agreeably short. Given the large themes that each essay addresses, the authors are forced to be precise and concentrate on the essentials. All succeed brilliantly. Common to all contributions is that the authors have full command of their material and can make it easily comprehensible to the reader. The range of themes addressed covers the usual areas studied by the historiography of Nazism today. Beginning with Nazi ideology, the volume goes on to look at the history of the Nazi Party up to 1934, Hitler's role in the Nazi system of rule, inclusion and exclusion mechanisms in the Third Reich, religion and church, and economic history and foreign policy. It reaches a climax with the topics of occupation and genocide, and finally ends with memories of the Nazi past in divided and unified Germany. The essays are framed by a survey of the main developments in research on National Socialism, its questions and controversies, and recommendations for further reading in each case.

It is noticeable that ideology figures prominently among the themes selected for treatment, while the editor considers neither resistance nor working-class attitudes worth a separate chapter. These classical topics are discussed in many places in the individual essays, but the fact that they are treated only in the context of other questions shows how much our picture of National Socialism has changed. However, the volume dispenses with all fashionable histo-

Book Reviews

riographical turns, with the result that there is neither a genuine contribution from the field of cultural history, nor one that takes a gender studies approach. Similarly, one seeks in vain for an essay about the war, despite the fact that recent work on the second half of the Nazi period has provided crucial input for our understanding of National Socialism as a whole. To be fair, it should be said that these methodological perspectives can be found here and there, and most of the essays give the war years of the Third Reich enough space. The thematic emphases which this volume sets, however, do reflect the state of research; neither conservative nor avant-garde, it offers the reader an overview which is both broad and up-to-date.

While none of the essays falls below the overall very high standard, two in particular stand out, those by Nikolaus Wachsmann and Adam Tooze. Writing on the theme of exclusion, Wachsmann looks at a central, if not the main, mechanism of Nazi social engineering. The strength of this essay is that the author does not just give a precise description of the victim groups and the extent and variety of oppression and persecution, but always keeps in mind the motives and forces driving the perpetrators and planners. He paints a horrifying picture of the Nazi dystopia of the new human being, of the racially uniform *Volksgemeinschaft* exercising total control over the body, spirit, and soul of every individual. This picture does not draw upon theoretical exercises, but on specific acts and their impact on victims, perpetrators, and observers. In this way, the reader learns a great deal about the nature of National Socialism.

Similarly, Tooze's essay is not only informative but also illuminating because he combines his specific subject with a much wider analytical horizon. His comments provide additional insights into the relationship between rationality and lunacy in National Socialism. Tooze sweeps away the common preconception that the Nazi economic system suffered from the organizational failures that were typical of Nazi rule as a whole. Instead, he places the irreconcilable mismatch between the unprecedented aims and the limited resources of the Nazi state at the centre of his investigation. Rational planning found its limits in the sacrosanct nature of Hitler's ultimate aims and his fixation on war as a means of achieving them. Within this framework, Nazi economic policy was consistent and even successful, although ideological wishful thinking could not overcome sober reality. Similar patterns can be traced in many policy fields for the peri-

od of the Nazi dictatorship. In addition, this interpretation contributes a great deal to our understanding of how functional elites such as entrepreneurs and managers, for example, worked. They used a system of incentives that allowed them to mobilize their forces much more effectively than mere fear of punishment.

By comparison with German historiographical trends, the authors represented in this volume display a certain degree of scepticism. This applies, for instance, to observations concerning the efficiency and cooperation between the bearers of different forms of power that many German researchers have emphasized in recent years. Jeremy Noakes in his contribution on the Nazi system of rule, by contrast, stresses the tendency towards disintegration, chaos, and friction. This applies even more to the term *Volksgemeinschaft*, which, it seems, no recent German publication on National Socialism can do without. Several authors write about this concept in this volume, but they do not see it as providing a useful analytical framework for grasping National Socialism as a whole. For Tooze, it is simply 'stuff' (p. 169), while Peter Fritzsche thinks that some scholars assume, 'perhaps a bit too easily' (p. 51), that this idea had great power of attraction over people. Jill Stephenson's contribution on the mechanisms of inclusion, too, has the term in its title and repeats it like a leitmotiv in the first few lines of her essay, but she draws on other categories in order to explain the inner structure of German society during the Nazi dictatorship. All three discuss the *Volksgemeinschaft* primarily from the point of view of propaganda and reality. The balance is sobering, for it is well known that the regime never fulfilled its promises to lift class barriers, raise the living standard of the majority of people, and transcend the continuing legacy of modern Liberalism and individualism by means of a collective myth. If we look at the impact and concrete expressions of the *Volksgemeinschaft* only in this way, however, attention is distracted from other psycho-social effects. Regardless of the real advantages and disadvantages it offered to its members, the questions remains as to whether the concept of the *Volksgemeinschaft* as such could generate cohesion with the regime, whether it was perceived merely as propaganda or a possible utopia, whether it contributed to establishing the image of human inequality in people's minds, and to what extent it helped garner the energy of hundreds of thousands of people in the service of the regime's aims. The consequences of the collective ostracizing of those excluded from the

Book Reviews

Volksgemeinschaft is another theme which this volume does not touch upon.

Unfortunately, a number of central Nazi terms are translated in slightly misleading ways in this volume. This applies, for example, to *Volksgemeinschaft*, which is mostly rendered as 'national community', and sometimes as 'people's community'. Because 'nation' and 'people' in English do not mean exactly the same thing as *Nation* and *Volk* in German, but are surrounded by their own semantic fields and associations in each case, some terms simply do not lend themselves to being translated. Similarly, designating the Germans in the Nazi state as 'citizens' or *Bürger* could be misleading because these terms are connected with ideas of equality, political participation, and the rule of law. In order to describe the Other in the Third Reich adequately, we need categories that do not blur the differences between them and our present-day understanding of a state, social, and legal order. Moreover, only in this way can it be shown what common things connect that time with ours, and where comparisons are possible.

What remains is a collection of essays that raises high expectations and largely fulfils them. It offers an excellent brief introduction to the study of the Nazi dictatorship. This reviewer hopes that German as well as English-speaking students will profit from it.

BERNHARD GOTTO is the author of *Nationalsozialistische Kommunalpolitik: Administrative Normalität und Systemstabilisierung durch die Augsburger Stadtverwaltung 1933–1945* (2006) and most recently, with Johannes Bähr and Axel Drecoll, *Der Flick-Konzern im Dritten Reich* (2008). Since 2005 he has been a *Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter* at the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich.

THORSTEN DIEDRICH, *Paulus. Das Trauma von Stalingrad: Eine Biographie* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008), 579 pp. ISBN 978 3 506 76403 4. €39.90

For decades, German historiography rejected the genre of biography as an outdated and inadequate form, but for the last fifteen years or so it has been undergoing a true renaissance. Recently, this has given rise to numerous biographies of, among others, the Third Reich's military elite. Yet even such renowned (military) historians as Klaus-Jürgen Müller and Bernhard Kroener cannot, in the introductions to their biographies of Ludwig Beck and Friedrich Fromm respectively,¹ dispense with a detailed methodological justification for choosing to write a biography. At least among this generation of historians, who were socialized in the West German historiography of the 1960s and 1970s, the previous rejection of the genre still seems to be in effect, making them feel a certain pressure to justify their choices. Diedrich, by contrast, born in 1956, who learned his trade as a historian in the late years of the German Democratic Republic and still works at the Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt in Potsdam, no longer shares these scruples. His main arguments for devoting himself to the life of Field Marshal Friedrich Paulus (1890–1957), unfortunately presented in a rather long-winded way, are, of course, first Paulus's inglorious role as commander of the German Sixth Army at Stalingrad. At this, its first major defeat in the Second World War, ending with the surrender of the last 110,000 or so soldiers besieged in Stalingrad on 31 January 1943, the *Wehrmacht* lost a total of almost a quarter of a million soldiers. Secondly, Diedrich repeatedly stresses the typical nature of Paulus's thinking and actions from when he entered the Prussian army in 1910 as an officer cadet to the surrender at Stalingrad. Thus, Diedrich argues, Paulus can stand for the army elite which, between 1939 and 1945, comprised 2,344 officers with the rank of general and willingly allowed itself to be used for the Third Reich's criminal policies.

However, to point to the typical, representative nature of a historical figure as justification for writing a biography is not an entirely convincing argument, for historians as a rule prefer to select an

¹ Klaus-Jürgen Müller, *Generaloberst Ludwig Beck: Eine Biographie* (Paderborn, 2007); Bernhard Kroener, *'Der starke Mann im Heimatkriegsgebiet': Generaloberst Friedrich Fromm – Eine Biographie* (Paderborn, 2005).

Book Reviews

extraordinary life as a subject. If Paulus had not been the first German field marshal since the Napoleonic Wars to be captured, and if the defeat for which he was partly responsible had not become the symbolic turning point of the Second World War, he would probably not have found a biographer to the present day, just like Field Marshal Maximilian Freiherr von Weichs, commander of Army Group B and Paulus's superior officer in the autumn of 1942, but largely forgotten today. In addition, as Diedrich himself points out, Paulus's life displays a number of untypical characteristics. His family background in the Prussian lower bureaucracy, not one of the circles from which the Kaiserreich preferred to draw its officer corps, is rather unusual. Thus from the point of view of his origins, Paulus as a social climber was an exception among the later *Wehrmacht* elite. His military career, which was outstandingly successful from the start, was also atypical in that during the First World War, the Weimar Republic, and the Third Reich he was employed almost exclusively as an aide-de-camp or General Staff officer because he proved to be an excellent organizer and planner of military operations. Untypical, too, was the fact that, as a lieutenant, he experienced the First World War as a war of movement mostly on subsidiary fronts in south-eastern Europe, not as the trench warfare that was characteristic of the Western Front. His first significant command was taking over the Sixth Army in January 1942. Because it was so highly motorized, it counted as an elite unit. This command was intended to give the general, highly valued by Hitler because of his calm, circumspect manner and avoidance of conflicts, the necessary experience of the front to enable him to rise to the heights of the *Wehrmacht* hierarchy. He was possibly selected either as a successor for Colonel General Alfred Jodl, Chief of the *Wehrmacht Führungsstab*, or as a replacement for Colonel General Franz Halder, Chief of the Army General Staff. Paulus had worked closely with Halder since the autumn of 1940 on the planning and implementation of Operation Barbarossa.

Despite this reviewer's methodological reservations about the extent to which Paulus can really be considered typical of the *Wehrmacht* generals, Diedrich convincingly presents a number of behavioural patterns and attitudes on the part of his protagonist which can certainly be seen as representative of his caste: a profound rejection of the Weimar Republic, disguised as an apolitical attitude

and, resulting from this, a certain sympathy for the political changes of 1933, without identifying himself explicitly as a National Socialist; a readiness to subscribe fully to unrestrained rearmament in order to prepare for a revisionist war aiming to change the borders drawn in 1919; a self-limitation to the purely military aspect of preparing for and conducting the war while ignoring the political context and any considerations of morality; and finally, ever since the victory over France, a blind faith in Hitler's military 'genius' and a wholehearted readiness, born of a fundamentally anti-Bolshevik attitude and frivolous underestimation of the enemy, to participate in planning and implementing a war of annihilation against the USSR which, it was believed, could be won within a few weeks.

One of the book's particular strengths, which fully justifies its biographical approach, is the detailed, convincing, and richly sourced account of Paulus's early childhood and individual disposition given in order to explain the decisions he made, especially at the Battle of Stalingrad, and his political development thereafter. Diedrich draws a critical but always fair picture of Paulus's character. As a legacy of his early years, Paulus was fixated on strong leaders, who influenced his development. At the same time, as a social climber, he identified all the more strongly and uncritically with the Prussian-German army as an institution, and with its values. He owed his astonishing military career to his conscientious work and great diligence, his intellectual ability to get to grips with problems of a military nature, and the perfect manners and appearance which he cultivated in order to cover up his modest social background. Thanks to these qualities, Paulus gained the favour of influential men such as Hitler himself, and Field Marshal Walther von Reichenau, a convinced Nazi whom he served in 1939-40 as Chief of Staff of the Sixth Army in the Polish and French campaigns, and from whom he took over the Sixth Army in January 1942. At the same time, Paulus was always an intellectual brooder, endlessly weighing up pros and cons for every decision. He was not a military leader with a clear ideological standpoint who was quick to reach decisions. This disposition made him susceptible to charismatic personalities such as Reichenau and Hitler, who were driven by an unconditional will and had an unambiguous point of view, and whom he followed willingly. Similarly, at the Battle of Stalingrad, the rather weak Paulus submitted to the disastrous influence of his energetic Chief of Staff, Lieutenant General Artur Schmidt,

Book Reviews

a loyal follower of Hitler. Schmidt decisively rejected the two options remaining to the Sixth Army after it was surrounded at the end of November 1942. Both would have gone against Hitler's orders: either to risk breaking out of the encirclement by December, or to take responsibility for allowing the Sixth Army to surrender at the beginning of January, given its hopeless situation. Instead, they continued to follow Hitler's order to hold out and trust in the *Luftwaffe's* impossible promise that it would keep the surrounded troops supplied. Schmidt's influence also meant that it was a full year after his capture before Paulus renounced the Nazi regime. Not until the events of summer 1944, with the failed attempt to assassinate Hitler on 20 July involving a number of the *Wehrmacht* officers Paulus held in high esteem, and the collapse of the Army Group Mitte on the Eastern Front, did Paulus change his views.

From July 1944, the influence of Lieutenant General Vincenz Müller, captured at the destruction of Army Group Mitte, replaced that previously exercised by Schmidt, but it went in the opposite direction. Müller broke completely with the Nazi regime, and through his commitment to the Bund Deutscher Offiziere (BDO), founded in autumn 1943 by the Soviets, attempted to sign up the German generals in Soviet captivity for the resistance against Hitler. On 8 August 1944, finally, Paulus addressed an appeal to the German POWs in captivity in the USSR and to the German people, urging them to repudiate Hitler. One week later, he joined the BDO. From 1953, when Paulus went to live in Dresden on returning from Soviet captivity, Müller, who was for a time Chief of Staff of the GDR's *Kasernierte Volkspolizei* (the hidden nucleus of the later East German Army) was instrumental in persuading Paulus, although he never became a Communist, to allow himself to be used in the GDR's propaganda directed against the FRG's inclusion in Nato. To be sure, Paulus was no opportunist who simply went along the Soviets and the East German Socialist Unity Party (SED). He kept a certain distance from both. Rather, his thoughtful, conscientious disposition led him, after 1943, to devote a great deal of attention to the defeat of Stalingrad, which he saw as his own personal failure that had cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of soldiers, ultimately pointlessly. For Paulus, Stalingrad became a trauma that haunted him until his death in 1957, and he did his best to make some sort of amends through his political commitment. The conclusions he drew from his experience

were entirely different from those drawn by the far less scrupulous *Wehrmacht* generals who lived in West Germany and formed a group around Erich von Manstein, Heinz Guderian, and Halder. While Paulus continued to advocate German-Soviet reconciliation, they, after 1945, did not condemn the attack on the Soviet Union per se, but merely deplored Hitler's amateurish interventions in operations on the Eastern Front which had allegedly precipitated defeat. Paulus, by contrast, had recognized the criminal nature of the German invasion while he was still in Soviet captivity. On taking over the Sixth Army, he had tried, as much as possible, to treat the Soviet civilian population and Soviet POWs in line with international law, in contrast to his unscrupulous predecessor, Reichenau, who had been fully committed to the war of annihilation. As early as 1946, Paulus was prepared to act as a witness for the prosecution at the Nuremberg trials. Drawing on his cooperation with Halder in planning Operation Barbarossa, Paulus was able to refute the argument put by the defence at Nuremberg that the Reich was just forestalling an attack from the east. Paulus, by contrast, testified that the German attack had been planned without any fear of Soviet aggression, and had been conceived, from the start, as a war aiming for the total subjugation and colonization of Russia.

The fact that, in West Germany, Paulus's political commitment was seen as a second failure on his part, after that as commander in Stalingrad, only strengthened his determination to commit himself to the GDR after 1953, although his family lived in the FRG. As the highest-ranking *Wehrmacht* officer who settled in the GDR after coming out of captivity, Paulus was of great propaganda value to the GDR. As a result, he was courted by the GDR, which gave him a large villa plus domestic staff in Dresden, a Western limousine, and a personal aide until his death. Until 1955 the GDR hoped – ultimately in vain – to influence former high-ranking *Wehrmacht* officers in the FRG through Paulus and gain their support for the project of a neutral, reunified Germany. What emerges clearly from this is that after 1945 Paulus was regarded as a traitor and military failure in West Germany, while the East German people could not understand why an officer who was held responsible for Stalingrad was now permitted to lead a privileged life in the state ruled by the SED. Even after the division of Germany, Stalingrad remained a trauma for the entire German people.

Book Reviews

The strongest part of Diedrich's biography is that covering the years 1939 to 1943. Here the author presents a convincing picture of decision-making processes in the *Wehrmacht* leadership and the career patterns that, at the time, could lead to the highest positions, all based around the story of Paulus. This shows clearly that the military elite more or less voluntarily subordinated itself to Hitler's will and was prepared to carry out his orders, sometimes nonsensical from a military point of view, even against their better judgement. Thus, as an experienced planner of military operations, Paulus was aware that given the Sixth Army's extended flanks and over-extended supply lines, the push on Stalingrad ordered by Hitler in the summer of 1942 was an unjustifiable risk. Diedrich's account of Paulus's life up to the mid-1930s, with the exception of the impressive and convincing sections on his personality is, by contrast, a fairly conventional trot through the stations of his career and is only loosely integrated into the social context. To be fair to Diedrich, it should be pointed out that the loss of documents in the Potsdam war archive in 1945 means there are many fewer extant sources for the military in the Kaiserreich and the Weimar Republic than for the period of the Third Reich. The chapter on Paulus's captivity in the USSR and his slow, realistically described transformation is interesting, but too long. Too many details that do not contribute essential information also stretch out the last chapter about Paulus's life in the GDR. For this segment of Paulus's life, the author draws mainly on the very substantial files left by the *Staatssicherheit*, the East German official secret police, who kept the prominent field marshal ret. and his surroundings under strict surveillance. Given this wealth of sources, historians might wish that the *Wehrmacht* leadership had been as closely observed while they were preparing for war. Better editing on the part of the publisher could certainly have cut the text by 100 pages without loss of substance, and might have avoided a number of lapses of style and factual errors, such as Bosnia's alleged entry into the First World War against the Central Powers, although the state did not even exist at that time, or giving the date of the Normandy landing as 6 July 1944. As it is, this book makes interesting, but sometimes laborious, reading.

Paulus. The Trauma of Stalingrad

ECKARD MICHELS is Reader in German history at Birkbeck, University of London. His main research interests are military and diplomatic aspects of twentieth-century German history and Franco-German relations. His biography of Paul von Lettow-Vorbeck, *'Der Held von Deutsch-Ostafrika': Paul von Lettow-Vorbeck – Ein preußischer Kolonialoffizier* (2008) was awarded the Werner-Hahlweg prize for military history in 2008.

KAREN BAYER, *'How Dead is Hitler?'* *Der britische Starreporter Sefton Delmer und die Deutschen*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz. Abteilung Universalgeschichte, 219 (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2008), viii + 349 pp. ISBN 978 3 8053 3876 9. €45.00

Who was Sefton Delmer, and why write a book about this British journalist who is almost forgotten today in Germany? Karen Bayer's biography gives us the answer. Sefton Delmer was born in Berlin in 1904 to Australian parents. After the First World War started, his family was interned and could not move to Britain until 1917. After completing his studies at Oxford, Delmer returned to Berlin, where his father had been working for the Inter-Allied Control Commission since 1921. In 1928, the press magnate Lord Beaverbrook appointed him Berlin correspondent for the *Daily Express*. There he made the acquaintance of leading Nazis in the late 1920s, and accompanied Hitler on his election campaign in 1932. In his articles, Delmer could not hide his admiration for the Nazis, and attended sumptuous parties with them. It was only after the Röhm putsch and under pressure from his newspaper that, from 1934, his sympathy gave way to a more critical attitude. In the years that followed, he worked as a foreign correspondent reporting, among other things, on the Spanish Civil War. In July 1940, Delmer began working for the BBC's German Service, and from 1941 he played a large part in the Black Propaganda which the Political Warfare Executive put out against Germany.

Delmer's work for the British authorities did not come to an end with the war. He was involved with the democratic re-education of the Germans in the British Occupation Zone, and built up a new German news agency, the German News Service. This later gave rise to the Deutsche Pressedienst, a precursor of the the Deutsche Presse-Agentur (dpa). He also designed a British newspaper for Germany which was intended to provide a model for other papers.

When Delmer left this job after disagreements in the autumn of 1945, he returned to the *Daily Express* as foreign correspondent. For the next fourteen years, Delmer reported from all over the world, but Germany remained one of his most important topics, and he continued to be regarded as a 'German expert' (p. 169). He was not re-appointed resident German correspondent, however, but presented

as a star reporter in the 1950s: 'Delmer—the man who is always there! SEFTON DELMER, chief foreign affairs reporter of the *Daily Express*, is the man who is on-the-spot when big news breaks' (p. 244). In addition, he served as the *Daily Express*'s oft quoted expert on National Socialism, his earlier sympathy for Nazism being 'consistently ignored' (p. 172). In the years that followed, he reported critically from the newly-founded Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic, warned against a Fourth Reich, and deplored the continuity of Nazi elites in a resurgent West Germany. Thus in September 1949, one month after the first elections in the Federal Republic, he issued the following warning: 'The new chapter in German history beginning this week is another Nazi chapter' (p. 184). Much attention was paid to Delmer's reporting in the Federal Republic—and it was also much criticized. In 1954 *Christ und Welt* saw him as a pathological enemy of the Germans.

Unexpectedly for Delmer, Beaverbrook sacked him in 1959, after thirty-two years of service. In his memoirs, Delmer blamed the ill will of his boss of many years; Bayer points to his extravagant expenses and the declining quality of his articles. In the following years, Delmer published his highly acclaimed memoirs, and continued to write for British and German newspapers. He died in 1979.

This biography by Karen Bayer, her Ph.D. thesis written for the Friedrich Schiller University in Jena, claims not merely to trace Sefton Delmer's life, but also to analyse his integration into his political surroundings, in particular, his ambivalent relationship with Germany and the Germans. Although the biography never degenerates into a mere retelling of Delmer's life, the study does not always fulfil its promise to provide an analysis. The main problem seems to lie with the book's chronological structure, which resists systematic analysis. Thus its highly readable nature is closely connected with one of its weaknesses, as it means that many of the work's important findings are scattered throughout the book. It might have been sensible to present and systematically to discuss, for example, Delmer's construction of his own biography in his memoirs, especially where it obviously differs from his reports, for instance, in his attitude to National Socialism. Bayer recognizes and discusses the problem (on pp. 23 and 26, among others), but she dedicates a whole chapter merely to the reactions to Delmer's books (pp. 255–61). Similarly scattered throughout the whole book we find references to Delmer's

Book Reviews

image of Germany (pp. 238–41, among others). Even if he never developed a coherent theory about the Germans (p. 239), a systematic account and discussion would have been desirable. Bayer shows that despite Delmer's knowledge of Germany and the Germans, his 'ideas about National Socialism were remarkably unclear'. According to her, it was 'the epitome of all that he considered bad' (p. 241).

Another point of criticism is that the biography is weakly contextualized. Readers find out too little about what distinguished Delmer's life and reportage from that of other British journalists, what he had in common with them, and what exactly made him a 'star reporter'. A brief glance at group biographies of British foreign correspondents in Germany and some reflections on the professional profile of journalists, and, in general, on the personalization of news might have provided greater clarity. More information about how he saw himself as a journalist would also have been welcome. Thus Bayer points out that in the 1950s, 'the presentation and content' of his articles suggests that they were 'not always to be taken completely seriously' (p. 217). The author cannot be blamed for the fact that, with the exception of a cartoon on the dust jacket, the book has no illustrations. These would have been helpful, among other things to document the presentation of Delmer as a star reporter, but also simply to help readers make themselves a clearer picture of the subject of the book.

Despite these weaknesses, this is a successful piece of work which shows that Sefton Delmer did not just report on Anglo-German relations, but that his reportage formed a part of these relations.

FLORIAN ALTENHÖNER studied history, political science, and American studies, and completed his Ph.D. at the Humboldt University in Berlin in 2005. He has been a member of a Bundestag deputy's staff, and now lives as an independent historian. His publications deal mainly with the history of communication and the secret service, and include 'Das "Heimatheer deutscher Frauen" – bürgerliche Frauen in Berlin 1918 zwischen Propaganda und Denunziation', *Ariadne*, 47 (2005), 38–45, and *Kommunikation und Kontrolle: Gerüchte und städtische Öffentlichkeiten in Berlin und London* (2008).

SANDRA CHANEY, *Nature of the Miracle Years: Conservation in West Germany, 1945–1975*, Studies in German History, 8 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), xii + 284 pp. ISBN 978 1 84545 430 2. \$85.00 £42.50

The history of the Federal Republic has frequently been interpreted as a process of liberalization or Westernization, as a path to the West successfully taken. The social and political renunciation of authoritarianism or totalitarianism in favour of a relatively unambiguous and general acceptance of pluralistic norms, different ways of life, and constitutional realities which these and similar concepts describe (a number of publications could be cited as evidence for this), can be correlated, relatively precisely, with the development of the West German conservation movement. Sandra Chaney, Professor of History at Erskine College in Due West, South Carolina, takes up this analytical thread in an original and, on the whole, convincing way. Her study combines a reconstruction of conservation intentions and measures for the whole of West Germany between 1945 and 1975 with a number of case studies, closely based on the sources, which confer a certain transparency on the changes and upheavals in this field. They deal, in chronological order, with the conflict about the Wutan Gorge in south Baden, the debates on controlling the river Mosel, and the controversies surrounding proposals to expand the Bayerischer Wald national park.

This stringently narrated investigation, whose arguments are always to the point, begins with a brief account of conditions at the start of the West German conservation movement. Chaney tellingly points to the continued impact of a long-lived tradition uniting the legacy of the classical and now well-researched view of nature, which looked at landscape in aesthetic terms and was infused with the ideology of *Heimat*, and the brutal topoi of the civilizatory pessimism of imperial Germany. Overblown racial doctrines were by no means foreign to this tradition. Beyond this, the author concentrates on the projects aiming to create a natural landscape including technical installations and resources for energy production (*Leistungslandschaft*) which, after hesitant beginnings in the Weimar Republic, reached a first peak in the Nazis' genocidal plans for the incorporated and occupied Eastern regions. The *Reichsnaturschutzgesetz* (RNG), a conservation law put through by Hermann Göring, receives critical

Book Reviews

attention. It was hailed as a milestone by the contemporary conservation commissioners of the states, regions, and administrative circles.

Against this background, it is hardly surprising that the official nature conservation movement re-established under Allied occupation and in the early Adenauer era was bathed in a diffuse, right-wing light. Chaney points to personal continuities in the movement which, under the terms of the RNG which remained in force, was mostly run by educators and foresters, among others, acting in an honorary capacity (see p. 129). They were initially dominated by the old hands of the Nazi conservation movement, which included an extended notion of protecting the landscape and well as actively shaping it. For Hans Schwenkel, Heinrich Wiepking-Jürgensmann, and also still for Konrad Buchwald, passive as well as creative nature conservation was primarily a service to the nation, or even to the 'German people' ('deutschen Volkstums'). To be sure, the national substructure of the conservation movement was rapidly perforated over time. Karl Arnold's claim, made in 1956 on behalf of the Deutsche Heimatbund, that plans to control the Mosel amounted to a materialistic attack on the moral and idealistic nature of the people could count on considerable public support at the time. Ten years later, when grandad's version of nature conservation had explicitly been put to rest, it would merely have irritated even those with an interest in the subject.

Chaney, well schooled in Konrad Jarausch's theories of contemporary history, shows that the objectification, technical and scientific rationalization, and widening of horizons in thinking on nature conservation which this reflects began in conservation associations that were, to start with, extremely conservative. These included organizations such as the Schutzgemeinschaft Deutscher Wald, the Vogelschützer, the Verein Naturschutzpark, the Rat für Landpflege, and others, which were joined by more and more local and regional societies dedicated to maintaining their local natural environments. Gradually, an idea of conservation oriented by the environment took over. Favoured by a younger membership, the movement no longer saw nature as an integral component of an organic whole, but began to interpret it as the fixed point of an ecologically defined whole, however this was quantitatively defined. With this change, new protagonists and organizations came into their own. The Bund für

Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland (BUND, German Alliance for the Environment and Nature Conservation) was established, and citizens' initiatives on the environment signalled that they had come of age. In other words, they were prepared to participate and protest, the TV zoologist Bernhard Grzimek opened the debate on the global dimension of environmental responsibility, Hubert Weinzierl became a 'rising star in conservation', and Erhard Eppler received plaudits for his statement that quality of life took precedence over living standards. Thus in the twenty to thirty years after the end of the war, the conservation and environmental movement underwent changes that, if we accept Chaney's conclusions, led to a 'greening of society' in the 1980s.

Late twentieth-century West German society can certainly be classified as quite 'green' by comparison with other countries, but whether it was lastingly 'greened' right through remains questionable. Chaney's conclusion seems a little contrived, as the existing open resistance to environmentalism and its actors are not adequately explored. Similarly ignored is the fact that leading environmentalists can be among the originators of anti-ecological sentiment. The first generation of the new ecological environmentalists in particular used language often bordering on the apocalyptic, and their prophecies of doom, reminiscent of Günther Schwab and kindred authors, encouraged resignation rather than stimulating commitment among receptive contemporaries. Others were simply irritated by the pronouncements of these notorious kill-joys.

These comments and certain reservations about the context of conservation and the fostering of regional values and traditions notwithstanding, this well-structured study of conservation in the miracle years is a concise, readable, and thematically profound analysis of trends in the Federal Republic of Germany.

WILLI OBERKROME has taught history at a number of German universities, including Münster and Freiburg im Breisgau. His publications include *'Deutsche Heimat': Nationale Konzeption und regionale Praxis von Naturschutz, Landschaftsgestaltung und Kulturpolitik in Westfalen-Lippe und Thüringen (1900–1960)* (2004), and *Ordnung und Autarkie: Die Geschichte der deutschen Landbauforschung. Agrarökonomie und ländlichen Sozialwissenschaft im Spiegel von Forschungsdienst und DFG (1920–1970)* (2009).

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Seventh Workshop on Early Modern Central European History, co-organized by the German Historical Institute London, the German History Society, and the University of Hull, and held at the GHIL on 24 Oct. 2008.

As every autumn for the last seven years historians from Germany, Ireland, and the United Kingdom (augmented this year by guests from Canada, Poland, and the United States) gathered on a Friday towards the end of October to attend the workshop on Early Modern Central European History held at the German Historical Institute London. They listened to and discussed nine papers which presented new research on a wide variety of themes, from classic topics such as the formation of the pre-modern state and the history of the Reformation to new cultural approaches to early modern history.

After a welcome by the organizers, Peter H. Wilson (University of Hull) and Michael Schaich (GHIL), the conference began with the session 'State Formation on the Ground' chaired by Beat Kümin (University of Warwick). Robert Mark Spaulding (University of North Carolina) in his inspiring talk on 'The Transformation of the Rhine and the Formation of Modern Germany 1648–1848' brought to life the rules that governed commerce on the river. He distinguished three periods in the history of the commercial regime of the Rhine. The first, the period before 1789, was characterized by physical neglect of the river, when towpaths were decaying and the collection of tolls was in an anarchic state. As a consequence the river was not very functional as a trade route. This changed dramatically in the second phase (1789 to 1815) when the river was jointly administered by French and German authorities and the system of collecting tolls was rationalized. The direct result of this new approach was that commerce flourished as never before. Part of the experience of the French revolutionary regime in Germany, as Spaulding stressed, was therefore positive and not just extractive as recent research has tended to emphasize. After 1815 the newly established Central Commission of the Rhine, which continued the former management of the river in a

more cooperative way, proved to be a driving force towards German unification. Among other things it allowed Prussia to demonstrate that it could provide public goods to other states, established a degree of economic integration, and provided the later Zollverein with a model for administrative and cooperative structures. Close attention to developments on the ground was also the hallmark of Paul Warde's (University of East Anglia) paper on 'State Formation from Below? By-laws, Lordship and Neighbourliness in the South-West'. He is engaged in a major research project that sees by-laws, which have been issued in large numbers from the fourteenth through to the eighteenth century with peaks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, not as evidence of intra-communal strife and tension or as means of adoptive environmental policies, as historians used to do, but as products of cooperation between lords and peasants in order to restore authority and guarantee order within the local community. As he demonstrated with examples from south-western Germany, by-laws helped households and communes in collaboration with the territorial government or the local lordship to maintain social relations and customs as they had been in the past and to preserve a social equilibrium deemed central to the well-being of the locality.

In the second session, chaired by Clarissa Campbell-Orr (Anglia Ruskin University) the focus of the debate shifted from the problems of state formation to methodological approaches which address questions of politics and society from the viewpoint of a constructivist understanding of history. Under the heading 'New Approaches to the Political', three speakers illustrated advances made in this field over the last few years. Alexander Schmidt (University of Jena) questioned older assumptions about German high culture in the years around 1800. According to his paper, 'The Power of the Muses? French and German Diplomats Assess High Culture in Napoleonic Germany', it was French diplomats who helped to create the picture of a politically apathetic German people pre-occupied with philosophy, literature, and aesthetics, while German intellectuals cultivated the idea of high culture as a political weapon. The Prussian reformer, Freiherr vom Stein, for example, viewed the support of the middle classes as crucial to the war effort against the French and suggested orchestrating military operations with cultural propaganda. Estelle Joubert (University of Toronto), on the other hand, aimed to revise

Conference Reports

the paradigm of the Habermasian public sphere in musicology by looking for an audience outside the concert hall. In her talk on 'German Opera and Politics from the Enlightenment to Napoleon' she pointed to the wide distribution of musical scores, the hearing and singing of popular tunes from operas in public spaces, and the reports on music in newspapers and journals as areas deserving further research. In addition, she presented a number of case studies, among them Mozart's *Magic Flute* and Beethoven's *Fidelio*, to highlight various modes of thinking about civil society in musical inventions. The last paper of the session, 'Pest in Thorn im 16.-18. Jahrhundert: Politisierung von Krankheit' by Katarzyna Pekacka-Falkowska (Nicholas Copernicus University, Torun) introduced the audience to the social history of medicine which proceeds from the assumption that diseases are socially and politically construed. In the case of Torun, a multi-confessional and multi-ethnic city in Poland, this means that the outbreaks of epidemics classified by contemporaries as plague have to be seen as social phenomena. In her talk Pekacka-Falkowska therefore investigated the discourse of mortality as it can be reconstructed from printed texts by medical practitioners, clergymen, and representatives of secular authorities. In particular, she dealt with the contemporary idea that imagination was a transmitter of disease in order to give prominence to the linkage between medicine, politics, and religion in dealing with the plague.

The first afternoon session, chaired by David Lederer (National University of Ireland, Maynooth), was dedicated to early modern religion. Scott Dixon (Queen's University, Belfast) in his paper, 'The Sense of the Past in Reformation Germany: History and Historiography in the Work of Johannes Letzner (1531-1613)', presented a fairly unknown historian working in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century to illuminate trends in Protestant historiography after the Reformation. The picture of Letzner that emerged from Dixon's talk was of a man fascinated with the German past who tirelessly visited monasteries, private libraries, and country houses and was in constant contact with other antiquarian scholars to collect the material for his works which gained him the status of a local celebrity. In his writings he betrayed a concern for the Catholic past and the disappearance of its material and literary remnants that led to suspicions about crypto-Catholic leanings. At the same time, however, he felt an urge to enlighten the younger generation, who had grown up

after the heyday of the Reformation, about the historical fate of Protestantism. Strategies of Protestant self-stylization were also at the heart of Jane Finucane's (University of Glamorgan) presentation. She took the city of Magdeburg, which was destroyed in 1631 by Catholic troops, as an example of a powerful martyrdom discourse in which it was likened to the fate of La Rochelle. In addition, she paid attention to the role of the Lutheran clergy in admonishing and warning the citizens at a time of crisis. Although the pastors were also drawing on resistance theories, they firmly adhered to the imperial ideal which was so characteristic of Saxon policy before and during the Thirty Years War, as Finucane emphasized in contrast to a tendency in modern research to play up anti-imperial positions within the community.

Some of the themes discussed in this session also resurfaced in the last session of the workshop which was devoted to 'Cultures of Knowledge', chaired by Thomas Biskup (University of Hull). Jennifer Smyth (Trinity College, Dublin) in a paper entitled 'Unnatural Pharisees: Knowledge, Clergy, and Laity in the Early Reformation' turned attention to the anti-clerical polemic which was so prevalent in the early Reformation movement and elucidated the consequences of the attacks on the allegedly ignorant traditional clergy on the definition of ecclesiastical authority. Taking the former Dominican Jacob Strauss, who held the position of preacher in Eisenach in the 1520s, as an example, she described his diatribes against medieval theology while pointing out his attempts to retain some measure of spiritual hold over his flock himself. Her paper addressed not only the contemporary question of who should be allowed to be knowledgeable, but also laid open the difficulties of defining the radical Reformation. In contrast, Richard Kirwan (Maynooth) addressed the question of how professorial social agency was acquired and consolidated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As part of a wider project entitled 'Universities, Representation and Social Action in the Holy Roman Empire, 1500-1700', which explores strategies of academic representation, he focused on the prototypical Protestant university of Helmstedt and the attempts of its professoriate to achieve and demonstrate social distinction. Displaying proximity to influential political figures by way of dedicatory texts and establishing close family ties among colleagues were only a few of the schemes employed by academics to create the image of a socially powerful professorial group. In the end, as Kirwan stressed, academic repre-

Conference Reports

sentational culture was so successful that it was imitated in wider parts of society and functioned as a civilizing force equal to, or even more important than, princely courts.

All papers were followed by discussions which showed the vibrancy of research on early modern Central European history and also highlighted recurring themes, such as the importance of locality for a better understanding of political, religious, and cultural processes; the validity of new constructivist approaches which give insights into perceptions and representations; and the enduring appeal of grand narratives like state formation which, at the very least, give coherence to a discipline which is under the constant threat of fragmentation. This year's workshop will take place on 30 October.

MICHAEL SCHAICH (GHIL)

Re-Imagining Democracy 1750–1850: Government, Participation, and Welfare in German Territories, workshop organized by the Historisches Seminar of the University of Munich, the University of Oxford, and the German Historical Institute London, and held at the Centre for Advanced Studies in Munich, 9–10 Jan. 2009.

This meeting of British and German historians working on the period between 1750 and 1850 was organized against the background of an Oxford-based project, 'Re-Imagining Democracy 1750–1850', convened by Mark Philp (Politics Faculty, Oxford) and Joanna Innes (History Faculty, Oxford). The aim of the project is to explore central aspects of how the history of modern democracy in its formative period can be conceived of and written by scholars operating in the early twenty-first century. Set up in a fairly informal way, the project relies on the cooperation of historians whose expertise lies in various national contexts. One of the aims, therefore, is to build a network of researchers in Europe and North and South America (and possibly more widely) who are interested in meeting for workshops and conferences to exchange ideas about this central theme, and to collaborate on publications. Over the past few years several workshops have taken place within the wider context of the project, dealing with topics such as 'Politicization', 'Authority and Obedience', and 'Democracy and Revolution, the King's View', and including British, French, and American historians.

The Munich workshop was intended to enable an exchange of ideas between the different historiographies in Britain and Germany. After a welcome and introductory remarks by Andreas Gestrich (GHIL), Eckhart Hellmuth (Munich), and Joanna Innes (Oxford) the proceedings were divided into five sessions, each dealing with a particular aspect of the wider topic. In accordance with the open and discursive format of the project, each session consisted of short introductory papers by German historians followed by comments by the British participants and then a general discussion. The first session ('Democracy') with papers by Annette Meyer (Munich) and Eckhart Hellmuth (Munich) and comments by Mark Philp (Oxford) and Philip Schofield (UCL), approached the general theme from the viewpoint of the history of concepts and ideas. Various strands of scientific thinking in late eighteenth-century Germany (such as *Policeywissenschaft* or natural history) which form crucial vantage points for

Conference Reports

any engagement with the topic were discussed, as were trends in German historiography over the last few decades subsumed under the heading 'politicization', which could prove useful for a comparative approach to the study of democracy.

The second session was devoted to the ideal and reality of late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century 'Reform States'. Thomas Stamm-Kuhlmann (Greifswald) and Walter Demel (Munich) introduced key features of the Prussian reforms and the reforms in the states of the Confederation of the Rhine, while Stefan Ehrenpreis (Munich) presented new research on 'Reich Patriotism', the allegiance shown by contemporaries to the Holy Roman Empire. All three papers raised questions about differences in political conceptions of society in Britain and Germany, but also about striking similarities between the British and German ages of reform as expressed by the two commentators, Richard Sheldon (Bristol) and Miles Taylor (IHR), and further pursued in the ensuing discussion.

The following morning opened with a session loosely entitled 'Public Life'. Two papers on what was going on at the local level were given in the first part of the session: Johannes Dillinger (Oxford Brookes) examined the role of the territorial estates and explained why the republican potential of the estates was not developed in the early modern period; and Stefan Brakensiek (Duisburg) advanced a sophisticated argument which illustrated how widespread non-democratic forms of participation in the German territories were. He argued that this tradition of local self-government at the prince's command ('beauftragte Selbstverwaltung') was swept away in the early nineteenth century by the introduction of the rational French model of local government. This was followed up by Katrina Navickas (Edinburgh) and Ultan Gillen (QMUL), whose comments stressed the wide array of participatory politics on offer to contemporaries and the fact that democratic and participatory practices did not have to be synonymous. The session was brought to a conclusion by a re-evaluation of one of the leading figures of early nineteenth-century German politics, Metternich. Wolfram Siemann (Munich) questioned the prevailing image of Metternich as an anti-constitutionalist and showed him to be much more sympathetic to the representative principle than previously thought which, as Joanna Innes commented, brought him rather closer to Edmund Burke.

Different ways of 'Theorizing Society' were at the heart of the next

session. Karl Härter (MPI Rechtsgeschichte, Frankfurt) gave an overview of German bureaucrats' obsession with the good order of society, whose theoretical foundation was provided by *Policeywissenschaft*, the guiding principle of much of what the German states enacted in the course of the early modern period. Although as recent research has shown, this included some degree of negotiation between subjects and authorities, it did not mean political participation in the modern sense. By contrast, Reinhard Blänkner (Frankfurt/Oder) suggested the modern concept of the 'neuständische Gesellschaft' as a methodological tool to describe a stratum of society that is not adequately described as either a class-based society or a society based on an estate order in the traditional sense. Both commentators, Gareth Stedman Jones (Cambridge) and Richard Bourke (QMUL), stressed the difficulties involved in applying terminology to the phenomena under discussion and assessing the historical value of self-descriptions of certain social groups.

In the ultimate session entitled 'Social Status and Belonging' Andreas Gestrich (GHIL) outlined two examples of social rights, the right of the poor to claim subsistence and the rights of women. Both discourses, which he traced from the early modern period to the nineteenth century, developed alongside ideas of democracy and at a certain point in time became intertwined. In their comments Malcolm Chase (Leeds) and Kathryn Gleadle (Oxford) widened the perspective by introducing the British example and asking for similar developments to phenomena such as the public-private divide, the role of guilds, and so on in the German case. The comparative dimension of the topic also resurfaced in the final discussion, which examined the question of continuity between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and identified some of the gaps which had not been addressed during the workshop, such as, among others, the crucial role of the 1830s and 1840s, the democratization of churches, and anti-democratic discourses.

A full account of the proceedings by Joanna Innes and Mark Philp can be found on: <<http://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/site/users/innes/public/democracy/>>.

MICHAEL SCHAICH (GHIL)

The City as a Stage for Reform: Britain and Germany, 1890–1914, conference organized by the German Society for Urban History and Urban Research (GSU) in cooperation with the Centre for Urban History, Leicester and the German Historical Institute London, and held at the GHIL, 26–28 Mar. 2009.

The centenary of the British Town Planning Act of 1909, which codified an acceptance of municipal responsibility for town planning, provided the occasion for a thematically wide-ranging conference on the role and significance of German and British cities during the period of reform from 1890 to 1914. Under the general topic of 'The City as a Stage for Reform', twenty-three speakers examined attempts at urban reform from eight different perspectives. The passing of the Act was not only a significant event in the history of town planning, but also marked a turning point in contemporary social policy and social reform. From a wider perspective, the period between 1890 and the First World War was characterized by a flourishing of urban reform movements both individual and collective. Facing growing criticism of the big city as a symbol of social and physical degeneration, municipal administrations intervened ever more actively in shaping the physical environment and everyday life of cities. Town planning was not the only issue; municipal services, housing policies, and welfare reform were also discussed. After 1900 these debates became more strongly integrated into an international context, and were conducted at international congresses and in international organizations. Britain and Germany had a special position in this debate, which by 1910 had developed into a mass movement of mutual exchange. This was the starting-point for the conference which, looking at a variety of municipal themes in both countries, asked whether it is possible to speak of an international movement dedicated to attempts at urban reform.

Taking a methodological approach, John Griffiths (University of Melbourne) looked at British debates on urban reform as reflected in the *Municipal Journal*, which was devoted to communal issues. The crisis of philanthropy and an increase in municipal initiatives meant that the task of providing arguments which explicitly supported urban commitment fell to journals such as this. Given local corruption scandals and the general suspicion of 'socialist municipal' tendencies, this was not always easy. Dieter Schott (University of

Darmstadt), taking the work of German mayors as an example, demonstrated the progressive nature of the municipal sector in Germany during the period under discussion. He argued that their extensive activities were, in effect, definitive for the turning point around 1890. Showing that a professional response to urban challenges was firmly anchored in the urban bourgeoisie, Schott illustrated this by reference to Adicke's property and housing policy for Frankfurt am Main, and the industrial initiatives of Beck in Mannheim. Andrew Lees (Rutgers University) explained how social reforms in British cities were 'read' by German town reformers. Among other things, it emerged that the German side identified British social reform as largely motivated by private philanthropy which was not the concern of the state, and valued it positively. As a consequence, differences in national traditions could, in future, be classified under an exchange of experiences. Ina Zweininger-Bargielowski (University of Chicago) discussed the British discourse on hygiene conducted at different levels within the framework of the reform movement. While the health of the wealthiest nation before the First World War was under discussion, the origins of public health were soon found in the private sector. Actors in the field of reform had the task of informing and educating individuals in a way of life that took greater account of physical well-being. Suggestions for daily exercise and encouraging vegetarianism were among attempts to make life healthier. The discussion stressed that the period from 1890 to 1914 saw significant changes in urban life. A stronger belief in progress combined with philanthropic traditions and municipal engagement allowed the city to become a focus of activities crossing national boundaries. Within this historical framework, the issues of how individuals related to the urban space and what impact technical and administrative knowledge had on them are of particular interest to scholars. Discussants queried the equation of 'bourgeois' with 'progressive', and the new term *zivilgesellschaftlich* provided only a conditional solution. Calls were made for further research on failed urban reform projects, municipal power structures, and the intellectual discourse on town planning.

Richard Rodger (University of Edinburgh) looked at statistical yearbooks and the contribution they made to decision-making at municipal level. He started by pointing out that unlike the states of continental Europe, Britain did not use this medium. Rodger argued

Conference Reports

that statistics on society collected by the state were especially important for keeping tabs on public health. Although the urban architecture of the period was not a central concern of the conference, Astrid Swenson (University of Cambridge) in her paper on the preservation of monuments in both countries argued persuasively that greater attention should be paid to the built fabric of cities. Attempts to draft adequate legislation for the preservation of monuments encouraged a look at practices in other countries, and Germany, with its numerous 'patriotic' associations for the preservation of monuments played a leading part here. As an illustration of the transitional nature of this period, we can point to the change in focus from individual buildings to the historical townscape reflected in the contributions which curators of monuments made to international exhibitions. The discussion focused mainly on the turning points which were the subject of both contributions, and a desire was expressed for more evidence for the switch from descriptive to narrative statistics, and the change in perspective on monuments and its dissemination.

The subject of Michael Schäfer's (University of Dresden) paper was urban poor relief around 1900. His main argument can be summed up as follows. It was not only municipal and professionalized welfare that was interested in poor relief, but a bourgeois movement that can be understood as contributing to the emergent welfare state also played a large part. This initiative, however, was based on the patriarchal view that the poor had to be given a helping hand; it cannot yet be seen as a fundamental social reform. Diana Maltz (Southern Oregon University) illustrated this bourgeois view of poverty in the urban slums by reference to Robert Sherard's writings from 1897 to 1905, which provide a powerful insight into urban ills and a cross-community comparison of conditions. The discussion and commentary established that Germany dealt with poverty on a municipal basis, whereas in Britain, the issue was approached more on a nationally organized voluntary basis. It was noted that committed amateurs could possess a high degree of professional expertise.

In their papers, Seth Koven (Rutgers University) and Gerd Kuhn (University of Stuttgart) looked at the living conditions of urban workers in both countries. Kingsley Hall People's House in the East End of London was a social institution with high aspirations to reform; findings concerning Germany were much more sober. Britain's experiences with social divisions in cities were repeated in

Imperial Germany. The discussion attempted to relate housing problems to the property market. Lees pointed out that we were, in fact, dealing with a number of housing problems relating to the simple procurement of housing, the use and furnishing of housing, and the claim to social reform.

The topic of the fifth session, town planning, was based on a field of research as wide as that on housing. Dennis Hardy (University of London), speaking on the British garden city concept, pointed out that although it had little impact on metropolitan settlement, especially in London, it gave the idea of living in the country a new status. Moreover, the international resonance of the garden city concept accelerated exchanges between town planners in Britain and Germany in both directions. The contribution of women to the German garden city movement and their role in it was the subject addressed by Gisela Mettele (University of Leicester). This gender aspect fell on fruitful soil in the discussion of housing and its influence on everyday family life and especially women. Mettele admitted, however, that the visible influence of women on the garden city movement as a whole was small, not least because they were prohibited from participating in the societies founded for this purpose. Michael Harrison (Birmingham City University) examined Thomas Horsfall and his work *The Improvement of the Dwellings and Surroundings of the People: The Example of Germany*, emphasizing again how much publicity it gave the German municipalities. Having experienced bad living conditions in Manchester, Horsfall visited a number of German cities and drew a sometimes idealized portrait of communal achievements in Germany, which earned him strong criticism. His achievement was to have stimulated the discussion in Britain by pointing out how conditions in his own country contrasted with those in the German model, and he also encouraged legislation in Britain to introduce improvements. Brian Ladd (SUNY Albany) spoke on Germany's positive image and its impact on developments abroad, contrasting the 'successes' of German town-planning with the anti-democratic structures of the German cities governed by the bourgeoisie. A bourgeois spirit of intervention was seen as a successful attitude, he argued, but one that did not take political account of social classes. Speakers in the discussion wanted to know more about the structures of legislative and social power at municipal level in both countries.

Conference Reports

Dirk Schubert (University of Hamburg) described responses to the clearance of the slums in Hamburg and London. Via legislative initiatives, the clearing of slums was increasingly integrated into a town-planning or social reform approach. William Whyte (University of Oxford) demystified the town-planning conference and exhibition held by the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in London in 1910, which attracted international visitors. He explained that this conference played a significant part in the domestic British discussion of the aims of town-planning. In particular, the voice of architects was loudly raised against national planning practices. Thus Whyte relativized the degree of international participation in such events, and called for a more critical reading of conferences on town-planning. Christiane Crasemann Collins presented her research on the lives of Werner Hagemann and Cipriano Montoliu. Her comments made clear that both were national pioneers in their discipline, and prepared the path for the international discourse on planning. The events and biographies presented so persuasively in this session made it all the more surprising that no mention was made of the findings of research on cultural transfer.

In her paper on Patrick Geddes, Helen Meller (University of Nottingham) also chose the biographical approach, explaining the contribution Geddes made to the regional survey. What should be stressed is that Geddes's understanding of urban reform always included the public. Christoph Bernhardt (University of Berlin/University of Darmstadt) illustrated two different versions of regional planning by comparing Berlin and the Ruhrgebiet. In both agglomerations, the question of space was a spur to administrative restructuring, which formed the subject of town-planning exhibitions in 1910 in Berlin and Düsseldorf, thus making possible a mutual exchange of experiences. Berlin stopped being a specific administrative union (*Zweckverband*) and quickly adopted the model of a large municipality (*Großgemeinde*), while the polycentric nature of the Ruhrgebiet produced a regional planning authority (*Siedlungsverband*) which, in the long term, established itself as the pioneer and model of regional planning. Pierre-Yves Saunier (University of Lyon) was invited to open up wider perspectives on the session which had already dealt comprehensively with regional planning topics, and did this by pointing to the complexity of the structure of inter-communal dialogue. Given that it was not only Britain and Germany that

maintained intense contacts concerning urbanization, Saunier suggested that the history of urban exchange fits into a wide field of international scientific movements and exchanges.

The concluding debate once again underlined the large variety of themes which the conference had addressed. This, of course, meant that it was difficult to define a common, international direction for comparative research. British historians in particular brought up the question of property prices again, which they saw as the crucial function by which morphological, political, and socio-economic processes relating to cities around 1900 can be described. The German side sometimes neglected to give sufficient weight to cultural history research on the city. It is to the credit of the conference organizers that this event brought together so many historians working in the field. Given the prominence of the examples selected by the speakers, the conference can be seen as providing a chance to 'synchronize watches', whose main aim was mutual encouragement for common research. In addition to the well-known examples and actors, such as Horsfall, Geddes, and Hegemann, other more unusual topics, such as the comparative perspective on the protection of monuments or the gender aspect of the garden city movement, were also discussed, which encouraged greater depth. A stronger theoretical framework for the international-municipal comparison would have been desirable, but the huge range of topics discussed meant that this was hardly to be expected. It is to be hoped that this German-British comparison of the city and urbanization can be continued in relation to groups of themes such as the history of town-planning, municipal poor relief, and garden cities.

CARL PHILIPP SCHUCK (Institut für vergleichende Städtegeschichte, Münster/Westfalen)

Local Histories, Global Heritage, Local Heritage, Global Histories: Colonialism, History, and the Making of Heritage, international conference organized by the German Historical Institute London and held at the GHIL, 16-17 May 2009.

The relationship between colonial power structures, the 'making' of modern archaeological/architectural heritage, and the writing of histories of colonized societies since the early days of modern European colonial empires has for some time been the subject of scholarly interest. Taking the cue from Edward Said's theorizing on orientalism, one major focus of such studies has been the hegemonic nature of colonial practices in the making of monuments and the writing of histories of colonized societies. Recent research has, for instance, drawn attention to the appropriation of local sites by colonial officials, archaeologists, and historians from local groups and communities and the re-framing of the histories of these sites in such a way as to serve the interests of colonialism. The ultimate goal was to emphasize the stabilizing, civilizing, and guardianship role of colonial rule in preserving the cultural heritage, history, and thus the social fabric of the colonies in order to provide legitimation for colonialism.

Comparatively less attention has been paid in studies of colonial archaeology, preservation, and heritage to the fact that colonialism itself was 'neither monolithic nor omnipotent'.¹ Despite the discursive thrust of colonial heritage thinking and history writing, in practice colonial officials and archaeologists were often circumscribed in their endeavours. This limitation on the autonomy of colonial regimes came from various sources: local communities and social practice on the spot, but also groups of heritage thinkers in the imperial metropolises and outside, all of whom engaged in various different and asymmetrical ways with preservation, heritage practices, and conceptualizing the past. At the same time, the 'making' of heritage in colonized societies was also taking place against the backdrop of thinking about heritage in a global sense. Colonial systems on the one hand acted as major agents of such global ideas of heritage and enforced these in the colonies. On the other hand, colonialism was itself part of the chequered and contested history of globalized ideas

¹ Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley, 1997), 6.

of heritage, and colonial authorities frequently found themselves having to stave off the invasion of global heritage thinking, often by resorting to the argument of specificity of local practice.

The goal of the conference was to understand colonial practices of rewriting the past of colonized societies and heritage-making on the interface of the global and the local. The papers were drawn from a wide canvas of regions which have experienced colonial or proto-colonial rule; at the same time, the framework of the conference envisaged a focus on specific themes and questions cutting across specific regional contexts, even while taking the specificity of regional case studies into account. Hence, while the papers related, for example, to British colonialism in South Asia, French colonialism in South-east Asia and North Africa, Dutch colonialism in Indonesia, and Japanese colonialism in Korea, the sections were divided into specific themes of the interface of the local, the regional, the national, and the global, rather than into regional groups. A point worth highlighting is the inclusion of the braided history of heritage thinking in colonial and metropolitan cultures in Europe and Asia, as well as a number of papers dedicated to areas which were not directly under colonial rule, but where the politics of heritage-making took on a strong colonial/postcolonial character. The conference was divided into six sessions and included a keynote lecture.

Following the welcome address by Andreas Gestrich (Director, GHIL), and a brief introduction to the agenda of the conference by the convenor Indra Sengupta (GHIL), the first session got underway. Entitled '(Post)colonial Predicaments: Defining the Local and the Global', it was chaired by John MacKenzie (Lancaster). The two papers in this short session dwelt on the issue of contestation of heritage sites and museums along colonialist, nationalist, regionalist, and local lines and thus addressed a problem that lies at the heart of studies of heritage and the politics of the past: the uneven, conflicting, and ever-changing character of the claims of various groups and communities to heritage. Tze M. Loo (Richmond, Virginia) showed how Shuri castle became the centre of conflicting claims to the past: on the one hand, it became the target of local claims to the site as symbol of the pre-colonial, Ryūkyū past of the Okinawa prefecture; on the other, it came to be appropriated by the 'bigger' claims of a Japanese national heritage, as well as a world heritage site. Sraman Mukherjee (CSSS, Kolkata) addressed the question of the politics of

Conference Reports

place as it revolved around the region-centred claims to the collections of the Bihar Sharif museum in colonial eastern India vis-à-vis the 'greater' claims of the Indian Museum, established by the colonial state for pan-Indian collections.

The second panel, called 'Fractured Canons: Heritage Conservation in Colonial Contexts', which was chaired by Sudeshna Guha (Cambridge), engaged with how European knowledge was called into question in the colonies. Fenneke Sysling (VU, Amsterdam) focused on the expeditions undertaken to Dutch New Guinea between 1903 and 1936 in order to aid research in physical anthropology seeking to show how the Papuan past and present were rewritten through racial science. At the same time, she showed how local practice intervened in the production of notions of human heritage. Indra Sengupta (GHI, London) dwelt on the manual for conservation of ancient buildings written by the Director of Archaeology in India, John Marshall, and published in 1923. She stressed that the manual needed to be read not only as a colonial text, but also as a work that was produced in the entangled history of metropole and colony, which sought both to reflect and define the local at a time when notions of preservation of heritage were increasingly acquiring a universal character.

The post-lunch session, 'Managing "Alien" Pasts', chaired by Holger Hooek (Liverpool), consisted of a panel that engaged with the role, functions, and self-perception of the bureaucracy as guardians of what they self-consciously perceived as an 'alien' past. Michael S. Dodson (Indiana/Bloomington) in his analysis of the historical preservation of small-town North India (Jaunpur) referred to what he described as the 'spatial imagination' of colonial governance and the bureaucracy, which was caught in the tension between the aesthetics of monumentality and urban preservation on the one hand and the realities of North Indian city life on the other. In the realization of their ideas on a day-to-day basis, colonial officials had to operate at a highly localized level, dependent as they were on the consensus of a wide range of local actors. E. Taylor Atkins (Northern Illinois) spoke of the paradoxical effects of the curatorial practices of the Japanese colonial bureaucracy in Korea: the very same notion of Korean heritage that was created by Japanese colonialism for its own political ends was used in independent Korea to define its national past. Lucia Gunning (London) looked at the links between the activities of Foreign Office officials in the Aegean and the growth of the British

Museum's antiquities collection against the backdrop of an Anglo-French competition for the acquisition of antiquities.

Due to the inability of the keynote speaker Monica Juneja (Heidelberg) to deliver her talk in person, the paper was read out. Juneja drew out the tension between religion and aesthetics, and the clear separation of the two, that goes back to colonial engagements with India's tradition and underlies the postcolonial definition of heritage as it is articulated in public discourse in India today.

The second day of the conference began with a session on 'Colonial Heritage and Metropolitan Cultures', which was chaired by Daniel Sherman (North Carolina/Chapel Hill). All three papers engaged with colonialism and heritage in metropolitan cultures. Robert Aldrich stressed the ways in which indigenous heritage played a role in French colonies and how this heritage made its way into the French *patrimoine*. Nathan Fisher (Oxford) focused on domestic debates as well as the specific climate of internationalism in the aftermath of the First World War to explain Britain's archaeological policy in the Near East. Daniel Steinbach (Dublin) dwelt on the construction of a past in Germany's African colonies by means of a *Heimat* history, which enabled German colonialists to inscribe the history of the colonies into the history of the German nation.

The session 'Travelling Images, Objects, Sites: Changing Meanings and Locations of Heritage', chaired by Deborah Sutton (Lancaster), was dedicated to the essential mobility and changeability of images and objects in the construction of heritage. Thus Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff (KITLV, Leiden/NIOD, Amsterdam) drew on the example of the Buddhist temple site of Borobudur in Java to show how such sites produce and disseminate knowledge that then leads to the production of a large number of artistic objects, and finally to the growth of international art collections centred on the site. The travels of these objects reveal how academic, trade, and tourist networks in the nineteenth century started to develop and interact from local to global levels and vice versa. Hyung Il Pai (California, Santa Barbara) developed the theme of moving objects and images for the tourist trade for the construction of a past that continues to this day. Arne Segelke (Hamburg) used the case of the Gal Vihara in Sri Lanka to show that the multiple and changing readings of the site included, in turn, a historical, an aesthetic, a national, and a religious significance.

Conference Reports

The brief final panel, 'History, Progress and Heritage-Making', chaired by Astrid Swenson (Cambridge) included two papers. Colette Appelian (Berkeley City) focused on how the advent of modernity in the form of motor cars in Fez, in French Morocco, changed the whole experience of monumental landscapes. Maximilian Hartmuth (Sabanci/Istanbul) conceptualized the proto-colonial cultural practices of shaping history and heritage in the Balkans, which was not a colonized region in the traditional sense of the term.

The concluding session was opened by two commentaries on the proceedings of the conference by Daniel Sherman and John MacKenzie respectively. Daniel Sherman referred to the themes of curating and the significance of the visual archive and 'moving' images, as well as imaginary histories marked by landscape that a number of papers addressed to draw attention to the movement and malleability of objects and monuments that are characteristic of the process of heritage-making, especially in colonial and postcolonial contexts. Preservation laws, in his view, represented a mere formalization of this process. John Mackenzie reiterated the notion of heritage-making as a dynamic, ever-changing process and argued that hegemony is an inadequate explanatory framework for understanding the construction of heritage in colonial contexts. He dwelt on the rise of a large, wealthy bourgeoisie, which was replicated in the empire, and the growth of a bourgeois public sphere as central to the development of ideas of heritage-making. The concluding discussion developed around questions such as the participation and role of missionaries, Christianization and women in the colonies, public sphere and aristocratic involvement in the colonies, modernity and heritage, including the question of pre-modern legacies in heritage-making, heritage and ideas of the nation-state. The discussion raised the question of the ethics of heritage-making and stressed the need in any historical treatment of the subject to find a balance between, on the one hand, socio-historical approaches and, on the other, the emphasis placed by postcolonial studies on power structures. It was agreed that a great degree of self-reflexivity was called for among historians trying to analyse how communities and groups in colonial systems fashioned and understood their pasts.

A conference volume is planned.

INDRA SENGUPTA (GHIL)

South Asian Experiences of the World Wars: New Evidence and New Approaches, workshop organized jointly by the School of Oriental and African Studies, the Zentrum Moderner Orient Berlin, and the German Historical Institute London, and held at the GHIL and SOAS on 26 May 2009.

The participation in and experience of war by non-Europeans in general and South Asians in particular has, in the wake of the recent boom in historical research on the experiences and memories of war, received some attention. However, most of this research has dealt with the war experience of soldiers (South Asia was famously utilized as an 'English barracks in the Oriental seas' throughout the colonial period and as a recruitment base during both world wars). Thus numerous publications have shed some light on 'sepoys' (as South Asian soldiers were called), on both their institutional involvements and their experiences.¹ This research, however, has overlooked certain other, significant ways in which the world wars were experienced by South Asians. Auxiliary non-combatant forces, for example, which were comparable in number to the sepoys, have hardly been dealt with. Further, the impact of war was deep and transformative for the families of those shipped to the battlefields of the world as well as for various other groups in South Asian society. Neither of these perspectives, that is, the experience of non-combatants and a social historical approach, has been dealt with in historical research. Not only this, but the main sources used so far for writing the history of these experiences have been drawn from soldiers' letters contained in the colonial state's censorship reports; non-British archives have hardly been explored for such purposes, nor have the remarkable efforts of historians of Africa to generate oral histories of the world wars inspired similar projects in South Asia.

Some recent research and ongoing research projects, however, seem to indicate that the field is both expanding and transforming itself. The workshop organized by SOAS, ZMO, and the GHIL brought together a number of scholars from various disciplinary backgrounds working on the subject and based in Britain or Germany to take stock of the state of research and discuss the prob-

¹ See e.g. David Omissi (ed.), *Indian Voices of the Great War: Soldiers' Letters, 1914-1918* (London, 1999).

Conference Reports

lem of locating/generating new evidence. In this context, the workshop also introduced to scholars in Britain the rich holdings of various archives in Berlin on South Asian (combatant as well as non-combatant) prisoners of war in Germany during First World War, which contain numerous unique sound recordings.

After an introduction to the workshop by Ravi Ahuja (SOAS, London), Heike Liebau (ZMO, Berlin) drew on the findings of German research to talk about the way in which South Asian prisoners of war have been documented in German archives and museums. Gajendra Singh (Edinburgh) spoke of the experience of the Indian National Army's interrogating chamber between 1941 and 1947. The session was chaired by Andreas Gestrich (GHI, London).

In the pre-lunch session, chaired by Yasmin Khan (Royal Holloway, London), Franziska Roy (Warwick) dwelt on the Indian civilians' experience of the First World War. Samiksha Sehrawat (Strathclyde) analysed the architectural specificity of war hospitals for Indian troops on the Western Front to show how perceptions of ethnicity influenced the style of such hospitals. Santanu Das (Queen Mary, London) focused on the writings of various groups of Indian actors in the First World War to draw out what he called an 'intimate history' of wartime experience.

The post-lunch session, chaired by Elleke Boehmer (Oxford), focused on representations of both war and Indian sepoys in various genres. Christian Koller (Bangor) spoke on the representations of Indians in German propaganda in the First World War. Talat Ahmed (Goldsmiths, London) argued convincingly in favour of using literary works as historical sources for the reconstruction of wartime experience. Amarjit Chandan (London) used Punjabi folk songs dwelling on the First World War to show how songs and poetry from the traditional catchment areas of the sepoys, which have rarely been touched on in academic research, can be extremely fruitful sources of information about how war was experienced by soldiers and the families that they left behind.

The penultimate session, chaired by Indra Sengupta (GHI, London), was dedicated to exploring the material contained in the Berlin Sound Archives. With the help of recordings from the archives Jürgen Mahrenholz (Lautarchiv, Berlin) spoke of the holdings of the archives that were relevant for the theme of the workshop and future research in the field.

South Asian Experiences of the World Wars

The final, plenary session, largely truncated due to pressures of time, briefly touched on future research perspectives.

In the evening, the award-winning film *The Half-Moon Files: A Ghost Story*, directed by Philipp Scheffner, on Indian soldiers in the First World War and the entangled history of India, Germany, and the British Empire, was shown at SOAS. The film was introduced by Britta Lange (ÖAW, Vienna) and was followed by a discussion led by Nicole Wolf (Goldsmiths, London).

INDRA SENGUPTA (GHIL)

NOTICEBOARD

Research Seminar

The GHIL regularly organizes a research seminar at which recipients of grants from the Institute 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 and meetings usually start at 5 p.m. For further information concerning future dates please check the GHIL's website or contact Dr Martina Steber (tel. 020 7309 2015; email: msteber@ghil.ac.uk).

Forthcoming Conferences

The Cultural Industries in the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: Britain and Germany Compared. Conference organized jointly by the German Historical Institute London and the Centre for British Studies at the Humboldt University, Berlin.

Date: 20–21 Nov. 2009

Venue: German Historical Institute London

Conveners: Christiane Eisenberg (Centre for British Studies at the Humboldt University, Berlin) and Andreas Gestrich (GHIL)

Increasingly during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, patrons, associations, courts, and the other public purveyors of culture were joined by private enterprises that approached the organization of cultural events as a business, using professional methods such as targeted advertising and cooperation with the mass press, and employing professional artists and managers. These methods were applied not only to new cultural forms such as film, cinema, and sport, but also to such traditional ones as theatre, concerts, choral performances, and variety shows. The growing popularity of commercial culture irritated social reformers and politicians, and stimulated discussion

of political interventions and new opportunities for social engineering.

As cultural industries of this sort had a long history in Britain, going back as far as the early modern period, they had become an accepted part of modern society by the late nineteenth century, like industrial production or the consumption of goods, and legal copyright was established early. By contrast, the literature on the cultural industries in Germany gives the impression that the breakthrough came later there, not until the end of the nineteenth century. It suggests that socially and politically, commercial culture was regarded in a highly critical way, some of its aspects being strongly rejected, and that the legal basis of commercialization was established with some delay. On the other hand, from the start political parties, churches, and other ideological interests seem to have been readier to intervene politically and to nurture the cultural industries in Germany than in Britain—an aspect that is of interest in relation to the formulation and political instrumentalization of mass culture during the inter-war period.

The conference will investigate the context within which the cultural industries were created in Britain and Germany, and ask whether the paths of development and modes of reaction were really as different as the literature suggests. In addition, it will analyse perceptions and mutual cooperation between the actors.

European Societies of Work in Transformation: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives on Great Britain, Sweden, and West Germany during the 1970s.

Date: 26–28 Nov. 2009

Venue: German Historical Institute London

Conveners: Kerstin Brückweh (GHIL), Andreas Gestrich (GHIL), Bernhard Rieger (University College London)

During the 1970s, many European countries experienced profound structural transformations that affected their character as industrial societies. In particular, the fundamental changes that reshaped the world of work galvanized public attention as much as they puzzled policymakers and social scientists. Moreover, countless people

Noticeboard

directly affected by the downturn made their grievances known in public. Focusing on Great Britain, Sweden, and West Germany, this conference compares how three European industrial societies struggled to deal with challenges of economic change in a broad range of economic, social, and cultural settings. While the 1970s signalled the end of West Germany's much-vaunted 'economic miracle', Britain experienced the difficulties against a backdrop of several decades of patchy economic performance. In Sweden, meanwhile, the 1970s brought new challenges after a sustained era of growth, but mass unemployment did not manifest itself until the 1980s. Our conference explores to what extent these different economic trajectories shaped public debates and private reactions as well as expectations in each country. We hope to open up this new field for comparative and transnational historical research.

Panels at the conference will discuss

- Structural Economic Transformations of the 1970s in Comparative Perspective
- The Search for Remedies to Problems of Work and Unemployment in the 1970s
- Beyond Utopias: Expectations of the Future in Societies of Work during the 1970s
- The Changing Role of Families in the 1970s
- The Expansion of Consumerism during a Period of Economic Problems
- The Politics of Education in Societies of Work

Postgraduate Students' Conference

On 14–16 January 2010 the German Historical Institute London will hold its fourteenth annual conference for postgraduate research students in the UK and Ireland working on German history, Anglo-German relations, or comparative topics. The intention is to give Ph.D. students an opportunity to present their work in progress and to discuss it with other students working in the same field. It is hoped that the exchange of ideas and methods will be fruitful for all participants. The Institute will meet travel expenses up to a standard rail

Noticeboard

fare within the UK (special arrangements for students from Ireland), and also arrange and pay for student accommodation, where necessary, for those who live outside London. For further information please contact the Secretary, Anita Bellamy (tel. 020 7309 2023; email: abellamy@ghil.ac.uk).

At the Margins of the Welfare State: Changing Patterns of Including and Excluding the 'Deviant' Poor in Europe 1870–1933.

Date: 25–27 Feb. 2010

Venue: German Historical Institute London

Conveners: Andreas Gestrich (GHIL), Beate Althammer (University of Trier)

The Collaborative Research Centre 'Strangers and Poor People: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion from Classical Antiquity to the Present Day (SFB 600)' at the University of Trier focuses its research on the modes of interaction with strangers and the poor developed by different societies from antiquity to the twentieth century. The conceptual pair 'inclusion/exclusion' provides the tool for analysing the ambivalence and dynamics of discourses and social practices when dealing with these two groups.

Using this analytical framework the conference will ask whether, and to what extent, the emergence of modern welfare states since the late nineteenth century has changed the perception, representation, and treatment of the 'deviant' poor. It aims to develop a European perspective on the relationship between poverty and 'deviance' by analysing expert discourses, administrative practices, welfare management, and representations in the mass media. Equally important, however, are the 'deviant' poor themselves. What experiences did these people voice in autobiographies, letters, and other testimonials? How did those affected perceive their 'deviancy' and their treatment, and what kind of counter-narratives did they develop? As the 'margins' of the welfare state can also be understood in a geographical sense, contributions on the economically 'backward' and peripheral parts of Europe are especially welcome.

Noticeboard

German Society in the Nazi Era: 'Volksgemeinschaft' between Ideological Projection and Social Practice. International conference organized by the Institut für Zeitgeschichte München-Berlin and the German Historical Institute London.

Date: 25–27 Mar. 2010

Venue: German Historical Institute London

Convenors: Horst Möller (IfZ), Andreas Gestrich (GHIL), Bernhard Gotto (IfZ), Martina Steber (GHIL)

One of the most striking changes of perspective in recent research on National Socialism is the new interest which younger historians in particular are taking in German society during the Nazi period. Adopting questions, theories, and methods derived from the cultural turn, they are examining the social foundations of the Nazi dictatorship in order to explain the regime's structure and its system of rule. The term *Volksgemeinschaft*, which has increasingly been used as the starting point from which to characterize Nazi society, can help to define both the visionary dimension of Nazi social policy, and its integrative and exclusive aspects. This change in perspective can be observed in Britain as well as Germany. It is noticeable that the social history approaches which shaped the discussion from the end of the 1970s to the middle of the 1980s rarely serve as reference points for the new research on Nazi society. Categories such as class or social inequality no longer play a large part in recent studies, not even in Britain, where they were the subject of especially close investigation.

The conference will address these new approaches, but emphasize their social history dimension. It is mainly interested in the social consequences of social practice inspired by the notion of the *Volksgemeinschaft*. It will systematically investigate the functional mechanisms and characteristics of society in the Nazi *Altreich*, while incorporating the enormous dynamic for change which was inherent in the Nazi regime and casting light on processes of social change from the Weimar Republic to the immediate post-war period.

New GHIL Publications

FRANK BÖSCH, *Öffentliche Geheimnisse: Skandale, Politik und Medien in Deutschland und Großbritannien, 1880–1914*, Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts London/Publications of the German Historical Institute London, 65 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009), vi + 540 pp. ISBN 978 3 486 58857 6. €59.80

Abstract

In the late nineteenth century the whole of Western Europe saw numerous spectacular scandals that led to political crises and indignation across national boundaries. This study looks at these political scandals systematically for the first time, drawing international comparisons, and using extensive archival sources. How they evolved and the effects they had are analysed by comparing Britain with Germany, but also taking account of the transfer effects across national borders. Approaching politics from the perspective of cultural history, the book addresses the question as to how far the scandals influenced political communication, power structures, and cultural norms, and how the relationship between politics and public changed. Thus it contributes equally to cultural, media, and political history.

Although the structures of politics and public were different in Germany and Britain, the scandals reveal similar tendencies in the two countries. In the German Kaiserreich the media and the Reichstag imposed limits on the authoritarian state by the scandals, while the British scandals show that Britain's political and cultural liberalism should not be over-estimated. In both countries the governments sought to prevent scandals by influencing the judiciary, though this was generally counter-productive. What also becomes clear is that the increase in scandals in the two countries was not only attributable to the simultaneous emergence of the mass and popular press. Rather, the revelations were the result of interaction between politicians and those newspapers closely connected with them. They deliberately broke rules of communication in order to attract attention and stir up emotions, and to instrumentalize the revelations for the purposes of their general political aims.

The scandals also played a part in removing taboos. They made such issues as homosexuality, divorce, and relationships with

Noticeboard

African women into popular topics of public discussion. They created not only stereotypes, but also new knowledge of spheres that were previously relatively unknown. In this way the scandals developed normative demands as regards the behaviour of monarchs, politicians, and civil servants. Moreover, they led to legal reforms, but also to a pessimistic perception of increasing moral decline. In each case the British commentary on German scandals and vice versa reinforced ideas about the other country.

FABIAN KLOSE, *Menschenrechte im Schatten kolonialer Gewalt: Die Dekolonisierungskriege in Kenia und Algerien, 1945–1962*, Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts London/Publications of the German Historical Institute London, 66 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009), x + 346 pp. ISBN 978 3 486 58884 2. €39.80

Abstract

The process of decolonization and the institutionalization of the general idea of human rights are two of the key features of twentieth-century world history. This dissertation combines these two fields of research, which so far have generally been looked at separately, and examines the interactions and repercussions in each case. The focus here is on the wars of decolonization and their massive violation of human rights.

Using the Mau-Mau war in Kenya (1952–6) and the Algerian war (1954–62) as examples, this comparative study examines the policy of violence of the two colonial powers, Britain and France. Analysis of the colonial state of emergency, the 'anti-subversive' military strategy, and the significance of humanitarian international law in both conflicts produces generally valid conclusions about the radicalization of colonial violence and the role of universal rights in the wake of decolonization. The crimes committed during the wars of decolonization were diametrically opposed to the global acceptance of the idea of human rights. Virtually until the end of decolonization they did lasting damage to the international human rights regime.

The study draws a wide arc and integrates three central topics: human rights and decolonization, wars of decolonization and the unleashing of colonial violence, and the repercussions on the international human rights discourse. Methodologically at the interface

Noticeboard

between a modern political history of ideas and a comparative history of events, the work is based on previously inaccessible material from a series of international archives such as those of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations Humans Rights Commission.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

REFUGEE VOICES *THE ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH REFUGEES* *AUDIO-VISUAL TESTIMONY ARCHIVE*

'Refugee Voices' is a collection of 150 filmed interviews with former refugees from Nazism now living in Britain. All the interviews, the interview summaries and transcripts, and the interviewees' database have been digitized and are now available for use (see the website: www.ajr.org.uk/refugeevoices). This paper describes the background and general methodology of the project and gives an introduction to the 'Refugee Voices' in this valuable oral history archive.

Background

In 2002 Dr Anthony Grenville, Dr Bea Lewkowicz, and Carol Seigel curated the exhibition 'Continental Britons: Jewish Refugees from Nazi Europe', which was funded by the Association of Jewish Refugees (AJR) and shown at the Jewish Museum. The exhibition contained a film made by Dr Lewkowicz, 53 minutes long and consisting of edited extracts from 16 specially conducted interviews with former refugees ('Continental Britons: Refugee Voices'). Following the success of the film, Dr Anthony Grenville and Dr Bea Lewkowicz submitted the proposal for 'Refugee Voices', a large-scale video oral history project, to the AJR. The AJR, the organization that has represented the Jewish refugees from Hitler in Britain since 1941, appreciated the importance of creating a resource that would memorialize the history and experience of the refugees and commissioned this project. The first interview was carried out in January 2003.

The remit of the project was to conduct 120 interviews (subsequently increased to 150) as widely as possible across the entire UK, avoiding too exclusive a concentration on north-west London, the principal area of refugee settlement. Consequently, there is a balance between the number of interviews carried out in London and the south-east and those carried out in the Midlands, the north of England, Scotland, and other regions. The spread of the interviews

ranges from Glasgow and Edinburgh to Winchester and Southend, from Batley and Knaresborough to Bristol and Cardiff. A considerable number of interviews were filmed in the Manchester area, some of them with members of the local Orthodox Jewish community, a group thus far under-represented in collections of interviews with German-Jewish refugees.

A further aim of 'Refugee Voices' was to record the experiences of the 'ordinary people' who form the bulk of the refugee community in Britain, and not only to concentrate on the prominent and high-achieving refugees, only a handful of whom were interviewed for the 'Refugee Voices' collection (for example, the film set designer Ken Adam). Most of the interviewees have never been interviewed before, and very few on film.

Methodology

The development of oral history in the UK is clearly linked to the development of *Alltagsgeschichte* and 'history from below', which attempted to give voice to marginalized groups, to 'give history back to the people in their own words' (Paul Thompson). At the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, some oral historians challenged the pure 'recovery' and 'gathering' focus of oral history and asserted that memory should be moved to the centre stage of analysis and not only remain the method of oral history. These methodological developments suggested that the purpose of the 'Refugee Voices' interviews needed to be two-fold:

- a) To gather evidence of historical experiences not widely recorded (of the emigration and settlement of German-speaking refugees in the UK in general and specific experiences in particular, for example, women as domestic servants, accounts of internment, refugees as POWs in Germany etc.), and
- b) To enable an individual to narrate his/her life story and reflect on his/her experiences.

Keeping in mind the aim of historical reconstruction on the one hand, and the creation of narrative memory on the other, the nature of the questions posed in the interviews was of crucial importance. They needed to be open, not suggestive, and descriptive ('Could you

Special Announcement

please describe . . . ?', 'What was it like . . . ?', 'How do you remember . . . ?'). Many of the interviews start with the question: 'Can you tell us about your family background?' The answers can vary from one minute to five minutes, from talking about grandparents to immediately talking about Hitler and the experience of emigration. The interviewers were also instructed to accept silences as part of the interview. The interviews vary in length from one to six hours, the average being between two and three hours. The interviews were conducted by a very small number of experienced and knowledgeable interviewers, which makes for a high degree of consistency in the quality of the interviews and the form that they take.

All the interviews are life story interviews, starting with the interviewee's family background and then following his/her life chronologically up to the time of the interview. While allowing a considerable degree of flexibility, this also ensures a broad measure of uniformity and comparability across the range of the collection overall. The interviewers and camera operators were given guidelines, which included notes about the kind of questions and the kind of shots recommended (medium head-and-shoulder shot of the interviewee throughout the interview and one wide shot at the end of the interview). The advantage of video testimony, as James Young has stated, is that unlike literary testimony (which is edited), silences are part of the image, and unlike in audio interviews, gestures, movements, and expressions provide an additional layer of interpretation.

Inspired by other video history projects, such as the Fortunoff Video Archive at Yale University (4,300 interviews), the University of Southern California Shoah Foundation's collection (52,000 interviews), and the Voice/Vision Holocaust Survivors Oral History Archive at the University of Michigan, Dearborn (300 interviews), 'Refugee Voices' is the first dedicated video archive of life histories of refugees from Nazism in the UK. It was decided very early on in the project that all interviews needed to be fully transcribed, in order to provide the best access for researchers to the raw material of the interviews.

All 150 interviews have now been fully transcribed, time-coded, and catalogued, enabling a researcher to view an interview and then to read a transcript of the words spoken in it, or vice versa. The time code in the transcripts makes it possible for a researcher to locate specific passages within an interview in a short amount of time. Accom-

panying the collection is a comprehensive database of the interviewees with 47 separate categories, including place and date of birth, parents' details, manner of emigration, prisons/camps and war experiences, as well as information about the interviewees' post-war lives, careers, families etc. The database makes a treasure trove of information easily available to researchers. They can easily locate information relevant to any number of specific areas of interest, for example Kindertransportees, domestic servants, internment on the Isle of Man, or relating to interviewees from specific locations. In this connection, one can note that the largest numbers of interviewees were born in Berlin (31) and Vienna (24), followed by other German cities, but that the places of birth extend from Britain and Belgium to the countries of Eastern Europe and to Greece, Turkey, and Carpatho-Ruthenia.

Each interview is also accompanied by still shots of photographs of family members and friends, of places of importance for the interviewee and of other items and documents of special importance in the interviewee's life. These filmed photographs, artefacts and documents furnish a rich source of images for educational or documentary purposes.

Overview

The interviews cover a very wide spectrum of experiences, including those of refugees who escaped to Britain before the outbreak of war in 1939, those who survived in hiding in occupied Europe, and those who survived the camps. The life stories of the interviewees reflect many aspects of the history of emigration and survival. Alongside those who came direct from Central Europe are people who came to Britain via Shanghai, via Palestine, and on the notorious ship *St Louis*; there are also people who were in the east of Poland in 1939, were deported to Central Asia by the Soviets and made their way to the Middle East after the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, joining the British forces there. There is an interview with a survivor who was smuggled to safety from Denmark to Sweden in the famous sea-borne rescue of Jews, an interview with a survivor who was released from Bergen-Belsen to Switzerland in January 1945 as part of a prisoner exchange, and an interview with the only surviving person who was present at the signing of the Israeli Declaration of Independence in 1948. The

Special Announcement

archive also features interviews with people who have rarely spoken about their experiences.

'Refugee Voices' is not an archive devoted solely to the period of National Socialism and the Holocaust. Since they explore the interviewees' entire lives, the interviews contain a large amount of material about the Jewish communities from which they came, going back well before 1933 and setting events in the various countries of origin in the context of a broader historical evolution. Similarly, the collection contains a wealth of material on the lives of the interviewees in Britain (and elsewhere) after 1945: on the manner of their settlement, the obstacles they encountered, the degree of their integration, their sense of identity, and their religious affiliation, as well as their professional development, their attitudes to Britain, Israel and their native lands, their family life, and their hopes and aspirations for their children. Some of these experiences and themes have been captured in the film 'Moments and Memories' (40 minutes long), directed by Dr Bea Lewkowicz. This film has been selected as a film resource for the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust and can be ordered from the AJR.

Outlook

Completed in 2008, 'Refugee Voices' consists of more than 450 hours of film and some 7,500 pages of typed transcripts, all available in digital form. It will form a very valuable resource for academics, researchers, educationalists, and others with a professional interest in such fields as Jewish Studies, Holocaust Studies, Migration and Refugee Studies, as well as modern British, German, Austrian, and European history.

Testimonies personalize history and enrich our historical understanding of events. The research and educational value of a collection such as 'Refugee Voices' must not be underestimated. One interviewee himself points to the importance of the interviews gathered in 'Refugee Voices': 'As time goes on, the memory of those days and the importance of it will dim with time and this programme [Refugee Voices] will help to keep it in people's minds and hopefully let the future generations have a better life, in a better world' (Arnold Weinberg, Interview 61, Refugee Voices Archive).

The wealth of material that 'Refugee Voices' contains and the manner in which it has been conceived and brought into being

Refugee Voices

should make it an indispensable tool for researchers in the field for many years to come. The Association of Jewish Refugees is to be congratulated for its foresight and generous support of the 'Refugee Voices Audio-Visual Testimony Archive'.

Anthony Grenville and Bea Lewkowicz, June 2009.

LIBRARY NEWS

GHIL acquires *Refugee Voices*

The GHIL library subscribes to a wide range of databases and electronic journals and constantly tries to make more digital resources available to its readers. It is therefore with great pleasure that we announce the acquisition of *Refugee Voices*, a major audio-visual archive for the study of the Holocaust and the history of German refugees to Britain during and after the Second World War. Through filmed interviews *Refugee Voices* provides insights into the life stories of 150 survivors of the Nazi persecutions in Germany who found refuge in Britain. All interviews can be listened to in one of the library's reading rooms. The interviews have been fully transcribed and extensively catalogued so that they can be searched in various ways. A fuller account of the making of this unique resource and the research opportunities it offers is given in the preceding announcement in this issue of the *GHIL Bulletin*.

Recent Acquisitions

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

- Acta Pacis Westphalicae*, series 3: *Protokolle, Verhandlungsakten, Diarien, Varia*, pt. A: *Protokolle*; pt. A.3: *Die Beratungen des Fürstenrates in Osnabrück*; pt. A.3.6: *Juni–Juli 1648* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2009)
- Adenauer, Konrad, *Briefe*, x. pt. 1: *Oktober 1963–September 1965*; pt. 2: *September 1965–April 1967* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009)
- Aust, Stefan, *Der Baader-Meinhof-Komplex* (3rd edn.; Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 2008)
- Avraham, Doron, *In der Krise der Moderne: Der preußische Konservatismus im Zeitalter gesellschaftlicher Veränderungen 1848–1876*, trans. from the Hebrew by Markus Lemke, *Schriftenreihe des Minerva Instituts für deutsche Geschichte der Universität Tel Aviv*, 27 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2008)

Recent Acquisitions

- Baberowski, Jörg, Hartmut Kaelble, and Jürgen Schriewer (eds.), *Selbstbilder und Fremdbilder: Repräsentation sozialer Ordnungen im Wandel, Eigene und fremde Welten*, 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2008)
- Bajohr, Frank and Dieter Pohl, *Massenmord und schlechtes Gewissen: Die deutsche Bevölkerung, die NS-Führung und der Holocaust, Die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2008)
- Barkow, Ben, Raphael Gross, and Michael Lenarz (eds.), *Novemberpogrom 1938: Die Augenzeugenberichte der Wiener Library*, London (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2008)
- Barton, John H., *The Evolution of the Trade Regime: Politics, Law, and Economics of the GATT and the WTO* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008)
- Bayer, Karen, 'How Dead is Hitler?': *Der Britische Starreporter Sefton Delmer und die Deutschen*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für europäische Geschichte Mainz, 219: Abteilung für Universalgeschichte (Mainz: von Zabern, 2008)
- Beales, Derek Edward Dawson, *Joseph II, ii. Against the World, 1780–1790* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- Beattie, Andrew H., *Playing Politics with History: The Bundestag Inquiries into East Germany*, Studies in Contemporary European History, 4 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008)
- Beck, Hermann, *The Fateful Alliance: German Conservatives and Nazis in 1933. The Machtergreifung in a New Light* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008)
- Benz, Wolfgang (ed.), *Handbuch des Antisemitismus*, i. Länder und Regionen (Munich: Saur, 2008)
- Blessing, Ralph, *Der mögliche Frieden: Die Modernisierung der Außenpolitik und die deutsch-französischen Beziehungen 1923–1929*, Pariser historische Studien, 76 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Brandes, Inga and Katrin Marx-Jaskulski (eds.), *Armenfürsorge und Wohltätigkeit: Ländliche Gesellschaften in Europa, 1850–1930*, Inklusion, Exklusion, 11 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008)
- Brodman, James William, *Charity and Religion in Medieval Europe* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2009)
- Brophy, James Mark, *Popular Culture and the Public Sphere in the Rhineland, 1800–1850*, New Studies in European History (2nd impr.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Library News

- Bruns, Claudia, *Politik des Eros: Der Männerbund in Wissenschaft, Politik und Jugendkultur, 1880–1934* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008)
- Bucher, Rainer, *Hitlers Theologie* (Würzburg: Echter, 2008)
- Buchheim, Christoph (ed.), *German Industry in the Nazi Period*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 174, 3 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008)
- Burke, Peter and Ronnie Po-chia Hsia (eds.), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, European Science Foundation (2nd impr.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Buschmann, Nikolaus and Karl Borromäus Murr (eds.), *Treue: Politische Loyalität und militärische Gefolgschaft in der Moderne* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008)
- Caplan, Jane (ed.), *Nazi Germany*, The Short Oxford History of Germany, 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Clemen, Gudrun, *Schmalkalden – Biberach – Ravensburg: Städtische Entwicklungen vom Spätmittelalter zur Frühen Neuzeit*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 203 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2009)
- Conze, Eckart, *Die Suche nach Sicherheit: Eine Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von 1949 bis in die Gegenwart* (Munich: Siedler, 2009)
- Cortright, David, *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Creuzberger, Stefan, *Kampf für die Einheit: Das gesamtdeutsche Ministerium und die politische Kultur des Kalten Krieges 1949–1969*, Schriften des Bundesarchivs, 69 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2008)
- Daston, Lorraine and Michael Stolleis (eds.), *Natural Law and Laws of Nature in Early Modern Europe: Jurisprudence, Theology, Moral and Natural Philosophy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008)
- Demel, Walter von and Ferdinand Kramer, with the assistance of Barbara Kink (eds.), *Adel und Adelskultur in Bayern*, Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte, Beiheft 32 (Munich: Beck, 2008)
- Denzel, Markus A., *Das System des bargeldlosen Zahlungsverkehrs europäischer Prägung vom Mittelalter bis 1914*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 201 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008)
- Dethlefs, Gerd, Armin Owzar, and Gisela Weiß (eds.), *Modell und Wirklichkeit: Politik, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Großherzogtum Berg und im Königreich Westphalen*, Forschungen zur Regionalgeschichte, 56 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008)

- Diner, Dan, *Cataclysms: A History of the Twentieth Century from Europe's Edge*, trans. William Templar with Joel Golb, George L. Mosse Series in Modern European Cultural and Intellectual History (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008)
- Doerry, Janine, Alexandra Klei, et al. (eds.), *NS-Zwangslager in Westdeutschland, Frankreich und den Niederlanden: Geschichte und Erinnerung* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008)
- Duceppe-Lamarre, François and Jens Ivo Engels (eds.), *Umwelt und Herrschaft in der Geschichte*, Ateliers des Deutschen Historischen Instituts Paris, 2 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Düding, Dieter, *Parlamentarismus in Nordrhein-Westfalen 1946–1980: Vom Fünfparteien- zum Zweiparteienlandtag*, Handbuch der Geschichte des deutschen Parlamentarismus (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2008)
- Eddie, Scott McNeil, *Landownership in Eastern Germany before the Great War: A Quantitative Analysis* (2nd impr.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Ehlers, Joachim, *Heinrich der Löwe: Eine Biographie* (Munich: Siedler, 2008)
- Emich, Birgit and Gabriela Signori (eds.), *Kriegs/Bilder in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, Beiheft 42 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2009)
- Engelmann, Roger, Thomas Großbölting, and Hermann Wentker (eds.), *Kommunismus in der Krise: Die Entstalinisierung 1956 und die Folgen*, Analysen und Dokumente, 32 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008)
- Engels, Jens Ivo, Andreas Fahrmeir, and Alexander Nützenadel (eds.), *Geld, Geschenke, Politik: Korruption im neuzeitlichen Europa*, Historische Zeitschrift, Beiheft. Neue Folge, 48 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Enzensberger, Hans Magnus, *Hammerstein oder Der Eigensinn: Eine deutsche Geschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2008)
- Fehrmann, Antje, *Grab und Krone: Königsgrabmäler im mittelalterlichen England und die posthume Selbstdarstellung der Lancaster*, Kunstwissenschaftliche Studien, 140 (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2008)
- Feldkamp, Michael F., *Der Parlamentarische Rat 1948–1949: Die Entstehung des Grundgesetzes* (rev. new edn.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008)

Library News

- Fellner, Michael, *Katholische in Bayern 1945–1960: Religion, Gesellschaft und Modernisierung in der Erzdiözese München und Freising*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 111 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008)
- Frank, Matthew, *Expelling the Germans: British Opinion and Post-1945 Population Transfer in Context*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Fritzsche, Peter, *Life and Death in the Third Reich* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008)
- Garber, Klaus, *Literatur und Kultur im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit: Gesammelte Studien* (Paderborn: Fink, 2009)
- Gersdorff, Gero von, *Die Gründung der Nordatlantischen Allianz, Entstehung und Probleme des Atlantischen Bündnisses bis 1956*, 7 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Goda, Norman J. W., *Tales from Spandau: Nazi Criminals and the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Goeschel, Christian, *Suicide in Nazi Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Graf, Rüdiger, *Die Zukunft der Weimarer Republik: Krisen und Zukunftsaneignungen in Deutschland 1918–1933*, Ordnungssysteme, 24 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Groth, Andrzej, *Warenumschlag am Frischen Haff: Eine Handelsstatistik der kleinen Seehäfen (1581–1712)*, Veröffentlichungen aus den Archiven Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 64 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009)
- Grundmann, Siegfried, *Der Geheimapparat der KPD im Visier der Gestapo: Das BB-Ressort. Funktionäre, Beamte, Spitzel und Spione* (Berlin: Dietz, 2008)
- Haefs, Wilhelm (ed.), *Nationalsozialismus und Exil 1933–1945*, Hansers Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart, 9 (Munich: Hanser, 2009)
- Hahn, Sylvia, *Migration, Arbeit, Geschlecht: Arbeitsmigration in Mitteleuropa vom 17. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Transkulturelle Perspektiven, 5 (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2008)
- Hamann, Brigitte, *Hitlers Edeljude: Das Leben des Armenarztes Eduard Bloch* (2nd edn.; Munich: Piper, 2008)
- Hartmann, Christian (ed.), *Von Feldherren und Gefreiten: Zur biographischen Dimension des Zweiten Weltkriegs*, Zeitgeschichte im Gespräch, 2 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)

- Hausman, William J., Peter Hertner, and Mira Wilkins, *Global Electrification: Multinational Enterprise and International Finance in the History of Light and Power, 1878–2007*, Cambridge Studies in the Emergence of Global Enterprise (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Heßler, Martina and Clemens Zimmermann (eds.), *Creative Urban Milieus: Historical Perspectives on Culture, Economy, and the City* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2008)
- Heuss, Theodor, *In der Defensive: Briefe 1933–1945*, ed. Elke Seefried, Stuttgarter Ausgabe, A.3 (Munich: Saur, 2009)
- Hockerts, Hans Günter (ed.), *Akten der Reichskanzlei: Die Regierung Hitler*, v. 1938, ed. Friedrich Hartmannsgruber (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Hoeres, Peter, *Die Kultur von Weimar: Durchbruch der Moderne*, Deutsche Geschichte im 20. Jahrhundert, 5 (Berlin: be.bra-Verlag, 2008)
- Holfelder, Moritz, *Palast der Republik: Aufstieg und Fall eines symbolischen Gebäudes* (Berlin: Links Verlag, 2008)
- Holm, Kerstin, *Rubens in Sibirien: Beutekunst aus Deutschland in der russischen Provinz* (Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 2008)
- Holzer, Anton, *Das Lächeln der Henker: Der unbekannteste Krieg gegen die Zivilbevölkerung 1914–1918* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2008)
- Hübner, Peter and Christa Hübner, *Sozialismus als soziale Frage: Sozialpolitik in der DDR und Polen 1968–1976*, Zeithistorische Studien, 45 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008)
- Hunt, Lynn, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: Norton, 2008)
- Jefferies, Matthew, *Contesting the German Empire, 1871–1918, Contesting the Past* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008)
- Jotischky, Andrew (ed.), *The Crusades*, 4 vols. (London: Routledge, 2008)
- Kater, Michael H., *Never Sang for Hitler: The Life and Times of Lotte Lehmann, 1888–1976* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Kaufhold, Martin, *Die Rhythmen politischer Reform im späten Mittelalter: Institutioneller Wandel in Deutschland, England und an der Kurie 1198–1400 im Vergleich*, Mittelalter-Forschungen, 23 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2008)
- Kershaw, Ian, *Hitler, the Germans, and the Final Solution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008)

Library News

- King, Richard H. and Dan Stone (eds.), *Hannah Arendt and the Uses of History: Imperialism, Nation, Race, and Genocide* (New York: Bergahn Books, 2008)
- Kolb, Eberhard, *Die Weimarer Republik* (new rev. edn.; Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Kossert, Andreas, *Kalte Heimat: Die Geschichte der deutschen Vertriebenen nach 1945* (4th rev. edn.; Munich: Siedler, 2008)
- Kowalczyk, Ilko-Sascha, *Endspiel: Die Revolution von 1989 in der DDR* (Munich: Beck, 2009)
- Kramper, Peter, *Neue Heimat: Unternehmenspolitik und Unternehmensentwicklung im gewerkschaftlichen Wohnungs- und Städtebau 1950–1982*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 200 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008)
- Kraushaar, Wolfgang, *Achtundsechzig: Eine Bilanz* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 2008)
- Krauss, Marita (ed.), *Integrationen: Vertriebene in den deutschen Ländern nach 1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008)
- Küng, Hans, *Disputed Truth: Memoirs* (New York: Continuum, 2008)
- Küppers, Heinrich, *Johannes Hoffmann (1890–1967): Biographie eines Deutschen*, Forschungen und Quellen zur Zeitgeschichte, 54 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2008)
- Lappin, Eleonore (ed.), *Deutsch-jüdische Presse und jüdische Geschichte*, i. *Identität, Nation, Sprache, jüdische Geschichte und jüdisches Gedächtnis, der Westen im Osten, der Osten im Westen, Konzepte jüdischer Kultur*, Die jüdische Presse, 6; Presse und Geschichte, 37; ii. *Religion und Politik in der europäisch-jüdischen Presse vor der Shoah, Antisemitismus, Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus, 1880–1943, Neuorientierungen nach der Shoah*, Die jüdische Presse, 7; Presse und Geschichte, 38 (Bremen: Edition Lumière, 2008)
- Louthan, Howard, *Converting Bohemia: Force and Persuasion in the Catholic Reformation*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- Lüdtke, Alf and Reiner Prass (eds.), *Gelehrtenleben: Wissenschaftspraxis in der Neuzeit*, Selbstzeugnisse der Neuzeit, 18 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008)
- MacDonough, Frank, *Sophie Scholl: The Real Story of the Woman who Defied Hitler* (Stroud: The History Press, 2009)
- Marszolek, Inge and Marc Buggeln (eds.), *Bunker: Kriegsort, Zuflucht, Erinnerungsraum* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2008)

- Mauch, Christof and Thomas Zeller (eds.), *The World Beyond the Windshield: Roads and Landscapes in the United States and Europe*, foreword David E. Nye (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2008)
- Mehrkens, Heidi, *Statuswechsel: Kriegserfahrung und nationale Wahrnehmung im Deutsch-Französischen Krieg 1870/71*, Schriften der Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte, Neue Folge 21 (Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 2008)
- Miethe, Ingrid and Martina Schiebel, *Biografie, Bildung und Institution: Die Arbeiter- und Bauern-Fakultäten in der DDR*, Biographie- und Lebensweltforschung des Interuniversitären Netzwerkes Biographie- und Lebensweltforschung (INBL), 6 (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2008)
- Mischek, Britta, *Die Konstruktion nationaler Identitäten in der englischen politisch-satirischen Druckgrafik zur Amerikanischen Revolution 1763–1783*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 28: Kunstgeschichte, 428 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008)
- Mittag, Jürgen, *Kleine Geschichte der Europäischen Union: Von der Europaidee bis zur Gegenwart* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2008)
- Möller, Frank and Ulrich Mählert (eds.), *Abgrenzung und Verflechtung: Das geteilte Deutschland in der zeithistorischen Debatte* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2008)
- Moltke, Helmuth James von, *Im Land der Gottlosen: Tagebuch und Briefe aus der Haft 1944/45*, ed. Günter Brakelmann (Munich: Beck, 2009)
- Morgenbrod, Birgitt and Stephanie Merkenich, *Das Deutsche Rote Kreuz unter der NS-Diktatur 1933–1945*, foreword Hans Mommsen (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008)
- Morlang, Thomas, *Askari und Fitafita: 'Farbige' Söldner in den deutschen Kolonien*, Schlaglichter der Kolonialgeschichte, 8 (Berlin: Links, 2008)
- Müller, Sven Oliver and Cornelius Torp (eds.), *Das deutsche Kaiserreich in der Kontroverse* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009)
- Mushaben, Joyce Marie, *The Changing Faces of Citizenship: Integration and Mobilization among Ethnic Minorities in Germany*, Monographs in German History, 21 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008)
- Nippel, Wilfried, *Johann Gustav Droysen: Ein Leben zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik* (Munich: Beck, 2008)

Library News

- Nisbet, Hugh Barr, *Lessing: Eine Biographie*, trans. Karl S. Guthke (Munich: Beck, 2008)
- O'Malley, John W., *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008)
- Osterhammel, Jürgen, *Die Verwandlung der Welt: Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Beck, 2009)
- Overesch, Manfred, *Bosch in Hildesheim 1937–1945: Freies Unternehmertum und nationalsozialistische Rüstungspolitik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008)
- Pfeil, Ulrich (ed.), *Die Rückkehr der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft in die 'Ökumene der Historiker': Ein wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Ansatz*, *Pariser historische Studien*, 89 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Pfisterer, Ulrich (ed.), *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte*, ii. *Von Panofsky bis Greenberg* (Munich: Beck, 2008)
- Planert, Ute (ed.), *Krieg und Umbruch in Mitteleuropa um 1800: Erfahrungsgeschichte(n) auf dem Weg in eine neue Zeit*, *Krieg in der Geschichte*, 44 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009)
- Pohl, Dieter, *Die Herrschaft der Wehrmacht: Deutsche Militärbesatzung und einheimische Bevölkerung in der Sowjetunion 1941–1944*, *Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte*, 71 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Pohlig, Matthias et al., *Säkularisierungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Methodische Probleme und empirische Fallstudien*, *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, Beiheft 41 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2008)
- Raithel, Thomas, *Die Strafanstalt Landsberg am Lech und der Spöttinger Friedhof, 1944–1958: Eine Dokumentation im Auftr. des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte München-Berlin* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Raithel, Thomas, Andreas Rödder, and Andreas Wirsching (eds.), *Auf dem Weg in eine neue Moderne? Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland in den siebziger und achtziger Jahren*, *Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, Sondernummer (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Raphael, Lutz and Herbert Uerlings (eds.), *Zwischen Ausschluss und Solidarität: Modi der Inklusion/Exklusion von Fremden und Armen in Europa seit der Spätantike*, *Inklusion, Exklusion*, 6 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008)
- Reemtsma, Jan Philipp, *Vertrauen und Gewalt: Versuch über eine besondere Konstellation der Moderne* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2008)

- Reitmayer, Morten, *Elite: Sozialgeschichte einer politisch-gesellschaftlichen Idee in der frühen Bundesrepublik*, Ordnungssysteme, 28 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Riezler, Kurt, *Tagebücher, Aufsätze, Dokumente*, ed. Karl Dietrich Erdmann, Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, 48 (new edn.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008)
- Rödter, Andreas, *Deutschland einig Vaterland: Die Geschichte der Wiedervereinigung* (Munich: Beck, 2009)
- Rösener, Werner and Carola Fey (eds.), *Fürstenhof und Sakralkultur im Spätmittelalter*, Formen der Erinnerung, 35 (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2008)
- Rösgen, Petra (ed.), *Flagge zeigen? Die Deutschen und ihre National-symbole. Begleitbuch zur Ausstellung im Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 5. Dezember 2008 bis 13. April 2009, im Zeitgeschichtlichen Forum Leipzig der Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 29. Mai bis 4. Oktober 2009, Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Bonn: Kerber, 2008)
- Rothe, Friedrich, *Harry Graf Kessler: Biographie* (Munich: Siedler, 2008)
- Rubin, Miri, *Mother of God: A History of the Virgin Mary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009)
- Schauz, Désirée, *Strafen als moralische Besserung: Eine Geschichte der Straffälligenfürsorge 1777–1933*, Ordnungssysteme, 27 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Scherner, Jonas, *Die Logik der Industriepolitik im Dritten Reich: Die Investitionen in die Autarkie- und Rüstungsindustrie und ihre staatliche Förderung*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 174/4 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008)
- Scheutz, Martin, Andrea Sommerlechner, et al. (eds.), *Europäisches Spitalwesen: Institutionelle Fürsorge in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 51 (Vienna: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Schmale, Wolfgang, *Geschichte und Zukunft der Europäischen Identität* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008)
- Schmid, Alois (ed.), *Die bayerische Konstitution von 1808: Entstehung – Zielsetzung – europäisches Umfeld*, Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte, Beiheft 35 (Munich: Beck, 2008)
- Schmid, Alois (ed.), *Justus Lipsius und der europäische Späthumanismus in Oberdeutschland*, Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte, Beiheft 33 (Munich: Beck, 2008)

Library News

- Schmidt, Sebastian (ed.), *Arme und ihre Lebensperspektiven in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Inklusion, Exklusion, 10 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008)
- Schmitt, Karl and Thorsten Oppeland (eds.), *Parteien in Thüringen: Ein Handbuch*, Handbücher zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 16 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2008)
- Schneider, Ute (ed.), *Dimensionen der Moderne: Festschrift für Christof Dipper* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008)
- Schröder, Joachim, *Internationalismus nach dem Krieg: Die Beziehungen zwischen deutschen und französischen Kommunisten 1918–1923* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2008)
- Schwarz, Hans-Peter (ed.), *Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Eine Bilanz nach 60 Jahren* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008)
- Smith, Helmut Walser, *The Continuities of German History: Nation, Religion, and Race across the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Sojic, Tvrtko P., *Die 'Lösung' der kroatischen Frage zwischen 1939 und 1945: Kalküle und Illusionen*, Historische Mitteilungen, Beiheft 71 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008)
- Stadt, Jochen, Tobias Voigt, and Stefan Wolle, *Operation Fernsehen: Die Stasi und die Medien in Ost und West* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008)
- Stadtland, Helke (ed.), *'Friede auf Erden': Religiöse Semantiken und Konzepte des Friedens im 20. Jahrhundert*, Frieden und Krieg, 12 (Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 2009)
- Steinacher, Gerald, *Nazis auf der Flucht: Wie Kriegsverbrecher über Italien nach Übersee entkamen*, Innsbrucker Forschungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 26 (Innsbruck: Studien-Verlag, 2008)
- Thijs, Krijn, *Drei Geschichten, eine Stadt: Die Berliner Stadtjubiläen von 1937 und 1987*, Zeithistorische Studien, 39 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008)
- Vincke, Ludwig Freiherr, *Die Tagebücher des Ludwig Freiherrn Vincke 1789–1844, i. 1789–1792*, ed. Wilfried Reininghaus and Herta Sagebiel (Münster: Aschendorff, 2009)
- Vogel, Berthold, *Wohlstandskonflikte: Soziale Fragen, die aus der Mitte kommen* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2009)
- Walter, Dierk, *Zwischen Dschungelkrieg und Atombombe: Britische Visionen vom Krieg der Zukunft 1945–1971* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2009)

- Walter, Rolf (ed.), *Geschichte der Arbeitsmärkte*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 199 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2009)
- Weidermann, Volker, *Das Buch der verbrannten Bücher* (2nd edn.; Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2008)
- Weil, Francesca, *Zielgruppe Ärzteschaft: Ärzte als Inoffizielle Mitarbeiter des Ministeriums für Staatssicherheit der DDR*, Berichte und Studien, Hannah-Arendt-Institut für Totalitarismusforschung, 54 (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2008)
- Wende, Peter, *Das britische Empire: Geschichte eines Weltreichs* (Munich: Beck, 2008)
- Wenzel, Horst, *Mediengeschichte vor und nach Gutenberg* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008)
- Wieviorka, Olivier, *Normandy: The Landings to the Liberation of Paris*, trans. M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008)
- Wippermann, Wolfgang, *Autobahn zum Mutterkreuz: Historikerstreit der schweigenden Mehrheit* (Berlin: Rotbuch Verlag, 2008)
- Wolfrum, Edgar (ed.), *Die 90er Jahre: Wiedervereinigung und Weltkrisen, Deutschland im Fokus*, 5 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008)

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 Kluge 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.), *Städtebürgertum 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 and 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: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985)

Vol. 17: Ulrich Wengenroth, *Unternehmensstrategien und technischer Fortschritt: Die deutsche und britische Stahlindustrie 1865–1895* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Vol. 18: Helmut Reifeld, *Zwischen Empire und Parlament: Zur Gedankenbildung und Politik Lord Roseberys (1880–1905)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 19: Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 20: Karl Heinz Metz, *Industrialisierung und Sozialpolitik: Das Problem der sozialen Sicherheit in Großbritannien 1795–1911* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 21: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Schwentker (eds.), *Max Weber und seine Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 22: Lothar Kettenacker, *Krieg zur Friedenssicherung: Die Deutschlandplanung der britischen Regierung während des Zweiten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen: 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: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)

Vol. 24: Helga Woggon, *Integrativer Sozialismus und nationale Befreiung: Politik und Wirkungsgeschichte James Connollys in Irland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 25: Kaspar von Greyerz, *Vorsehungsglaube und Kosmologie: Studien zu englischen Selbstzeugnissen des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 26: Andreas Wirsching, *Parlament und Volkes Stimme: Unterhaus und Öffentlichkeit im England des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 27: Claudia Schnurmann, *Kommerz und Klügel: Der Englandhandel Kölner Kaufleute im 16. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 28: Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, *Vom Wiener Kongreß zur Pariser Konferenz: England, die deutsche Frage und das Mächtesystem 1815–1856* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 29: Peter Alter (ed.), *Im Banne der Metropolen: Berlin und London in den zwanziger Jahren* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 30: Hermann Wentker, *Zerstörung der Großmacht Rußland? Die britischen Kriegsziele im Krimkrieg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 31: Angela Schwarz, *Die Reise ins Dritte Reich: Britische Augenzeugen im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland (1933–1939)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 32: Johannes Paulmann, *Staat und Arbeitsmarkt in Großbritannien: Krise, Weltkrieg, Wiederaufbau* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 33: Clemens Picht, *Handel, Politik und Gesellschaft: Zur wirtschaftspolitischen Publizistik Englands im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 34: Friedrich Weckerlein, *Streitfall Deutschland: Die britische Linke und die 'Demokratisierung' des Deutschen Reiches, 1900–1918* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994)

Vol. 35: Klaus Larres, *Politik der Illusionen: Churchill, Eisenhower und die deutsche Frage 1945–1955* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 36: Günther Heydemann, *Konstitution gegen Revolution: Die britische Deutschland- und Italienpolitik 1815–1848* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 37: Hermann Joseph Hiery, *Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee (1900–1921): Eine Annäherung an die Erfahrungen verschiedener Kulturen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 38: Michael Toyka-Seid, *Gesundheit und Krankheit in der Stadt: Zur Entwicklung des Gesundheitswesens in Durham City 1831–1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 39: Detlev Clemens, *Herr Hitler in Germany: Wahrnehmung und Deutung des Nationalsozialismus in Großbritannien 1920 bis 1939* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 40: Christel Gade, *Gleichgewichtspolitik oder Bündnispflege? Maximen britischer Außenpolitik (1910–1914)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Vol. 41: Benedikt Stuchtey, *W. E. H. Lecky (1838–1903): Historisches Denken und politisches Urteilen eines anglo-irischen Gelehrten* (Göttingen: 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: Florian Altenhöner, *Kommunikation und Kontrolle: Gerüchte und Städtische Öffentlichkeiten in Berlin und London 1914/1918* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Vol. 63: Renate Held, *Deutsche als Kriegsgefangene in Großbritannien im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Vol. 64: Dominik Geppert, *Pressekriege: Öffentlichkeit und Diplomatie in den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen (1896–1912)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2007)
- Vol. 65: Frank Bösch, *Öffentliche Geheimnisse: Skandale, Politik und Medien in Deutschland und Großbritannien, 1880–1914* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Vol. 66: Fabian Klose, *Menschenrechte im Schatten kolonialer Gewalt: Die Dekolonisierungskriege in Kenia und Algerien, 1945–1962* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Vol. 67: Almut Steinbach, *Sprachpolitik im Britischen Empire: Herrschaftssprache und Integration in Ceylon und den Föderierten Malaiischen Staaten* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)

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, 2007)

Karina Urbach (ed.), *European Aristocracies and the Radical Right 1918–1939* (Oxford, 2007)

Markus Mösslang and Torsten Riotte (eds.), *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914* (Oxford, 2008)

Dominik Geppert and Robert Gerwarth (eds.), *Wilhelmine Germany and Edwardian Britain: Essays on Cultural Affinity* (Oxford, 2008)

Richard Bessel and Claudia B. Haake (eds.), *Removing Peoples: Forced Removal in the Modern World* (Oxford, 2009)

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: 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: Saur Verlag, 1993)

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

Dagmar Engels and Shula Marks (eds.), *Contesting Colonial Hegemony: Africa and India 1858 to Independence* (London: 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 M. 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: I. B. Tauris, 1998)

Sabine Freitag (ed.), *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003)

Dominik Geppert and Udo Wengst (eds.), *Neutralität: Chance oder Chimäre? Konzepte des Dritten Weges für Deutschland und die Welt 1945–1990* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

BRITISH ENVOYS TO GERMANY

Sabine Freitag and Peter Wende (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, i. 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*, ii. 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*, iii. 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 Constitution* (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)
- 2006 John Breuilly, *Nationalism, Power and Modernity in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (London, 2007)
- 2007 Stig Förster, *The Battlefield: Towards a Modern History of War* (London, 2008)
- 2008 Janet L. Nelson, *Opposition to Charlemagne* (London, 2009)

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

German Historical Institute London Bulletin Index, 1979–1996 (London, 1996),
plus supplement for the years 1997–2001

German Historical Institute London Bulletin Supplements

- No. 1 Indra Sengupta (ed.), *Memory, History, and Colonialism: Engaging with Pierre Nora in Colonial and Postcolonial Contexts*, with a foreword by Hagen Schulze (London, 2009)

Die Macht der Medien



Frank Bösch

Öffentliche Geheimnisse

Skandale, Politik und Medien in Deutschland
und Großbritannien 1880–1914

2009 | VI, 540 S., 13 Abb. | Gb. | € 59,80

ISBN 978-3-486-58857-6

Im ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert traten in ganz Westeuropa zahllose spektakuläre Skandale auf. Es kam zu Enthüllungen über Korruption, Ehebrüche und koloniale Gewalt, die zu politischen Krisen und grenzübergreifender Empörung führten. Frank Bösch untersucht diese politischen Skandale erstmalig systematisch, international vergleichend und anhand von umfassenden Archivquellen. Er analysiert Verlauf und Wirkungen der Skandale und fragt, inwieweit sie die politische Kommunikation, Machtstrukturen und kulturellen Normen beeinflussten. Zudem zeigt die Studie, wie sich in Deutschland und Großbritannien das Verhältnis von Politik, Medien und Öffentlichkeit veränderte und verdeutlicht die Interaktionen und Annäherungen zwischen den beiden Ländern.

Eine Veröffentlichung des Deutschen
Historischen Instituts London



Frank Bösch (* 1969) ist
Professor für Fachjournalistik
Geschichte an der Universität
Gießen .