GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

# Bulletin

General Editor Andreas Gestrich

Editors Angela Davies, Jane Rafferty, Valeska Huber, Cornelia Linde, Markus Mösslang, Michael Schaich

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 2019/2022/2039

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

ISSN 0269-8552 (print)
ISSN 3049-9135 (online)

Cover design: Lucy Schönberger
Photograph: John Goldblatt

# German Historical Institute London

# Bulletin

Volume XXXV, No. 2 November 2013

CONTENTS

*Special Theme: Solidarity and Care*



## Article



## Book Reviews



(cont.)

Contents



## Conference Reports

# *SOLIDARITY AND CARE: A RESEARCH AREA OF THE GHIL*

ANDREAS GESTRICH

Since 2009 most of the research projects undertaken by the Fellows of the German Historical Institute London have contributed to one of three thematic fields designated as the Institute's major research areas.[1] This themed issue of the *GHIL Bulletin* is initiating a loose series on the Institute's work by presenting current research in these special thematic fields. The present issue is dedicated to the Institute's activities in the research area entitled Solidarity and Care.

Comparative research on the structures of the welfare state in Britain and Germany has been a focal point of the Institute's wider work on the development of industrial society in the two countries since the 1980s.[2] Current projects in the research area Solidarity and Care build on this tradition, but extend it in terms of chronology, geographical scope,[3] and, above all, the development of new approaches and research perspectives. In line with recent general trends in this field, research at the GHIL now concentrates less on the legal and institutional history of the modern welfare state than on the concepts, languages, and practices of state and non-state actors; the experience of poverty and dependence; and the types of social control associated with social inclusion and support. In this context we focus on the sources produced by local or regional poor relief administrations, private philanthropic activities, and families and neighbourhoods in the context of poor relief, but also on practices such as the care of orphans or adoption. We will make hitherto neglected source material on the linguistic strategies of the poor and dependant, the verbalization of their needs and experiences, and the attitudes of those involved in

[1] See <http://www.ghil.ac.uk/research.html>, accessed 13 Aug. 2013.

[2] Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds.), *The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany* (London, 1981).

[3] See e.g. 'The European Welfare State in a Global Context', conference organized by Christoph Cornelißen (Frankfurt), Gerda Henkel Visiting Professor 2010/11, and held at the GHIL, 11–13 Apr. 2013. See the conference report in this issue of the *GHIL Bulletin*.

supporting them accessible in electronic, online editions. Our research focuses on modern Britain and Germany (from the eighteenth to the twentieth century), but always within a wider comparative European context.

## *The Conceptual Framework*

Solidarity and care are important terms of conceptual history which have long been neglected. Solidarity, one of the key concepts in sociology since Auguste Comte and especially Émile Durkheim's seminal work, *The Division of Labour in Society* (1893),[4] long remained, as Kurt Bayertz graphically put it, something of an 'erratic rock in the moral landscape of modern society',[5] while Herfried Münkler simply called it 'the stepchild' of moral philosophy.[6] This has clearly changed in recent years. The concept of solidarity has attracted new theoretical and historical interest, partly in the context of the burgeoning literature on civil society (*Zivilgesellschaft*)[7] and studies on the orientation towards the common good (*Gemeinwohl*);[8] and partly in the context of the present economic crisis, growing income disparities, and a general interest in the theoretical and practical aspects of social justice,[9] the future of the modern welfare state, and other areas

[4] Émile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society* (New York, 1997).

[5] Kurt Bayertz (ed.), *Solidarität: Begriff und Problem* (Frankfurt am Main, 1996). For a shorter English version of this volume see id. (ed.), *Solidarity* (Dordrecht, 1999). Quoted from the preface of the German edition, p. 9.

[6] Herfried Münkler, 'Enzyklopädie der Ideen der Zukunft', in Jens Beckert et al. (eds.), *Transnationale Solidarität: Chancen und Grenzen* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004), 15–28, at 15.

[7] From the vast literature on this topic see esp. Dieter Gosewinkel, Dieter Rucht, Wolfgang van den Daele, and Jürgen Kocka (eds.), *Zivilgesellschaft – national und transnational* (Berlin, 2004); John Ehrenberg, *Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea* (New York, 1999); Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds.), *Civil Society: History and Possibilities* (Cambridge, 2001).

[8] See in particular Herfried Münkler, Harald Bluhm, and Karsten Fischer (eds.), *Forschungsberichte der interdisziplinären Arbeitsgruppe 'Gemeinwohl und Gemeinsinn' der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 4 vols. (Berlin, 2001–2).

[9] At the GHIL Felix Römer has started a research project entitled 'Semantics of Social Justice in Britain and Germany since 1945', which is attached to a

of modern ethical discourse.[10] Similarly, since Carol Gilligan's *Ethics of Care*, the concept of care (*Fürsorge*) has shifted from being a theoretically unspecific term into the centre, first, of feminist discourse on ethics, and then of social theory in general. It has now gained wide significance in modern ethical theory and social policy.[11] The concept of care 'implies that there is moral significance in the fundamental elements of relationships and dependencies in human life'.[12] On this basis, the concept on the one hand tries to explain gender differences in moral development (Gilligan), and on the other to function as a critical moral theory transcending the realm of private relationships in family and community, and aiming to change the way we conceive of obligations for private and public mutual support in wider national and international contexts.[13]

The number of studies which deal with the concepts of solidarity and care from these various theoretical perspectives is now substantial.[14] For the Institute's projects they provide an interesting framework for a wider analysis of the development of the modern welfare state, and of the mental changes within it. Care (*Fürsorge*) is a term whose usage can be traced back to antiquity (Latin: *cura*; Greek:

different research area. See <http://www.ghil.ac.uk/research/political_history/the_semantics_of_social_justice.html>, accessed 9 Sept. 2013.

[10] See e.g. Steffen Mau and Benjamin Veghte (eds.), *Social Justice, Legitimacy and the Welfare State* (Aldershot, 2007); Eckhard Romanus, *Soziale Gerechtigkeit, Verantwortung und Würde: Der egalitäre Liberalismus nach John Rawls und Ronald Dworkin* (Freiburg, 2008). Some of the most interesting research on solidarity has been produced in the context of modern bioethics. For an overview and extensive bibliography see Barbara Prainsack and Alena Buyx, *Solidarity: Reflexions on an Emerging Concept in Bioethics* (Swindon, 2011).

[11] Carol Gilligan, 'Moral Orientation and Moral Development', in Virginia Held (ed.), *Justice and Care: Essential Readings in Feminist Ethics* (London, 2005), 31–47; Virginia Held, *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global* (Oxford, 2006).

[12] Maureen Sander-Staudt, 'Care Ethics', in *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2011), at <http://www.iep.utm.edu/care-eth/>, accessed 5 Aug. 2013.

[13] Daniel Engster, *The Heart of Justice* (Oxford, 2007).

[14] In addition to the works already cited see also Ulf Tranow, *Solidarität: Soziologische Perspektiven und Konzepte* (Saarbrücken, 2012); Geza Reisz, *Solidarität in Deutschland und Frankreich: Eine politische Deutungsanalyse* (Opladen, 2006). Solidarity also plays a major role in the sociology of Anthony Giddens and in

*epimeleia*). It has been linked with poor relief (*Armenfürsorge*) and, in particular, taking responsibility for and looking after children in need, right through to modern times, although primarily with a different, more paternalistic twist than its modern feminist counterpart. Solidarity, however, is a term which only originated in the nineteenth century. The French Revolution transformed the Christian notion of brotherhood into the secular concept of *fraternité*, which, in turn, provided the basis for the rise of the concept of socialist class solidarity and the sociological understanding of solidarity as a force for social cohesion.[15] Thus, as concepts with their own historical development, solidarity and care form useful tools for analysing the changing legitimation of aid, their links with the evolving concept of human dignity, and the religious or secular drives behind charitable or philanthropic activity in general. It is also important to see, however, that these changes affected not only those who helped, but also the expectations of the poor, and how those in need of help justified and defended their claims for public or private assistance.

All the projects in this research area at the Institute are interested in these aspects of conceptual history, but they are at the heart of a large project, 'Pauper Letters and Petitions for Poor Relief in Germany and Great Britain, 1770–1914', jointly funded by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), and directed by Andreas Gestrich and Steven A. King (Leicester). This project centres on the production of a large database and online edition of letters and petitions written by, or on behalf of, the poor, and will also contain the relevant administrative correspondence. This will provide insights into how such changes in the perception of what constitutes the cement of the social fabric affected the languages and rhetoric of entitlement and help used by paupers and the institutions and individuals they turned to. This interest in changing concepts also informs other projects and some of our major conferences in this field, such as 'The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid in

all social theory referring to his work. See e.g. Anthony Giddens, *Beyond Left and Right*: *The Future of Radical Politics* (Cambridge, 1994).

[15] Karl Heinz Metz, 'Solidarität und Geschichte: Institutionen und sozialer Begriff der Solidarität in Westeuropa im 19. Jahrhundert', in Bayertz (ed.), *Solidarität*, 172–201.

the Twentieth Century',[16] that on the protests and the visual representations of the unemployed,[17] and on the concept of the dignity of the poor.[18]

### *Institutions and Practices of Solidarity and Care*

The projects in this research area are all interested, but not necessarily primarily, in the history of concepts. Rather, they focus on language usage in certain social and institutional contexts, and on the practices described in the source material. Their emphasis is on the significance of natural and social relationships for the care of especially vulnerable people, such as orphaned children, the sick, or the elderly.[19] The top-

[16] 'The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid in the Twentieth Century', conference organized by Johannes Paulmann (Mannheim/Mainz), Gerda Henkel Visiting Professor 2009/10, and held at the GHIL, 12–14 May 2011. Full details can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>. The proceedings of this conference are presently being prepared for publication with OUP.

[17] 'From the Blanketeers to the Present: Understanding Protests of the Unemployed', conference organized by Matthias Reiss and held at the GHIL, 16–17 Feb. 2007; 'Visual Representations of the Unemployed', conference jointly organized by Matthias Reiss (University of Exeter) and Andreas Gestrich (GHIL), and held at the University of Exeter, 12–13 Dec. 2008. Full details of both conferences can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>. See also Matthias Reiss (ed.), *The Street as Stage: Protest Marches and Public Rallies since the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford 2007); and Matthias Reiss and Matt Perry (eds.), *Unemployment and Protest: New Perspectives on Two Centuries of Contention* (Oxford, 2011).

[18] 'The Dignity of the Poor: Concepts, Practices, Representations', conference organized by Andreas Gestrich (GHIL) in cooperation with the DFG Collaborative Research Centre 600 at the University of Trier: 'Strangers and Poor People: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion from Classical Antiquity to the Present Day' and held at the GHIL, 7–9 Dec. 2006. Full details can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>. The proceedings of this conference are being prepared for publication with OUP.

[19] Andreas Gestrich, Elizabeth Hurren, and Steven A. King (eds.), *Poverty and Sickness in Modern Europe* (London, 2012); Andreas Gestrich, 'Altersarmut', in Herbert Uerlings, Nina Trauth, and Lukas Clemens (eds.), *Armut: Perspektiven in Kunst und Gesellschaft,* exhibition catalogue (Trier, 2011), 34–5;

ics addressed in this context range from adoption as a form of social inclusion and care to the importance of family networks among the poor. In particular, the history of adoption (comprising the adopted child as well as the adopting family) is a field that has so far been gravely neglected by social historians,[20] and in which the complex ambivalences of care between altruism and self-interest can be studied. Family networks among the poor tended to be portrayed as fragile, or almost non-existent.[21] However, research based on letters and petitions of the poor, in particular, shows that the contrary was the case. These sources also allow us to reconstruct the multi-layered network of relatives, neighbours, and friends of the poor and their social and economic significance at times of hardship and distress.[22] The projects, however, also look at other institutions of care and solidarity, such as neighbourhoods, parishes and churches, trade unions and organizations of the unemployed, and the various ways in which they provided relief and decided who to support and who to turn away.

Andreas Gestrich and Daniela Heinisch, '"They sit for days and have only their sorrow to eat": Old Age Poverty in German Pauper Narratives', in Beate Althammer, Lutz Raphael, and Tamara Stazic-Wendt (eds.), *Rescuing the Vulnerable: Poverty, Welfare and Social Ties in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe* (forthcoming).

[20] Benedikt Stuchtey, 'Adoption', in Friedrich Jaeger (ed.), *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart, 2012), xv. 675–8; id. 'Stiefeltern', ibid. (Stuttgart, 2010), xii. 999–1001.

[21] Peter Laslett, 'Family, Kinship, and Collectivity as Systems of Support in Pre-Industrial Europe: A Consideration of the "Nuclear Hardship" Hypothesis', *Continuity and Change*, 3 (1988), 153–75.

[22] Steven A. King, 'Friendship, Kinship and Belonging in the Letters of Urban Paupers 1800–1840', *Historical Social Research*, 33 (2008), 249–77; id. 'Forme et fonction de la parenté chez les populations pauvres d'Angleterre, 1800–1840', *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 65/5 (2010), 1147–74. The importance of family ties in pauper families is also shown by Jens Gründler, *Armut und Wahnsinn: 'Arme Irre' und ihre Familien im Spannungsfeld von Psychiatrie und Armenfürsorge in Glasgow 1875–1921* (Munich, 2013); see also Sheila Cooper, 'Kinship and Welfare in Early Modern England: Sometimes Charity Begins at Home', in Anne Borsay and Peter Shapely (eds.), *Medicine, Charity and Mutual Aid: The Consumption of Health and Welfare in Britain, c.1550–1950* (Aldershot, 2007), 55–70.

The differentiation which public institutions made between the deserving and the undeserving poor is of primary importance to the DFG–AHRC project 'Pauper Letters and Petitions for Poor Relief in Germany and Great Britain, 1770–1914', as these are classic documents for analysing how the poor described their lives and hardship, and for looking at the strategies they used to prove their deservingness and justify the legitimacy of their claim on public funds. By using such strategies, the poor were demonstrating their compliance with the official requirements for obtaining relief, and frequently also referring to languages and concepts outside the 'offical mind'. These related not only to the Christian values and duties of those who were in a position to help, but also, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to the new secular values of philanthropy and solidarity. Thus these letters and petitions show that paupers must be treated as part of the history of changing concepts of solidarity and care. The letters they wrote provide historians with exciting sources for a conceptual history from below.

The following presentation of current projects at the GHIL will concentrate on the project 'Pauper Letters and Petitions for Poor Relief in Germany and Great Britain, 1770–1914', which started in April 2011 and comprises both an online edition of pauper letters and petitions, and two Ph.D. projects. Andreas Gestrich and Steven King will present the aims, objectives, and initial findings of the project. Daniela Heinisch at the GHIL is working on a Ph.D. thesis which concentrates on pauper petitions in Frankfurt, and Ben Harvey at Leicester University is working on pauper letters and petitions for poor relief in the Welsh borderlands. This overview presents Daniela Heinisch's thesis. Benedikt Stuchtey then writes about his work on the history of adoption. This project will result in a major monograph on the topic. It opens up many new insights into the development of our concepts of childhood and family. However, the topic also presents us with a unique focus for studying the multiple and ambivalent social and ideological, national and international contexts of care for and solidarity with children who are orphaned or unwanted.[23]

Finally, we are grateful to Anke Sczesny (Augsburg) for contributing a review article, 'Poverty Research from Below: Letters and

[23] Benedikt Stuchtey has recently left the GHIL to take up a Chair of Modern History at the University of Marburg. This project will, therefore, be continued outside the framework of this GHIL research area.

Petitions by the Poor', to this *Bulletin*. As her review article deals with work relevant to this research area and publications closely related to our own project, it will be included in this section as an additional paper charting the wider landscape of international research in the field of poverty, welfare, solidarity, and care.

# *PAUPER LETTERS AND PETITIONS FOR POOR RELIEF IN GERMANY AND GREAT BRITAIN, 1770–1914*

ANDREAS GESTRICH and STEVEN A. KING

Historical research has shown a new and intensified interest in life testimonies (ego-documents) of the lower classes. In this context certain types of ego-documents, namely, letters, applications, and petitions written by or for paupers applying for relief have attracted increasing attention in recent years, first in Britain, and now increasingly also in Germany and other European countries. Such 'pauper narratives' are preserved in local or county archives in Britain and elsewhere, often in large numbers. The German Historical Institute London (Andreas Gestrich) and the Centre of Medical Humanities at the University of Leicester (Steven A. King) are engaged in a joint project, generously funded for three years (1 May 2011 to 30 April 2014) by the German Research Foundation and the British Arts and Humanities Research Council, to collect, edit, and analyse such documents. This paper will introduce this project by outlining first its research contexts, secondly its aims and perspectives, and, finally, some preliminary results.

## *Research Context*

The state of research on pauper letters and petitions still differs markedly in Britain and Germany. British literature on pauper narratives and related material has flourished over the last two decades,[1] intersecting with an increasingly sophisticated literature on working-class autobiography,[2] an emergent European literature

[1] See esp. the pivotal volume by Tim Hitchcock, Peter King, and Pamela Sharpe (eds.), *Chronicling Poverty: The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor, 1640–1840* (Basingstoke, 1997).

[2] For the rising interest in autobiographies see e.g. Rudolf Dekker (ed.), *Egodocuments and History: Autobiographical Writing in its Social Context since the Middle Ages* (Hilversum, 2002); Christa Hämmerle (ed.), *Plurality and Individuality: Autobiographical Cultures in Europe* (Vienna, 1995).

on petitions,[3] and 'ordinary writings' or *écritures ordinaires*,[4] to show that the poor and labouring classes were functionally literate and used language to assert and reflect their agency.[5] However, German historiography now also has a growing number of studies making use of petitions in general.[6] Some use them not only as a rich mine for portraying the everyday life of paupers,[7] but also to ask more far-reaching questions about their writing culture,[8] or about pauper rights, participation, and agency.[9] So far, work on pauper narratives

[3] Lex Heerma van Voss (ed.), *Petitions in Social History* (Cambridge, 2001); on the difference between letters and petitions see Peter Jones and Steven A. King, 'From Petition to Pauper Letter: The Development of an Epistolary Form' (unpublished manuscript) and for German letters and petitions also Andreas Gestrich, 'Das Leben der Armen: Ego-Dokumente als Quellen zur Geschichte von Armut und Armenfürsorge im 19. Jahrhundert', in Anke Sczesny, Rolf Kießling, and Johannes Burkhardt (eds.*), Prekariat im 19. Jahrhundert: Armenfürsorge und Alltagsbewältigung in Stadt und Land* (forthcoming 2013).

[4] Martyn Lyons (ed.), *Ordinary Writings, Personal Narratives* (Berne, 2007); Daniel Fabre (ed.), *Écritures ordinaires* (Paris, 1993).

[5] See also Martyn Lyons, 'New Directions in the History of Written Culture', *Culture and History Digital Journal*, 1/2 (Dec, 2012), online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/chdj.2012.007>, accessed 9 Sept. 2013; Reiner Prass, 'Das Kreuz mit den Unterschriften: Von der Alphabetisierung zur Schriftkultur', *Historische Anthropologie*, 9/3 (2001), 384–404; on rural areas see Klaus-Joachim Lorenzen-Schmidt and Bjørn Poulsen (eds.), *Writing Peasants: Studies on Peasant Literacy in Early Modern Northern Europe* (Gylling, 2002).

[6] For an overview of recent German language research see esp. Andreas Würgler, 'Bitten und Begehren: Suppliken und Gravamina in der deutschsprachigen Frühneuzeitforschung', in Cecilia Nubola and Andreas Würgler (eds.), *Bittschriften und Gravamina: Politik, Verwaltung und Justiz in Europa (14.–18. Jahrhundert)* (Berlin, 2005), 17–52.

[7] Helmut Bräuer, 'Persönliche Bittschriften als sozial- und mentalitätsgeschichtliche Quellen: Beobachtungen aus frühneuzeitlichen Städten Obersachsens', in Gerhard Ammerer, Christian Rohr, and Alfred Stefan Weiß (eds.), *Tradition und Wandel: Beiträge zur Kirchen-, Gesellschafts- und Kulturgeschichte. Festschrift für Heinz Dopsch* (Vienna, 2001), 294–304.

[8] Otto Ulbricht, 'Supplikationen als Ego-Dokumente: Bittschriften von Leibeigenen aus der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts als Beispiel', in Winfried Schulze (ed.), *Ego-Dokumente: Annäherungen an den Menschen in der Geschichte* (Berlin, 1996), 149–79.

[9] Robert Jütte, 'Sprachliches Handeln und kommunikative Situation: Der Diskurs zwischen Obrigkeit und Untertanen am Beginn der Neuzeit', in

(and more widely on 'ordinary writing') has tended to focus on several key issues.

1. *The texts themselves as material objects.* Thomas Sokoll's 2001 edition of Essex pauper letters provides the editing benchmark for all pauper narratives,[10] and his central concern in this volume is with the appreciation of the texture of the letters themselves. He has developed this work to look at issues such as the deployment and development of rhetoric, orthography, and typology, suggesting that English narratives fall into one of three types, ranging from the formally structured petition (by far the least important in the English context, but dominant in the German setting) to the familiar letter.[11] Sokoll's work is a key foundation for the approach to editing and understanding the narrative material that we intend to collect and disseminate.

2. *The place of these letters and petitions in marking the shift from oral to literate culture.*[12] Within the wider historiography of the rise of reading, writing, and publishing, pauper letters push back the date of an effective literate culture for ordinary people, and illustrate how, for many decades in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, oral and literate cultures survived side-by-side, each reinforcing the other.[13] In Germany questions concerning not only the reading, but

Harry Kühnel (ed.), *Kommunikation und Alltag in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit* (Vienna, 1992), 159–81; Christa Hämmerle, 'Bitten—Klagen—Fordern: Erste Überlegungen zu Bittbriefen österreichischer Unterschichtsfrauen (1865–1918)', *BIOS: Zeitschrift für Biographieforschung, Oral History und Lebensverlaufsanalysen*, 16 (2003), 87–110.

[10] Thomas Sokoll, *Essex Pauper Letters 1731–1837* (Oxford, 2001).

[11] Id., 'Writing for Relief: Rhetoric in English Pauper Letters 1800–1834', in Andreas Gestrich, Steven A. King, and Lutz Raphael (eds.), *Being Poor in Modern Europe* (Berne, 2006), 91–111.

[12] Adam Fox, 'Custom, Memory and the Authority of Writing', in Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996), 89–116. For Germany see the seminal volume by Ian McNeely, *The Emancipation of Writing: German Civil Society in the Making, 1790s–1820s* (Berkeley, 2003).

[13] Bob Bushaway, 'Things Said or Sung a Thousand Times: Customary Society and Oral Culture in Rural England 1700–1900', in Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf (eds.), *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain 1500–1850* (Manchester, 2002), 256–76. See also Martyn Lyons, *Reading Cultures and Writing Practices in Nineteenth-Century France* (Toronto, 2008), 151–66.

also the writing culture of the lower classes (a well-established field, especially in folklore studies) have also attracted a renewed and interdisciplinary interest.[14] It is symptomatic, however, that as far as letter-writing is concerned, much of this work is based on migrant letters because of the scarcity of other edited material.[15] Impressive numbers of migrant letters have been collected and edited in recent decades.[16] Pauper letters and petitions, however, have been almost completely ignored.

3. *The study of life cycle groups and conditions.* Pauper narratives have overwhelmingly been used to illustrate and analyse the poverty and relief experiences of groups such as the aged, sick, widows, the dying, and children.[17] Such work has afforded valuable new

[14] See Stephan Elspaß, *Sprachgeschichte von unten: Untersuchungen zum geschriebenen Alltagsdeutsch im 19. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 2005); or the older studies by Marion Klenk, *Sprache im Kontext sozialer Lebenswelt: Eine Untersuchung zur Arbeiterschriftsprache im 19. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1997); Isa Schikorsky, *Private Schriftlichkeit im 19. Jahrhundert: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des alltäglichen Sprachverhaltens 'kleiner Leute'* (Tübingen, 1990); Siegfried Grosse, Martin Grimberg, and Thomas Hölscher, '*Denn das Schreiben gehört nicht zu meiner täglichen Beschäftigung': Der Alltag kleiner Leute in Bittschriften, Briefen und Berichten aus dem 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1989).

[15] Stephan Elspaß, 'Briefe rheinischer Auswanderer als Quellen einer Regionalsprachgeschichte', *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter*, 72 (2008), 147–65; id., '"Everyday language" in Emigrant Letters and its Implications on Language Historiography: The German Case', in Wim Vandenbussche and Stephan Elspaß (eds.), *Lower Class Language Use in the Nineteenth Century*, special issue of *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 26/2–3 (2007), 151–65.

[16] See esp. the numerous publications by Wolfgang Helbich and Walter Kamphoefner and the network of collections they have created: <http://www.auswandererbriefe.de/sammlung.html>, accessed 9 Sept. 2013 (with an extensive bibliography of editions and secondary work on the topic). Some of these editions are also interesting and relevant to this project, as migrants frequently reflected on the poverty they escaped, its causes, and their new lives in the New World.

[17] Thomas Sokoll, 'Old Age in Poverty: The Record of Essex Pauper Letters, 1780–1834', in Hitchcock, King, and Sharpe (eds.), *Chronicling Poverty*, 127–54; Thomas Sokoll, 'Armut im Alter im Spiegel englischer Armenbriefe des ausgehenden 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts', in Christoph Conrad and Hans-Joachim von Kondratowitz (eds.), *Zur Kulturgeschichte des Alterns* (Berlin, 1993), 39–76; Stephanie Lorenz, *Verarmungsverläufe bei adligen Frauen: Bitt-*

insights into the thoughts and strategies of the dependent poor, and into the nature of their understanding of the obligations of communities and the local state. To take just one example, it has become increasingly clear that female letter writers deployed complex rhetorical arguments in their engagement with officials, simultaneously emphasizing their dependence as women and the moral obligations of the community to the weaker sex, while forcefully asserting their rights to relief as common citizens.[18]

4. *The study of agency and concepts of entitlement.* There has been an increasing interest in the degree to which 'ordinary writing' reveals the labouring classes to have had an understanding of, and a desire to participate in, the political process, using storytelling, rumour, and balladry to assert a 'political' voice.[19] Pauper narratives reveal that paupers were not, and did not conceive of themselves as being, in a situation of structural dependence, with all that this implies about the need for subservient behaviour, gratitude, deference, and passivity. While paupers certainly claimed to be humble, grateful, and sorry in their approaches to the local state, in practice it is striking how often the poor asserted their 'rights' (moral, legal, or Christian) and the 'duty' of the parish. Equally, pauper letters are replete with insults, challenges to the authority of officials, and accounts of behaviour that suggests anything but deference. Yet even such paupers manage to establish an entitlement.

*schriften an den preußischen König in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 2011); Christina Vanja, 'Patientenbiographien im Spiegel frühneuzeitlicher Bittschriften', *BIOS: Zeitschrift für Biographieforschung, Oral History und Lebensverlaufsanalysen*, 19/1 (2006), 26–35.

[18] Steven A. King, '"The particular claims of a woman and a mother": Gender, Belonging and Rights to Medical Relief in England 1800–1840s', in A. Andresen, T. Grønle, W. Hubbard, T. Rymin, and S. A. Skålevåg (eds.), *Citizens, Courtrooms, Crossings* (Bergen, 2008), 21–38.

[19] Sokoll, *Essex Pauper Letters*; Tim Harris (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded c.1500–1850* (Basingstoke, 2001); Klaus Tenfelde and Helmuth Trischler (eds.), *Bis vor die Stufen des Throns: Bittschriften und Beschwerden von Bergleuten im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung* (Munich, 1986).

*Aims and Objectives of the Project*

There is, then, a considerable body of work on which this project can draw. Nonetheless, important gaps in the literature and, in particular, in the source base remain, and this is a central rationale for our project. The prime objectives of the project, therefore, are to collect such source material, to make it available for research on a larger and more comprehensive scale, to further its analysis, and to contribute to interdisciplinary research on popular writing.

1. *Extension of source base*. Even for Britain there are still significant gaps in the availability of pauper letters in published collections. Those for counties such as Essex and communities such as Kirkby Lonsdale are well known,[20] but there is so far only one other collection of published material, primarily from the south-west of England.[21] For the English Midlands and south, the north-east, west, and especially Scotland and Wales, the coverage of collected and transcribed or even published letters is either patchy or non-existent. The project will initially concentrate on these 'missing' counties. Eventually, however, all British counties will be represented in the project database.

For Germany, no edited collections of pauper letters are available at all.[22] This is not because such letters and petitions do not exist or have not survived in the archives. On the contrary, many German archives have large holdings of material concerning poor relief and most also contain letters and petitions. However, unlike in Britain they are not deposited in the centralized holdings of county archives, but have to be searched for in individual town or village archives.

[20] James Taylor, 'A Different Kind of Speenhamland: Non-Resident Relief in the Industrial Revolution', *Journal of British Studies*, 30 (1991), 183–208.

[21] Steven A. King, Thomas Nutt, and Alanah Tomkins, *Narratives of the Poor in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 2006).

[22] There is, however, also another project in Germany directed by Rolf Kießling and Anke Sczesny (Augsburg) and funded by the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung, which is based primarily on such letters and petitions: 'Armut in Stadt und Land vom Ende des Alten Reiches bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg'. See <http://www.fritz-thyssen-stiftung.de/foerderung/gefoerderte-vorhaben/projekt/pl/armut-in-stadt-und-land-vom-en/p/83/?no_cache=1>, accessed 9 Sept. 2013. See also Anke Sczesny, *Der lange Weg in die Fuggerei: Augsburger Armenbriefe des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Augsburg, 2012).

This is probably why, although they have been used occasionally for illustrative purposes, neither petitions nor ordinary letters written by or for paupers asking for relief have been collected, edited, or analysed in any systematic way.[23]

2. *Extending the search to different types of 'pauper narratives'.* British research has so far focused primarily on what Thomas Sokoll termed 'pauper letters', that is, letters from people who were not residing in their home parish writing home and asking the overseers to send them money when they got into financial difficulties as a result of unemployment, illness, or old age. Such letters are found primarily for the time before the New Poor Law of 1834, and editions of these sources have therefore mostly concentrated on the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Under the New Poor Law such money transfers tended to be made between the Poor Law Unions and not to individuals directly. However, this does not mean that letters and petitions stopped being written after 1834. This is especially true if the search for these documents is extended beyond parish or Poor Law Union records to include the papers of private charities and other archives, such as the estate papers of noble landowners. There are also significant gaps in the range of narrative material collected. The British literature has overwhelmingly focused on the collection and analysis of pauper letters. In common with other European countries, however, as recently exemplified by the work of Martyn Lyons,[24] a wide range of other narrative material also exists. This includes correspondence between officials, correspondence by epistolary advocates, petitions, begging letters, and balladry/storytelling. While it is beyond the scope of the project described here to

[23] Exeptions are e.g. Hämmerle, 'Bitten—Klagen—Fordern'; see also n. 22 (above) for Rolf Kießling and Anke Sczesny's (Augsburg) current project. Pauper letters also form part of an innovative study of homeless paupers in the Westphalian 'workhouse' of Benninghausen by Eva Maria Lerche, *Alltag und Lebenswelt von heimatlosen Armen: Eine Mikrostudie über die Insassinnen und Insassen des westfälischen Landarmenhauses Benninghausen (1844–1891)* (Münster, 2009) and of several studies of pauper medicine, such as Angela Schattner, 'Probleme im Umgang mit Bittschriften und Autobiographien aus dem 18. Jahrhundert am Beispiel der Epilepsie', in Philipp Osten (ed.), *Patientendokumente: Krankheit in Selbstzeugnissen* (Stuttgart, 2010), 99–114; workers' petitions are edited and analysed in Tenfelde and Trischler (eds.), *Bis vor die Stufen des Throns*.

[24] Lyons (ed.), *Ordinary Writings*.

collect all such material, a sample at least is needed for a true understanding of the place, language, and strategy of pauper letters and their reception by officials.

In Germany the 'classic' pauper letter in which paupers living outside their home parish asked the overseers of their place of settlement for relief tends to be rare. Rather, the majority of letters in Germany are from paupers living within their parish, writing to the board asking, in a more or less formal way, for support. Paupers might have chosen to write rather than to ask in person because they were ashamed to be seen in this situation, or they might have written to the local nobility for a sign of special favour at a time of distress. Some turned to superior levels of the local administration after their applications had been turned down by the board, and asked them to intervene and review the decision. Many also wrote to private charities. Such correspondence is available in both Germany and Britain, and it is necessary to include it in the body of source material collected by the project in order to gain a fuller picture of the writing activities of paupers.

3. *Regional variance of pauper language and development over time.* The project aims to collect sources and select them for publication in a way which will allow historians (and students of other subjects) to investigate regional and national differences, and to analyse how the genre, its usage and functions, developed over time in both Britain and Germany. For Britain this poses no major problem as all counties will be represented in the larger database, at least up to the New Poor Law of 1834. After this point 'classic' pauper letters become less frequent and the search for them more difficult. Even though there is enough other material to make up for this lack of letters written from outside the parish, this might result in a slightly less even coverage of the British counties in the second half of the nineteenth century.

For Germany, where there is no equivalent to the holdings of pauper letters in the British county archives, the project had to identify well-sorted local archives and find a way of combining the quality of the archival documentation with criteria which allow meaningful regional and international comparisons, and the analysis of structural change over time. Differences between predominantly Catholic and Protestant areas also had to be taken into consideration. This eventually resulted in project researchers searching and using about twenty local archival collections. The sample ranges from the coastal

regions of the north to southern Germany, from old Hanse or imperial cities such as Stralsund, Frankfurt, Cologne, and Ulm to rural districts such as northern Friesland and Württemberg, and from industrial towns such as Essen in the west and Eisenach in the east to rural noble estates such as those of the Hesse counts of Erbach or the dukes of Hohenlohe.

4. *Database and open-access online edition.* The project will make these sources available in a way which allows historians, linguists, and scholars of other subjects interested in such documents to use them for their research. The data will be available electronically, partly as an open-access online edition which fulfils all the requirements of a scholarly edition of historical sources, partly as a large database of several thousand letters and petitions with fewer metadata and historical annotations, open for scholarly use upon request. The edition will be based on the software DENQ developed by Jörg Hörnschemeyer at the German Historical Institute in Rome,[25] and will be permanently stored and accessible on *perspectivia.net*, the international online publication platform for the institutes of the Max Weber Stiftung.[26]

## *Preliminary Results*

So far the project has transcribed and digitized about 4,000 letters and collected many more, in particular on the British side, and is preparing a selection of these for a comparative online edition. This edition will contrast ten German with ten British localities, presenting about fifty cases for each locality over the long nineteenth century. Introductory comparative texts and comments will allow these sources to be read as a comparative history of nineteenth-century poor relief and welfare state development from below. A Beta version of this edition is already in place, and the online edition is due to be officially launched in May 2014.

As far as the analysis of the material is concerned, the project combines local or regional studies in the framework of two Ph.D.

[25] DENQ is a German acronym for Digital Edition of Sources on Modern History (Digitale Edition Neuzeitlicher Quellen). For DENQ see <http://digiversity.net/2010/denq/>, accessed 9 Sept. 2013.

[26] See <http://quellen.perspectivia.net/>, accessed 9 Sept. 2013.

theses[27] with overarching comparative analysis of the material. There are several ways in which we aim to promote research on these sources and on the history of poor relief in general.

Pauper letters have mostly been used as individual examples to illustrate key themes such as agency, the range of the linguistic register, and the strategic use of arguments such as hunger, illness, or old age. Attempts to draw on perspectives from linguistics or English literature, both disciplines with established theoretical and practical models for understanding and using narrative material,[28] have been much rarer. This project endeavours not only to safeguard the interdisciplinary usability of the database, but also to deploy sophisticated electronic tools and methods for the linguistic analysis of such texts, and to cooperate internationally with linguists interested in our material. First attempts to use qualitative data analysis software (QDAS) were published by Steven King before the project started. The textual analysis package NVIVO was used to investigate differences in the linguistic corpus and negotiating strategies of urban versus rural paupers.[29] More recently it has been used to analyse how the English poor used and understood the concept of kinship in making claims and writing letters, suggesting that far from the English poor having narrow and shallow kinship links, they demonstrated considerable kinship fluidity and flexibility.[30] Other project papers

[27] Daniela Heinisch is the Ph.D. student working on the German part of the project at the GHIL and her topic is 'Petitions to the Frankfurt City Council'. For her thesis see her contribution in this *Bulletin*. Ben Harvey is the Ph.D. student on the Leicester part of the project and he is working on 'Pauper Narratives and the Contestation of Relief in the Welsh Borderlands'.

[28] For recent corpus linguistic approaches see e.g. Terttu Nevalainen and Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen (eds.), *Letter Writing* (Amsterdam, 2007); Marina Dossena and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.), *Studies in Late Modern English Correspondence: Methodology and Data* (Berne, 2008); Marina Dossena and Susan M. Fitzmaurice (eds.), *Business and Official Correspondence: Historical Investigations* (Berne, 2006). For German-language oriented analysis see Klenk, *Sprache im Kontext*; Elspaß, *Sprachgeschichte von unten*.

[29] Steven A. King, 'Friendship, Kinship and Belonging in the Letters of Urban Paupers 1800–1840', *Historical Social Research*, 33 (2008), 249–77.

[30] Steven A. King, 'Forme et fonction de la parenté chez les populations pauvres d'Angleterre, 1800–1840', *Annales*, 65 (2010), 1147–74.

using word frequency lists and collocation analysis are in preparation.[31]

Related to this methodological issue, it has become increasingly clear that the linguistic register used by British paupers contains phrases, sentiments, and rhetoric appropriated directly from the letters of officials, the law, official publications, letter books, newspapers, and political/politicized documents such as speeches by radicals. Writing pauper letters was, in other words, an organic process that must be firmly linked with the development of a much wider body of ordinary writing. This also includes the problem of the role of scribes and the question of the authenticity of the letters. The project explores the practices of writing and uses the letters as a basis for analysing the production of different types of narrative, including the writing down of oral depositions of paupers, the collaborative production of letters by paupers and scribes, and letters written by the paupers themselves.[32] The extensive and enforced use of scribes was particular to German (poor relief) bureaucracy, and the project analyses the changes in pauper language after the decline of official or commercial scribes in the mid nineteenth century. It links in well with other research on administrative language.[33]

In this context of linguistic analysis the project also explores the distinctive rhetorical, strategic, and linguistic registers of different life cycle and gender groups. A particular feature of King's work has been the suggestion that the sick, women, mothers of illegitimate

[31] Andreas Gestrich and Daniela Heinisch: ' "They sit for days and have only their sorrow to eat": Old Age Poverty in German and British Pauper Narratives', in Beate Althammer, Lutz Raphael, and Tamara Stazic-Wendt (eds.), *Rescuing the Vulnerable: Poverty, Welfare and Social Ties in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe* (forthcoming, 2014).

[32] See Gestrich, 'Das Leben der Armen'; and Jones and King, 'From Petition to Pauper Letter'. On the process of letter-writing see also Andreas Gestrich, Elizabeth Hurren, and Steven A. King, 'Narratives of Poverty and Sickness in Europe 1780 to 1938: Sources, Methods and Experiences', in eid. (eds.), *Poverty and Sickness in Modern Europe* (London, 2012) 1–33, at 15.

[33] Peter Becker (ed.), *Sprachvollzug im Amt: Kommunikation und Verwaltung im Europa des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Bielefeld, 2011); id. and Rüdiger von Krosigk (eds.), *Figures of Authority: Contributions Towards a Cultural History of Governance from the Seventeenth to the Twentienth Century* (Berne, 2008); Michael Herzfeld, *The Social Production of Indifference: Exploring the Symbolic Roots of Western Bureaucracy* (Chicago, 1993).

children, and the aged each possessed and employed a distinctive linguistic register and strategy when making their claims to entitlement. In the case of the aged, for instance, there was a clear tendency for old people in Britain to focus on specific claims (shirts, specified amounts of cash, etc.) and specific explanations for their dependence (a spell of illness, a sick wife, theft of goods, etc.) when initially approaching officials.[34] Analysing such claims and strategies on the German side and finding the voice of women is also at the centre of Daniela Heinisch's work, which concentrates on women's petitions to the Frankfurt town council at the turn of the eighteenth century. Even though these petitions were all written by men, mostly local doctors for the poor, on behalf of women, this does not mean that they did not have any influence on what demands were made and how they were formulated.[35] However, the problem of authenticity of language and voice in the context of multiple authorship is a major interest of the project.

Much of the project's work centres on the question of agency of the poor, and this is also at the heart of the general interest in 'ordinary writing'. How far were the poor able to claim and defend agency in their negotiations with local relief officials and the wider rate-paying bodies in Britain and Germany? While poverty and applying for relief is often seen as tying paupers into a hierarchical relationship in which deference, appropriate behaviour, and gratitude were the defining expectations of the poor, this project, along with other recent research, suggests that the British poor maintained and claimed considerable agency. They quickly came to appreciate the law of welfare's extensive 'grey areas', and deployed the language of custom, belonging, rights, Christian duty, nakedness, and dignity to exploit these grey areas and assert their rights to relief even where none legally existed.[36] The research on the German sources also

[34] King, 'The particular claims of a woman and a mother'.

[35] See her article below and Daniela Heinisch, 'Unterstützungsgesuche und Bittschreiben von Frauen an den Frankfurter Rat, 1770–1809', in Sczesny, Kießling, and Burkhardt (eds.), *Prekariat im 19. Jahrhundert*.

[36] See e.g. Steven A. King, 'Kleidung und Würde: Über die Aushandlung der Armenunterstützung in England, 1800–40', in Sylvia Hahn, Nadja Lobner, and Clemens Sedmak (eds.), *Armut in Europa 1500–2000* (Innsbruck, 2010), 82–99; Steven A. King, 'Negotiating the Law of Poor Relief in England, 1800–1840', *History*, 96 (2011), 410–35.

shows that the negotiating power of paupers was considerable. Complaints and petitions by paupers to the higher echelons of local administration to revise negative decisions taken by their poor relief boards generally resulted in a whole series of new administrative correspondence and inquests into their cases. Frequently, legitimate causes of complaint were respected and decisions at least partially revised. Similarly, petitions to the local nobility, even though they required particularly deferential language, were often a successful alternative (or addition) to parish relief. Pauper language in general, however, was markedly more deferential in Germany than in England (not necessarily Scotland). So far it seems that the wider political debates of the late nineteenth century on the social questions and social rights of the working classes had little immediate effect on the language used by paupers. In Germany, it was more the First World War and subsequent revolution and the economic crisis of the interwar period that seem to have brought this *ancien régime* of deferential pauper petitions for relief to an end.[37]

Finally, the material already collected seems to indicate that despite some general shifts over time, marked regional differences in the language and agency of the poor persisted. Comparative work on these differences at regional level and across state boundaries poses the greatest challenge for this project. During the nineteenth century most European states introduced some general legal regulations governing the granting of poor relief. Even in Britain, however, where overarching legislation of this sort was put into place by the New Poor Law as early as 1834, regional differences in levels of relief seem to have remained remarkably strong over the entire nineteenth century.[38] It is one of the hypotheses of this project that regional differences in levels of public generosity in Britain also influenced the

[37] This topic was at the centre of a paper by Andreas Gestrich on 'German Pauper Letters and Petitions for Relief: New Perspectives on Nineteenth-Century Poor Relief' delivered at a conference organized by Lutz Raphael and entitled 'Poverty and Welfare in Modern German History: New Perspectives in Current Research', held at the European Studies Centre, St Antony's College Oxford, 16–17 Mar. 2012. The proceedings of this conference are being prepared for publication.

[38] For this observation see Steven A. King, 'Welfare Regimes and Welfare Regions in Britain and Europe, *c*.1750–1860', *Journal of Modern European History*, 9 (2011), 44–67.

ways in which paupers perceived themselves and their rights, and how they interacted with the local authorities. According to the German Empire's official poor relief statistics, such differences in the levels of relief, that is, the money spent on poor relief per pauper or per head of population, must have been pronounced in Germany, too, right through the nineteenth century. Whether, as in Britain, this really corresponds to differences in the style and rhetorical strategies of pauper letters and petitions can only be explored when the transcriptions of the selected areas are complete.

The project funding will end in 2014, when a wide range of material will be available for purposes of teaching and research. Several papers and edited volumes are in the making as additional outcomes of this project. It is to be hoped, however, that especially for Germany this is only the beginning and not the end of a systematic search for and analysis of this fascinating genre of 'ordinary writing'. Other students of poverty and poor relief (but also genealogists and other researchers working with this material) are, therefore, welcome to access and supplement this database with their own collections of pauper letters and petitions for relief, or person-related data, in order to make this into an expanding research tool able to create and answer complex questions about the writing cultures and agency of the poor.[39]

[39] Please direct requests for access to Steven A. King, Professor of Economic and Social History, University of Leicester, School of History, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH (email: sak28@le.ac.uk) or Andreas Gestrich, Director, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ (email: gestrich@ghil.ac.uk).

# *PETITIONS TO THE COUNCIL OF THE FREE IMPERIAL CITY OF FRANKFURT AM MAIN, 1765–1809*

DANIELA HEINISCH

It is not only since the founding of the European Central Bank in 1998 that Frankfurt am Main has been Germany's most important financial centre. As the home of a trade fair, it has a documented tradition going back to the eleventh century. Its favourable location at the heart of the continent allowed the city to assume an important position in European trade from an early date, one which was sealed by its political significance as the place where German kings and emperors were elected and later crowned, and where the stock exchange was founded in 1585. Around the mid eighteenth century the business of lending money flourished, especially to Austria and Prussia, but also to other German and European states. The status of imperial immediacy (*Reichsunmittelbarkeit*), royal elections, and its trade fairs were ultimately what gave the city its particular status. And although Frankfurt was 'among the happiest cities in Europe' until the end of the Holy Roman Empire,[1] its Institut für Stadtgeschichte holds a wealth of sources providing insights into the lives of those who did not benefit from the city's prosperity, indeed, could not even support themselves. Anyone who was poor and too old or sick to work, or widowed with family members to look after, or incapable of supporting themselves for any other reason, was dependent on the help of friends and relatives.[2] Where there was no social network, the

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

[1] Rainer Koch, 'Vorwort', in Andreas Hansert (ed.), *Aus Auffrichtiger Lieb Vor Franckfurt: Patriziat im alten Frankfurt* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000), 10–11, at 10.

[2] Robert Brandt, 'Frankfurt sei doch eine "Freye=Reichs=Statt, dahin jedermann zu arbeithen frey stünde": Das Innungshandwerk in Frankfurt am Main im 18. Jahrhundert—zwischen Nahrungssemantik und handwerklicher Marktwirtschaft', in id. and Thomas Buchner (eds.), *Nahrung, Markt oder Gemeinnutz: Werner Sombart und das vorindustrielle Handwerk* (Bielefeld, 2004), 155–99; and Ulrich Niggemann, 'Craft Guilds and Immigration: Huguenots in German and English Cities', in Bert de Munck and Anne Winter (eds.),

last resort in many cases was to turn to the authorities. In order to receive poor relief, application had to be made to Frankfurt council.

These petitions for support, in which the poor described their situation and explained why they were asking for help from the city's charities, are the sources on which my Ph.D. thesis is based. It is being undertaken within the framework of the project 'Pauper Letters and Petitions for Poor Relief in Germany and Great Britain, 1770–1914', which is supported by the German Research Foundation and the British Arts and Humanities Research Council. These petitions are for outdoor relief; those who received this sort of assistance as a rule continued to live at home and were given money. Recipients of indoor relief, by contrast, were required to enter an institution, such as the poorhouse. For the period under consideration, we have around 1,300 petitions. Entitled 'Applications for Support from the Town Council of the Imperial City of Frankfurt am Main, 1765–1809', my thesis asks how those who found themselves in acute poverty as the result of their individual circumstances coped with their daily lives and explained their ideas, perceptions, and conduct to justify their request for support from the authorities. These petitions provide the closest possible approach to ordinary people 'from below', that is, not via the authorities. For those who depended on physical labour for their livelihood, the transition from making a modest living to finding themselves in a situation of acute distress was, in many cases, fluid.[3] The Frankfurt petitions, therefore, are not representative testimonials of a closed group of urban poor. Rather, they allow us to hear the voices of some of those who, with no one to turn to but themselves and in urgent need, applied for outdoor relief from the city's authorities. The few documents produced by the lower classes that have survived from this time cannot be regarded as reflecting the poor in general. Rather, they add a few tiles to the mosaic pieced together by social history and the history of mentalities.

Social history research on Frankfurt am Main has so far essentially approached the subject 'from above' (that is, by looking at government files, political writings, reports, pamphlets, legislation, regula-

*Gated Communities? Regulating Migration in Early Modern Cities* (Aldershot, 2012), 45–61.

[3] Thomas Sokoll, 'Selbstverständliche Armut: Armenbriefe in England 1750–1834', in Winfried Schulze (ed.), *Ego-Dokumente: Annäherungen an den Menschen in der Geschichte* (Berlin, 1996), 227–71, at 228.

tions, statutes, court records, etc.). In the context of this previous research, my thesis investigates to what extent its findings have been confirmed, and asks whether new insights can be gained into the life worlds of the lower classes. By concentrating on the institutional circumstances, my work will allow the specificities of the various social groupings to emerge. Further, the thesis asks whether the various political turning points which Frankfurt experienced during the period under investigation, for example, repeated occupation by French troops, are reflected in the sources, and to what extent they can be evaluated as poverty factors. This article will begin by briefly explaining Frankfurt's system of poor relief, and then provide a brief overview of the practice of petitioning. The case studies that follow are drawn from two groups that are especially strongly represented in the sources, namely, widows and craftsmen. Three representative cases will be presented to show the wealth of information that can be gleaned from the petitions, and to demonstrate the strategies which the petitioners used to achieve their ends.

## *Poor Relief in Frankfurt*

In the Middle Ages, poor relief was primarily the concern of the church. In the late fourteenth and especially the fifteenth century, responsibility for the regulation of poor relief passed more strongly to municipalities right across Europe.[4] After the Reformation, Frankfurt's system of social care underwent profound changes which the city's patrician upper classes were involved in shaping. In 1531, poor relief was put under the control of the General Alms Box (*Allgemeiner Almosenkasten*), which was administered by the council.[5] Later, cultural work was added to the General Alms Box's social

[4] For the state of research on this topic see esp. Sebastian Schmidt and Alexander Wagner, ' "Gebt den Hußarmen umb Gottes willen . . .": Religiös motivierte Armenfürsorge und Exklusionspolitik gegenüber starken und fremden Bettlern', in Andreas Gestrich and Lutz Raphael (eds.), *Inklusion/Exklusion: Studien zu Fremdheit und Armut von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart (*Frankfurt am Main, 2004), 479–509, at 481–6.

[5] Harry Gerber, Otto Rupperspergand Louis Vogel, *Der Allgemeine Almosenkasten zu Frankfurt am Main 1531–1931* (Frankfurt am Main, 1931), 10.

functions.[6] Its re-establishment was mainly intended to curb begging. The General Alms Box was essentially an umbrella organization administering funds from foundations and money from industry and commerce.

Previously, alms had been distributed mainly by the Nicolai Church, but the seat of poor relief administration now shifted to the Franciscan Monastery. When responsibility for poor relief passed to the municipality, attitudes towards poor relief as a duty also changed. In the Catholic tradition, doing good deeds for the poor was seen as rendering a service unto God, and having the right intention was the main criterion on which it was judged. Now drawing a distinction between the deserving and the undeserving poor and the need to check this distinction was the basis on which the usefulness of alms-giving was defined.[7] During the Middle Ages, Scholastic doctrines and the duty to alleviate acute and visible want had shaped the face of charitable giving. Now the focus changed from religiously motivated alms-giving to receiving alms, and to the recipient.[8] From now on, the poor had to prove that they were worthy of support by providing a reference, generally from a doctor, pastor, or teacher, attesting to their regrettable situations and upright lifestyles. Thus the poor repeatedly and actively renegotiated their membership of the community and their positions within its social hierarchy, while at the same time participating in shaping its moral code of values and ethics.[9]

[6] Wolfgang Klötzer, 'Frankfurt am Main von der Französischen Revolution bis zur preußischen Okkupation 1789–1866' in Frankfurter Historische Kommission (ed.), *Frankfurt am Main: Die Geschichte der Stadt in neun Beiträgen* (Sigmaringen, 1991), 303–48, at 316.

[7] See Schmidt and Wagner, 'Gebt den Hußarmen umb Gottes willen . . .', 483–5; Andreas Gestrich, 'Trajectories of German Settlement Regulations: The Prussian Rhine Province, 1815–1914', in Steven A. King and Anne Winter (eds.), *Migration, Settlement and Belonging in Europe, 1500–2000: Comparative Perspectives* (Oxford, 2013), 250–68, at 251–2; Andreas Hansert, 'Patriziat im alten Frankfurt', in id. (ed.), *Aus Auffrichtiger Lieb Vor Franckfurt*, 13–32, at 22–3.

[8] Robert Jütte, *Obrigkeitliche Armenfürsorge in deutschen Reichsstädten der Frühen Neuzeit: Städtisches Armenwesen in Frankfurt am Main und Köln* (Cologne, 1984), 23.

[9] Larry Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I* (New York, 2008), 4.

Most of Frankfurt's petitioners were craftsmen and their dependents. Frankfurt city council, dominated by patricians, had been involved in a centuries-old dispute with the craft guilds, whose members did not hesitate to appeal to the emperor in the case of a quarrel. Craftsmen had participated in the city government since the second half of the twelfth century; in the fourteenth century their influence was strengthened with the codification of guild statutes.[10] This situation, however, gave rise to tensions. In order to increase the city's wealth, the patrician majority on the council protected wholesale trade. While asserting their interests, members of the council exploited urban benefices and financial mismanagement occurred. Furthermore, resentment of the Jews grew as, condoned by the council, they circumvented the laws that regulated the life and trade of the Jewish community. Various instances of unrest and disturbances culminated in the Fettmilch revolt, named after its leader, Vincenz Fettmilch. Revolutionary clashes between the guilds and civic associations on the one side, and the council on the other, lasted from 1612 to 1616, mostly concerning the disclosure of old privileges, the regulation of the corn market, and the restriction of Jewish participation in trade and the economy. After the suppression of the organized resistance, an imperial decree of 8 March 1616 prohibited guilds and societies (with the exception of the academic Frei-Gesellschaft and the aristocratic Geschlechter der Frauensteiner und Alten Limpurger) 'on pain of physical punishment and loss of honour and worldly goods'.[11] Koch sees the subsequent appropriation or transfer of all the capital previously controlled independently by the guilds, the handing out of all contracts, documents, records, and articles of association, and the fine of 25,000 Gulden plus half the cost of setting up a commission for the purpose, to be paid within just six weeks, as the 'political death of the city's citizens active in trade, commerce, and

[10] Rainer Koch, *Grundlagen bürgerlicher Herrschaft: Verfassungs- und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zur bürgerlichen Gesellschaft in Frankfurt am Main (1612–1866)* (Wiesbaden, 1983), 9.

[11] 'Decretum Commissionis de dato Höchst d. 8. Mart 27. Feb. Anno 1616 die Abschaffung der Zünfte und das Verhalten der Handwerker betreffend', in Christoph Sigismund Müller (ed.), *Vollständige Sammlung der kaiserlichen in Sachen Frankfurt contra Frankfurt ergangenen Resolutionen . . . 1. Abteilung*. Quoted from Koch, *Grundlagen bürgerlicher Herrschaft,* 11.

the crafts'.[12] The abolition of the guilds and the loss of guild law deprived craftsmen of the chance of self-government. From now on, they were completely subject to the council's laws.

Master craftsmen and the committee of citizens who were not guild members thus lost their function as representatives of the citizenry, as well as their social and political power. Unlike in other cities, where the craft guilds played a large part in taking care of their impoverished members, the Frankfurt craftsmen were therefore dependent on the urban institutions controlled by the council. Craftsmen in distress and their widows found themselves in an awkward situation, both dependent on the goodwill of the council, and traditionally in conflict with it. Moreover, the sweeping changes in the system of poor relief did nothing to prevent corruption and mismanagement. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the council and its administration were inspected on the orders of the emperor. It transpired that the poor and sick had been deprived of their food, clothes, and belongings. Although the citizens' influence on the council's financial administration (*Kastenamt*) increased as a result of the inspection, the welfare system was not reformed until almost a century later.[13]

## *Petitions and Petitioners*

The archive of the Institut für Stadgeschichte in Frankfurt am Main (ISG Frankfurt a. M.), despite heavy losses during the war, has rich holdings of applications and petitions to the city council. Unlike private correspondence, whose preservation and transmission is, in many cases, problematic,[14] submissions addressed to the council, primarily applications for citizenship or the right of residence, marriage announcements, and petitions for support or financial assistance, are

[12] Koch, *Grundlagen bürgerlicher Herrschaft*, 11.

[13] Friedrich Bothe, *Geschichte der Stadt Frankfurt am Main in Wort und Bild* (Frankfurt, 1913), 205.

[14] On this see e.g. Benigna von Krusenstjern, 'Schreibende Frauen in der Stadt in der Frühen Neuzeit', in Daniela Hacke (ed.), *Frauen in der Stadt: Selbstzeugnisse 16.–18. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern 2004), 41–58. Although this essay deals mainly with women, it also discusses the general condition of private records preserved from the early modern period.

tidily filed by date in thick folders.[15] While members of the middle and upper classes are visible in their correspondences, diaries, memoirs, and autobiographies, the lower classes rarely left documents behind. These mostly took the form of civil and court records, minutes of interrogations, complaints, and petitions. The right to lodge petitions has a long tradition. Derived from the Latin verb *supplicare* (request, plead), the German word *supplizieren* began to shift in meaning from the thirteenth century, when what were initially subjective letters began to give way to documents drawn up according to strict rules. From the Middle Ages it was thus usual to submit supplications or petitions in the standardized form of a *stilus curie*. If this custom was not observed, long waiting times could result, or the petition might even be rejected.[16] External form was therefore crucial to the success of a petition, just as communications with the authorities in general were highly ritualized in the eighteenth century.[17] Among the Frankfurt petitions are very few that were drawn up by petitioners themselves, and these are distinguished with a special mark. In the extremely rare cases in which petitioners actually presented the documents in their own handwriting, the authors were, as a rule, scribes who had fallen on hard times. These documents similarly follow the rules. Examples from other areas often do not allow us to say whether they were written by the petitioners themselves, and their form may vary. English poor letters of this period, for example, were not generally written by scribes, thus testifying to a certain degree of literacy.[18]

Whether ego-documents and personal testimonies are a reliable source for researching the history of everyday life is a recurring topic

[15] ISG Frankfurt a. M., Ratssupplikationen, period covered: *c.*1600–1809.

[16] Alexandra Kathrin Stanislaw-Kemenah, 'Zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit: Supplikationen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts zur Aufnahme in das Dresdner Jakobshospital—eine linguistische Analyse', in Philipp Osten (ed.), *Patientendokumente: Krankheit in Selbstzeugnissen* (Stuttgart, 2010), 80–97, at 82.

[17] Claudia Ulbrich, 'Zeuginnen und Bittstellerinnen: Überlegungen zur Bedeutung von Ego-Dokumenten für die Erforschung weiblicher Selbstwahrnehmung in der ländlichen Gesellschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts', in Schulze (ed.), *Ego-Dokumente,* 207–26, at 208–9.

[18] Sokoll, 'Selbstverständliche Armut', 227.

of debate among scholars.[19] The question of whether petitions can be regarded as personal testimonies is also controversial, as they were always to some extent the forced outcome of an emergency, and mostly composed by scribes. Unlike other classic personal testimonies, such as autobiographies or diaries, petitions mostly reveal only those facts about the lives of supplicants that were relevant to their request and most likely to lead to its fulfilment. Although they were not 'sites of self-observation, self-description, and a medium for constituting identity', as Brigitte Schnegg, for example, describes the diary of Henriette Stettler-Herport from Berne,[20] petitions do reveal an 'explicit I' that self-referentially creates a relationship between its own self and the textual object, and thus occupies the position of an individual.[21] Even if petitions were prompted by a situation of distress and often not composed by supplicants themselves, they did arise out of everyday life situations.[22] Unlike interrogation records, for example, they therefore record the supplicants' wishes, demands, and statements about how they felt. Stanislaw-Kemenah describes petitions as '"free acts" that only revealed as much "private" information as was deemed necessary for achieving their immediate

[19] On the concept of ego-documents see the definition by Schulze: 'All texts that can be described as ego-documents should contain statements or partial statements which, even in the most rudimentary or disguised form, provide information about the voluntary or enforced self-perceptions of people within their family, their community, their country, or social class, or reflect their relationship with these systems and changes in them. They should justify individual and human conduct, reveal fears, demonstrate stocks of knowledge, cast light on values, and reflect life experiences and expectations.' Winfried Schulze, 'Ego-Dokumente: Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte? Vorüberlegungen für die Tagung "Ego-Dokumente"', in id. (ed.), *Ego-Dokumente,* 11–30, at 28.

[20] Brigitte Schnegg, 'Tagebuchschreiben als Technik des Selbst: Das "Journal de mes actions" der Bernerin Henriette Stettler-Herport (1738–1805)', in Hacke (ed.), *Frauen in der Stadt*, 103–30, at 105. In this context, she suggests, writing a diary can serve 'self-observation, self-presentation, and self-control'.

[21] Benigna von Krusenstjern, *Selbstzeugnisse der Zeit des Dreissigjährigen Krieges: Beschreibendes Verzeichnis* (Berlin, 1997), 18.

[22] Gesa Ingendahl, ' "Eigen-Sinn" im "Fremd-Sinn": Ravensburger Witwen in städtischen Verwaltungsakten des 18. Jahrhunderts', in Hacke (ed.), *Frauen in der Stadt*, 165–85, at 166.

goal'.[23] The focus is on the request itself, but demonstrative feelings are expressed appropriately for the letter form.[24]

The Frankfurt petitions had to follow a strict scheme. As a prerequisite for the request, the supplicant's situation of crisis or want is described with the aim of alleviating or remedying it. The process of asking, aspiring to a partnership, is located between the directive action of instructing and the consultative act of recommending or advising. In different cultural areas, petitions presenting complaints, requests, or wishes had long been established as a form of communication between subjects and the authorities or their representatives.[25] As petitioning spread throughout the Holy Roman Empire from the sixteenth century, the emperor was the ultimate authority to whom petitions were addressed. This means that in principle it was possible for an individual, regardless of social class, to have direct access to the ruler, the state, or the authorities. Although not legally codified, the traditional practice was generally accepted. In order to buttress the petitioner's credibility, reports, written intercessions, or certificates were required.[26]

Unlike in a letter, that is, a conversation between two spatially separated interlocutors, petitions to the council contained no 'sermo absentis ad absentem'.[27] Rather, what took place was a correspondence in multiple parts, in which petitioners first told a scribe of their request. The scribe wrote it down and submitted it to the council. The vast majority of petitions were written down by scribes of this sort who were, in general, school teachers or pastors, lawyers, procurators or notaries, town clerks or stewards, or other respected members of the community acting in this capacity. They made sure that the letters were given the appropriate form.[28] In this context, Ulbrich describes 'writing as an occupation, literacy embedded in a function-

[23] Stanislaw-Kemenah, 'Zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit', 81.

[24] Ulrike Gleixner, 'Familie, Traditionsstiftung und Geschichte im Schreiben von pietistischen Frauen', in Hacke (ed.), *Frauen in der Stadt*, 131–63, at 138.

[25] Stanislaw-Kemenah, 'Zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit', 82.

[26] Ibid. 85.

[27] Beatrix Bastl, 'Der Begriff des Friedens in der Ehe', *Wiener Geschichtsblätter*, 52/4 (1997), 221–555, at 225.

[28] Stanislaw-Kemenah, 'Zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit', 83.

ing system of text-production and communication based on a division of labour'.[29]

Today, we cannot establish to what extent scribes might have shaped individual petitions. While in most cases they would merely have written down an oral communication in adequate form, conforming to the rules of style, it was possible for them to modify the petitioners' message for their own ends. After the petition was read out at a council meeting and a decision had been reached, the *Armendiener* (Servant of the Poor or Deacon, who administered funds for the poor) was instructed how to proceed in each case. Thus there was no direct written or personal communication between the parties, but various intermediaries were employed. Like other petitions, those to the Frankfurt council were hierarchically structured from bottom to top,[30] clearly expressing the petitioners' dependence on the goodwill of the authorities.[31] When interpreting the petitions, therefore, the difference in power as well as the social and cultural differences between the authorities, the scribes, and the poor must be taken into account.

According to classical tradition, a petition begins with the *Intitulatio* or introduction, in which the addressee is addressed in formulaic expressions.[32] The *Narratio* explains the background to the request. This is followed by the *Petitio*, which precisely formulates the request. The petition closes with the *Conclusio* or *Subscriptio* which, as a rule, contains information about the date (and perhaps the place) of composition. It may name the addressee and sender again, and bears the petitioner's signature. The introductory and concluding formulae are visually highlighted, as is the name. As calls for action which intend to influence the recipient positively, petitions thus typically display a quadripartite structure. By comparison with their equivalents in other German towns, the Frankfurt petitions are especially highly formalized, and all follow this quadripartite scheme. This by no means applies to the same extent everywhere. Applications for a place in the Fuggerei, the Fugger family's highly traditional social

[29] Ulbrich, 'Zeuginnen und Bittstellerinnen', 209.
[30] Stanislaw-Kemenah, 'Zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit', 81.
[31] Ingendahl, '"Eigen-Sinn" im "Fremd-Sinn"', 168.
[32] Stanislaw-Kemenah, 'Zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit', 83.

housing complex in Augsburg, for example, display a variable degree of formalization.[33]

Apart from what is found in the petitions, we generally know little about the petitioners. In most cases, the appeal was made by the male head of the family. As a rule, women acted as petitioners only if their husbands, fathers, or brothers had died, or were absent or too ill to petition in person. The overwhelming majority of women petitioners, therefore, were the widows of craftsmen, but we also find officials' and soldiers' widows. Without the husband's income, the surviving dependents often did not have enough to live on. Added to this was the social decline faced by widows of officials and office-holders in particular.[34] We can assume that those who made an active appeal to the council did not have access to the social network that was still so important for the poor at this time, and could have supported them in their plight.[35] In fact, a lack of friends and relatives was one of the arguments used to justify the request for assistance. Many petitions refer to the fact that there was no chance of obtaining money or support in kind from their social environment. Petitioners had to demonstrate their own sense of justice and honour by asking for support adequate to their situation while also showing that they had some idea of what someone in their situation of need could appropriately ask for.

### *Widows*

One group that features frequently among the widows is mothers with young children to support. The multiple tasks which a single mother was confronted with often placed widows in a complicated situation. In addition to bringing up their children, they had to look after their households and earn money at a time when women were paid

[33] On this see Anke Sczesny, *Der lange Weg in die Fuggerei: Augsburger Armenbriefe des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Augsburg, 2012), esp. 19–29 and Andreas Gestrich, 'Das Leben der Armen: "Ego-Dokumente" als Quellen zur Geschichte von Armut und Armenfürsorge im 19. Jahrhundert', in Anke Szesny, Rolf Kießling, and Johannes Burkhardt (eds.), *Prekariat im 19. Jahrhundert: Armenfürsorge und Alltagsbewältigung in Stadt und Land* (forthcoming 2013).

[34] Gleixner, 'Familie, Traditionsstiftung und Geschichte', 145.

[35] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 3.

much less than men and their wages were barely enough to survive on. Anna Sybilla Gräfin, widow of the citizen and master brewer Gräf, found herself in this sort of situation when, on 16 January 1805, she explained to the council that not only had she lost her husband, but that her six children were suffering badly from the loss of their father. As a widow without means she was completely unable to provide even the bare necessities for herself and her children. The reasons she mentioned were lack of time, opportunity, and ability to work. She further made clear that she did not lack diligence or a willingness to work, but that all her energy went on bringing up her children.[36]

As the children of the widow Gräfin were young and unable to contribute to the family's income, she explained, she had already asked the council for assistance. But the weekly amount of one Gulden which had been granted, and which she acknowledged as a respectable sum, was not enough to feed a family of seven. Despite her efforts, her children were starving and she could no longer keep them alive on her own. The last resort for a single mother was to beg the council for further alms from other charities. The request expressed explicitly at the end of the petition, which mentioned St Catherine's Convent and the White Women's Convent, makes clear that petitioners were aware of the internal workings of the support system, and clearly indicated the agencies responsible for them. Public charitable institutions administered the city's poor relief. As all petitions had to go to the council first, it was not possible to petition the charities directly. After the council had decided whether a request should be granted or not, the petition was passed on to the relevant charity with the appropriate instructions. In addition to the *Allgemeine Almosenkasten*, which administered public poor relief, the most important charities in the period under investigation were the Holy Ghost Hospital which was responsible for indoor relief; the poorhouse, workhouse, and orphan's house; and St Catherine's Convent and the White Women's Convent, whose main function was to look after women, but who also gave scholarships to especially talented but impoverished students of medicine. The administration was undertaken separately by various offices.[37]

[36] ISG Frankfurt a. M., Ratssupplikationen 1.805 vol. i. 216–18: petition of 16 Jan. 1805, read out in the council on 22 Jan. 1805.

[37] On this see H. Graab, 'Die öffentlichen milden Stiftungen in Frankfurt am Main' (diploma thesis, University of Frankfurt am Main, 1939), 4, held by ISG

Widows were especially vulnerable to falling into poverty when they lost their husbands in old age, even if, as in the case of Susanna Catharina Söllnerin, née Rechwelin, they no longer had children to provide for. Söllnerin, widow of an administrative official in a supply office, *Proviantschreiber* Söllner,[38] described a problem that, while not exclusive to old age, appeared more frequently then. Her late husband had been ill for more than a year before his death. This meant not only that he could not work, but also that the couple's meagre savings had been used up to cover the costs of daily life as well as to pay the doctor's bills and buy medicine. Söllnerin presented this as the reason for her dismal situation. Her case illustrates that many petitioners had not spent their lives in poverty, but that they could quickly be propelled into distress by everyday circumstances such as old age, illness, the death of relatives, and inability to work. Söllnerin was able to live on her savings for a while after her husband's death, but ultimately had no choice but to petition the council for adequate charitable support. She finished her letter in the hope that the councillors, as gracious city fathers, would charitably take care of wretched and afflicted widows and take them to heart in their needy condition.

This case illustrates a pattern of argument that recurs frequently in the Frankfurt petitions. By reminding the council of its paternal duty of care towards widows and orphans who, with the head of the family, had also lost their male breadwinner, Söllnerin addresses a topos, widespread during the early modern period, that goes back to Biblical times and was frequently used as an argument by women in pursuing their interests.[39] 'Poor widows and orphans' stood for those

Frankfurt a. M., Manuskripte S6a/17Bl./S.63.Bl. See also Ernst Moritz Arndt, *Constitution der freien Stadt Frankfurt am Main* (Frankfurt am Main 1814), 22; online at < http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/ object/display/bsb10550854_00044.html?contextType=scan&contextSort=score%2Cdescending&contextRows=10&context=Verm%C3%B6gensstand%2C+Verwaltung+und+Verwendung+s%C3%A4mtlicher+Frankfurtischen+milden+Stiftungen+&zoom=0.7000000000000002>, accessed 16 June 2013.

[38] ISG Frankfurt a. M., Ratssupplikationen 1.765 vol. iii. 348–50: petition of 16 July 1765, read out in the council on 18 July 1765.

[39] On this, see the petition from a button maker's widow, Elisabetha Jordanin, to the city's craftsmen's court in Ravensburg in June 1765. In the matter of a dispute, she appealed to 'Einen Hochedlen und Hochweisen Magistrat, als

who had fallen into indigence through no fault of their own and were in need of special protection. Thus widows and orphans had a God-given right to the goodwill of those in power, who, in turn, could expect divine as well as worldly esteem for their graciousness towards the most vulnerable. In addition, they had certain expectations to fulfil in the matter of their duty of care.[40] The expression 'poor widow' thus reflects the state of mind as well as the status of petitioners who, by applying it to themselves, could underline their divinely given right to protection without mentioning it explicitly. The council legitimized its leadership role and claim to exercise power by its responsibility towards the destitute who, in return, were supposed to include the council in their prayers. Nevertheless, not all widows were successful with their petitions. They still had to prove their neediness and irreproachable lifestyle, and could be declined if they were found to be capable of working.

### *Craftsmen*

The case of Johann Michael Ahles, citizen and master cooper, illustrates that the poor had to account for their situation and demonstrate that they were worthy of support.[41] In his letter, read to the council on 12 March 1765, we hear of three blows of fate he had suffered. He began by reporting tax arrears for four and a half years, which were not his fault, but the result of a harsh fate imposed by God. Added to the financial burden to his house were various misfortunes, which caused hardship and poverty. Right at the beginning of his petition Ahles pointed out that his unfavourable starting point was not his fault as it had been imposed by God. The external circumstances were portrayed almost as a divine test, which the council could thus hardly consider illegitimate. In his letter he went on to explain that he had tried to work off his mountain of debt with the

Vätter der Wittwen und Weysen, auf das flehentlichste anzuruffen und zu bitten, mier unter denen Knopfmachern Fride zu Schaffen'. Quoted from Ingendahl, '"Eigen-Sinn" im "Fremd-Sinn"', 177.

[40] Ibid. 179–80.

[41] ISG Frankfurt a. M., Ratssupplikationen 1.765 vol. ii. 47–50: petition of ? Mar. 1765, read out in the council on 12 Mar. 1765.

labour of his own hands in order to gain God's mercy. Just as he had stepped up his efforts, a serious accident had made him an invalid when a wine barrel had smashed his right arm. The ensuing protracted and expensive treatment could not prevent his arm from being paralysed. To his mountain of debt was added the fact that he could no longer work.

Shortly thereafter he suffered a third blow when he lost his property to a fire which destroyed his house. Ahles could rescue only very few belongings. In extreme distress, all he could do was turn to his daughter, but she was responsible for his ultimate ruin. Although she acknowledged his miserable situation and took him in, she sold his few remaining belongings for less than their value to Jews. Ahles punished her for this, whereupon she fled to Mainz, leaving him alone. He was now totally dependent on the help and goodwill of others, finding himself in a situation in which he had to call on strangers to care for him, including such private and intimate tasks as dressing him, which should have been the duty of a close relative. Ahles, however, must have had a close social network of good friends who provided financial assistance in the form of alms. This may be why he petitioned the council merely to waive his back taxes. His application mentioned neither regular support, a one-off handout, nor any other form of assistance, such as help in kind. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Ahles had enough support, presumably from other members of his trade.[42]

After giving a touching portrayal of his life shaped by these blows of fate, Ahles, like the widow Söllnerin, concluded that there could be no doubt that he would find consolation from the council in his pitiful condition. He therefore did not ask for his back taxes to be waived, but implicitly assumed this outcome as a citizen under the protection of the council. Further, he underlined the council's responsibility towards him by pointing out that the only way of earning money left to him was begging. This, however, was impossible because of restrictive laws and the moral proscription against it.[43] In

[42] After the guilds were dissolved in 1616, craftsmen organized themselves in loose corporations without their own administrations. Anton Schindling, 'Wachstum und Wandel vom Konfessionellen Zeitalter bis zum Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV.: Frankfurt am Main 1555–1685', in Frankfurter Historische Kommission (ed.), *Frankfurt am Main,* 205–60, at 238.

[43] Koch, *Grundlagen bürgerlicher Herrschaft*, 129.

return, Ahles promised those who helped him that their good deed would move him to pray for them. Ahles's petition met all the requirements and, as a petitioner, he described a pitiful situation. But if we read closely, it becomes apparent that he was aware of certain strategic arguments which he could use to make the council acknowledge its responsibility for him.

## *Conclusion*

The three examples of the widows Gräfin and Söllnerin and master cooper Ahles show that the Frankfurt petitions, like other ego-documents, while leaving out many aspects, provide insights into the lives, work, everyday problems of illness, old age, and parenting, as well as the anxieties and feelings of the petitioners created by their situation of distress.[44] Of course, the circumstances under which these specific sources were created must always be taken into account. A poor person petitioning the council for support, while leaving out other aspects, would clearly emphasize the circumstances that favoured a positive outcome. Yet we must also remember that the petitions, like the testimonials and references submitted with them, were, as a rule, composed by respected members of the community who knew the petitioners personally and could vouch for them. If the council had any doubts about the credibility of a submission, a further investigation of the case was ordered, and sometimes more evidence had to be provided. If we compare the Frankfurt petitions with those from other places, it is surprising that external form played such an important part in Frankfurt, in contrast, for instance, to petitions in Aurich. There we find petitions such as the one which the settler Gerd Folker from Aurich sent to the king of Prussia on 6 January 1806, in which he addressed the king directly, using a relatively short form of address.[45] The contrast between Frankfurt and other cases stands out even more clearly in a letter by the widow Ysobele Behrens (also from Aurich).[46]

[44] Gleixner, 'Familie, Traditionsstiftung und Geschichte', 158.

[45] Staatsarchiv Aurich, Preußische Kriegs- und Domänenkammer (1744–1808) no. 2503 vol. vii. 1–3: petition of 6 Jan. 1806.

[46] Staatsarchiv Aurich, Preußische Kriegs- und Domänenkammer (1744–1808) no. 2500 vol. iv. 54: petition of 14 Feb. 1784.

Her petition lacks all punctuation, many words are missing, and the structure seems to follow her flow of thought or speech. It describes her distress, but does not formulate a request.

Although the Frankfurt petitions are rigidly structured and their language strongly hierarchical, close analysis reveals that, while aware of the requirements, petitioners were able to express themselves and were aware of their room for manoeuvre. Only at first glance do the petitions seem relatively uniform. In fact, they display a marked degree of individuality in their arguments and linguistic expression. In terms of content, the Frankfurt petitions differ from others in the sort of support requested, which is often connected with the difference between town and country. Gerd Folker, mentioned above, wrote in his petition that neither he nor his old, sick wife were in a position to earn money. Although he owned a small piece of land, it was of such poor quality that he could not grow anything on it. He added that in his home village of Moorsdorf he could not buy milk for money, and therefore asked for a grant to buy a cow. In rural areas, support often took the form of help in acquiring livestock, clothing, or firewood, which was especially frequent in Erbach, Hesse, for example. In Frankfurt, by contrast, almost only monetary assistance was requested.

The lives of the poor have not been of special interest to historians for a long time, and have therefore been hidden in the darkness of an anonymous mass. These pauper letters provide us with important information not only about the biographical data of the poor, but also about the strategies, embedded in the political and geographical context, that they used to cope with everyday life. They thus help us to identify the life paths of individuals.

DANIELA HEINISCH studied modern and medieval history, Spanish philology, and comparative literature at the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz and the University of Barcelona. She is currently engaged in a research project on pauper letters and petitions for poor relief in Germany and Britain, 1770–1914. Her dissertation surveys petitions and pauper letters from Frankfurt am Main, 1765–1809, focusing on biography, gender, self-perception, the ability to act, and the strategic use of language.

# *SOLIDARITY WITH CHILDREN? TOWARDS A HISTORY OF ADOPTION*

BENEDIKT STUCHTEY

'Solidarity' is not a term that we necessarily expect to encounter in the context of adoption. Children, especially orphans, appear to us as the quintessential objects of care. Protecting orphans, along with widows, was the primary responsibility of Christian communities. Yet we do find the term solidarity in the context of adoption, not only at present, but also in earlier periods.[1]

That is why the title of this article contains a question mark. The question of whose interests are best served by adoption has always been directly connected with this issue: those of the child, those of the parents giving up the child, those of the adoptive parents, or those of the state and other organizations? It was the GDR's solidarity with Communist Vietnam that led it to bring war-damaged children to East Germany, while the welfare of the children seemed to be almost a secondary consideration. But it could equally be the solidarity of a church community pursuing the practical pastoral care and welfare which it saw as the pillars of civil society. Not all the tensions that arise out of this topic can be explored here, but a number of examples presented in this article will allow us to discuss the fragility of solidarity and welfare, and to examine how profoundly entangled they were with the ideological shifts of the twentieth century. It will be asked what significance adoption and its history have for our understanding of childhood, social welfare, the family, identity, the state and private life, love and care.

> It started with adoption. The Bartsch parents had to wait for seven years before they could adopt him, because of 'doubts about descent', which meant that the father was a worker and poor and already had a family, and the mother had been with-

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

[1] For a general overview with recent literature see Benedikt Stuchtey, 'Adoption', in Friedrich Jaeger (ed.), *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit*, 15 vols. (Stuttgart, 2005–12), xv. 675–8.

> out a husband for years and later got sick, a poor woman. A toxic brew concocted from Nazi theories of descent still haunted the Welfare and Youth Services. That the child had already been in a home for a year should have been cause for concern, and led them to the conclusion that what was needed was a quick adoption, clarity, security. But the judge himself brought this Nazi biologism up when he told the mother that after all, the boy was not 'her own flesh and blood', and the father still hadn't got rid of it when he said that they would have treated their own child differently because nobody told him in time that heredity makes no difference, everything depends on the environment, that the child's future depends on that alone and nothing else. For seven years they had wavered with the adoption, kept the child in a state of uncertainty, had thought that adoption was a disgrace for the child, whereas it could only have made him happy and, God knows, was something honourable for the parents.[2]

This passage by Ulrike Meinhof was published in the journal *Konkret*. In it, she points to many of the key themes of the topic of adoption: its legal and social history aspects; the tensions between genes and social environment; and, finally, the public interest that it arouses in connection with criminal behaviour. In the winter of 1967, the District Court in Wuppertal, in a court case described by the media as the trial of the century, convicted the 21-year-old apprentice Jürgen Bartsch as a sex offender and quadruple child murderer. The newspaper commentators were mainly interested in his social background, which, they said, predestined him to going off the rails some day. The boy had been born illegitimate, and his mother had given him up to an orphanage at the age of four weeks. The adoption, which the Bartsch family, butchers by trade, had pursued, took a disproportionately long time because the Youth Services warned the adoptive parents about the child's allegedly bad genetic inheritance. Although it was said that the family a child lived with was more important than its birth family, psychological reports presented to the court later pointed out how great was the general risk to a child

[2] Ulrike Meinhof, 'Jürgen Bartsch und die Gesellschaft', *Konkret*, 1 (1968), 10; cf. Kerstin Brückweh, *Mordlust: Serienmorde, Gewalt und Emotionen im 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main, 2006), 225.

when placed in a different family. It was also emphasized that the child's biological father had gone on to have another eleven children, all of whom were healthy and none of whom had come into conflict with the law.

The court, by contrast, stressed the strict but caring upbringing the boy had had in the home of his adoptive family. That untrained social workers had made only a few routine visits to the Bartsch family, whose civic probity was taken as proof of their suitability to bring up a child as adoptive parents, was not flagged up as a problem. Yet as a child, Bartsch had lived like Kaspar Hauser because his adoptive parents, following instructions from the Youth Services, had forbidden him to have contact with anyone of his own age so that he did not discover his adopted status. This sums up my first point: the connection between adoption and the discourse of criminality, and the function of adoption in creating security and preventing criminality.

My second point touches on the child's welfare and rights in the context of the social environment and professionalization of adoption. The twentieth-century debate about adoption largely focused on the influence of the social environment on the one hand, and the child's biological and genetic predisposition on the other. This is not specific to the history of adoption in Europe and America, but can also be found in non-Western societies.[3] Adoption is a mirror of, perhaps also a model for, the variety of family patterns that give more weight to social identity than to genetic make up.

The history of adoption is also one of increasing professionalization and institutionalization. It is a history located right on the intersection between private and public life, and symbolically stands for how much in life cannot be planned, but can, to some extent, be corrected. Children's, teenage, and adult literature bears witness to this,[4] as do many sources from state and church archives. The fact that the state, church, and state-accredited intermediary organizations have a

[3] See e.g. Erdmute Alber, Jeannett Martin, and Catrien Notermans (eds.), *Child Fostering in West Africa: New Perspectives on Theories and Practices* (Leiden, 2013).

[4] Heinrich von Kleist, *Der Findling* (1811); Adalbert Stifter, *Katzensilber* (1853); Thomas Mann, *Der Erwählte* (1951); Gabriele Wohmann, *Paulinchen war allein zu Haus* (1989); Astrid Lindgren, *Rasmus and the Vagabond* (1960); Kirsten Boie, *Paule ist ein Glücksgriff* (1985); Jamie L. Curtis and Laura Cornell, *Erzähl noch mal, wie wir eine Familie wurden* (2000).

monopoly on initiating adoptions makes the interface with private life more permeable.

Third, the adoptive family, that is, a family with two parents created for the adopted child, could in future develop into a model reflecting the trend for biologically related families living together no longer to be seen as the norm. This is a positive opportunity for adoption. As more and more children grow up with divorced parents, or as step-children in family-like relationships not based on ties of kinship, the model of the adoptive family that copes with biological difference is particularly interesting and points to the future. Adoption as the key to social parenthood can work against the overvaluation of 'natural' origins, which is also part of the programme of reproductive medicine. But it can equally find a foothold in the field of racial and ethnic stereotypes, especially in the case of intercountry adoption.

A history of adoption, therefore, can, in microcosm, contribute to a history of social change in the light of international relations. Like other social, political, and cultural phenomena, it reflects the conditions and limitations of American, European, and non-European societies. Although the history of adoption is an almost unknown chapter of European–US relations, it has played a major part in the social and cultural history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Taking individual US, British, and German case studies as examples, the research project presented in this article will focus on the USA and Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It will cast light on legal, social, and cultural history dimensions, and examine the tension between genetic predisposition and socialization, heredity and life history. It will raise questions about the extent to which adoption reflects aspects of the history of colonialism and imperialism. And it will deal with various levels, including the family between the private and the public sphere; and links between European and non-European family history. In order to approach this history, the three points made above (adoption and the discourse of criminality; the welfare of the child; and social parenthood) will be discussed in the context of the historical development of adoption in Europe and the USA. Thereafter, aspects of colonial history and adoption will be examined, and in conclusion, a number of open questions will be presented.

*Europe and the USA*

The legal incorporation of adoption as an institution around 1900 was based primarily on the interests of the childless who, for example, wanted to gain an heir by adopting an adult.[5] When minors were adopted, the relief to the public purse that this represented was welcomed. The adoption of infants or young children under 3 years of age did not happen in practice on a large scale before the end of the First World War. After this it became the rule for war orphans, and thus an expression of interest in continuity, a classical aspect of child welfare. During the Weimar Republic there was no uniform vision governing adoption policy, let alone a chance of implementing it. But at least the Reich Youth Welfare Act of 1922 had placed the right of children to an 'education for physical, intellectual, and social proficiency' on the statute books.[6] Under National Socialism, by contrast, a centralized adoption policy was the result of the regime's monolithic racial ideology, as expressed, for example, in the infamous forced adoptions that took place in Nazi-occupied Norway, the destruction of all private and church-run adoption offices, and the centralization imposed by the *Lebensborn* breeding programme.

There were also centralizing tendencies in the GDR, for example, in the adoption of Vietnamese children and as a method of separating the families of those who were critical of the regime. The Federal Republic, finally, arrived at a point from which American society had long since set out: understanding the adoptive family as embodying the highest degree of reliability, that is, the opposite of the unreliability imputed to the modern patchwork family. In 1916 John Dewey had published a book on this topic, *Democracy and Education*.[7] In it, he put forward the idea that all forms of dualism—nature and spirit, body and soul—as well as social classes could be overcome in the integrity of a family upbringing. German research on hospitalism and deprivation by Meinhard von Pfaundler, Hildegard Hetzer, and

[5] For the USA see Ellen Herman, *Kinship by Design: A History of Adoption in the Modern United States* (Chicago, 2008), 22 ff.

[6] Christoph Neukirchen, *Die rechtshistorische Entwicklung der Adoption* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005), 107–11.

[7] John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York, 1916).

René Spitz was built on the conviction that the physical, mental, and social development of children was best secured within the reference system of the family. And the Freiburg behavioural biologist Bernhard Hassenstein underlined that in human terms, adoptive parenthood had the same value as biological parenthood.[8]

There are major cornerstones in US history for studying the legislative development of adoption, as adoptive parenthood began its legal existence in Massachusetts in 1851.[9] It was emphasized that the aim was to protect the interests of the child, and that prospective adoptive parents would have to submit to stringent examination. The state of Minnesota, which had passed a law for 'home study' in 1917, became a pioneer again in 1948 when the first interracial adoptions took place there. These became more frequent after wars. Japanese orphans were adopted after the nuclear bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and Korean children were adopted after 1953. Operation Babylift, which flew more than 3,300 children of American servicemen from Vietnam to the USA, was especially controversial. A dense network of representatives of many interests, including the Child Welfare League of America, the Adoptees' Liberty Movement Association, adoption agencies, and many more had long been established. At present, about 5 million adopted Americans live in the USA; between 2 and 4 per cent of all families have adopted; and 2.5 per cent of all children under 18 are adopted.[10]

Comparing the American with the German case, adoptions in the Federal Republic between 1950 and 2005 followed a wave-like motion. Recent figures have stabilized at about the same level as when they were first measured: in 1950, 4,279 people were adopted; in 2005 the figure was 4,065. The figure rose steadily until 1976, reaching a peak in 1978 when, in response to a reform, 11,224 people were adopted. Since then, the curve has sunk steadily again, only temporarily rising to 8,500 in the period immediately after Ger-

[8] Bernhard Hassenstein, *Freiburger Vorlesungen zur Biologie des Menschen* (Heidelberg, 1979).

[9] Julie Berebitsky, *Like Our Very Own: Adoption and the Changing Culture of Motherhood, 1851–1950* (Lawrence, Kan., 2000), 20–3.

[10] Cf. Judith S. Modell, *A Sealed and Secret Kinship: The Culture of Policies and Practices in American Adoption* (New York, 2002), 124 ff.

many's reunification.[11] An important factor has been that social acceptance of single mothers increased constantly throughout this period, making adoption to some extent unnecessary. And at the same time, intercountry adoption, which has outnumbered domestic adoption since the 1960s, threw up cultural and legal problems. In 1968, 83 per 100,00 inhabitants of the USA were adopted; in Britain the figure was 45; in Norway 21; in Belgium 20; in Italy 10; in Israel 9; in France 8; and in the Netherlands 7. According to an official demographic investigation, thirty-five years later, that is, in 2003, the majority of adopted children in France came from Vietnam (51), Madagascar (87), Ethiopia (115), and Haiti (119). This means that after the USA, France has accepted the largest number of non-European children for adoption. But as a percentage of its population, France lags behind Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, where 10 to 12 per 1,000 adopted children come from non-European countries.[12]

Unlike in Scandinavia, France's colonial past plays a large part in the significance of intercountry adoption. This also applies to the Netherlands where, with a population of 14.5 million, the majority of adopted children come from Indonesia; in 1980, for example, there were 669.[13] In Italy, the close connection of the topic with abortion, infanticide, and child abandonment is noteworthy. Italian historiography emphasizes the dominant position of the Catholic church, and its control of orphanages and institutions that fight poverty. As early as the nineteenth century, hospitals had *ruote* where babies could be left anonymously. In Milan, at times, as many as seven babies were left every night, 75 per cent of them illegitimate. It is known that many of the boys from the orphanages were employed in agriculture. Whether they were adopted, however, is not known.

[11] Norbert F. Schneider, Doris Rosenkranz, and Ruth Limmer, 'Nichtkonventionelle Lebensformen', in Ulrich Mueller, Bernhard Nauck, and Andreas Diekmann (eds.), *Handbuch der Demographie* (Berlin, 2000), 980–1024, esp. 1014 ff.

[12] See Françoise-Romaine Ouellette, 'Les usages contemporains de l'adoption', in Agnès Fine (ed.), *Adoptions: Ethnologie des parentés choisies* (Paris, 1998), 153–76.

[13] Signe Howell, *The Kinning of Foreigners: Transnational Adoption in a Global Perspective* (New York, 2007), 159–75; Peter Selman, 'Intercountry Adoption in the New Millennium: "The Quiet Migration" Revisited', *Population Research and Policy Review*, 21 (2002), 205–25, at 211.

In conclusion, what these different cases in the USA and Europe make clear is that a comparative and transnational history of adoption is needed. Much has been written so far in national contexts but little effort has been made to elaborate international contexts, let alone imperial ones.

## *Colonial History*

Anyone who wants to combine a European and US perspective on adoption confronts different family traditions, legislation, welfare provision, and religious contexts. That children can become part of an increasingly global network makes adoption no less complicated as space and time are compressed. Welfare policy looked like turning into family policy in order to exert control over people and their movements in manageable spaces, from private lives to the communal life of the nation or empire. At a time when traditional 'natural' orders were conclusively breaking down, as in the case of serious crises, wars, or when confronted by death, a separate world of social engineering unfolded, subjecting social life to interventionist ideas. What is interesting is that these global tendencies were equally effective at local level, requiring specific local appropriation.

This context, therefore, possesses a dimension involving colonial history and migration history. In the case of the British empire, it can be dated back to 1618, when the first ship, carrying more than 100 children, left England to colonize Virginia. Charles Loring Brace, mid-nineteenth-century American philanthropist and social reformer, had in mind the plight of the children and young people of New York, plunged into poverty and criminality, when he published his book, *The Best Method of Disposing of our Pauper and Vagrant Children*, in 1859. In the same year, the number of homeless children in New York was estimated as 34,000.[14] Brace did not think much of orphanages, believing that they would make the poor too dependent on the charity of others. His plan, by contrast, was to set up the Children's Aid Society. From its foundation in the early 1860s to 1929, this society put more than 150,000 orphans from US conurbations on orphan

[14] Charles Loring Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York and Twenty Years' Work Among Them* (New York, 1872).

trains to the country, in most cases to Michigan, Kansas, Iowa, or Missouri, where they were placed with foster families. The difference clearly was that fostering was less legally binding than adoption.[15]

Kingsley Fairbridge, son of a British colonial administrator in South Africa, had a similar aim when he founded the Society for the Furtherance of Child Emigration to the Colonies in the Oxford Colonial Club in 1909. Like Brace, Fairbridge was a Calvinist and like Brace in New York, Fairbridge observed the fate of impoverished, homeless, and delinquent orphans in London's slums. And as Brace saw the open spaces of the American West as the place to realize his mission of civilizing American children, Fairbridge had a similar frontier in mind in the British Empire: in Australia, New Zealand, Rhodesia, and Canada. He confided to his diary how well children could be treated in adoptive families, regardless of where in the world. In England, he said, their lives would be wasted, 'while the Empire cried out for more'.[16] In January 1913, the first thirteen boys from London, aged between 7 and 12, arrived in Fremantle in Western Australia. With the aid of the Child Migrants Scheme, six Farm Schools were soon built, and during the Second World War they also housed Dutch children from Indonesia and Singapore, fleeing from the advancing Japanese troops. The following words are carved on the foundation stone of one of these schools: 'To the Glory of God and the Children of the Empire.'[17] Thus Fairbridge was a true empire builder who believed that the Empire would benefit from British children being sent all over the world, whether they settled in families or orphanages.

It is obvious that this subject attracted a steadily growing interest among the media and the public, whether in the USA, Britain, or Germany. Ultimately it resulted in the initiative of increasing rates of early adoption from baby homes. This brings us back to a subject touched upon at the beginning of this article, which can also be seen

[15] On Brace see also Paula F. Pfeffer, 'A Historical Comparison of Catholic and Jewish Adoption Practices in Chicago, 1833–1933', in E. Wayne Carp (ed.), *Adoption in America: Historical Perspectives* (Ann Arbor, 2004), 101–23, at 102–3.

[16] Quoted from Margaret Humphreys, *Oranges and Sunshine* (1st edn. 1994; London, 2011), 145.

[17] Ibid. 167.

against the background of finding places for children with mental or physical illnesses, or those who were the result of rapes or short-term relationships, and symbolize the unwanted and unloved. These were not eagerly awaited children, as adoptive children often are today.

In his study *Uneheliche und verwaiste Verbrecher* (1930), Ferdinand Tönnies voiced his expectation that the care of their adoptive families precluded the allegedly innate delinquency of illegitimate children from being expressed.[18] Walter Nährich's work, *Die Kriminalität der unehelich Geborenen* (1951), also attempted to demonstrate that, in contrast to those who were later legitimated, married, or remained illegitimate, adopted children were beacons of hope.[19] Not only their legal status, but the milieu-changing conditions they experienced resulted in the expectation that they would form a smaller proportion of criminals, provided that the adoption was quick and successful. In sum, expectations of what adoption could and should achieve were quite similar in Europe and beyond. But the period under investigation makes a big difference: sources for the twentieth century are clearly richer.

## *Open Questions*

There are several other aspects which could be considered in a history of adoption. In conclusion, they will be mentioned briefly. First, there is the issue of forced adoptions. Between 1920 and 1960 more than 100,000 children were forcibly removed from the indigenous population of Australia and placed with white foster or adoptive families. They were expected to contribute to the development of a white Australia. In Switzerland a scandal made headlines when it became known that between 1926 and 1973 the government had secretly given Roma children to adoptive applicants. They were known as 'children of the open road'. Certainly the two cases were very different. But they illustrate how easily vulnerable people could become objects of state politics.[20]

[18] Ferdinand Tönnies, *Uneheliche und verwaiste Verbrecher: Studien über Verbrechertum in Schleswig-Holstein* (Leipzig, 1930).

[19] Walter Nährich, *Die Kriminalität der unehelich Geborenen* (Bonn, 1951).

[20] Sara Galle and Thomas Meier, *Von Menschen und Akten: Die Aktion 'Kinder der Landstrasse' der Stiftung Pro Juventute* (Zurich, 2009).

Second, it must be asked what European history can learn from non-European adoption practices. In many west African societies, for example, it was widespread practice before colonial rule for children to grow up not with their biological parents, but in a form of 'kinship fosterage' within the extended family. This was customary in northern Benin, where it strengthened social relations within a small society.[21] It must be asked what changed here with the beginning of French rule in 1893, and to what extent French notions of family and childhood were accepted in west Africa, even after decolonization in 1960?

Another good example is that of Tiyo Soga, who was born in southern Africa in 1829 and died in 1871. He is known for translating the Bible and John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* into Xhosa. Soga arrived in Glasgow as a 15 year old, and was adopted by a Presbyterian family. Baptized, he later returned to the Cape and became the first black missionary, priest, and composer of hymns there. Unlike his contemporary Henry Morton Stanley, who was adopted by a wealthy businessman in New Orleans at almost the same time and became famous when he found Livingstone in Africa, Soga's story gave rise to more controversies than positive newspaper headlines. He was accused of having become a 'black Englishman'.[22]

Third, we could look at the aspect of asymmetry and racial prejudice. Around 50 million people died in the Second World War. But almost 70,000 Germans, who are now at least 60 years old, owe their lives to the war—the children who nobody wanted. These are the people who, in an article published in the summer of 1995, *Spiegel* magazine called the 'children of shame', 'children of the enemy': the children born of rapes or brief liaisons between Allied soldiers and German *Frolleins*. According to figures released by the Federal Statistical Office in 1955, about 10 per cent of the children of the occupation were of African-American background.[23] If they were not simply abandoned in the hospital after birth, and did not die of starvation in the post-war period, many of these children shared the same

[21] See the research project 'Kindspflegschaften im Kontext ethnischer Heterogenität', currently being conducted by Erdmute Alber at the University of Bayreuth.

[22] Donovan Williams, *Umfundisi: A Biography of Tiyo Soga 1829–1871* (Lovedale, South Africa, 1978).

[23] *Der Spiegel*, 28 (1995), 56–65.

fate: they were adopted. To the present day little is know about who adopted them: families, couples, or single people; and what social background, even which countries, they came from. This is one of the starting points for the present project.

Is the fact that black families hardly ever adopt white children, whereas there has been much experimentation with white families adopting black children, a continuation of ethnic colonialism by other means? Are commercial considerations and power relations still involved here? In November 1948, when the mayor of Cologne asked the Youth Service in Frankfurt what was to be done with the mixed race children, the suggestion came back that they could be sent to the USA for adoption. This was echoed in a sitting of the German Bundestag in March 1952.[24] Catholic missionaries in north Africa who, among other things, ran orphanages, had suggested that it might be better to return 'mixed race Negroes to the land of their fathers', as the German climate was not good for them. That the children of the occupation presented a problem for German post-war society, which was not immune to racial prejudice, was obvious almost every day. Frankfurt's orphanage, a foundation dating from the late seventeenth century, found that Germans did not like adopting the children of the occupation. Other German cities also closely observed these children, known at the time as 'welfare kids', and their mothers, of whom the *Volkszeitung* in Fulda wrote in January 1950 that they were 'rarely to be seen except in the company of a soldier'. Army magazines therefore ran advertisements such as: 'Germany's "Brown Babies" Must Be Helped! Will You?'[25] The prospect of introducing special visas was held out to support this adoption programme. The wives of African-American officers founded a number of self-help groups which assisted in financing and organizing the transport of children to the USA for adoption. Often the whole process took more than a year, and little was known about the prospective adoptive parents in the USA apart from their name and appearance from a passport photo.

Today, facts about adoption can be painstakingly gathered via the US Occupation Kids Services based in Frankfurt, or the *Leitfaden für*

[24] Deutscher Bundestag, 198. Sitzung, 12 Mar. 1952, 8504–10.

[25] In general see Heide Fehrenbach, *Race after Hitler: Black Occupation Children in Postwar Germany and America* (Princeton, 2005).

*suchende US-Besatzungskinder*, which has been available since 2006.[26] Its website contains pleas by the adopted for the US courts to grant them full clarity about their biological fathers, and for society to deal more honestly with this chapter of its history. They suggest that the general opinion that adoption is something that should be passed over in silence is still too strong, as is the view that the children of the occupation should be grateful that, at the time, they were accepted at all. But, it is repeatedly argued, everyone has the right to know as much as possible about their own identity, and everyone has the right to reject adoption as an inadequate alternative. And we also find debates about the main forces on the adoption scene: the state, legal, social, and church institutions involved; those who adopt; the biological parents; and the child. The balance of power is, at present, shifting towards the previously weaker actors. Anyone who follows their or similar stories in the USA, Australia, Britain, or Germany experiences the full emotional range of the history of adoption. The emotional aspect goes along with the social dimension and the question addressed at the beginning of this article: solidarity with children. In its long story since Moses' basket was hidden among the reeds, adoption has forfeited nothing of this.[27]

[26] Margaretha Rebecca Hopfner, *Leitfaden für suchende US-Besatzungskinder* (Vienna, 2006).

[27] Benedikt Stuchtey, 'Seit Moses Schilfkörbchen. Die Adoptivfamilie ist etwas Privates, die Adoption selbst aber regelt der Staat. Das darf die Politik nicht missbrauchen', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung*, 14 Apr. 2013, no. 15.

BENEDIKT STUCHTEY was Deputy Director of the GHIL from 2004 to 2013. In 2012/13 he was Visiting Professor of Modern European History at the University of Basel, Switzerland. In October 2013 he moved to the University of Marburg, where he holds a Chair of Modern History (nineteenth and twentieth centuries). His recent publications are *Die europäische Expansion und ihre Feinde: Kolonialismuskritik vom 18. bis in das 20. Jahrhundert* (2010) and *Geschichte Irlands* (2012). He is currently writing a history of child adoption.

# *POVERTY RESEARCH FROM BELOW: LETTERS AND PETITIONS BY THE POOR*

ANKE SCZESNY

HERBERT UERLINGS, NINA TRAUTH, and LUKAS CLEMENS (eds.), *Armut: Perspektiven in Kunst und Gesellschaft. Eine Ausstellung des Sonderforschungsbereichs 600 'Fremdheit und Armut', Universität Trier in Kooperation mit dem Stadtmuseum Simeonstift Trier und dem Rheinischen Landesmuseum Trier, 10. April 2011–31. Juli 2011*, exhibition catalogue (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2011), 448 pp. ISBN 978 3 89678 859 7. €49.90

ANDREA PHILLIPS and MARKUS MIESSEN (eds.), *Caring Culture: Art, Architecture and the Politics of Health (Actors, Agents and Attendants)* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2011), 336 pp. ISBN 978 1 934105 71 9. €25.00

KONRAD KRIMM, DOROTHEE MUSSGNUG, and THEODOR STROHM (eds.), *Armut und Fürsorge in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Oberrheinische Studien, 29 (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2011), 302 pp. ISBN 978 3 7995 7829 5. €34.00

JOSEF MOOSER and SIMON WENGER (eds.), *Armut und Fürsorge in Basel: Armutspolitik vom 13. Jahrhundert bis heute*, Beiträge zur Basler Geschichte (Basel: Christoph Merian Verlag, 2011), 296 pp. ISBN 978 3 85616 523 9. CHF 29.00. €22.00

JOANNE MCEWAN and PAMELA SHARPE (eds.), *Accommodating Poverty: The Housing and Living Arrangements of the English Poor, c.1600–1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), xiv + 292 pp. ISBN 978 0 230 54242 6. £60.00

ALANNAH TOMKINS, *The Experience of Urban Poverty, 1723–82: Parish, Charity and Credit* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), xii + 289 pp. ISBN 978 0 7190 7504 9. £55.00

Poverty is multi-dimensional: it is relative and subjective, sometimes voluntary but mostly involuntary, and has pervaded all societies and cultures for centuries. It signifies an existential, economic, social, and

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

cultural lack. For centuries, different measures have been taken against poverty—by spiritual, secular, or aristocratic powers; by churches and communities; by democracies and dictatorships. But poverty is still with us, whether open or hidden.

Historiography has also dealt with poverty in many ways, both its causes and the measures taken to combat it in religious, demographic, economic, and war-related contexts. Over the last twenty years or so, however, the approach taken by historians has shifted from the macro to the micro level. In other words, the poor are starting to speak for themselves. Using serial sources from both urban and rural settings, such as letters written by the poor, requests for assistance, autobiographies, inventories, wills, and so on, historians are now investigating how the poor saw and dealt with issues such as old age, sickness, unemployment, and life-cycle related distress.

The volumes to be reviewed here—monographs, edited volumes of collected essays, and an exhibition catalogue—will be examined against this background to reveal similarities and differences in various spaces and times. The research perspectives of these works, which deal fundamentally with poverty and poor relief, cover an extraordinary range, from art and society (Uerlings, Trauth, and Clemens) to the current restructuring of social policy in an interdisciplinary setting (Phillips and Miessen). In addition, there are classic works (Krimm, Mussgnug, and Strohm; Mooser and Wenger) and specific investigations which take a new approach to welfare and indigence by focusing on the housing and living conditions of the poor (McEwan and Sharpe), or on credit arrangements (Tomkins). This list reflects the course taken by this review article, but also shows why, given the range of volumes under review, we will have to dispense with a definition of poverty, and any differentiation between poverty and indigence.

British scholars have taken the lead in research on poverty from below.[1] They were the first to recognize the specific informative

[1] In addition to the publications under review here, see Tim Hitchcock, Peter King, and Pamela Sharpe (eds.), *Chronicling Poverty: The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor, 1640–1840* (Basingstoke, 1997); on sickness and poverty, see now Andreas Gestrich, Elizabeth Hurren, and Steven King (eds.), *Poverty and Sickness in Modern Europe: Narratives of the Sick Poor, 1780–1938* (London, 2012); see also the research project currently being conducted at the German Historical Institute London by Andreas Gestrich and Steven King, 'Pauper

value of serial sources and have presented remarkable new interpretations and results, including reflections on the flexibility of the poor in situations of crisis, their awareness of a right to support, their self-confidence, living conditions, credit arrangements, and so on.

In the meantime, however, this research method is also gaining a foothold in Germany. Collaborative Research Centre 600 Foreignness and Poverty: The Transformation of Forms of Inclusion and Exclusion from Antiquity to the Present, set up at the University of Trier in 2002, can be seen as a pioneer in this field.[2] In this context, an exhibition entitled 'Poverty: Perspectives in Art and Society' was organized in cooperation with the Stadtmuseum Simeonstift and the Rheinisches Landesmuseum, both in Trier. The volume accompanying the exhibition, which was put on in 2011, is impressive in terms of both appearance and content. A large, lavishly illustrated book, it far exceeds the usual expectations of an exhibition catalogue. It is divided into three sections—Key Concepts, Essays, and Catalogue—whose contents are not merely juxtaposed, but overlap and complement each other in a positive way. After the section entitled Key Concepts, which provides a common vocabulary 'in the sense of making suggestions for interpretation, not prescribing irrefutable certainties' (Herbert Uerlings, p. 22), the following thirty essays, divided into four parts, form the main part of the book.

After the introductory essay, an outstanding survey of poverty and welfare since late Antiquity by Lutz Raphael, the first two parts in the essay section, entitled 'Ideological Concepts' and 'Patterns of the Ruling Order' under the heading 'Long-Term Perspectives' are concerned mainly with representations of poverty and the institutionalization of poor relief, both in a religious setting and in the context of changing political doctrines. The following essays, under the heading 'Poverty and Representation', look at the media and process-

Letters and Petitions for Poor Relief in Germany and Great Britain, 1770–1914', online at <http://www.ghil.ac.uk/research/solidarity_and_care/pauper_letters_and_petitions.html>, accessed 29 May 2013; and the project being conducted by Jeremy Boulton et al., 'Pauper Lives in Georgian London and Manchester', online at <http://research.ncl.ac.uk/pauperlives/>, accessed 29 May 2013.

[2] See <http://www.sfb600.uni-trier.de/>, accessed 29 May 2013, where the most recently published research can be found.

es of inclusion and exclusion relating to the poor. Although these sections contain few explicit statements by the poor, the perspective of the poor themselves at least implicitly serves as a backdrop, for example, in the essay by Nina Trauth ('Testimonials of Poverty? Pictorial Strategies in Documentary Art'), which deals with the truth content of photographs from the nineteenth to twenty-first centuries. Until the twentieth century, Trauth argues, photographs were documentary statements *about* the poor, partly because they were mostly taken without the knowledge of their subjects. Thereafter a style emerged in which the self-representation of the poor moved to centre stage, documenting their situation. Because they return the look of the observer, she suggests, they are granted a 'certain dignity *qua* representation' (p. 159). Thus documentation is a means of self-representation of the poor by which 'documentary images . . . and every truth claim . . . are to be historicized . . . and located within their specific historical period in time', so that, *sui generis*, they can serve 'the creation of solidarity with the poor' (p. 159).

Beate Althammer can claim something similar in respect of social reportage around 1900. Despite the way in which American and German journalists mingled incognito with the unemployed and vagabonds, and went into shelters for the homeless in order to be able to document the lives and survival of these marginal groups as 'authentically' as possible, their reports are ambivalent, Althammer suggests, because in line with contemporary prejudices, they were torn between sympathy and rejection. Nonetheless, they managed 'to shift the marginalized and . . . their life worlds into society's horizon of perception' (p. 223).

This is also achieved by the Catalogue section of the exhibition volume, which operates under the following perspectives: Documentation, Appeal, Ideal, Stigma, Reform, and, Poverty in Antiquity. The sometimes shocking illustrations and photographs, reaching to the present day, have comprehensive accompanying texts which not only describe the visual material but also explain its background. These texts clearly relate to the preceding essays, but still (intend to) leave the observer perplexed and puzzled. In sum, the volume *Armut: Perspektiven in Kunst und Gesellschaft* is not just a 'basic reference work' (Uehrlings, Introduction, p. 20) on the subject of poverty, as the extensive bibliography at the end of the volume shows. It is also a work that, despite the multi-dimensionality of poverty, offers

a consistent representation and interpretation of poverty and poor relief within a broad chronological and thematic panorama.

The edited volume of essays, *Caring Culture: Art, Architecture and the Politics of Public Health*, which goes back to a conference entitled 'Speculations on the Cultural Organizations of Civility' initiated and organized by the Foundation for Art and Public Domain (SKOR) in October 2011, is much more heterogeneous in nature. Twenty-one interdisciplinary contributions by artists, curators, politicians, and architects can be divided into essays, interviews, photographic documentations, and diary-like notes. They look at the neo-liberal economic model of health care and welfare that is dominant in Western European democracies, especially the Netherlands and Britain, and ask how the privatizations which have been undertaken have affected the welfare system, and what consequences they have had. They also address the question of what chances there are for artists, designers, and architects within the health and social care systems to express criticism of these changes in their chosen media.

The essays take different positions on the changing shape of the health and social care systems. Andrea Phillips, for example, describes the existing concept of welfare as too patriarchal, that is, as dominating the recipient, and then places this in relation to art, whose task, she argues is to regulate or criticize the new welfare concepts (p. 56). Mark Fischer subscribes to the interpretation of the political and historical development of neo-liberalism in Britain, which, in his view, is mutating into 'a zombified mode of power' (p. 63) as welfare support is cut, public institutions are privatized, and people are forced to be more self-reliant. At this point Fisher picks up on the striking increase in the incidence of mental illness, which, he suggests, is attributable to the 'massive privatization of stress' (p. 69). External factors are no longer seen as producing strain on workers, he goes on, but unhealthy working conditions that induce illness are blamed on workers themselves, who now have to take responsibility for their own illnesses. These neo-liberal developments can only be halted, Fisher suggests, by developing new corporate entities and systems, something that will require the sort of inventiveness and creative courage displayed by the founders of the labour movement in the nineteenth century. Steven de Waal, by contrast, wants to see individuals assume more responsibility for themselves. He sees bureaucratization as a negative factor inhibiting innovative creativi-

ty, and the burgeoning of administration as an independent force as degrading people into mere 'non-responsible' recipients.

Sally Tallant, arguing equally clearly, points out that the transformation of the welfare state has not only exacerbated the contrast between rich and poor, but that the state, in taking recourse to Victorian concepts, has reverted to distinguishing between the deserving and the undeserving poor. This, she argues, is the outcome of 'a perverse and moralizing mentality' (p. 147), and the reason for it lies in British Conservatism—catchphrase: the Big Society—which wants to transfer the state's responsibilities to the individual, passing social commitments to communities and citizens although these are part of the state's duties. Voluntary activities of this sort, however, create inequalities, she points out. Few people can afford to engage in them, with the result that 'moral choices are being eroded and articulated as moral obligations' (p. 147). Tallant suggests that drawing on the experience and knowledge of old people, for instance, would enrich society far more than the entire welfare state, and she goes on to illustrate this with reference to a number of works of art. From various additional perspectives, this volume aims to integrate art and society more closely in order to counteract the further decline of the welfare state and the collateral damage done by neo-liberalism, which not only wants to leave individuals to their own devices, but also seeks to instrumentalize art and culture.

While this publication is future-oriented and explores the chances of overcoming the crisis of the welfare state in Western European societies in a highly political way, the conference volume edited by Konrad Krimm, Dorothee Mussgnug, and Theodor Strohm, *Armut und Fürsorge in der frühen Neuzeit*, deals with religious forms of poor relief, something which could have been mentioned in the title. Based on a conference held in October 2008, the volume starts by looking at 'Transformations of the Sixteenth Century'. These are illustrated mainly by reference to regulations governing alms, beggars, and the police; imperial regulations; reforms in urban poor relief; and secular as well as ecclesiastical innovations. These transformations are investigated both in local settings (Dorothee Mussgnung on the Electoral Palatinate) and in Europe more widely (Theodor Strohm). Despite Strohm's European perspective, it comes as a surprise that in his introduction to the volume he presents the Thirty Years War as 'a consequence of the religious division of the country' (p. 9), while for

the last twenty years or so, historiography has seen it as a war of state-building.[3]

Taking an institutional and normative view, Heinrich Pompey asks what lay behind the charitable practices of the churches, what different motives inspired the charities and deaneries of the churches emerging in the early modern period, and what specific impact they had on poor relief (p. 41). He points out that the impossibility of 'directly questioning the subjects' (p. 42) is a difficulty in establishing motivations. This somewhat one-sided theological and theoretical look at changes in poor relief, mitigated only by one footnote pointing out that there were also purely pragmatic intentions (p. 56, n. 118), leaves out the complexity of church and community,[4] while also constructing a dichotomy between the old and reformed church that no longer features in this extreme form in current research.

After the account of sixteenth-century transitions would have been a good place for the section on 'Welfare under Enlightened Absolutism', which clarifies chronological developments in poverty and welfare. Instead, it is placed at the end of the volume. In any case, Hans Ammerich introduces the Enlightened absolutist approach to welfare with a case study of poor relief in the Bishopric of Speyer. Taking the example of social policy, which he defines as 'measures implemented in the health system, poor relief . . . and in the supply system' (p. 208), and precautionary ones in the education system, for example, or in economic policy, Ammerich describes the activities of the bishops of Speyer in the eighteenth century. By establishing prisons, work houses, and orphanages, reforming education, setting up a fund for widows, introducing new alms regulations (1771), and building a new hospital, they made a considerable contribution to social provision for the people.

Sebastian Schmidt deals with the significance of monastic welfare activities during the Enlightenment by looking at poor relief in the Electorate of Mainz; Bernhard Schneider investigates Catholic poor relief in the Bishopric of Constance in the eighteenth century; and Frank Konersmann, studying the orphanage (founded in 1759) of the

[3] See Johannes Burkhardt, *Der Dreißigjährige Krieg* (Frankfurt am Main, 1992).
[4] On the interaction between church and community see Rolf Kießling, Thomas M. Safley, and Lee Palmer Wandel (eds.), *Im Ringen um die Reformation: Kirchen und Prädikanten, Rat und Gemeinden in Augsburg* (Epfendorf, Neckar, 2011).

Duchy of Palatinate-Zweibrücken and the lunatic asylum of Eben-Ezer, which was established in the county of Lippe in 1871 and survived into the 1950s, analyses the position of the two institutions outside society and the liminal experiences, in an anthropological sense, to which this gave rise. This refers both to the 'peculiarities of Christian social work . . . in an institutional framework' (p. 270), and to the carers in such institutions as well as the inmates, who were 'directly and constantly confronted with Christian demands' (p. 270). At the end of his essay, Konersmann concedes that this historiographical construct for systematic research on Christian welfare activity requires more practical research. But he already regards it as a vehicle for asking 'specific questions about structural elements and structural problems' (p. 293) in Christian welfare activity.

The second section, entitled 'Dealing with Illness and Poverty', would have been better placed as the final section in the book because its essays address specific problems. It also presents official directives, illustrated by the cases of leprosy (Elisabeth Clementz), early modern plague processions on the Upper Rhine (Kirsten Renate Seelbach), and Jewish poor relief to the present day, using the example of burial brotherhoods (Uri R. Kaufmann). Taking a regional history approach, Helmut Neumaier discusses poverty and how it was dealt with in the areas being built on by the Imperial Knights. He deserves credit for providing a definition of the poor, and distinguishing between beggars, the domestic poor, peasants, and those impoverished by war.

Annemarie Kinzelbach examines poverty and illness in the early modern towns of upper Germany. Working critically with the sources, she demonstrates accurately and methodically that without openly asking for help, the sick 'implicitly [formulated] a claim for support that was based on social capital' (p. 148) or on 'social networks, which generally facilitated access to the relevant forms of assistance' (p. 149). And even if an explicit request for help was made because of illness or poverty, any stigmatization of the petitioner depended on the distress caused by events related to life stages—including being an apprentice, a child, a single woman, pregnant, or old—which made them particularly worthy of assistance. This, of course, did not apply to 'foreign' supplicants, who were supported only within the framework of the established norms, and no further. Kinzelbach draws this distinction on the basis of the 'voices of the

(poor) sick in official documents' (p. 147). The evidence from the statements of those involved stands out, despite gaps in the records. This also relativizes any suggestion that poor relief was dispensed along strictly confessional lines. According to Kinzelbach, a traditional, Christian value system was not the only factor influencing the help granted to the poor in need. The rendering of assistance could also be ascribed to the 'common good', which served not only the 'restoration of an individual's ability to function, but also . . . the preservation of the urban community' (p. 176).

Taking personal statements by Ulrich Bräker (1735–98), a poor man in Tockenburg who tried to earn his living as a 'spinner, weaver, dealer in yarn, printer and distributor of cotton' (p. 177) as an example, Susanne Hoffmann examines poverty and poor relief. According to Bräker, harvests spoiled by bad weather, negative economic developments, poverty, and illness could all result in indigence, but he blamed the able-bodied poor for their penchant for luxury which, at bad times, drove them into ruin. Bräker's interpretation of the substantive relationship between work and poverty is, however, ambivalent as he 'praised both work and poverty, and at the same time liked to indulge in despised idleness' (p. 181). As already hinted at in Kinzelbach's essay, social capital also played a large part in Bräker's biography, for self-help at times of illness as well as borrowing in times of need were largely dependent on the 'good reputation' of the person needing support, which therefore had to be preserved under all circumstances. This could mean that, vice versa, an 'increase in economic capital', for example, by receiving poor relief, had to be paid for 'by a loss of social capital' (p. 189). The rational strategies pursued by the poor in Bräker's reports, whose views changed 'between Pietism and Enlightenment, between a work ethic and ideas of education' (p. 192) reveal the limitations of poor relief seen purely in institutional terms, as individual 'economies of the makeshift' are ignored.

This volume leaves a somewhat mixed impression because of its rather imprecise title, the division into sections which does not quite make sense, and the inclusion of some essays which are not entirely up to date with the current state of research. Those studies, however, which in addition to looking at the normative level investigate the practical aspect of poor relief from below significantly mitigate this impression.

Unlike the publications discussed above, which are limited to the early modern period, the volume *Armut und Fürsorge in Basel* deals with a longer period, from the thirteenth century to the present, but concentrates on local policy for the poor. It shows how policy for the poor developed over time, and focuses on specific themes relative to Switzerland or Basel in particular.

The first four essays, by Katharina Simon-Muscheid, Susanna Burghartz, Claudia Opitz-Belakhal, and Sara Janner, concisely present the development of poor relief and policy for the poor in Basel from the late Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. A constant theme throughout these centuries is the ever expanding policy of repression on the part of the authorities, which destroyed the former charity sector and the acceptance of it by the poor. Ever new regulations for beggars and the poor divided them into 'deserving' and 'undeserving', and the increase in the number of poorhouses, orphanages, and workhouses along with the institutionalization of almsgiving meant that poor relief was communalized and bureaucratized. These exclusion mechanisms were exacerbated by the sixteenth-century laws governing citizenship and the right of domicile (*Heimatrecht*), which were designed to exclude needy foreigners and those from rural areas from any form of support, especially at times of crisis.

This process can be followed into the twentieth century, as the principle of a home parish was not abolished in Switzerland until 1975 (Sonja Matter; Georg Kreis). The right of domicile and citizenship law were also used to prevent poor people from getting married, as only those who could support a family were permitted to marry. In her essay, Regina Wecker describes how this led to the birth of illegitimate children and sometimes even to infanticide because of the 'moral stigma' (p. 207). Although this ban on marriage was liberalized in 1874, marriage law was changed in 1912 to state that 'under no circumstances are the insane fit to marry' (p. 208). Consequently, marriage was no longer the main issue, but public health. This opened the door to eugenics, and forced sterilizations and abortions were the result. In other words: 'Attempts were made to eliminate old social problems using the new medical opportunities offered by the twentieth century' (p. 214).

The main focus of this volume is on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to which six essays are devoted (Martin Leng-

wiler, Regula Zürcher, Urs Hofmann, Bernard Degen, Mirjam Häsler Kristmann, and Josef Mooser). They cast light on the transformation of poor relief into a state social policy from various different perspectives. There are some redundancies, in particular, in Gaby Sutter's essay on public welfare in the twentieth century, in which she repeatedly refers to several other authors, which makes reading somewhat tiresome. Yet it also reflects the complexity of Basel's poor relief, which was divided into social welfare for the citizens of Basel (Bürgerliches Armenamt from 1900; Bürgerliches Fürsorgeamt from 1930) and support for people from other home parishes who had settled in Basel, essentially provided by the Gesellschaft für das Gute und Gemeinnützige (Society for the Good and Charitable), church communities, religious societies, and other private associations. This voluntary sector was absorbed by universal poor relief which, after the principle of a home parish was abolished in 1975, was merged with the social welfare office (Bürgerliches Fürsorgeamt).

What is striking about Basel's policy for the poor is that the division into 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor—benefit scroungers in today's parlance—continues to the present day, perpetuating a work ethos dating from the late Middle Ages according to which gainful employment protects against poverty, as Ulrich Bräker had put it in the eighteenth century. Simon Wenger argues, however, that this 'cannot do justice to the complexity of the issues because it ignores the norms, structures, and mechanisms of social inequality by which people are forced into poverty, or kept imprisoned in it' (p. 266). This is explained in Regula Zürcher's essay, which looks at the nineteenth-century temperance movement from the point of view of those affected. Taking as an example an application to emigrate, she describes alcohol abuse in the nineteenth century ('Elendsalkoholismus', p. 126), a condition that affected mainly men, who thereby cast their families into disaster. Zürcher also links the teetotal movement with the contemporary image of poverty, because 'poverty was seen as self-inflicted and mainly male in character, while families were regarded as innocent "collateral" victims' (p. 131). The split between the deserving and undeserving poor thus continued to perpetuate itself.

All the essays offer competent, critical, and balanced analyses of poor relief from the perspectives of the history of science, the history of space, cultural history, or gender history. As a result, the reader gains a deep insight into the changing policy for the poor in the city

and canton of Basel from the late Middle Ages to the present day. Yet as the introduction puts it, the essays 'stress the perception of poverty and the poor from the perspective of actors in policy-making for the poor and the institutionalized forms of dealing with them . . . but this does not represent a synthesis, which would have to include the voices of those affected by poverty themselves' (p. 21). This points to one of the dilemmas of the field of poverty research, which requires macro history, that is, a perspective from above, to capture fundamental structural developments, but can get close to the actual manifestations of poverty, and resistance to it, only with the voices of the needy themselves.

The validity of the statements of the poor about poor relief and poverty is clearly illustrated in the volume *Accommodating Poverty: The Housing and Living Arrangements of the English Poor, c.1600–1850*. With the aim of examining the symbolic and material value of housing, the composition of households in relation to mobility during the process of British industrialization, and poor relief in the context of poorhouses and workhouses, this volume comprises eleven essays including a detailed introduction that covers the most recent research literature. In a highly differentiated way, the essays in this volume present the housing and living conditions of the poor, which have not so far been at the centre of research.

Jeremy Boulton's comments on the precarious conditions faced by London's poor, who were placed under great pressure by the need to pay rent, and his investigation, conducted with Leonard Schwarz, of high residential mobility in London reveal a mentality among the poor in which knowledge and the use of workhouses seems to have been part of a survival strategy. While Joanne McEwan looks at London's poor and their various dwellings, Adrian Green, drawing upon inventories, descriptions of houses, and biographies, establishes that between 1650 and 1830 most of the poor he investigated had at least the most necessary cooking utensils and bedsteads. He comes to the conclusion that even the poorest, so long as they had their own living space, 'usually had a pot to piss in' (p. 96). The other contributions, too, which deal with living in various different spaces, such as the British colonies (Sarah Lloyd), in the country (Steve Hindle), and in poorhouses (John Broad and Alannah Tomkins), or discuss the conditions under which single mothers lived and their life strategies (Samantha K. Williams) correct the general historical picture pro-

duced by research on poverty by analysing letters written by the poor, reports, and petitions for support. As a result, a much more differentiated image of the poor and the conditions under which they lived emerges.

Two contributions in particular, which relate not only to narratives of the poor and petitions but go beyond this type of source to look at different complexes of problems, deserve mention here. Tim Hitchcock looks at vagrants and vagrancy between norm and practice, while Steven King examines the life cycles of the poor and their family situations in Britain between 1800 and 1840.

Studying a number of (auto-)biographies of British vagrants in the eighteenth century, Hitchcock looks at their living conditions, where they slept, and how they were accepted in the places they stayed in. By doing this he questions previous historiography. This has tended to concentrate on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, on the expulsion of these unpopular figures, and on the characteristics that led to these expulsions, so that more is known about vagrancy than vagrants themselves. Against the background of detailed descriptions of vagrants' lives, Hitchcock presents a highly nuanced and complex picture of their ways of living. He shows that despite the increasingly harsh laws against vagrancy between 1700 and 1824, both men and women repeatedly found loopholes in their applications. This made it possible for them to live a life on the road and find opportunities for work, including illegal ones. Descriptions of places where this minority overnighted without being driven away, such as barns, outbuildings, on the roadside, and under bushes, shows the high degree of tolerance for them displayed by the resident population. This also contradicts the findings of historians that internal migration was subject to strict restrictions, suggesting that the laws to suppress vagrancy were often circumvented or broken, and that their effectiveness therefore needs to be questioned. Ultimately, these laws provoked the disobedience of vagrants so that they could survive on the streets. This illustrates the significance of these biographies, which are the only way in which we can begin to approach the experiences of the poor in the eighteenth century.

In his study, Steven King also looks at ego documents, not autobiographies, but letters written by the poor. Drawing on 3,000 letters written in 78 parishes in Berkshire, Lancashire, and Northamptonshire between 1810 and 1840, he analyses the life cycles of the poor

and their family situations. In order to generalize from the huge amount of data he has assembled, King restricts the pool to those families that wrote several letters to their home parishes. On the basis of this selection, King can show that the poor, and especially the aged poor, displayed a remarkable tenacity in keeping their homes. Although permanently under threat of eviction, they managed to stay in their homes for years. His research also reveals complex and permeable family structures, something that considerably expands the findings of previous research, which tends to be based on snapshots rather than processes of development. Whether single people, married couples with children, or households that also supported relatives, all based the arguments in their petitions on these structures. In other words, they used housing, the household, and the family rhetorically and strategically. They drew on the language of living alone, or referred to their local roots, the bringing up of young children, illness, and old age. Depending on their concerns, they developed a semantics 'that shifted between housing as a salvation to housing as millstone' (p. 163). Statistical data can undoubtedly provide the background to research, but it is not enough to explain how the poor dealt with their poverty, or to show how complex their life situations and survival strategies were.

All contributions to this volume successfully combine the macro and micro levels of research on poverty while taking in the perspective of the needy on the basis of diverse yet subject-centred sources. As a result, this new methodology modifies and corrects dominant notions and ascriptions of poverty, welfare, and the poor, and produces a complex, detailed picture of people in distress and their strategies.

To examine this is also the aim of Alannah Tomkins's book, published in 2006, *The Experience of Urban Poverty, 1723–82: Parish, Charity and Credit*. Based on the investigation of twelve well-documented parishes in Oxford, Shrewsbury, and York, her study compiles biographies of the poor from community records and invoices. She aims to find the greatest possible common denominator between the various overlapping groups, without drawing on the letters of the poor or on-going legal proceedings, in order to examine the significance of statutory community support as opposed to non-statutory assistance in the life of the poor. She asks whether these forms of relief provided a secure and reliable safety net for the poor, or whether they were

merely sporadic services which contributed to the permanent uncertainties in the lives of the poor.

Tomkins presents the conditions under which the poor lived, drawing on life in the workhouse, traditional poor relief such as lodging in poorhouses, health care, and schools for the poor. The section on credit and pawn broking among those in distress is especially significant because this is a field that has hardly been researched so far, and it demonstrates the flexibility of the poor in their struggle against want. Using a pawn book covering a period of more than a year, from August 1777 to December 1778, Tomkins analyses nearly 11,000 pledges. This suggests that around 15 to 17 per cent of the population of York pawned their belongings at times of need. This group of vulnerable people can be further differentiated into those who sought out the pawnshop once, and those who repeatedly pawned some of their possessions in order to deal with problems that kept cropping up. This makeshift economy allowed the poor to overcome short-term crises, or to escape deeper misery as long as they possessed something to pawn.

At the end of her study, where Tomkins sums up its findings in the context of wider research, she explains why she excludes the voices of the poor themselves from her analysis, as indicated above. On the basis of autobiographies of four Oxford families, seemingly selected at random, she suggests that the analysis of life histories as an approach tends 'to privilege male stories' (p. 238). Yet she does not seem to take into account the women named in the biographies she presents. Thus Tomkins misses the chance to gain deeper insights into the experiences of poor men *and* women. Her wider conclusion, that these biographies came into being against the background 'of peculiarly needy, criminal or uniquely named families' (p. 238) while the majority of the Oxford poor did not leave such personal statements, is not a convincing reason for leaving out their biographies. Rather, case studies of this sort could cast more light on the horizon of experience of the poor, illuminating it from different perspectives and revealing much more detail, without necessarily having to be absolutized.

To sum up, the volumes reviewed here, which will appeal to a specialized, expert readership as much as to the interested general reader, reveal a wide spectrum of research methods and produce a range of results, even if not all the books have been discussed in

equal depth or every individual essay considered. But one thing should have become clear. In order to explore poverty and experiences of poverty, the survival strategies and makeshift economies of the poor, research on poverty cannot use the micro or the macro level alone. Rather, the combination of many approaches is needed to reveal the full complexity of a life lived in poverty.

ANKE SCZESNY is a member of the Department of History at the University of Augsburg. She is the author of *Zwischen Kontinuität und Wandel: Ländliches Gewerbe und ländliche Gesellschaft im Ostschwaben des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (2002) and numerous articles.

# ARTICLE

## *THE FIRST WORLD WAR AS A 'RUPTURE' IN THE EUROPEAN HISTORY OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HERMENEUTICS OF NOT-UNDERSTANDING*

LUCIAN HÖLSCHER

The history of the nineteenth century in Europe is a history of long continuities; that of the twentieth one of ruptures and discontinuities. Reasons for this are not only the numerous wars and the collapse of political, social, and economic systems, but also the radical change in structures of scientific and religious orientation and the inventories of aesthetic expression (*outillage mental*) by which people represented the world in which they lived. At times of radical change such as the First and Second World Wars, the seizure of power by Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco, the Russian Revolution and all the socialist revolutions that followed it, some sections of society at least were gripped by a confusion long-since unknown; old images of history broke down and new ones took their place. The history of the twentieth century is therefore pervaded not only by political ruptures, but also by mental ones, which even today we find it difficult to understand. In this article I should like to examine why it is so hard to understand the past properly, beyond historical ruptures, and how we can overcome these difficulties in writing history. This is what I mean by the new and somewhat puzzling concept of a 'hermeneutics of not-understanding'.[1]

Trans. Jane Rafferty (GHIL). This article is based on a lecture delivered at the German Historical Institute London on 20 Nov. 2012. Thanks to Jane Rafferty for her careful translation of the German manuscript and Valeska Huber for her skilful editing.

[1] For a discussion of this concept see Lucian Hölscher, 'Hermeneutik des Nichtverstehens', in id., *Semantik der Leere: Grenzfragen der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Göttingen, 2009), 226–39.

## I *The Concept of 'Rupture' in Modern Historiography*

In twentieth-century historical works the concept of 'rupture' occurs time and again.[2] But what does it mean? The first thing to establish is that the concept of a historical 'rupture' always relates to an assumed continuity, that is, an overall context of history, as has been part of the general understanding of world history since the eighteenth century.[3] The existence of an overall context for all historical events was not, up until then, taken for granted; indeed calling it into question was a productive achievement of modern historical philosophy. This is what raised history to the level of an academic discipline in the first place.[4] The rejection of such an overall context must therefore arouse considerable unrest amongst historians.

I shall start by discussing the concept of 'rupture' in historical science. When historical works talk about ruptures, this is generally in terms of historical cuts, historical caesuras; what in earlier times was called 'epochs' before the word took on the new meaning of a period in history.[5] Talking about a rupture in this way can either place it retrospectively within the whole of history to date, thereby structuring its course, or it can also anticipate the course of history, thus drafting it into a future that is yet to happen. But in both cases talking about a historical rupture in the sense of a historical caesura assumes the

[2] See Bruce Mazlish, 'Ruptures in History', *Historically Speaking*, 12/3 (June 2011).

[3] See Hans Michael Baumgartner, *Kontinuität und Geschichte: Zur Kritik und Metakritik der historischen Vernunft* (Frankfurt am Main, 1972).

[4] See Reinhart Koselleck, 'Wozu noch Historie?', in id. (ed.), *Vom Sinn und Unsinn der Geschichte: Aufsätze und Vorträge aus vier Jahrzehnten* (Berlin, 2010), 32–51; id., Article 'Geschichte', in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck, 8 vols. (Stuttgart, 1972–97), ii. (1975), 503–718.

[5] For the general discussion of the concept of 'ruptures in history', see the conference 'Ruptures and Continuities in European History (Sixteenth–Twentieth Centuries): Periodizations in History, Historiography and the History of Historiography', held at the Berliner Kolleg für Vergleichende Geschichte Europas in April 2008 <hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=2186>, accessed 27 Mar. 2013.

existence of an overall context of history, a historical totality, which is in fact structured by a caesura of this sort.

Applied to twentieth-century European history, however, such a concept of rupture is too tame: it does not do justice to the historical reality. We are talking here about ruptures in a far more radical sense. Ruptures mark not only epochs within a history perceived as unified, but also the collapse and distortion of entire drafts of history. In 1918, 1933, 1945, and 1989 in Germany not only were new chapters opened in the book of history, but the existing books were themselves thrown overboard and new ones introduced. And this happened not only in Germany, but in many countries, not always at the same time, but with similar consequences.[6] The world of historical ruptures is one in which various drafts of history exist and are exchanged. Changing from one to the other means that not only the present is altered, but the future as well, and even the past.

This reflects what many people living in the twentieth century experienced. In the course of their lives they had to re-learn, often not once but many times, how to locate themselves in history. They had to appropriate a new past and gear their hopes, expectations, and fears towards new futures. Many crumbled in the face of such a challenge; others adapted of necessity to the new situations, not without a touch of bitter cynicism. When we, as historians, confront this fact, then we are also carrying out a piece of historical justice. We stop drafting history solely from the retrospective point of view of our own time, of our own experiences and questions of history. And we start to take the perspective of contemporaries themselves in a new and more serious way.

But this is where we encounter a considerable difficulty. We say that in ruptures of history, historical patterns of orientation disintegrate and are replaced by new ones, past experiences lose their dom-

[6] If we look at the world beyond Europe, the problem often presents itself in an even more extreme form. In Japan and many other East Asian countries, their image of history only conformed with that of the West when they opened up to the West at the end of the nineteenth century, assuming the Western form of a process of history orientated towards progress for the first time. See Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria (eds.), *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus: Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften* (Frankfurt am Main, 2002); Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt: Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 2009).

inant significance for the future, that ethical values and inventories of aesthetic expression become less convincing than they have been hitherto. But if this is true, then the question arises as to whether we, too, just as much as those who were alive at the time, are not affected by this loss. How can we today understand what these contemporaries—after the historical rupture they went through—were often unable to understand themselves? Are not we, with our understanding of history, bound just as much as they were to the time when concepts acquire their meaning, experiences their value, values either prove themselves, or, indeed, do not?

Greater historical distance may perhaps modify certain judgements that were reached too quickly, norms that were once rejected; it may also relativize principles that were once new, but which have themselves become old-fashioned in the meantime. But the main task of the historian here is to describe the historical transition from the old to the new, to explain how the old norms came to be discredited and what made the new ones attractive, what constituted their potential for hope, their surplus of utopianism. For however we might engage with the past morally, aesthetically, or theoretically, we always remain guests in the past. We have our own home in the present. That is what we must always keep in mind, particularly in the alien world of times gone by. Ultimately something about the past always remains closed to us, impenetrable despite all hermeneutic efforts. That is why we must try to embrace a hermeneutics of not-understanding which brings the limits of understanding more sharply into focus.

## II *Three German Biographies*

In order to give concrete form to the possibilities of this hermeneutics of not-understanding, I should like to look now at the lives of three German artists and scholars who lived through a rupture in history during the First World War. They stand for many other contemporaries, not only in Germany, but in every country that went to war. And similar fates can also easily be traced from the period of the Second World War, the collapse of the Communist systems at the end of the 1980s, and other periods of upheaval. But in the First World War they were still new, surprising, and unexpected and that is why they hit people particularly hard.

*George Grosz*

My first case is the artist George Grosz, who, having originally joined up voluntarily in the winter of 1914, became a passionate opponent of the war.[7] With his drawings in the last years of the war and the first post-war years he carried out some of the fiercest attacks against the 'ruling class'. Drawings such as the one cynically portraying a skeleton being declared 'fit for war deployment' by a military doctor, or the representation of Christ wearing a gas mask on the cross caused public outrage in the 1920s and harsh criticism of Germany's conduct of the war.

In his autobiography of 1951, Grosz later described himself as someone who was originally quite unpolitical and only got entangled in the wheels of politics during the First World War.[8] His experiences at the Front drove Grosz, like thousands of other soldiers of this time, literally into madness, and thus into the psychiatric institutions behind the Front.[9] The pattern of interplay between experience of the Front and psychiatric treatment here was always the same. The soldiers first reacted personally to the brutalities of the war with increased fear and attention, then with repulsion, and finally with silence and symptoms of madness which could be as severe as suicide or complete apathy.

Since the soldiers needed something to believe in when deployed at the Front in order to survive the loss of orientation, the feeling of senselessness that overwhelmed them during the course of the war did great damage. For them, as for us today, it was almost impossible to distinguish who had succumbed to the greater madness: they themselves, the badly treated patients in the field hospitals, or their superiors who were conducting the war, society, and the political system that gave them their power. For these soldiers the war was characterized by a high degree of absurdity which they were unable

[7] Uwe M. Schneede, *George Grosz: Der Künstler in seiner Gesellschaft* (Cologne, 1975) is an excellent and comprehensive introduction to Grosz's life and work.

[8] George Grosz, *A Small Yes and a Big No* (New York, 1946; new edn. 1998).

[9] Ben Shepard, *A War of Nerves: Soldiers and Psychiatrists 1914–1994* (London, 2000).

to escape. For them there was only one lesson to be learned from the war—that there should never be war again.[10]

George Grosz was lucky: with the help of influential friends he escaped the murderous treatment methods of war psychiatry at that time. After his release in spring 1915, and then again two years later, after he had been called up again and sent to a psychiatric clinic at the beginning of 1917, he joined the group of Dadaists that was just emerging in Berlin. Like the surrealists in France later on, they declared war on the existing society and its aesthetic forms of expression. The Dadaists tried to counter the madness of war by means of an aesthetics of the absurd. It was based on the realization that existing art had lost all legitimacy, and that a radical rupture with it must therefore be made. What had been regarded as true until then had turned out to be untrue, a lie. Behind the beautiful mask of art an ugly world was concealed, which in Grosz aroused nothing but extreme revulsion. In order to present this he, too, had to break with the inventory of aesthetic expression. From now on, in his search for a new artistic means, he oriented himself to graffiti in public toilets and children's scribbles.

The provocation was successful. After the war Grosz became a celebrated practitioner of a new anti-bourgeois art. Although his accusation against the ruling class called forth furious protests and even a charge of blasphemy, at the same time it aroused admiring recognition and, ultimately, just before Hitler seized power, brought an invitation to New York and with it the opportunity to emigrate. Nonetheless, although externally he had escaped almost certain annihilation, Grosz's worldview remained broken. After the experiences of the First World War, this was perpetuated by his rejection of the Communist Party and his integration into American society in the mid 1920s. After all, America had offered him a home, which the Communists were no longer able to do.

But at the same time the American public no longer understood his art, despite every sympathy with his clear rejection of Germany's authoritarian political system. So Grosz's relationship with his American public also remained broken. After all, here his art was cel-

[10] Ulrich Linse, 'Das wahre Zeugnis: Eine psychohistorische Deutung des Ersten Weltkriegs', in id. (ed.), *Kriegserlebnis: Der Erste Weltkrieg in der literarischen Gestaltung und symbolischen Deutung der Nationen* (Göttingen, 1980), 90–114.

ebrated by the very bourgeois classes against whom this art was originally directed. But, and this is the question we must ask today, was this art ever really made to survive the specific circumstances of its creation? And have we today, a hundred years later, any chance at all of understanding it properly in all its ugliness? It emerged as a time-specific expression of his view of the existing situation. But we have made them into enduring works of art, which today are sold for millions on the international art market. But after all, is this not part of a permissible misunderstanding of Grosz's own artistic intentions?

*Stefan Zweig*

My second example is the writer Stefan Zweig. When war broke out at the end of July 1914, Zweig, as in previous years, was living with his friend Emil Verhaeren in Belgium. Travelling through the Front he just managed to get the last train to reach his home town of Vienna. Though cosmopolitan by origin and upbringing, Zweig intially accepted the war as a great national awakening, like virtually all German artists and scholars of the time. It was only during the course of the following spring that his sympathy turned to antipathy.

What is striking is how this change is reflected in his diaries. For Zweig, writing a diary was always a way of orientating himself to the times. As we know from his early masterpiece *Sternstunden der Menschheit*, he believed in the existence of—often inconspicuous—historical moments when the course of history takes a new direction. According to him, by recognizing these, the attentive observer could look into the future and capture the sense of the historical process as a whole. Diaries were for Zweig like seismographs of history. As soon as he entered a significant period he started writing his entries. And so it was at the beginning of August 1914. Yet six months later he was already tired of it, because he did not see any sense in the course of the war. So he stopped, started again, stopped again, again and again.

But then something new and unexpected happened. Just as political events were deteriorating catastrophically in mid November 1918 and Zweig had returned to his Austrian homeland from Switzerland, he finally stopped writing his diary. The last entry of 13 November explains why:

> The ceasefire concluded, Victor Adler dead, Kaiser Karl deposed—earlier we would have been in turmoil. Now we are just weary. So much has already happened and there is so much still to come. Enough is enough. And I at least expend half my intellectual energy in the terrible visions of these upheavals to come where class hatred will fill this world on a massive scale.[11]

Before this Zweig had already reacted with weariness to the stresses of the war. His lament demonstrates that it was all just too much for him. But now panic seized him. He no longer knew which way the fates would turn and not even his diary could offer any foothold or orientation. The winter of 1918–19 marked for Zweig, quite simply, a collapse of history. It was not until thirteen years later, when the Nazis were on the rise, that he made another attempt.

The rupture in history is quite tangible here. For Zweig the end of the war was an end without any new beginning, without prospect or hope. But with increasing distance from the war, even this rupture took on a different form in his eyes. The collapse of the existing society became a historical caesura, an incision between two epochs, as Zweig described it in his final work, *Die Welt von gestern*, shortly before he committed suicide in exile in Brazil in 1942. More impressively than virtually any other writer of his generation, he depicts in the preface the brokenness of his generation:

> Three times they have overthrown my house and existence, cut me off from everything past and hurled me into the abyss with dramatic vehemence. . . . My today is so different from each of my yesterdays . . . my ascents so different from my descents, that it sometimes seems to me that I have not lived just one existence, but several, completely different ones. . . . I have the feeling that the world in which I grew up and the world of today, and the one in between the two, are separating into completely different worlds.

And he said that when he spoke to young people today who did not know the world of yesterday, that is, the world of his youth before the First World War, then he had to agree with them that 'between

[11] Stefan Zweig, *Tagebücher*, ed. Knut Beck (Frankfurt, 1984), 338.

our today, our yesterday and the day before every bridge has been broken off'.[12]

Since then another world war has come to an end. For democrats and socialists this was again linked with enormous hopes, which this time were not so fundamentally disappointed. Conservative and fascist sections of society, however, experienced an epochal collapse of their previous norms and hopes. Zweig did not live to experience this end, but he anticipated it in the hope that 'future generations would no longer tolerate such a descent into barbarity unknown to fifty previous generations'.

But even if this hope was fulfilled, the question still arises today: did this heal the ruptures in history to which Zweig was exposed? Should we not, in fact, try to remember them in terms of what they were for him: that is, senseless and constantly also hopeless ruptures in the historical process? The openness of the past future, and the annihilation of this future by new historical experiences and expectations is also part of the memory we owe to the past. It is precisely this insight that illustrates the aporias of historical understanding. Although we can imagine another course of history this imagination can never recapture the intensity of reality experienced by contemporaries of the First and Second World Wars.

*Max Scheler*

This brings me to my third and last biography, that of the philosopher Max Scheler. At first glance he does not seem to fit very well into my series of ruptures in history, for Scheler himself never articulated such an experience of his life-perspectives in collapse as reported by Grosz and Zweig, even though he may have felt it. But his life and work point us to another, no less important form of historical rupture: the one between past and present norms and values. It makes us doubt whether we are, in fact, capable at all of adequately understanding past values and images of history.

Of all the innumerable works that glorified the First World War in Germany when it started, Max Scheler's *Der Genius des Krieges und der deutsche Krieg* was one of the most popular. Written in just a few weeks at the end of 1914 in splendid style, it was soon sold out, a sec-

[12] Id., *Die Welt von gestern: Erinnerungen eines Europäers* (1944; new edn. Frankfurt, 1981), 7–9.

ond edition appeared as early as spring 1915, and brought its author wide public recognition. When initial belief in a rapid victory had evaporated in Germany, the author simply turned away from the message of success contained in his book, without ever retracting it.[13]

His argument here was as scandalous as it was demagogic. Its main thrust consisted in the assertion that the right to wage major wars like the present one could never be measured against legal criteria as formulated by international law in the question, for example, as to who had started hostilities or who was the first to violate the territorial integrity of another country. Scheler maintained that the only crucial thing was whether the war was being conducted for a 'grand idea' that affected the intellectual existence of a people, indeed, of humanity as a whole.[14] According to him, whether or not such a war was just was decided not by formal international law, but by God himself. In fact, as far as victory and defeat were concerned here, they were decided by nothing less than a divine ordeal.

We would have to look at the entire breadth of Scheler's argument, which space does not permit me to do here, in order to grasp just how outrageous, how scandalous it was. Indeed, in retrospect, given the outcome of the war, it not only proves to be untenable and positively ridiculous, but also, right from the start, to despise both God and mankind. With incredible arrogance it claims for Germany's intellectual and cultural life a superiority over that of other nations. Britain, for example, is decried as a frivolous haggler concerned only with economic interests, and a cultural gulf between Germany and Russia was asserted, one that could never be bridged.

Nowadays Scheler's argument seems all the more dangerous because key elements of it, for instance, the common feature of the 'chosen people' or the 'superior cultural idea', are still to be found in reasons for going to war today—not so much in Germany, but in other nations. But it has, given today's political morality, become completely unacceptable and as regards its claim to present a reasonable basis for war, it is almost incomprehensible.

So what does it mean, nonetheless, to 'understand' such an argument historically, as Scheler's biographers always claimed to do?[15] It

[13] See Max Scheler, *Gesammelte Werke*, iv. (Munich, 1982), 691–2.

[14] Id., *Der Genius des Krieges und der deutsche Krieg* (Leipzig, 1915), 166.

[15] See John Raphael Staude, *Max Scheler 1874–1928: An Intellectual Portrait* (Toronto, 1967); Wilhelm Mader, *Max Scheler in Selbstzeugnissen und Bild-*

should not really be all that difficult to adopt such a philosophy of war even today. But do we want to? Are we able to? Would this do justice to the experiences of senselessness and absurdity that we saw in the cases of George Grosz and Stefan Zweig; not to mention the catastrophic suffering such a justification of war has brought to many nations in the decades that followed? It is remarkable how rarely later interpreters of Max Scheler's work have contradicted his philosophy of war. Yet in my view, his argument cries out for contradiction: we can, but we should not, understand it.

But if we decide that although we are able to understand this philosophy of war we do not want to do so, then this is not a purely ethical postulate. It also raises questions of historical theory. Are we being fair to Scheler's argument of 1914 if we measure it against the experiences of a later time? To make this even more difficult, we should bear in mind that, after all, in 1914 Scheler could call upon a broad philosophical tradition reaching back at least to Hegel. The vast majority of scholars of his time will certainly have agreed with him. Even a sensitive contemporary such as the Jewish philosopher Franz Rosenzweig, who in 1912 based his dissertation *Hegel und der Staat* on just such a philosophy, did not realize until the war was under way how untenable and old fashioned Hegel's teleology of history had become.

But what Rosenzweig went through as a philosophical learning process presents an epistemological problem to the historian. So one has to ask once again: should the truth of a philosophical argument be measured against historically variable experiences? The question is: was Scheler's philosophy of war wrong from the start or only once his nationalistic hopes had not been fulfilled? And to put it the other way round: can we today still pass any sort of judgement at all on the relative validity of Max Scheler's argumentation in the winter of 1914 if we accept historical experience as a yardstick for philosophical truths?

What we are dealing with here is not a biographical but a hermeneutic rupture in history: not only a rupture in the political–ethical acceptance of past norms and values, but an aporia of historical

*dokumenten* (Hamburg, 1980); Jan H. Nota, *Max Scheler: Der Mensch und seine Philosophie* (Fridingen, 1995). The only explicit critique of Scheler's war rhetoric was expressed by Kurt Flasch, *Die geistige Mobilmachung: Die deutschen Intellektuellen und der Erste Weltkrieg* (Berlin, 2000), 103–5.

understanding per se. And this brings me to the third and final part of my thoughts on historical ruptures in the twentieth century.

## III *The Hermeneutics of Not-Understanding*

Why do we sometimes say that we do not understand someone? There are various possible reasons for this. It could be that we do not share some of his epistemological foundations, for instance, his language or certain signs and symbols that he uses. More important for the historian is another scenario, namely, that we know more than he does about the subject he is talking about. We do not understand, for instance, how in times gone people thought lightening strikes were acts of God, or how on old maps of the world the continents could be drawn in a way that is obviously wrong. It is just as impossible for us to understand how the Nazis could believe in a happy future for Europe based on their racial policy. In all these cases we have to say that today we know better. Our understanding only ever grasps the circumstances of earlier experiences and convictions, never these experiences and convictions themselves.

The last example, however, is exactly what demonstrates that there can be other reasons, namely, moral ones, for not understanding somebody or something. We could, for example, understand the reasons for a murder, but we do not want to because we are afraid that understanding means agreeing with these reasons, making them our own. And in the process something of the deed would transfer itself to us. So understanding someone can also mean sharing his principles and motives, his experiences and moral norms. That is why in our historical understanding we generally restrict ourselves to addressing the reasons and circumstances around the deed. But we do not want to think and act like the perpetrators themselves.

From this we can see that understanding is a social act, that understanding forms a community, which has its own existence in time and space. Applied to history, societies and epochs can be regarded as communities of this sort which share certain norms and experiences. The productive assumption of eighteenth-century historians and philosophers was that such epochal communities exist, in which everything hangs together, one spirit flowing through all things. And, at the same time, the limits of such epochs and societies

are always the limits at which such community ends. Ruptures in history mark them strikingly.

This also applies to the First World War. What was regarded as beautiful, as just, as effective before the war lost this status after the war. Entire sciences and arts, with their established systems of concepts, founding strategies, and inventories of expressions were worn out. Concepts such as 'spirit' and 'reason', 'truth' and 'justice' were seen as polluted, belief in a God who steers the fate of the world as a children's fairytale.[16] And this process of discrediting old norms and knowledge also continued after the Second World War. Since then, concepts such as 'race' and 'Volksgemeinschaft' are regarded in Germany as useless for describing the real state of affairs, despite their great significance before the war, and not only for the Nazis.

This is one of the reasons why after the war many contemporaries partially lost their memory of the time before. Not only did they want to forget their evil deeds, but they were no longer even able to understand how they had willingly supported the war at that time, why they had been cruel to innocent people, and so on. After the rupture in history, what they had done, what they had thought, no longer made any sense to them. Instead of becoming heroes they had become criminals, condemned not only by a hostile society, but often self-condemned as well.

The psychological consequences of addressing their experiences in such a way were far reaching. Many of those who survived the catastrophe developed virtual worlds that established themselves in nightmares and traumas alongside social reality. Cut off from the present, the world of the past survived in the form of parallel universes, comparable to the un-dead, who do not want to die and continue to pursue the living. As psychiatrists we could talk here of a mental illness. But as historians we have to relate such virtual realities to the past from which they have emerged. They emerge—this is my conviction—when the past future has no access to the present past.

It could be argued that all this was not unique to the twentieth century, that similar experiences already existed in earlier centuries. It could even be argued that in the nineteenth century, the age of historicism, this was precisely what was regarded as the actual benefit from studying history, namely, the realization that people only

[16] Flasch, *Die geistige Mobilmachung*.

remember what has survived, what has conquered. But in the twentieth century many contemporaries began to rebel against this sort of philosophy of history. The past experiences of the victims could and should not any longer be so easily forgotten. How did this new ethics of historical recollection come about?

One reason lies in the fact that the victims have pushed themselves more forcibly into memory, and also that in a democratic global community they can no longer be so easily ignored. Another reason, however, is that the perpetrator societies themselves, once they had been made aware of their crimes, began to take an interest in the dark side of their past. Although this often did not happen until the second or the third generation, the global community has formed a collective memory in which far more recollection survives than before of lost social groups, their hopes and ways of life.

This is where a hermeneutics of not-understanding must come into play.[17] Not-understanding in this sense is more than the ambiguity which, according to Gadamer,[18] is inscribed on all understanding, where two people who understand each other still understand something different from each other. In classical hermeneutics going back to Heidegger, what is not understood in the act of understanding always appears incidental. But in the hermeneutics of not-understanding, it is crucial. We must learn to grasp that the norms and logical rules followed by earlier generations were different from ours today. We have to accept that we cannot understand everything that they did and thought, even if we can reconstruct the conditions in which they did all this. If we look at these circumstances in detail, we can even understand how this change in norms came about, even if a residue of creative reaction to the old norms still remains, which no one will ever be able to explain.

Even with the aid of a hermeneutics of not-understanding, of course, the ruined life-chances of past generations cannot be restored. Values and norms, experiences and images of history that have not proved their worth continue to be discredited. A past future that was never to come about remains an illusion. But what such a hermeneutics does do is this: it allows us to stop trying to present something that cannot be understood as understandable in retrospect. In one

[17] Lucian Hölscher, 'Hermeneutik des Nichtverstehens', 227–8.
[18] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (2nd edn. London, 1989).

sentence: ruptures in history must be recognized in historiography as hermeneutic ruptures, not covered up. We owe this just as much to those who lived through past times as we do to our own confrontation with the past.

LUCIAN HÖLSCHER is Professor of Modern History and Theory of History at the Ruhr-Universität Bochum. His research interests lie in the theory of history, especially *Begriffsgeschichte*, the theory of historical times, and the history and methodology of historiography; and the political, social, and cultural history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with special emphasis on the history of religion in modern times. His many publications include *Semantik der Leere: Grenzfragen der Geschichtswissenschaft* (2000); and ed. with Frank Bösch, *Kirchen – Medien – Öffentlichkeit: Transformationen kirchlicher Selbst- und Fremddeutungen seit 1945* (2009).

# BOOK REVIEWS

LUDGER KÖRNTGEN and DOMINIK WASSENHOVEN (eds.), *Religion and Politics in the Middle Ages: Germany and England by Comparison / Religion und Politik im Mittelalter: Deutschland und England im Vergleich*, Prince Albert Studies, 29 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013), 234 pp. ISBN 978 3 11 026204 9. € 99.95. US$140.00

This volume brings together the papers given at the annual conference of the Prince Albert Society, held at Coburg in 2010. In keeping with the Society's stated aim to promote research on Anglo-German relations, the theme chosen was religion and politics in medieval England and Germany. The papers cover a wide span of time, from Carolingian Francia to England and Germany in the late Middle Ages, but are held together by a common interest in the complex interrelationship of religion and politics in these years. They vary greatly in length, with some constituting little more than fully referenced versions of the orally delivered paper (Nelson, Ormrod, and Fößel), and others representing very substantial studies in their own right (Görich and Weiler).

After a brief preface detailing the background to the collection, the book begins with an introduction (presumably by the editors, though this is not clearly stated). An overview of the volume's aims is given, as well as summaries of the individual papers. There is little attempt to saying anything new here and the exercise seems to be designed to help the casual reader pick out which article(s) might be of interest. In any case, the summaries given are fair and judicious, although there are a few egregious slips. Thus King Æthelred's defeat against the vikings at the Battle of Maldon came in 991 not 993 (p. 13: Pentecost 993 is when Æthelred reacted to this defeat by undertaking a public act of repentance); meanwhile the canonization of Charlemagne was not accomplished by Barbarossa in 1065 (p. 15), some half a century before his own birth.

The volume picks up speed with the first main contribution, a short piece by Janet L. Nelson on 'Religion and Politics in the Reign of Charlemagne'. Nelson does not attempt to be comprehensive here,

but rather chooses to approach her subject from three different angles: the degree of control the emperor exerted over the institutional church; the means by which he managed to exert this control; and the manner(s) in which he channelled the religious towards political ends. She covers much ground and the result is a nuanced view of Charlemagne's relationship with the church, one which gives *Realpolitik* its place, but does not deny the emperor's own very real religious convictions. Amongst the important points made is that Charlemagne's harsh actions during the conquest of Saxony should not be seen as a proto-crusade or *jihad*, but rather as a conscious response to Saxon infidelity (*infidelitas*: a term which, as Nelson notes, carries both religious and secular connotations).[1]

In the second contribution Dominik Waßenhoven takes discussion into the Ottonian and Salian periods. His focus is on the role of bishops during royal successions, particularly their part in the election of kings. Here he sensibly distances himself from traditional constitutional readings of such events, taking a more flexible approach to royal election.[2] At the heart of his paper lies a basic but important observation: between the early Ottonian and early Salian periods the role of bishops at these events changed substantially. Thus while bishops did not take part in the election of Otto I, as described by Widukind of Corvey, Wipo presents them as playing a key role in the election of Conrad II in 1025. Waßenhoven is well aware of the source-critical issues raised by these accounts and makes a strong case for taking this difference to be meaningful. Indeed, he highlights the importance of the disputed succession of Henry II (1002) as a tipping point, at which bishops were able to start taking on a more prominent role in the election process. On the whole, these arguments are convincing and raise important further questions. In particular, it would be interesting to examine the Carolingian back-

[1] Here she takes issue with Yitzak Hen, 'Charlemagne's *jihad*', *Viator*, 37 (2006), 33–51. See, similarly, Jonathan Jarrett, 'Charlemagne's "Jihad"' <http://tenthmedieval.wordpress.com/2007/01/14/charlemagnes-jihad/>, posted 14 Jan. 2007, accessed 23 July 2013.

[2] See further Steffen Patzold, 'Königserhebungen zwischen Erbrecht und Wahlrecht? Thronfolge und Rechtsmentalität um das Jahr 1000', *Deutsches Archiv*, 58 (2002), 467–501 (a study cited by Waßenhoven).

ground to growing episcopal self-consciousness in this era.[3] In the next contribution, Catherine Cubitt takes us to England in the same period, examining the role of penance and lay piety. She deftly combines evidence for pastoral care and religious practice on the ground with indications that these had an impact at a national level. Particular importance is attached to Æthelred's penitential politics in the 990s, which Cubitt sees as an indication of the extent to which sin and pollution had become political as well as religious concerns. She goes little beyond synthesizing previous work on the subject (much of it her own), but her article is a welcome *entrée* for Germanophone readers into what is proving to be a profitable sub-field of studies on penance and piety in Æthelredian England.[4]

The fourth and fifth contributions, by Stuart Airlie and Ludger Körntgen, shift the focus on to the later eleventh century by examining the Investiture Contest, perhaps the most famous case of the intersection of religion and politics in the Middle Ages. Airlie provides a witty and insightful discussion of recent Anglophone work on the subject, noting many important differences between this and research undertaken in the Germanophone world. His intention is not so much to call for a 'cosy consensus' (p. 87), as he puts it, as to encourage historians to grapple with historiographical traditions beyond their own. In this respect he neatly sets the scene for Körntgen's article, which returns to the relationship between religion and politics in the earlier Middle Ages, as exemplified by the Investiture Contest. Körntgen builds on important recent work (much of it his own), arguing that the Investiture Contest did not create a distinction between religion and politics *ex nihilo*; rather, the line

[3] On this see Michael E. Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300–850* (Washington, 2011); and Steffen Patzold, *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008).

[4] Catherine Cubitt, 'Bishops, Priests and Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe*, 14 (2006), 41–63; 'Ælfric's Lay Patrons', in Mary Swan and Hugh Magennis (eds.), *A Companion to Ælfric* (Leiden, 2009), 165–92; and 'The Politics of Remorse: Penance and Royal Piety in the Reign of Æthelred the Unready', *Historical Research*, 85 (2012), 179–92. Cf. Levi Roach, 'Penitential Discourse in the Diplomas of King Æthelred "the Unready"', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 64 (2013), 258–76.

continued to be blurred long thereafter.[5] Körntgen's arguments are persuasive and his picture of the Investiture Contest shares much with that drawn by Anglophone historians, who have tended to be less interested in the events which took place at Canossa in January 1077 than in the European-wide impact of the reform papacy.

In the next section Knut Görich and Björn Weiler take the story into the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The former provides a discussion of the canonization of Charlemagne by Frederick Barbarossa in 1165. Whereas previous scholarship treated this event as part of an (abortive) effort to re-sacralize German kingship in the aftermath of the Investiture Contest, Görich sees local and religious motivations as being primary; the canonization was driven not so much by the emperor's need for sacral legitimation, as by the interests of the local canons of the *Marienkapelle* at Aachen. Barbarossa, insofar as he was involved, seems to have been motivated more by personal piety than *Realpolitik*. There is much to be praised here and Görich's article will doubtless be one of the most cited in this collection; nevertheless, one cannot help but feel that his arguments run the risk of throwing the proverbial baby out with the bathwater. Whilst Görich is doubtless right that this act should not be seen in political terms alone, it seems equally reductionist to insist that the emperor's actions were without political undertones. Indeed, a comparison between Barbarossa and his Angevin counterparts, whose piety carried clear political implications, might have added nuance to Görich's conclusions here.[6]

More consciously comparative in this regard is Björn Weiler's discussion of relations between bishops and kings in high medieval England. Here Weiler argues that English bishops stand out from their continental (and in particular German) counterparts for their

[5] See Ludger Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade: Zu Kontext und Funktion sakraler Vorstellungen in Historiographie und Bildzeugnissen der ottonisch-frühsalischen Zeit* (Berlin, 2001), esp. 435–45, and '"Sakrales Königtum" und "Entsakralisierung" in der Polemik um Heinrich IV.', in Gerd Althoff (ed.), *Heinrich IV.* (Sigmaringen, 2009), 127–60; and cf. Hartmut Hoffmann, 'Canossa—eine Wende?', *Deutsches Archiv*, 66 (2010), 535–69.

[6] See e.g. Nicholas Vincent, 'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings of England 1154–1272', in C. Morris and P. Roberts (eds.), *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan* (Cambridge, 2002), 12–45; and cf. Jürgen Petersohn, 'Saint-Denis—Westminster—Aachen: Die Karls-Translatio von 1165 und ihre Vorbilder', *Deutsches Archiv*, 31 (1975), 420–54.

ability to criticize rulers. He suggests that this tradition had deep roots, stretching back at least as far as the tenth-century monastic reform movement. There is much to be said for these arguments and it would be all too easy for the eager Anglo-Saxonist to add to Weiler's observations. To provide but one thought: the very process of reform during the tenth century was framed as a response to an act of royal admonition: the *Regularis Concordia* states that during his youth King Edgar had been warned by a certain churchman (who is know to have been the reformer Æthelwold) to pay heed to the ecclesiastical well-being of the realm.[7] Where more might be said here is about the earlier continental background— as Weiler is aware, there are important Carolingian precedents for such behaviour.[8] Equally, something might be said about why this tradition did not take off (or continue?) in Germany during the high Middle Ages. Certainly Ottonian bishops and their representatives were able to criticize rulers, sometimes even in public.[9]

The final two contributions, by Mark Ormrod and Amelia Fößel, take us into the later Middle Ages. Ormrod focuses on the rulers of late medieval England, examining the part played by religion in ritual, ecclesiastical patronage, and the burgeoning sense of nationhood in these years. His arguments are convincing and he makes a number of interesting points; nevertheless, one cannot help but feel that he misses a trick by not engaging with German literature on the subject of medieval and early modern ritual.[10] Fößel, on the other hand, briefly sketches the situation in late medieval Germany. Here the power of the localized princes prevented kings from utilizing reli-

[7] *Regularis Concordia*, proem 1, ed. Thomas Symons and Sigrid Spath, Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum, 7 (Siegburg, 1984), 61–147, at 69.

[8] See Moore, *Bishops*; and Patzold, *Episcopus*. Weiler cites the latter, but does not engage with its arguments in detail.

[9] See e.g. Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon* VI.32, ed. R. Holzmann, MGH: SS rer. Germ. n.s. 9 (Berlin, 1935), 312–13; with E.-D. Hehl, 'Der widerspenstige Bischof: Bischöfliche Zustimmung und bischöflicher Protest in der ottonischen Reichskirche', in Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert (eds.), *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen* (Sigmaringen, 1998), 295–344.

[10] For an *entrée* into this rich literature, see Gerd Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale: Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2003), esp. 170–86; as well as Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Des Kaisers alte Kleider: Verfassungsgeschichte und Symbolsprache des Alten Reiches* (Munich, 2008).

gious ritual to their benefit in the fashion witnessed in England. As with Ormrod's contribution, there is much of interest here, but more might have been made of the comparative angle, examining the similarities and differences between the ways in which English and German monarchs dealt with the demands of their leading magnates in these years.[11]

Overall, Körntgen and Waßenhoven are to be congratulated for bringing together a set of interesting articles which will do much to encourage further engagement with religion and politics in the Middle Ages, particularly from a comparative angle. Although some of the articles are more avowedly comparative than others (Weiler's and Airlie's stand out in this regard) they all provide much useful food for thought. The only real regret must be the volume's price (€99.95), which means that it will only be bought by major research libraries and its circulation will be correspondingly limited.

[11] For an exemplary study of this nature from a somewhat earlier period, see Björn Weiler, *Kingship, Rebellion and Political Culture: England and Germany, c.1215–c.1250* (Basingstoke, 2007).

LEVI ROACH was appointed Lecturer in Medieval History at the University of Exeter in 2012. Before that he held a Research Fellowship at St John's College, Cambridge. He is the author of *Kingship and Consent in Anglo-Saxon England, 871–978: Assemblies and the State in the Early Middle Ages* (forthcoming 2013), and future projects include a biography of Æthelred 'the Unready' and an edition of two of the law-codes of King Æthelstan's reign.

JOHANNES FRIED, *Canossa: Entlarvung einer Legende. Eine Streitschrift* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012), 181 pp. ISBN 978 3 05 005683 8. €29.80

Contemporary accounts of the meeting of Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV of Germany at Canossa in January 1077 have always had a 'mythical' quality: a penitent king humiliatingly forced to stand in the snow for three days to grovel before the pope in order to be restored both to Christian communion and the kingship of the German Reich. Such accounts have challenged historians ever since to interpret the nature of the meeting, its significance, and whether it marked a fundamental transformation in papal–imperial relations and, indeed, in European history more broadly. Yet, as Johannes Fried argues in this new book, whose title could be translated as 'exposing' or even 'de-bunking a legend', it is time to dismantle not merely the mythical image but also the historical interpretations of what led to and, in fact, happened at Canossa once and for all. Building upon a distinguished body of previous work on cultural memory, Fried looks to apply his methodological approach 'der Memorik' so as better to understand what occurred between Gregory VII and Henry IV between 1076 and 1077, the nature of the meeting at Canossa, and also why the 'Canossagang' and 'Canossa als Wende' myths have been, and continue to be (as he contends), perpetuated in modern historiography as well as popular culture.

Building upon his far from universally accepted 2008 article, 'Der Pakt von Canossa',[1] in which he argued that Canossa marked a peace alliance between the pope and king, Fried here extends his discussion over six chapters. In the introduction, Fried assesses what he terms 'the dubious success story of the legend of Canossa', and sets out his ambition to strip away the erroneous layers of historical myth which have led historians consistently to misunderstand what took place. In chapter 1, he briefly outlines the methodological considerations developed in earlier work and addresses how historical research needs to circumvent false memory with a brief analysis of the key sources we possess for Canossa and their problems. In chapter 2, Fried ques-

[1] Johannes Fried, 'Der Pakt von Canossa: Schritte zur Wirklichkeit durch Erinnerungsanalyse', in Wilfried Hartmann and Klaus Herbers (eds.), *Die Faszination der Papstgeschichte: Neue Zugänge zum frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Cologne, 2008), 133–97.

tions past readings of the sources, especially historians' neglect of the significance of the terms 'pactum' and 'pacis federa' in the texts and what he sees as too great a reliance on post-1080 sources. These have highlighted the issue of the non-restoration of Henry IV to the German kingship and have led historians wrongly to focus on the status of Henry's kingship in the period 1077 to 1080. Here Fried also addresses issues of dating, the transmission of reports and, indeed, the travel itineraries of the pope and the king, which he argues present a very different sort of relationship. A very brief chapter 3 turns to the issue of whether and how far we can trust the contemporary historians: Lampert of Hersfeld, Bruno of Merseburg, and Berthold of Reichenau.

In chapter 4, Fried assesses what he terms 'deformations in cultural memory' by examining how the perspectives and agendas of humanist and early modern authors reading the contemporary accounts contributed to a 'Canossa complex'. In chapter 5, Fried outlines his reconstruction of the events by examining the preparations for the meeting between the pope and the king at Canossa, the alliance concluded there, the nature of its content, and the way in which this guaranteed mutual honour for both parties. In light of this, a brief chapter 6 then reassesses the relationship of Gregory and Henry following the reconciliation until the second excommunication of the king at the Lenten synod of 1080. In the conclusion, Fried reaffirms his argument and underlines the paramount need of historical research to recognize and circumvent the 'deformative power of memory' that has led to an erroneous interpretation of Canossa both in the historiography and in popular culture. The volume includes, as an appendix, a chronology from 1076 of Henry's 'progress' to Canossa in support of Fried's position.

This is a difficult work to characterize, given that it combines the methodology of 'Memorik' with extended analysis of the proof for Fried's contention that Canossa was a peace alliance between the pope and the king. At the same time, although Fried indicated that it was for others to judge whether or not the book was a 'Streitschrift' (p. 7), the tone is highly polemical and Fried, in fact, dismisses almost all previous historiographical interpretations of Canossa as misguided or incorrect. There is considerable refutation of the critics of his 'Der Pakt' article, one of whom—a highly respected German historian—is rather regrettably referred to as the DAMALS-Autor (after the

journal in which this historian's review was published). The uneasy marriage of the two seemingly principal ambitions of the book, the reinterpretation of the events and the refutation of past historians and critics, the latter of which one senses might have been curtailed, make the monograph a far from easy read.

That said, Fried's overall argument is relatively simple to summarize and is perhaps not quite as revolutionary as he seems to believe. There are essentially five key elements to his thesis. In the first place, the accounts of Lampert, Bruno, Berthold, and Bonizo cannot be trusted at face value and must be subjected to critical remembrance theory and also be more rigorously counterpoised by Gregory's letter to the princes (*Registrum Gregorii VII.,* 4.12), the Königsberg Anonymous, and Arnulf of Milan's account. Second, when an appropriate critical assessment of the sources is undertaken, Fried contends that we have an entirely new understanding, namely, that Canossa was far from being about the absolution of the king or the exaltation of the pope as judge of the German kingship, but rather about cementing a peace treaty and alliance between the two men. Third, as a consequence, Canossa was neither a fundamental turning point nor a key moment in the Investiture contest writ large. Fourth, the peace alliance failed not because of Henry or Gregory, but rather because of the precipitous act of the princes to elect Rudolf of Rheinfelden at Forchheim in March 1077, something which Gregory did not explicitly condemn. Fried concludes that only critical remembrance analysis can work out the full extent of the modulations and deformations of the events in the memories of the witnesses (p. 146).

There are probably few historians who would dispute the need for careful, critical reading of the highly partisan sources of this period. Yet one can hardly avoid concluding that the issue of the kingship was in Gregory's mind, even if this only crystallized after Forchheim. The characterizations of the factual errors and omissions of Lampert and Bruno as 'errors of memory' (pp. 73, 76) seem a bit of a stretch; after all, both writers had clearly defined agendas for their characterizations of Canossa, which is in many ways the more interesting question, at least for this reviewer. At the same time, dates and rates of travel, which are key elements of Fried's chain of evidence, are often unreliable.

The key contention in the end is the question of what precipitated the meeting: the falling away of German support for Henry after the

Lenten synod of 1076 and the force exerted by the princes at Tribur, as many historians would favour, albeit with variations, or whether there was a long-planned meeting to make a formal peace alliance in 1077, as Fried contends? It seems unlikely that such an event would go so wholly unnoticed in the sources. Fried is, of course, correct to underline that that this was scarcely a spontaneous penitential act on Henry's part, but his reading of 'pax' is perhaps too narrow. Whilst the list of signatories to the 'iurisiurandum' to which Henry committed himself before he and his German companions received the kiss of peace clearly underlines the collective (and hence clearly also well-planned) nature of the meeting, the 'pax' signified a peace and concord between the Church and the kingdom that Gregory had long sought even before the events of 1076 (*Registrum Gregorii VII.*, 4.12), and wished to better secure by travelling to Germany from Canossa. Moreover, there has been considerable debate and revisionist work on the nature of the meeting, all of which has more nuance than Fried perhaps allows. For example, in an article 'Contextualizing Canossa: Excommunication, Penance, Surrender, Reconciliation' published posthumously in 2006 (seemingly unknown to Fried), Timothy Reuter argued that one would do well to think of Canossa in terms of 'deditio', a ritual public surrender of a rebel to a lord, in which the very public surrender was just an integral part of a less public compromise; something originally explored in different contexts by Gerd Althoff and also touched upon by H. E. J. Cowdrey. Canossa, in this view, was a 'deal', a way out of present difficulties for both parties. But as ritual, Canossa was inherently ambiguous because the king 'submitted' both as a penitent and as a rebel, and we find it hard to tell the difference because contemporaries also did.[2]

In the end, *Canossa: Entlarvung einer Legende* is unlikely to be the last word on Canossa or to find universal acceptance. Yet Fried's arguments will challenge medieval historians to think further about what led to the events that transpired in Tuscany in January 1077.

[2] Timothy Reuter, 'Contextualizing Canossa: Excommunication, Penance, Surrender, Reconciliation', in id., *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), 147–66.

KATHLEEN G. CUSHING is Reader in Medieval History at Keele University. She is interested in the religious and social history of early medieval Europe. Her work to date has focused on the 'Gregorian' reform of the eleventh century, and on the use of medieval canon law as a tool of polemic. This has resulted in several books, including *Papacy and Law in the Gregorian Revolution: The Canonistic Work of Anselm of Lucca* (1998); *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change* (2005); and (ed. with Martin Brett), *Readers, Texts and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages: Studies in Medieval Canon Law in Honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl* (2009). She is currently investigating the significance of monastic compilers of canon law and is also writing a book on penance, reform, and pastoral care in eleventh-century Italy.

MICHAEL VAN DUSSEN, *From England to Bohemia: Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 86 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), x + 217 pp. ISBN 978 1 107 01679 8. £55.00. $US85.00

In this book Michael van Dussen's aim is to work out the patterns and networks of textual communication between England and Bohemia at the time of Richard II and the early Lancastrian kings, something that has not yet been done for this combination. The purely quantitative method (as used, for example, by Neddermeyer in his graphics), is not adequate in van Dussen's view as it cannot explain the movement of books. Although England's book production was modest at that time by comparison with Europe, it was of some significance for the new *studium* in Prague because of the interaction between the universities of Paris and Oxford. The author wants to place heretical 'Lollard–Hussite communication' (see below), whose importance he does not deny, into a wider chronological and factual context. As the Bohemian king at this time also wore the Roman–German crown, van Dussen regards his contact with the Holy Roman Empire as a whole as relevant. The author also wants to explore whether the longstanding Council of Constance, a large, centralized book market with numerous tracts, put an abrupt stop to Lollard–Hussite communication. It might have been more interesting for the reader, however, not to find out the outcome of the study in the Foreword.

Chapter 1 deals with Anne, daughter of Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV and sister of Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia and Roman–German king, who married the English king, Richard II, in 1382. It has long been maintained that, with her Bohemian household, she could make access to England, and Oxford in particular, possible or easier for Bohemian students. But van Dussen does not set out to discover anything new about the historical Anne. He is more interested in how the textual tradition, and English culture as a whole, dealt with her symbolically. The view that Anne promoted Wycliffism dates from the sixteenth century, when it was put forward by English Protestant historiographers. John Foxe (d. 1587), in particular, considered it possible that Anne had connections with the Lollards and

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

Hussites; later English authors of the seventeenth century (Thomas James, William Sanderson) saw her as a Protestant sympathizer in order to justify Lutheran influence by pointing to its home-grown English national roots.

The author returns to the Middle Ages, to Anne's funeral (the service was held on 3 August 1394, two months after the burial), which reveals other Bohemian–English contacts. The eulogists praised her piety, her support of the poor by alms-giving, her reading of the gospels in English, and her good influence on the king. One textual transfer between England and Bohemia is the travel account (1402–13) of a Bohemian knight, Wenceslaus, from a manuscript held in the library of the metropolitan chapter in Prague. This preserves the texts of three panegyrics on the epitaphs of Queen Anne, which van Dussen studies in detail. In them, her figure is associated, among other things, with that of St Anne, who was already popular in England (for example, the queen was buried on the day after St Anne's feast day). One of the panegyrics to Anne is also preserved in a later Hussite compilation of 1414. We must agree with van Dussen's (hardly surprising) conclusion that while Anne was not involved in a heterodox exchange of texts, her marriage and her piety, which appealed to the reformers, encouraged exchange between England and Bohemia in an ideological context that was still fluid.

In chapter 2, the author investigates a sizeable group of Bohemian manuscripts containing material by the English religious writer Richard Rolle of Hampole (d. 1349). Rolle's popularity among the Lollards is well known, and some material is dated 1412–13 in the manuscripts. Van Dussen, however, also wants to take account of pre-Wycliffite relations. A large group of clergy in Rome read Rolle's *Incendium amoris*, which was taken to the Curia by English monks; from there, van Dussen surmises, on the basis of other indications, the early reformers Johann of Jenstein or Johannes Cardinalis might have taken it to Bohemia. Other material by Rolle was probably transferred directly from England to Bohemia, for example, by the Bohemian students Mikuláš Faulfiš or Jiří of Kněhnice.

Chapter 3 deals with 'Lollard–Hussite communication', in particular, the transmission of Wycliffe's most powerful and effective works to Bohemia. The earliest evidence that Wycliffe was known in Bohemia is found before 1380 in Mikuláš Biceps, and in 1385 in Jenštejn, who calls Wycliffe the 'heresiarch'. Perhaps these early con-

tacts were mediated by reform-oriented Bohemian students who were members of the English nation at the university of Paris. It is well known that in the 1390s, Wycliffe's philosophical works were the first to reach Prague, while the most important theological tracts, *Dialogus* and *Trialogus,* were taken there by Hieronymus of Prague between 1399 and 1401. In 1406–7 the Faulfiš mentioned above brought further tracts by Wycliffe to Prague; van Dussen believes he has evidence that Faulfiš undertook a second journey to England in 1410, and suggests that he might have brought Richard Wyche's letter to Hus and other works by Wycliffe with him from there. Van Dussen speculates that Faulfiš might have died on a third journey to England in 1411. John Foxe later regarded Faulfiš as playing a large part in establishing these contacts. Other reformers, such as Šimon of Tišnov, Nicholas of Hus, and Matthias Engliš, might also have been involved. The burning of Wycliffe's books ordered by the Archbishop of Prague in 1410 strengthened contacts between the network in that year: protest letters from Wyche and John Oldcastle (to Woks of Waldstein) in Bohemia were the result. Four letters written in 1410 by the Scottish preacher Quentin Folkhyrde also reached Bohemia. Jean Gerson was likewise aware of these connections. Master Peter Payne's visit to Prague from England in 1414 was the last known contact between the Lollards and Bohemia. With the Council of Constance and the death of Jan Hus, this connection came to an end.

Chapter 4 looks at official diplomatic communications with the Holy Roman Empire in the period 1411 to 1416, which turned against 'heretical' contacts between England and Bohemia. According to van Dussen, before the Council the English king tried to forestall any possible suspicion of England's religious orthodoxy by sending a delegation to King Sigismund in Hungary. Their journey took the envoys, Hartung von Clux (in the service both of Henry and Sigismund) and John Stokes (Licentiate of Law in Cambridge), via Prague, where they came into contact with the circle around Jan Hus. A letter from the university of Oxford, which expressed itself positively about Wycliffe and described the opposition to him as a minority, played a special part in this context. According to Hus, it was taken to Prague by Faulfiš and his companions in 1407. Hieronymus referred to it in his arguments in 1409, Hus not until 1411. Van Dussen leaves open the question of whether it was a forgery. Archbishop Arundel, who had appointed a commission to judge Wycliffe as early as 1407, only

found out about this letter in 1411. Thereupon he applied to Pope John XXIII for permission to exhume Wycliffe and burn him. The events surrounding this letter were one reason for the English delegation's especially energetic persecution of Hus in Constance, while the Lollards' attempts to win over King Sigismund with a letter on a visit to London that resulted in the Treaty of Canterbury (August 1416) were, of course, in vain. Van Dussen surmises that the two Christian princes had agreed to make a concerted effort to condemn Wycliffe and Hus in Constance, but this seems questionable to me, especially for Sigismund. The English king's entourage, however, contained other people dedicated to finding out about conditions in Bohemia. For the English, it was certainly important that Wycliffism now no longer appeared as a purely English problem.

Chapter 5 looks forward to the Reformation. The revolutionary events in Bohemia after 1419 had an unpleasant significance for England precisely because of Wycliffe. The theologian Thomas Netter, who was also present at Constance, saw Lollards and Hussites going back to a common root, although he did acknowledge their differences on the Eucharist, for example. In a letter of 1428 Pope Martin V, drumming up support for the anti-Hussite crusade, reminded the English that the Bohemian heresy had begun in England. Other English theologians, such as Reginald Pecock and Thomas Gascoigne, tended to pass over the alliance between the Lollards and Hussites in silence and seek other reasons for events in Bohemia. By the early sixteenth century, English writers such as Henry VIII, Thomas More, and John Clerk lumped Hus (the old heresy) and Luther (the new heresy) together, as was often done in the Roman Catholic Holy Roman Empire. The opportunist Luther was regarded as merely having copied Hus. At this time information about Bohemia flowed fairly freely to England, for example, via the voluminous (and non-partisan) correspondence of Erasmus of Rotterdam.

Van Dussen's book provides a careful and thorough account of communication between England and Bohemia from the later Middle Ages to the sixteenth century, naturally seen more strongly from the English perspective. His (sometimes scarce) sources and other indications occasionally lead him to speculate, but he always identifies speculations as such. The author is right to look beyond the narrow confines of contacts between Wycliffites and Bohemians, and

rejects any fixation on the antithesis between heretical and orthodox communication. His notion that ideological relations in the communication networks of the two countries were often fluid is undoubtedly appropriate. In Prague, criticism of the Church can be found as early as the fourteenth century among the preachers Konrad Waldhauser, Jan Milíč of Kroměříž, and Matěj of Janov. Even some of the German masters in Prague, such as Heinrich Totting, Konrad of Soltau, and Matthäus of Krakau were reform-oriented scholars who, at times, fell under suspicion of heresy. Hus himself, however, as far as I can see, never referred to these 'predecessors'. The impetus to radical reform among the young masters of the *Natio Bohemica* seems to have started from scratch with the adoption of Wycliffe. Van Dussen's terminology in referring to 'Lollard–Hussite communication' (which came to an end with Constance and Hus's death), however, must be seen in a more critical light because in today's terms, Hus was not a 'Hussite'. His reforming movement can be seen as Wycliffite, but cannot (yet) be called 'Hussite'.

Appendix A contains the three poems written to Queen Anne (*Anglica regina, Femina famosa*, and *Nobis natura florem*) with a commentary and English translation; Appendix B presents *Nouitates de Anglia de Wikleph* on the basis of a (corrected) old edition by Jodok Stülz (1850) and a manuscript from the district archives of Wittingau/Třeboň, similarly with scholarly apparatus and translation. Extensive endnotes, a bibliography of sources and secondary literature, a list of manuscripts, and an index complete the volume.

PETER HILSCH is Professor Emeritus of Medieval History at the University of Tübingen. His main field of research is the history of the Bohemian lands in the Middle Ages. His publications include *Johannes Hus: Prediger Gottes und Ketzer* (1999); and *Das Mittelalter: Die Epoche* (3rd rev. edn. 2012).

MARTHA WHITE PAAS, *The Kipper und Wipper Inflation, 1619–23: An Economic History with Contemporary German Broadsheets*, with Broadsheet descriptions by John Roger Paas and translations by George C. Schoolfield (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), xii + 172 pp. ISBN 978 0 300 14676 9. £65.00

Since the publication of Gustav Freytag's *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, the major currency devaluation that took place in Germany at the beginning of the Thirty Years War has been known to the historically aware public as the Kipper und Wipper inflation. This name goes back to a term coined in the pamphlets and broadsheets of the years around 1620. In addition to the monetary and economic aspects of the Kipper und Wipper period, the way in which it was presented in the media has already attracted a certain amount of scholarly interest. In first place we should mention works by Gabriele Hooffacker and the present reviewer.[1] Added to this there are the large editions of seventeenth-century German pamphlets associated with the names of Wolfgang Harms, Michael Schilling, and John Roger Paas.

This book by Martha White Paas, Professor of Economics at Carleton College in Northfield (Minnesota), also picks up the theme of the presentation in the media of the Kipper und Wipper inflation in twenty-seven selected broadsheets on the Kipper und Wipper period. It reproduces the whole sheets as images, and in each case provides an English translation of the text. This is supplemented by a seventeen-page introductory essay on the German inflation between 1619 and 1623 by Martha White Paas, and two brief explanatory texts by John Roger Paas on early modern pamphlets and Georges C. Schoolfield about his English translations of the texts of the Baroque German pamphlets.

The undertaking of presenting the illustrated pamphlet, a medium so characteristic of the early modern media landscape in the German-language area, to an English-speaking public is certainly to be welcomed. It would, however, have profited its readers even more

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

[1] Gabriele Hooffacker, *Avaritia radix omnium malorum: Barocke Bildlichkeit um Geld und Eigennutz in Flugschriften, Flugblättern und benachbarter Literatur der*

if the contents of the broadsheets had been explained and placed in the context of research on economic and media history. Unfortunately Paas has not done this, perhaps because she has taken little or no note of essential studies on the topic. While Gabriele Hooffacker's work is mentioned in a footnote, Paas does not use the contents of her work, and the present reviewer's works are not mentioned at all. The result is that Paas does not recognize the illustrated pamphlets of the Kipper und Wipper period for what they were: rapidly produced, commercial printed matter which, in a functionally differentiated and networked media landscape, offered its readers explanations for current events. In the broadsheets, therefore, we do not hear contemporaries who sought a public voice because of personal involvement, but media professionals with a keen sense for commercially marketable topics and contents. To this extent, seeing the illustrated broadsheets of the Kipper und Wipper period as an 'eyewitness account' (p. 17) of events of the time is problematic.

In addition, the basis on which Paas selected the broadsheets to include in her book remains unclear. This is regrettable because in three cases the connection between the broadsheets and the Kipper und Wipper period is highly doubtful. *Trawrige Klag/Vber meinen Seckhel* (no. I) dates from 1616, and was clearly published before the Kipper und Wipper inflation began. *Des Seckels Jämmerlich Heulen* (no. II) is a general lament about wasting money without any recognizable connection with the Kipper und Wipper period in particular. The same applies to *Hie wirdt Fraw Armuth angedeut* (no. XI), produced in 1621 by Daniel Manasser in Augsburg, which concerns the economic consequences of alcohol abuse.

The introductory text on the German inflation between 1619 and 1623 adds nothing new to the current state of research, but some factual errors in it are surprising. According to Paas, for instance, the Fugger trading house, which existed until 1657, collapsed as the result of a Spanish bankruptcy in 1607 (p. 5), and the doubling or trebling of the European population between 1500 and 1618 which she postulates (p. 6) cannot be verified by reference to the relevant liter-

*Kipper- und Wipperzeit (1620–1625)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988); Ulrich Rosseaux, *Die Kipper und Wipper als publizistisches Ereignis (1620–1626): Eine Studie zu den Strukturen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (Berlin, 2001).

ature. If we compare the figures given by Jan de Vries,[2] we find a moderate population growth in the sixteenth century of around 28 per cent (1500: 61 million; 1600: 78 million).

All in all, although it is beautifully produced, this book is disappointing as a contribution to the academic debate on the Kipper und Wipper inflation. At most, it may be of some use as an introduction for readers who do not know German and are not familiar with the subject.

[2] See Jan de Vries, 'Population', in Thomas A. Brady Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy (eds.), *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1994), i. 13.

ULRICH ROSSEAUX is Deputy Director of the Money Museum of the German Bundesbank in Frankfurt am Main. He also teaches early modern history at the Technical University of Dresden. His research interests include the history of early modern media and communication, the history of towns and cities, and the history of leisure. Among his publications are *Die Kipper und Wipper als publizistisches Ereignis (1620–1626): Eine Studie zu den Strukturen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (2001), *Städte in der Frühen Neuzeit* (2006), and *Freiräume: Unterhaltung, Vergnügen und Erholung in Dresden 1694–1830* (2007).

EVA GILOI, *Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany 1750–1950*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 422 pp. ISBN 978 0 521 76198 7. £60.00. US$99.00

Monarchy is back. Almost 100 years after the end of the Kaiserreich, the historical exploration of the dozens of kings and grand dukes, dukes and princes, whose *Bund* formed the constitutional backbone of Imperial Germany until 1918, is reaching new heights. From the 1960s to the 1980s, social history, and not only of the Bielefeld brand, relegated ancient institutions alongside 'great men' to the margins of history. Over the last twenty years, however, historiography has refocused on the versatility and adaptability of monarchy, which survived several revolutions and foreign interventions to remain politically, socially, culturally, and economically important in Germany well into the twentieth century. Yet most studies focus on the Kaiserreich, nineteenth-century history, or the early modern period, and there are still too few attempts to trace the fate of monarchy across the threshold of the years around 1800. And the impact of the sudden disappearance of German monarchies in 1918 on the political culture and social fabric of republican Germany in the following decades is rarely considered.

This is where Eva Giloi comes in. She follows the public image of the House of Hohenzollern over 200 years, starting in the middle of the eighteenth century, when new modes of communication and consumption ('public sphere') affected the relationship between kings and subjects, and ending after the Second World War, when the democratically elected father figures of the Adenauer era replaced the hereditary patriarchalism that had underpinned German monarchies for centuries. The theme of Giloi's book, which has grown out of a Princeton Ph.D. dissertation, is the popular attitudes of Prussians to their monarchy, which she analyses through the form they took in 'material culture'. Although the 'Germany' of the book title really refers only to Prussia, Giloi makes an effort to compare her findings with research on the British and French monarchies, which has inspired so much of the recent revival of monarchy studies.

At the centre of the work is the exchange of gifts and objects between Prussian subjects and their kings (and, after 1871, German emperors). Here, Giloi distinguishes between two kinds of objects.

First, she considers 'relics', that is, objects that were used by a member of a ruling house (such as Frederick the Great's frock coat), that formed part of the royal body (Queen Louise's locks of hair, for instance), or that bore traces of it (for example, royal autographs). Second, Giloi examines the production, sale, and use of souvenirs, such as cups bearing royal portraits, which were produced for a market that included royalty in celebrity culture from the start. She demonstrates that members of the middle classes in particular displayed an avid interest in both relics and souvenirs, and collected them from early on. Moreover, subjects sent some of these objects, as well as other items related to specific episodes in dynastic history, to the ruling monarch himself, and the analysis of these donations and the accompanying letters forms the centre of Giloi's study. She asks which monarchs received most gifts (and at what period of their reign), and whose relics were most popular; she examines the social profiles as well as the gender of donors; and considers the landscape of gift-giving.

Most 'relics' originally started life as royal gifts to servants or courtiers (sometimes because of their monetary value), and then made their way through various family generations and stages of selling-on. Giloi follows the trajectory of these objects, examines how they were sold, who bought them, and how particular meanings came to be attached to them. From the 1850s on, a veritable market emerged, but some objects returned to the orbit of the court as donations. The combination of royal display and public appropriation of monarchy was not a specifically German practice. Royal objects were popular throughout nineteenth-century Europe. Prussia, Giloi points out, was actually a latecomer in this field as royal celebrity culture depended on a sophisticated consumer and leisure culture. Celebrity tourism emerged during the nineteenth century, as thousands visited museums, monuments, galleries, and palaces as well as their inhabitants, and it spelled out when members of the royal dynasty could best be viewed ('Kaiser-spotting').

With this shift towards objects, Giloi appropriates the recent focus on objects (*Dinge*) and material culture in the humanities for her examination of monarchy. In this historiographical field, the culture of gift-giving has so far only been considered in the context of inter-dynastic exchange between various courts, and thus in relation to diplomatic activity. By embedding the mass use of royal 'relics' and

'souvenirs' in a wider culture of gift-giving that took root in middle-class families in the later eighteenth century, Giloi sheds new light on the political culture of Germany in the long nineteenth century. In line with recent research on political culture, Giloi understands *Herrschaft* not as top-down governance, but as an act of communication in which the roles of subject and ruler were subject to constant negotiation and change. Consequently, the book deals both with royal projections and middle-class appropriations, and thus moves away from older notions of royal propaganda. By asking where the Germans' enthusiasm for their monarchs came from, and how it can be measured, Giloi circumvents any problems which an exploration of public opinion in pre-1918 Germany might encounter, as the press was officially regulated and informally guided.

The book's structure is partly chronological and partly systematic. It begins with an overview over the 100 years from 1750 to 1850, when a new material culture of monarchy took root in German society. Here, the cult surrounding Frederick II 'the Great' and the *Luisenkult*, which turned Frederick William III's consort, who died early, into the epitome of German motherhood and Prussian resistance to Napoleon, were pivotal. Memorabilia of Frederick and Louise also formed the centrepieces of later collections. Frederick William III, by contrast, pales by comparison, which Giloi attributes to his conservative politics and restrained personality. Giloi thus demonstrates that the *Luisenkult*, which took off almost immediately after the queen's death in 1810, did not translate into admiration for the widowed king. Here it already becomes apparent that the popular cult of monarchy was a question of projection. This becomes especially clear in Giloi's chapters on William I and the Hohenzollern Museum. They form the analytical core of the book, making up five of the book's eleven chapters (excluding introduction and conclusion), and also figuring prominently in the long term analyses in chapters 2 and 4.

What made William I so central was two things. First, the culture of gift-giving was institutionalized and made public under William I, when the Prussian monarchy established its own museum in 1877. While Frederick William III and Frederick William IV had stored donations in the royal collections scattered across various palaces, and thus kept them removed from the public gaze, the Hohenzollern Museum now displayed gifts from subjects along with other 'relics' in a series of specially designed rooms in Berlin's Monbijou Palace,

which were constantly being redecorated to adapt to changing public taste (chapter 9). Here the history of the House of Hohenzollern was narrated as both national and family history, thus linking the ruling dynasty with two dominant discourses of the nineteenth century. In the museum, William I's cradle could be seen alongside the chair in which Frederick the Great had died in 1786.

Secondly, the link between William I and his mother, Queen Louise, did not just connect Imperial Germany with the mythologized and distant Napoleonic era but, more importantly, it partially 'feminized' the Prussian monarchy that had just achieved German unification through military victory. Making the monarch look both heroic and vulnerable, Giloi argues, was important for the monarchy's ability to put down sentimental roots in German society as well as to command the public's respect for its power and authority. Although William I made his dislike of publicity well known, he proved to be much more adept at managing his public persona than Frederick William III or William II. In combining ostentatious modesty with a shrewd use of the media, he bears some resemblance to Frederick the Great, who also managed to do justice to the demands of audiences as different as European courts and the Parisian *philosophes*. The story of the Prussian monarchy that emerges is thus different from the usual narrative of the rise of an all-conquering Prussian military state by the 1870s. Rather, Queen Louise's maternal love and William I's vulnerability as an orphaned prince reflected the vulnerability of what had, for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, been the weakest of Europe's great powers as a whole.

This combination of the *Luisenmythos* with a specific narrative about William I also helped to compensate for the relative poverty of the House of Hohenzollern's folkloric resources by comparison with other, older German dynasties, who could boast historical figures, such as Henry the Lion or Emperor Ludwig the Bavarian, to emphasize their ancient traditions in the age of historicism. It was not access to the monarch as head of state and church and commander-in-chief of the army with political, religious, and military functions that was sought, but to his personality and character. Gift-giving established a personal link between subject and monarch that could be interpreted in various ways. The emotional bonds that this kind of vision fostered were, however, difficult to maintain, and needed careful managing. Counterbalancing Bismarck's image as Iron Chancellor, the

public image of William I successfully reconciled military courage and sentimental vulnerability. William II, by contrast, wanted to project imperial power and glory, while the public was much more interested in glimpsing the Kaiser's otherwise 'hidden' side.

Paying particular attention to the subjects' *Eigensinn*, Giloi points out that gift-giving should by no means be misread as an act of unquestioned loyalty. Rather, subjects created their own image of monarchy, one that often contravened official purposes. Giloi thus emphasizes the multiplicity of meanings: not all 'relics' were admired, and the very triviality of many everyday objects offered unedifying views of the ruling dynasty (p. 10). Political reform, however, was rarely advocated through gifts; royal relics and souvenirs were certainly not objects of revolution. This becomes clear when the social and regional background of donors is considered. Here the nobility, coming in at around 25 per cent, was over-represented, while under William II in particular, industrialists and the wealthy bourgeoisie stepped up their gift-giving, reflecting the Kaiser's particular fondness for technical and industrial innovation.

Moreover, throughout the period, most gifts to the court were sent from Prussia's core provinces, such as the Mark Brandenburg. Prussia's western provinces, acquired after 1815, were under-represented, accounting for only 10 per cent of donations (p. 318). Even after 1871, few objects came from the other constituent states of the new Kaiserreich; under William II, only 16 per cent of gifts were sent in from the non-Prussian parts of Germany. Whether this points to the Imperial monarchy's limited powers of integration, or to the regional limits of a particular culture of gift-giving within Germany is a question that remains unanswered. But what does become clear is how closely gift-giving was tied both to social structure and long-standing regional connections, as well as to specific political developments. Donations to William I increased greatly in the late 1870s, when the vulnerability of the ageing emperor was highlighted by a series of unsuccessful assassination attempts that pushed memories of William's earlier controversial career into the background.

By putting William I at centre stage, Giloi provides a welcome reassessment of this important monarch, who has always remained in the shadow of the more glittering figure of Bismarck. William II, by contrast, is cast in the usual role of blundering egomaniac who spoilt it all. Kings Frederick William II and Frederick William IV,

however, make surprisingly few appearances. Although this certainly mirrors Giloi's analysis of gift-giving, as well as the rulers' attempts to banish the potentially dangerous popular cult of Frederick the Great, it begs the question of what exactly their role was in shaping the public image of the Hohenzollern monarchy. Frederick William II, after all, was the first Prussian king who made a deliberate effort to popularize monarchy in the decade of the French Revolution, while Frederick William IV pursued a novel public relations strategy integrating both ceremonial and the new tool of public speeches.

Giloi approaches the role of monarchy in emergent modern society from a highly original perspective that goes beyond the now conventional analysis of courts and ceremonial, newspapers and artistic patronage. She has an impressive command of the literature in a wide field, and brings to life the culture of gift-giving in readable yet precise prose interspersed with observations of dry wit. Once or twice, Giloi seems confused by royal and imperial titles: in 1848, the later William I was not 'His Majesty the Prince of Prussia' (p. 100), while a 1861 coronation photograph could show only his royal, but not yet imperial, crown (figure 22). It is also unlikely that the 'poor invalid' mentioned in a 1830s board game refers to widowed Frederick William III (p. 96). In general, however, the book is edited and illustrated to a high standard. Giloi's analysis of written sources and examination of museum layouts are skilfully linked to larger developments in European politics, German society, consumer culture, and mass media. Especially laudable is that she not only highlights the multiple meanings attached to 'royal objects', but herself openly asks questions. Often she discusses several possible interpretations, as on the political effects of the 'disparity between popular depiction and royal intention' (p. 8). Two decades after Peter Burke's seminal *Fabrication of Louis XIV*, Giloi's examination of royal images through the interaction of monarchy and subjects thus places the study of monarchy on a new level.

THOMAS BISKUP is a Lecturer in Early Modern History at the University of Hull. His main publications include *Friedrichs Größe: Inszenierungen des Preußenkönig in Fest und Zeremoniell 1740–1815*

(2012) and, as co-editor with Martin Kohlrausch, *Das Erbe der Monarchie: Nachwirkungen einer deutschen Institution seit 1918* (2008). He is currently working on natural history and politics in eighteenth-century Britain and Germany.

ROLAND WENZLHUEMER, *Connecting the Nineteenth-Century World: The Telegraph and Globalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), xvi + 339 pp. ISBN 978 1 107 02528 8. £65.00. US$110.00

The historian-zealots of the 1970s who believed that quantification would revolutionize the writing of history (most notably the advocates of QUASSH, Quantitative and Social Science History) would be demoralized by the state of the field today. Despite great initial enthusiasm in the 1960s and 1970s, efforts to transform the discipline through the application of statistics eventually fell on hard times.[1] By 2010, according to a survey by the American Historical Association, older historians, from the generation that pioneered quantitative history, were more likely than younger historians to use heavy-duty number crunching statistical programmes.[2] In fact, contrary to the predictions of cliometricians, the most trendy historical research of the last three decades moved in the opposite direction, towards a fascination with language and culture that owed more to the humanities (especially literary studies) than to the social sciences. Instead of seeking numbers in the quest for universal truths, historians moved towards greater tolerance of subjectivity, particularism, and anecdote.

In this context, *Connecting the Nineteenth-Century World* may be an exciting harbinger of emerging scholarly trends. The book, which seeks to understand how the telegraph affected globalization, is eclectic, innovative, and pragmatic in its approach, employing (as will be described below) a mixture of humanistic and social scientific methodologies. A brief summary indicates the diversity and complexity of the subjects it covers. Chapter one introduces the topic and also contrasts the telegraph with the internet. Chapter two offers a conceptual analysis of the concepts of globalization, space, and net-

[1] For telling statistics on this trend, see Steven Ruggles's PowerPoint slides on 'The Decline of Quantitative History', available on the internet at <www.hist.umn.edu/~ruggles/hist5011/Decline.pptx>, accessed 1 July 2013; Robert Whaples, 'Is Economic History a Neglected Field of Study?', *Historically Speaking*, 11/ 2 (Apr. 2010), 17–20.

[2] Robert B. Townsend, 'How is New Media Reshaping the Work of Historians?', American Historical Association, *Perspectives on History* (Nov. 2010).

works, and then explores the vexed question of whether technology is an autonomous force driving historical change. Chapter three describes the development of long-distance electric communication during the nineteenth century. Chapter four considers the effect of telegraphy on imperialism, commerce, journalism, and culture. Chapter five examines the structure of the worldwide telegraph network, and how it influenced economic integration and contemporary notions of 'global communication space'. Chapter six makes generous use of social scientific methods of inquiry to identify centres and peripheries in the global communication network of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Chapter seven, also employing social scientific methods, reconstructs the structure and use of the domestic British telegraph system during the nineteenth century. Chapter eight provides a similar analysis of the telegraph network of British India during the same period. Finally, chapter nine attempts to weave these strands together, and offers perspective on telegraphy's impact upon cultural practices and global spaces.

As he investigates these topics, Wenzlhuemer makes good use of the vogue for particularism and anecdote popularized by cultural historians and characteristic of much recent historical scholarship. The book is filled with marvellous tales that illustrate his arguments. For example, he narrates an instance in which the viceroy of India and his wife diverged in their use of language during a public exchange of telegrams, suggesting that context, habit, gender, and cultural expectations influenced the messages of telegraph users as much as intrinsic aspects of the technology. Even more dramatically, he describes an early telegram ordering that a convicted criminal be executed, which generated confusion due to the lack of context in telegrams (which tended to be extremely brief because of the expense) and the difficulty of determining whether they were really from the person purporting to send them.

Wenzlhuemer sympathizes with the view that time and space, as historically experienced, were subjective and unstable, but he challenges assertions that these concepts were 'annihilated' by technology. He subjects such generalizations to empirical critique, as with a story he tells demonstrating that, far from becoming irrelevant, space and time retained their importance in the age of telegraphy: during the 1908 Telegraph General Strike in India, strikers transmitted telegrams without their date and time, destroying their value in

many cases (p. 255). More generally, he describes other instances when the telegraph failed to operate as intended. While engaging stimulating ideas from postmodern authors, Wenzlhuemer brings an empirical rigour that is useful when examining their sometimes breathless claims. For example, a close examination of the historical record suggests that the 'communications revolution' often associated with the rise of a global telegraph network actually occurred decades earlier, during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when the time required for land and sea travel fell rapidly in absolute terms (p. 30). He likewise offers an intriguing challenge to the conventional narrative of communications progress when he suggests that 'absolute message delivery times had in many instances grown between 1890 and 1900' due to increased traffic on a telegraph system that had not increased in capacity (p. 128).

Wenzlhuemer's judicious approach is helpful when, from the standpoint of the electric telegraph, the book examines the technological millennialism surrounding the internet. Wenzlhuemer concludes that much of what is genuinely new about the internet is the relatively broad public access to it, the disintermediation it provides between customer and technology (we no longer need to communicate through telegraphers, for example), and its relatively low cost (which is why email spam is a problem and telegram spam was not). Perhaps most importantly, the digitization of information and enormous growth of bandwidth 'allow internet users to exchange much more than just brief text-based messages', while the 'World Wide Web stores information and makes it accessible on-demand and from any (connected) place' (p. 8).

While Victorians would have been astonished by these last two capabilities, they were already familiar with other aspects of the 'information age', such as the 'dematerialization' of information (by converting a written message into electrical impulses) and the drastic change in the relationship between distance and the speed of sending news. These two characteristics of telegraphy are central to Wenzlhuemer's analysis of its impact on 'globalization', which he describes as comprising 'all processes that lead to a gradual detachment of patterns of sociocultural interaction from geographical proximity' (pp. 14–15). As the book shows, messages could frequently be sent more quickly from London to distant but well-connected parts of the British Empire than between addresses within London. This

helped reconfigure contemporary notions of space and time. Wenzlhuemer particularly emphasizes that telegraphy, by dematerializing information, allowed for communication that was much faster than a human could travel. As he notes, 'dematerialized information outpaced material transport and could, therefore, be used to efficiently co-ordinate, control and command such material movement' (p. 31). Unlike technological enthusiasts, who tend to be ahistorical, Wenzlhuemer argues that information technologies are historically shaped and limited by path dependence.

But telegraphy did not affect everyone equally. At one point, Wenzlhuemer notes: 'Only a very small privileged group of mostly Western administrators, businessmen and travellers really witnessed a transformation of global communication space in the nineteenth century' (p. 49). His focus on elites, although likely an accident of subject matter rather than a methodological or moral preference, is worth noting. Indeed, one of the few areas of continuity between the proponents of quantitative history and the advocates of the 'cultural turn' is a concern with recovering the stories of ordinary people and socially marginalized groups. Both approaches rebelled against more traditional histories focused on political, economic, and social elites. In this area, Wenzlhuemer's work has a more traditional focus on the wealthy and powerful because telegrams were expensive, and generally only elites sent or received them. Even the labourers most closely identified with the telegraph industry, despite their legitimate workplace grievances, were not prototypical members of a Marxian proletariat. The humble telegrapher, subject as he or she was to repetitive stress injuries and other unsatisfactory labour conditions that sometimes led to strikes, possessed a highly marketable skill that allowed for geographic freedom and led many towards a middle-class life.[3] Likewise, poorly paid telegram delivery boys worked outside the confines of an office, and sometimes showed surprising upward mobility as a result of their contact with powerful businessmen and familiarity with what was a leading technology of its day, as is shown most starkly by the extraordinary career of Andrew Carnegie.

In the course of addressing many stimulating topics, such as the effect of telegraphy on language and manners, the book sensibly and

[3] Edwin Gabler, *The American Telegrapher: A Social History, 1860–1900* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1988).

assiduously employs classic archival research as well as more recently fashionable methodologies such as cultural analysis. But where it makes its most significant methodological contribution is in sections that deploy techniques more common in other disciplines, such as the use of geographic information systems (GIS) and statistical analysis, using these two techniques to complement one another. For example, through the application of social network analysis tools, Wenzlhuemer tries to locate centres and peripheries in the global telegraph system. He employs four tools: degree (which counts the number of connections that a node has with other nodes), closeness (how few connections a node requires to reach each and every other node), betweenness (how often the shortest connection between two nodes passes through a certain node), and eigenvector (to what extent a node is connected to other central nodes) (pp. 138–46). The application of these four 'centrality measures' produces a plethora of maps and statistics. The book prints twenty-five maps and an appendix with forty-three pages of statistical tables in addition to other tables scattered throughout the text.

While all of this is extremely laudable, it is not clear to me that these innovative techniques provide startling new insights; for the most part they offer additional confirmation for what we already suspected, such as the importance of London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna to the international telegraph network. Similarly, it seems unsurprising that small countries sent more international telegrams per capita (other things being equal) than big countries. This is almost inevitable, just as small countries tend to import and export a higher percentage of their goods than big countries if both follow similar policies. In one frustrating case, statistical analysis fails to support or even provide clear evidence about the hypothesis that better global telecommunications increased transnational economic integration (for example, an improvement in telegraphic communication between two places distant from one another might thereby increase trade between them). It appears that Wenzlhuemer had anticipated a more favourable result (p. 133). Yet, although this last finding is preliminary and cannot be considered definitive, it is nonetheless extremely valuable to publish negative or inconclusive results, which help future generations of scholars to avoid endlessly re-testing enticing theories that never pan out. Likewise, it is worthwhile to examine the validity of hypotheses that at first glance seem obvious

or common sense but are sometimes wrong and, in any case, extremely difficult to prove. I have no doubt that the findings in this book will be of great assistance to future researchers.

One problem in using statistics to answer important historical questions is the frequent inadequacy of the data. For example, as Wenzlhuemer acknowledges, his work is hindered by the difficulty of finding usage data to complement more abundant evidence on the structure of the international telegraph network, although he does achieve some success in overcoming this formidable obstacle (pp. 122, 176). Despite such challenges, this book offers thoughtful and sensible judgements on a variety of topics, as well as generally good writing, and indefatigable research. Yet it may be the use of innovative (at least among historians) research techniques that captures the attention of many readers. This book may be part of a movement that will integrate history back into the social sciences.[4] There are drawbacks to this focus on social scientific methodology, which results in a book that is rather dense in places and lacking in narrative drive. Despite valuable efforts to provide coherence in the introduction and conclusion, it feels more like a collection of essays than a monograph. But is that so bad? It would be unfair to criticize this book for literary shortcomings that do not relate to its aims and accomplishments, which, indeed, are ambitious, and impressive, enough.

[4] The next frontier may be the natural sciences. See Michael McCormick, 'History's Changing Climate: Climate Science, Genomics, and the Emerging Consilient Approach to Interdisciplinary History', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 42/2 (Autumn 2011), 251–73.

DAVID PAULL NICKLES is the author of *Under the Wire: How the Telegraph Changed Diplomacy* (2003) and a historian at the US Department of State. The views expressed here are the author's and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of State or the US Government.

TATJANA TÖNSMEYER, *Adelige Moderne: Großgrundbesitz und ländliche Gesellschaft in England und Böhmen 1848–1918*, Industrielle Welt, 83 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2012), 372 pp. ISBN 978 3 412 20937 7. €59.90

The wave of interest in the late modern history of European nobilities unleashed some three decades ago, in part by Arno Mayer's provocative thesis on 'the persistence of the old regime', continues its slow rise, tossing up fine works of historical learning as it does. This book comparing and contrasting what would seem to be quite disparate groups of English and Bohemian nobles at the high tide of landed aristocracy is one of them. The apparent dissimilarity is accentuated by the state of the literature. Where the English or British landed establishment has been illuminated from many angles and is the subject of major narrative interpretations such as David Cannadine's *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (1992), the Bohemian or Habsburg high nobility has remained in the shadows. The notable revival of interest in recent years in central European nobilities, specifically in various German lands, has also largely passed the Habsburg Monarchy and its territories by. The collapse of the old regime at the end of the First World War and the rise of nation-states within whose physical and mental boundaries the old elites would seem to have little place continues to exert a profound influence on the approach to, and writing of, history nearly a century later. Thanks to the long parliamentary tradition, the English peerage has not been understood, in contrast, as having been foreign or extraneous to the 'nation'.

That old corporate diets enduring down to 1848 shaped noble traditions in the Habsburg lands points to another meaningful divergence in the historical experiences of English and Bohemian nobles. Those diets were the political expression of a social order that had ultimately rested on the manorial system, which in the English countryside had withered away centuries earlier. Only in consequence of the events of 1848 did that system, together with the customary Estates, disappear in the Habsburg lands. Yet this change confronted Bohemian landowners with a challenge very like that facing their English counterparts following the abolition of the Corn Laws only two years earlier (1846): it exposed them to the full blast of agrarian capitalism. These mid-century caesuras form the starting point for the study under consideration here. Both groups of landowners were furthermore uniquely well equipped to take the heat. It is well known

that the British elite was Europe's most broadacred, with vast swathes of the urban and rural worlds in the hands of a few hundred families. Less familiar is that the Habsburg aristocracy, especially its Bohemian and Hungarian manifestations, was its closest continental equivalent in terms of resources. In 1896, almost a quarter of the Bohemian kingdom's total land area was held by 163 proprietors; fourteen of these, led by Prince Schwarzenberg with 150,000 hectares, owned 11.4 per cent of that area (p. 23). Both the English and Bohemian nobilities were strongly supra-regional in orientation, which reflected the importance of 'imperial' polities as essential points on their compass. And they were also part of a closely interconnected, European-wide social elite.

That we get little sense of cross-influences or of the nobility's British, Habsburg, or European context is a function of this study's resolutely local focus, which is at the same time its great merit. Starting from the historian Otto Brunner's famous premise that the essence of nobility over time has been *Herrschaft über Land und Leute* at the level of the estate, the author asks how her focus groups attempted to stabilize and uphold 'dominion over land and people' under circumstances very different from those of the medieval and early modern periods with which Brunner was concerned. In view of the high proportion of people who continued to live in the European countryside after 1900, this is an important question. Because of strong 'national assumptions' (p. 31), however, it has been rarely asked. In the English case, the combination of land, opulence, and authority has been taken as a given, with paradoxically little need seen to explore just how the noble base was sustained. For the Czech lands, national teleology has postulated a landed nobility deprived of its legal hold over the subject populace by the mid-century revolution and then inexorably pushed aside by modern, middle-class society. Perhaps even more than their English counterparts, Bohemian great landowners remained firmly rooted on their ancestral acres—and a power to be reckoned with—down to 1914 and beyond. The author's findings for Bohemia show how carefully they avoided identifying with any one group in a multi-lingual world. This helps to explain their success.

In keeping with recent advances in the understanding of how power is exercised, the author firmly and effectively integrates the 'ruled' into her picture of the 'rulers'. The same has been done, for

example, by primarily English-language scholars to overturn older notions of 'absolutism' in early modern France and thus deepen our knowledge of how the expansion of royal power occurred. In German-language scholarship, the emphasis has been on power as a process of communication and negotiation. Impulses coming from sociology and other disciplines have been important in this re-thinking. Drawing on such insights, Tönsmeyer interprets dominion as a form of 'social practice' in which historical players interact in what is thought of as a 'force field' (*Kräftefeld*) (p. 19); the focus is on their interaction with each other and the cultural 'tools' they use in doing so. These 'tools' are often rooted in daily usage that itself draws on long-established custom, rather than reified ideas of 'efficiency'. In other words, the actors bring their 'own logic' (*Eigensinn*) into play. In conceiving of the exercise of power as a matter of negotiation, some scholars have gone too far in assuming a level playing field between 'rulers' and 'ruled', a mistake that the author carefully avoids. Those who were dependent or lacking resources had 'fewer possibilities for being successful in processes of negotiation' (p. 256), as a conflict between the beneficiaries of a foundation for the poor and the administration of Count Czernin, whose family funded it, suggested. But to be most effective, noble dominion had in some way to take into account the interests and needs of those they ruled.

The book is divided into four major sections that reflect how the theoretical and methodological reflections apply to the actual historical record as surveyed by the author in family and estate papers surviving in eight regional archives in England and the Czech Republic (and concerning roughly a dozen families in all). The first section thus introduces the reader to the 'actors in agrarian society'—those who in effect occupied the postulated 'force field'. These included not only the noble landowners themselves, but also their bailiffs, stewards, and other administrators, as well as the many other rural social elements that fell within the penumbra of estates. Another player not introduced at this point but nevertheless factored into the equation later in the book is the 'state', which was extending its reach into the countryside by creating new structures of government.

Proprietors in both England and Bohemia shared a central concern, reflected in their frequent presence on their lands and close involvement in management, to turn the profit needed for them to maintain a lifestyle in accordance with their rank. Otherwise the

structures in the two places varied, as both this and the following section, 'The Working World of the Estates: Practices and Conflicts', show. A key difference was that the English nobility generally leased out its holdings—thus the prominence of tenant farmers in agrarian society there—whereas the Bohemian nobility tended to farm its properties itself. Flashpoints of conflict also differed significantly as a consequence of historical circumstance. In England, they concerned cottages, the consumption of alcohol, and unionism; in Bohemia, pay-in-kind (such as dairy products), access to forests, and the use of ponds and streams. In both the Bohemian and English cases, the author interestingly teases out the clashing conceptions of 'property' that, in some cases, despite being rooted in older ways of thinking, were now criminalized. That the nobility did not always manage to enforce its will was evident in the struggle over the unionization of workers on its industrial holdings in England. Here patriarchal and paternalistic appeals to 'common interests' had lost their effectiveness.

The last two sections explore 'traditional' and 'modern' ways in which the nobility sought to stabilize its hold in the countryside. These again differed somewhat according to circumstance. Among the former, the provision of charity, the maintenance of churches and schools, and celebrations and solemn occasions all provided opportunities for reinforcing hierarchy. As late as the 1870s, petitioners for help in Bohemia are on record as recommending themselves to noble patrons by recalling the former subject-status of themselves or their immediate ancestors. In England, the dissenting chapels in the so-called 'open villages' offered alternative forms of allegiance bitterly opposed by noble landowners, not least because of the connection to unionism. New structures of local government and associations were the most important of the 'modern' forums used by the landed nobility with some success in defending its interests.

The interpretative model of the 'force field' that brings interaction and conflict into focus has perhaps not allowed for consideration of one aspect of the nobility's continuing assertion of its presence and status in the agrarian world: the later nineteenth century was the last great age of the construction and remaking of castles and country homes in both England and Bohemia. Such buildings had traditionally been a supreme expression of the nobility's claim to dominate. Did they provoke no opposition in the later nineteenth century, or is

the silence a function of the sources examined? The study's focus on the problem of conflict, in combination with the comparative English–Bohemian perspective, nevertheless casts more light than it obscures. Where conflict has been seen as a pervasive daily phenomenon in Bohemia with its traditions of customary rights anchored in the manorial system, historians have tended to assume a 'culture of deference' in the English countryside. The author convincingly calls this assumption into question. The original findings and fresh perspective are thus not limited to the less well-known Bohemian case and make abundantly clear how profitable, even essential, comparisons remain to historical scholarship.

WILLIAM D. GODSEY is a Research Fellow at the Institute for Modern and Contemporary Historical Research of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and a University Lecturer in Vienna. His major publications include *Aristocratic Redoubt: The Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office on the Eve of the First World War* (1999); *Nobles and Nation in Central Europe: Free Imperial Knights in the Age of Revolution 1750–1850* (2004); and, as co-editor, *Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten der Landesfürsten? Die Stände in der Habsburgermonarchie* (2007).

MATTHEW S. SELIGMANN, *The Royal Navy and the German Threat 1901–1914: Admiralty Plans to Protect British Trade in a War Against Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), x + 186 pp. ISBN 978 0 19 957403 2. £60.00

Everything seems to have been said about Anglo-German rivalry and the arms race before 1914. Studies of British sea power before and after the launching of the battleship *HMS Dreadnought* in 1906, which took naval armament to a new level, have filled whole libraries over the last twenty or so years. It is all the more surprising, therefore, that Matthew Seligmann seems to have discovered a new topic, one that has received little attention so far: the protection of British sea trade against 'Germany's extensive fleet of large Atlantic liners' (p. 6).

Those who know Seligmann's work will recognize that he does not belong to those revisionists, who, in recent years, have questioned the paradigm of Anglo-German measure and counter-measure. On the contrary, he has recently attempted to underpin the orthodox view that the sole threat to Britain before 1914 was posed by German naval policy. In this new book he believes he has got to the heart of the Anglo-German rivalry at sea. It was not the German battle fleet that had given the British Admiralty a permanent headache since the turn of the century, he suggests, and certainly not any other modern world fleets, or even financial or technical problems, but Germany's fast passenger ships.

This arresting claim commands the reader's attention. With a great deal of verve, Seligmann first directs our gaze towards Germany's supposed intention of disrupting British trade in future by using armed commercial ships (pp. 7–24). His claim that this adds a completely new factor to existing patterns of interpretation (pp. 5, 171), however, quickly falters. In particular, the exclusive focus on Germany suggests that this is just another addition to the orthodox line of a sole German challenge. It completely ignores the French *Jeune École*, which directed its attention exclusively to the task of wearing Britain down in an extensive trade war. The Cunard Agreement (pp. 46–64) on the military use of the *Lusitania*, therefore, needs to be considered in the context of France. Nonetheless, this perspective on the use of commercial shipping in the war is refreshing and

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

promising. It is also noteworthy that Seligmann does not, like so many others, merely describe German intentions and extrapolate a British reaction from this. Rather, he draws on intelligence investigations of Britain (pp. 25–45).

Yet despite this promising approach, Seligmann's evidence is surprisingly thin in quality and quantity. For example, his claim that the German government was considering war when it subsidized commercial ships requires further analysis. The interconnectedness of commercial and political interests and the fact that the ships were not commercially viable is not enough to demonstrate Berlin's sinister motives. At the beginning of the twentieth century there was a real competition between passenger steamships, often driven by prestige rather than solely commercial considerations. HAPAG's ships, for example, competed with those not only of Britain's White Star Line, but also of Germany's Norddeutsche Lloyd, and vice versa. Instead of concentrating purely on the potential wartime use of merchant and passenger ships, the argument would have benefited here from at least bearing the economic background of commercial shipping in mind.

In addition, there is little evidence that Germany's approach was peculiar. After all, it has always been completely normal for seafaring powers at times of war to count on any suitable merchant and commercial shipping. The Boer War had already demonstrated to all seafaring powers that at times of war even the ships of neutral powers were not immune to seizure by the Royal Navy. Moreover, by June 1914—still in peacetime—the Royal Navy was counting on the *Lusitania* as well as over forty civilian ships, armed with 4.7-inch guns.[1] German efforts, by comparison, were extremely modest. Seligmann himself repeatedly admits that contemporaries regarded the collected intelligence information as a whole as 'inaccurate' (p. 38) and German preparations as 'overemphasized' (pp. 44–5). Even a well-informed and capable naval attaché such as Philip Dumas was unable to deliver any information about possible converted cruisers (p. 36).

It may seem surprising that, against this background, the author manages to construct a significant threat potential based on scarcely a dozen passenger ships that might be armed. An example of Selig-

[1] Churchill, House of Lords, 17 Mar. 1914, Naval Notes, June 1914, *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution,* 58 (1914), 668–77, at 670.

mann's procedure is how he treats the Beresford Inquiry of 1909. The Commission of Inquiry dealt with Lord Charles Beresford's allegations against his arch-enemy, the First Sea Lord, Sir John Fisher's preparation of the Royal Navy for defence and war. According to Seligmann, the Commission of Inquiry was mainly interested in the threat to British trade. It is true that at the twelfth sitting Beresford referred to the protection of trade as a 'big thing' (p. 33). It is also true, but is unfortunately not mentioned in this book, that at the same sitting, Beresford left no doubt that 'the state of the Home Fleet', that is, the strength of the battle fleet, was incomparably more important: 'This is, from my point of view, the crux of the whole thing—the whole thing hangs on it.' Prime Minister Henry Asquith explicitly agreed: 'It all hinges on that.'[2] Characteristically, the Commission's final report does not even mention trade protection.[3]

Here Seligmann accepts uncritically Bereford's view. The reader gains the impression that the Admiralty had simply neglected to address the question of armed merchantmen. In fact, however, comments by the First Lord of the Admiralty, Reginald McKenna, indicate the exact opposite. What was crucial, he said, was whether or not the German merchant navy was armed in peacetime. If not, McKenna said, he saw 'no danger'. But if 'the German mercantile ships do carry guns and ammunition, then we shall make different preparations . . . but we do not want to have our present preparations examined upon the presumed basis that German ships do carry guns and ammunition in peace, when we have the very best of reasons for thinking they do not.'[4] A sober assessment of the situation had obviously prevailed over insufficient information. Not so in Seligmann's view. Instead of looking more closely at the feud between Beresford and Fisher, he follows Beresford too closely in assuming, without any obvious evidence, that McKenna was obscuring the situation, or even lying (p. 34). What reasons McKenna might have had for not telling

[2] Report and Proceedings of a Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence Appointed to Inquire into Certain Questions of Naval Policy Raised by Lord Charles Beresford, 15 June 1909, TNA, CAB 16/9A–B (Q.2417).

[3] Beresford to Asquith, 2 Apr. 1909, Report of the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence Appointed to Inquire into Certain Questions of Naval Policy Raised by Lord Charles Beresford, 12 Aug. 1909, Accounts and Papers, Cd. 256, fos. 295–7.

[4] Beresford Inquiry, TNA, CAB 16/9A–B (Q.2403).

the truth, given that he had just replaced Lord Tweedmouth, who was seen as too pro-German, remains an open question. The same applies to the obvious question of why Germany, if it wanted to attack British trade, had opted for a battle fleet rather than for a cruiser fleet, which would have been much better suited to this purpose, and did not start building submarines systematically until 1909. The explanation supplied later, after the event, by Admiral Slade in May 1909 that this was another example of Germany's obfuscation tactics (p. 172) is typical of the general stereotyping of Germany as the putative enemy in the wake of contemporary invasion scares and spy hysteria, but is hardly convincing from today's point of view.

Long before 1914 the facts spoke clearly in favour of Britain, and the threat scenarios were largely imaginary. This plays no part in Seligmann's line of argument, however. He explicitly stresses that 'no solid evidence ever support[ed]' the view 'that German ships carried their armament . . . in peacetime'. Apart from a few 'unsubstantiated agents' reports', he goes on, 'plenty of material' exists 'that contradicted the idea'. 'Yet the rightness or wrongness of British thinking is . . . irrelevant', because the British 'believed that the Germans would behave in a particular way', and this 'moulded British planning' (p. 45). Contemporaries knew that there was not much behind the idea that German merchantmen were armed, but according to Seligmann 'almost everyone' except Fisher and Churchill believed it (p. 45). Who in particular he means by this, however, remains open. A look at military journals of the time would have made a more differentiated account possible.[5]

This brings us to one of the main problems of the book: the narrow range of sources used and the overabundance of conjecture. Seligmann's explanation for recent increased interest in the building of British battle cruisers is particularly dubious (pp. 65–87). He argues that these served primarily to pursue and fight the fast German passenger steamers and potential auxiliary cruisers run by

[5] Rear-Admiral R. G. O. Tupper, 24 Jan. 1912, in G. Renwick, 'Our Supplies of Food Stuffs and Raw Materials in Time of War', *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, 56/1 (1912), 483–514, at 513; W. C. Crutchley, in Stewart Murray, 'The Internal Condition of Great Britain During a Great War', *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, 57/2 (1913), 1561–616, at 1609; K. Dewar, 'Influence of Overseas Commerce on the Operations of War', *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, 57/1 (1913), 449–500, at 466.

Norddeutsche Lloyd and HAPAG. But again, there is little evidence to back this up. It is completely forgotten, for example, that the battle cruisers had been ordered before the Battle of Tsushima, that is, at a time when Lord Selborne, for example, still sounded rather dismayed about the Russian threat, as 'these cursed Russians are laying down one ship after the other'.[6] Apart from this, the claim that battle cruisers could be employed to combat armed merchantmen and passenger ships (p. 86) is tenuous. It hardly seems credible that, given the budgetary constraints of the time, the Admiralty would have opted for the costly construction of the Invincible class with 12-inch artillery simply to counteract a handful of unarmoured passenger ships (p. 82).

On the whole, the book often lacks wider contextualization. It is true, of course, that up to 1907, several German passenger steamers repeatedly won the Blue Riband awarded for the fastest Atlantic crossing. A number of these ships were drafted into military service, as was usual among all seafaring powers, and one is inclined to agree with Seligmann's judgement on the Cunard Agreements on arming merchant vessels (pp. 47–53), especially as a signal to an excited public at home (p. 51). As far as German motives go, however, the chronologies are problematic. For one thing, eight of Germany's twelve giant ocean liners were built at a time when the political leadership in Berlin still believed that it could impress, if not outdo, Britain in the arming of its battle fleet. And for another, by 1907, German steamers had permanently lost their superiority in speed to the Cunard Line.

Moreover, Seligmann rather nonchalantly ignores the technical contexts and the financial aspects and background of British naval policy. What precisely did a specific threat posed by German merchant and passenger shipping mean? How should we imagine this in concrete terms? These ships could carry only a limited stock of coal, which meant that they could operate freely only for a limited period of time. Contemporaries were well aware that even in wartime, these ships could only replenish their stocks of coal in large harbours. And if they ventured in while at war, they would be detained in a neutral harbour and impounded, as in fact happened later. Only the *Prinz Eitel Friedrich*, whose top speed was a mere 15 knots and which thus

[6] Selborne to Balfour, 28 Oct. 1903, Sandars Papers, Bodleian Library, MSS Eng. hist. c. 715.

does not really fit into the author's scheme of fast steamers, and the *Kronprinz Wilhelm* operated successfully, responsible for eleven and fourteen sinkings respectively. The greatest successes, characteristically, were achieved by a ship built as an auxiliary cruiser from the start, the *SMS Möwe*, which was responsible for forty-two sinkings, and, of all things, a former cargo ship, the *SMS Wolf*, which, at a top speed of 10 knots, was especially slow (p. 163).

Seligmann's argument, contesting both the classic interpretation's focus on the battle fleet and the revisionist view of British naval policy developing independently of a German threat, is not fully convincing. The source material he provides on a few members of the navy is too cursory. His focus on the trade war, however, is promising. In this context, a recent study by Nicholas Lambert, *Planning Armageddon*,[7] shows that Britain early on envisaged an extended trade war against Germany. Seligmann's work again makes use of the standard action–reaction theorem which postulates a German challenge and an inevitable British response. But it has become clear how much some members of the Royal Navy overestimated Germany's striking power on the water. That this can be attributed to an error or misperception (p. 164), which was the result of Berlin's merely asserted deviousness, seems questionable. Similarly, Seligmann's conclusion that the misperceptions were ultimately irrelevant and the German threat, whether real or not, was the cause of Britain's pre-war policy (p. 173) falls short. In the case of Germany, thanks to the Fischer controversy of the 1960s we have for a long time not been satisfied by references to the mere existence of Berlin's encirclement phobia as the basis for decision-making. In the case of Britain, too, it is high time to look beyond mere (mis)perceptions and ask about inner motives and their causes.

[7] Nicholas A. Lambert, *Planning Armageddon: British Economic Warfare and the First World War* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012).

ANDREAS ROSE teaches history at the University of Bonn. His work focuses on international history, naval as well as military history, and the history of ideas in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He is the author of *Zwischen Empire und Kontinent: Zur Transformation britischer Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik im Vorfeld des Ersten Weltkrieges* (2011); *Deutsche Außenpolitik in der Ära Bismarck, 1862–1890* (2013); and *Die Außenpolitik des wilhelminischen Kaiserreichs, 1890–1918* (forthcoming 2013). He is currently working on transnational liberal and conservative networks in the 1970s and 1980s in Germany, France, and Great Britain.

THOMAS ROHKRÄMER, *Die fatale Attraktion des Nationalsozialismus: Über die Popularität eines Unrechtsregimes* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag, 2013), 402 pp. ISBN 978 3 506 77676 1. €34.90 (hardback)

'National Socialism's aspiration', writes Thomas Rohkrämer in this new and engaging book on popular opinion in the Third Reich, 'was not simply to fill a vacuum, but rather to awaken enthusiasm for a take-off into a new, and supposedly better future' (p. 37). In this it was largely successful, at least until 1942–3 and, to some extent, beyond. Nazism, he argues, was not just a 'protest movement' against Weimar, and its rise to power and continuing appeal over twelve years cannot be explained solely by reference to the Republic's failures. Rather it was a political phenomenon which exerted a 'fatal attraction' on millions of ordinary Germans, both lower middle class and working class. Its true significance can be seen in the way it began (with the support of a 'good third' of German voters in free and open elections in the early 1930s), and the way it ended (with most Germans choosing to fight on until 1945 regardless of the hopeless odds). In spite of this, historians have been reluctant to recognize the sheer popularity of the Nazi dictatorship and/or have pushed to one side the issue of why so many aligned themselves with this barbaric and criminal regime. Instead, emphasis has been placed on identifying, explaining, and differentiating between various forms of complicity, conformity, 'immunity', resistance, opposition, and dissent. For Rohkrämer this means that, as far as the attitudes of ordinary Germans are concerned, the wood has been missed for the trees.

How, then, does he account for the regime's overwhelming popularity? Some of the causes, he argues, are quite bland: full employment, cheap holidays through the Strength through Joy organization, perceived opportunities for social mobility, and the supposed removal of class privileges. On these grounds he rejects as 'too narrow' the notion of Nazism as a political religion that sought to mobilize the irrational longing of the masses for spiritual leadership in the wake of rapid secularization and the 'disenchantment' of the world by science and reason. Yet, equally, he criticizes Götz Aly's 'materialist' explanation of the Third Reich as a 'convenience dictatorship' (*Gefälligkeitsdiktatur*) which stayed in power by bribing the people with a generous range of economic gifts and social benefits made possible by

plundering occupied territories and dispossessing the victims of racial persecution.[1] Rather, borrowing a phrase from the philosopher Ernst Bloch, Rohkrämer argues that National Socialism's popular success was based on its ability to offer a consciously elastic 'realm of beliefs' (*Glaubensraum*) which could accommodate both other-worldly and this-worldly visions and combine idealistic with rational, goal-oriented aspirations. The common dominator was not a utopian desire for a new religion in an age of secularization, but the romantic yearning for community, for connection with *Volk* and homeland, or what Rohkrämer describes as a 'single communal faith' (*ein gemeinschaftlicher Glauben*) uniting all Germans.

In terms of the history of ideas, Rohkrämer traces the concept of a 'single communal faith' back to the early nineteenth century, but he also recognizes that it gained political traction only with the rise of radical nationalism in the 1890s and the rapid fluctuations between expectations of national greatness and fears of national decline brought about by the First World War.[2] Even then, the advocates of 'Conservative Revolution' who carried the notion forward in more brutal form in the 1920s were 'too elitist' and insufficiently pragmatic to have any serious hope of success. Rohkrämer's explanations therefore rely on elements of contingency as well as continuity. Without the economic crisis of the late 1920s and early 1930s, and without the 'aestheticization of politics' (Walter Benjamin) promoted by the ruthlessly popularizing and 'ideologically polycratic' Nazi movement (p. 53), the ideal of a 'single communal faith' as a 'positive' alternative to democratic pluralism may never have been attractive to the majority of Germans.

A second element in the pernicious appeal of National Socialism was Hitler himself. Here Rohkrämer largely follows Ian Kershaw's approach, arguing that in the Third Reich power functioned less through authoritarian, top-down structures or strict, bureaucratic enforcement of ideological conformity than through the Nazi leader's

[1] Götz Aly, *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War and the Nazi Welfare State*, trans. Jefferson Chase (New York, 2006), originally published in German as *Hitlers Volksstaat: Raub, Rassenkrieg und nationaler Sozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005).

[2] See also Thomas Rohkrämer, *A Single Communal Faith? The German Right from Conservatism to National Socialism* (New York, 2007).

charismatic authority.[3] When things went wrong, corrupt party officials at local level or Germany's enemies abroad were blamed. When successes came, all the credit went to Hitler, who stood 'above party' and sectional interest. The emphasis on charisma also helps us to understand the regime's need for constant success, its desire to project itself as based on the popular will, and its predilection for public spectacle and ritual, all of which served to reinforce the 'Hitler myth' as a key pillar of Nazi rule. All this is entirely convincing, but it is hardly a new, or controversial, line of argument.

More original and distinctive is Rohkrämer's emphasis on ordinary Germans' support for militarism, which he links in with a more nuanced interpretation of the public reception of rearmament and war. Not only did Germans applaud Hitler for his foreign policy successes before and after 1939, he argues, but they were also attracted by his risk-taking and his *Politik der Stärke* (p. 119) towards neighbouring countries and towards the West. The reintroduction of conscription in 1935, for instance, was hugely popular, not only, but especially, among young men. So, too, of course, were the victories over Poland in 1939 and France in 1940. The 500,000 women auxiliaries who volunteered for service with the *Wehrmacht* are a further indication that belief in soldierly virtues like 'order' and 'discipline', and pride in the apparent strength and invincibility of Germany, was not confined just to men (pp. 246, 249–50). Seen against this broader trend, the depressed and fatalistic mood of September 1939 appears as a short-term aberration. Even after 1945, when many West Germans rejected militarism, for instance, by joining the anti-rearmament 'Ohne Mich' movement, there was still a tendency to remember the excitement and feelings of wonder and awe occasioned by early *Wehrmacht* victories. In popular memory, the bad times had come only after the Russian campaign began to falter in the winter of 1941–2, and especially after the defeat at Stalingrad in 1942–3.

Overall, Rohkrämer underpins his argument with careful use of a variety of rich sources, from Sopade and SD mood reports to diaries, letters, memoirs, post-war opinion surveys, and published oral history interviews. In his introduction and throughout the book Rohkrämer subjects these raw materials to a thorough and largely convincing *Quellenkritik*. On the question of how different genera-

[3] Ian Kershaw, *The 'Hitler Myth': Image and Reality in the Third Reich* (1st edn. Oxford, 1987; 2nd edn. Oxford, 1989).

tional identities are constructed, however, one might have expected a more critical attitude, especially in view of the growing body of literature challenging the idea that there was a common German war experience for any or all age groups during and after the First World War.[4] The highly stylized autobiographical pieces in the Abel collection, for instance, should be seen for what they are: a group of essays written in 1934 by dedicated Nazis that say more about the authors themselves and about the regime's wish to peddle certain myths concerning its own origins than about the wider enthusiasms of the German population.[5]

In any case, regardless of when they were born, how they experienced the First World War, and whether or not they identified themselves as belonging to a particular class, region, confession, or generation, in Rohkrämer's account most ordinary Germans, including those who were initially quite sceptical, were able to find some reason for joining the National Socialist *Glaubensraum* after 1933. Beyond this, generalizations are difficult to make. Indeed, while supporters of the regime bought into the same broad, generic vision of a bright new tomorrow under Hitler and, as such, were bound together in 'a common structure and alignment' (*einer gemeinsamen Struktur und Ausrichtung*), there were also 'numerous individual variations' in motivation (p. 14). Even the founders of the Confessing Church were not directly opposed to Nazism as a political cause, but merely to its interference in spiritual questions and matters of faith (pp. 138, 291). Most ordinary citizens were coldly indifferent towards, or, at best, mildly supportive of anti-Semitic persecution, but hardly enthusiastic, especially when it came to boycotts of Jewish shops. They were also mistrustful of the official justifications for 'euthanasia'; uncertain or fatalistic about war in 1939; and resentful of the brutal campaigns targeting individual Christian

[4] Prominent examples include Richard Bessel, *Germany after the First World War* (Oxford, 1993); Bernd Ulrich, *Die Augenzeugen: Deutsche Feldpostbriefe in Kriegs- und Nachkriegszeit, 1914–1933* (Essen, 1997); and Benjamin Ziemann, *War Experiences in Rural Germany, 1914–1923*, trans. Alex Skinner (Oxford, 2007), first published in German as *Front und Heimat: Ländliche Kriegserfahrungen im südlichen Bayern 1914–1923* (Essen, 1997).

[5] See also the comments on the Abel collection in Benjamin Ziemann, *Contested Commemorations: Republican War Veterans and Weimar Political Culture* (Cambridge, 2013), 124.

priests and religious symbols in schools that were periodically launched by fanatical Nazis at local level. Nonetheless, violence against 'outsiders' was approved of where it was seen as necessary to the imagined future happiness of the German people. This imagined future happiness also involved the retention of the Hitler regime at almost any cost, even after war without end and then impending defeat had become a daily reality.

From 1942 at the latest, knowledge of the mass crimes committed by the SS and the *Wehrmacht* in occupied countries was commonplace. In line with Nazi racial teaching, certain categories of 'enemy' were regarded as 'sub-human' and their murder was thus legitimized, especially in the East. For soldiers in the combat zones this was combined with an acceptance of atrocities against foreign civilians as a 'natural' part of war ('Krieg ist eben Krieg') and an emphasis on the 'manly' duty to defend the homeland (pp. 246, 264–6). Even in July 1944 most Germans disapproved of the assassination attempt carried out by Stauffenberg and his fellow conspirators, and were prepared to fight on in spite of the radically dwindling prospects of victory. Ultimately, however, Hitler's failure to come up with a 'miracle weapon' which would turn the tide in Germany's favour, his eventual suicide in the bunker in Berlin, and the overwhelming material superiority of the Allies all destroyed the will to resist further.

What we are left with, then, is the 'banality' of Germans' enthusiasm for National Socialism, including the regime's use of violence. Nazism was popular when it was successful. Its successes, and the propaganda around them, offered some excitement in what was otherwise a humdrum existence, a sense of living in 'great times', and an emotionally satisfying level of distraction from the hardships of everyday life. After 1942–3 fascination gradually gave way to fear and introspection, the *Volksgemeinschaft* to a focus on individual survival and private family interest. Defeat in 1945 was total. Yet even if Hitler was now condemned as a criminal or madman who had led Germany into an unwinnable war, something remained of the old attraction to National Socialism in the accounts that ordinary Germans told themselves (and others) about their experiences in the 1930s and early 1940s. In this sense, Rohkrämer's findings also have a bearing on our understanding of Germans' somewhat detached or semi-hostile attitudes towards Allied de-Nazification trials after 1945, their reluctance to accept collective or personal responsibility

for wartime atrocities, and their support for the amnesties offered by the Adenauer government in the early 1950s.

In conclusion, this is a fine piece of scholarship which will be of great interest to all those concerned with the question of popular feeling in Nazi Germany and how to measure it, particularly in relation to the mindset towards rearmament, racial persecution, wartime violence, and military comradeship. An English translation must surely follow.

MATTHEW STIBBE is Professor of Modern European History at Sheffield Hallam University. He has published widely on Germany in the era of the two world wars, including *Women in the Third Reich* (2003); *British Civilian Internees in Germany: The Ruhleben Camp, 1914–18* (2008); and *Germany, 1914–1933: Politics, Society and Culture* (2010). He is also co-editor, with Kevin McDermott, of *The 1989 Revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe: From Communism to Pluralism* (2013).

VERA K. FAST, *Children's Exodus: A History of the Kindertransport* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2011), xvii + 270 pp. ISBN 978 1 84885 537 3. £25.00 (hardback)

Until the 1980s, few were aware of the fate of the children rescued from Nazi Germany by the *Kindertransport*. Even those affected had not, before then, generally perceived their own stories as part of a collective Holocaust destiny, and *Kindertransport* did not appear as heading in major accounts of the Holocaust, such as Saul Friedländer's *Nazi Germany and the Jews*,[1] or the *Enzyklopädie des Nationalsozialismus* edited by Wolfgang Benz and others.[2] Not until the fiftieth anniversary in 1989, when around a thousand of these *Kinder* met in London on the initiative of Bertha Leverton, herself one of the rescued *Kinder*, did this unique mission, which had made it possible for 10,000 Jewish children from Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland to flee from Nazi Germany, become known to a wider public. Self-help groups were set up (the Association Kindertransport in the USA and the Reunion of Kindertransport in Britain), and many *Kinder* wrote their life stories, inspired by an important monograph in which Bertha Leverton and Smuel Lowensohn collected around 1,000 reports by the rescued children.[3] Historians also began to address this significant topic, and studies were undertaken, most recently a Ph.D. thesis by Claudia Curio, written at the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung in Berlin in 2005.[4] In addition to academic treatment, the theme has also received literary attention,[5] and has been the subject of numerous films, including the Oscar-winning

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

[1] Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, vol. i (New York, 1997), published in German as *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden*, trans. Martin Pfeiffer (Munich, 1998).

[2] Wolfgang Benz, Hermann Graml, and Hermann Weiß (eds.), *Enzyklopädie des Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart, 1997).

[3] Bertha Leverton and Smuel Lowensohn (eds.), *I Came Alone: The Stories of the Kindertransport* (Lewes, Sussex, 1990), published in German as *Der jüdische Kindertransport von Deutschland nach England 1938/39: Geschichte und Erinnerung*, trans. Rebekka Göpfert (Frankfurt am Main, 1999).

[4] Published as Claudia Curio, *Verfolgung, Flucht, Rettung: Die Kindertransporte 1938/39 nach Großbritannien* (Berlin, 2006).

[5] E.g. in W. G. Sebald, *Austerlitz* (Munich, 2001).

documentary *Into the Arms of Strangers*. Along with exhibitions and monuments (London set the ball rolling with the dedication of a memorial in Liverpool Street Station in 2003), all this has resulted in the *Kindertransport* being deeply rooted in the collective awareness of the general public in both Britain and Germany.

Now, in *Children's Exodus*, Vera K. Fast has produced a further history of the *Kindertransport*. Like other accounts, Fast's begins by describing the Nazi seizure of power and the step-by-step process by which the Jews were eliminated in order to contextualize the relief campaign. In a total of ten chapters she presents a detailed picture of the whole rescue operation, from the arrival of the first transport in December 1938 to that of the last in 1948, linking the activities of the relief organizations with reports of their experiences by those involved. She describes the various local, regional, and national relief committees, their structures, problems, and organizational efforts, and their not always successful attempts to work together.

Triggered by the alarming news of the November pogrom in 1938, which left tens of thousands of Jewish children in Germany and Austria orphans, leading representatives of the Jewish community in Britain worked to have the children admitted to the country. The British government was the only one to declare that it was prepared to permit entry to unlimited numbers of vulnerable children on condition that they were unaccompanied, less that 17 years old, and that a surety of fifty pounds sterling was paid for each one. A wave of helpfulness ran through the country. Within a short time, around 180 local and regional initiatives had been set up. They organized the reception of close to 10,000 Jewish children and teenagers; found foster parents; looked for accommodation; collected the money required for their keep, the organization, and sureties; and provided training places. The assumption that the children's stay would be brief and temporary as a rule excluded the need for any higher or academic education. The assistance committees consisted largely of untrained volunteers acting under the auspices of the Refugee Children's Movement (RCM), a central organization set up in November 1938. Not all assistance groups by far were Jewish, and the RCM was explicitly set up to cross religious boundaries. Thus numerous Christian organizations, especially the Quakers, took part in rescuing the vulnerable children, as the roughly 350,000 British Jews did not have the resources to take in all the threatened or orphaned children.

Fast firmly refutes the widespread accusation that the Jewish community in Britain provided money, but not hospitality (p. 189). She does, however, describe the catastrophic organizational and conceptual shortcomings of the relief campaign, already known from many memoirs and the research literature. Only recently a former *Kind* has described how, one year after the *Kindertransport*, her 16-year-old brother died from heart failure in a hostel in Westgate-on-Sea, where he had no help.[6]

Power struggles between Liberal and Orthodox British Jews and Zionist groups overshadowed the cooperation between the various aid organizations. In this context, Fast explores in detail the role of the charismatic and idiosyncratic Orthodox Rabbi Dr Salomon Schonfeld, the young founder and assertive executive director of the Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council. As Fast had access to the organization's archive in the University of Southampton's Hartley Library, she can provide new insights into this Orthodox branch of aid for refugee children ('The Orthodox Experience', pp. 97–114), while she hardly considers the work of the Reich Association/ National Association of Jews in Germany. Schonfeld's commitment must have been unflagging. Right at the beginning of the campaign, he single handedly brought 300 children from Vienna to Britain. In his Orthodox attitude, however, the Rabbi did not shy away from imputing hostile intentions to other assistance organizations because they 'only' wanted to rescue the children, but not their Jewish identities as well. Schonfeld placed the commandments of his religion above everything else, and refused to receive a transport on the Sabbath. The Orthodox Rabbi preferred to accommodate children in camps, where they were largely left to themselves, rather than let them go to Christian families. Fast correctly points out that conflicts between the various religious camps were exacerbated by the fact that the majority of the rescued German and Austrian children came from assimilated families, while the religious background of most British Jews was that of Orthodox immigrants from the East. She also reports, however, about conflicts with children who insisted on ob-

[6] Monika Müller, *'Es ist ein hartes Los, das uns getroffen hat.' Der Weg der Familie Einstein aus Augsburg-Kriegshaber. 'It's a Cruel Hand We've Been Dealt.' The Einstein-Family of Augsburg-Kriegshaber*, Lebenslinien: Deutsch-jüdische Familienschicksale, 5. Lifelines: German-Jewish Family Stories, 5. (Augsburg, 2012).

serving their Orthodox customs even in secular or Christian surroundings. It cannot be overlooked that her sympathies lie on the side of the Orthodox experience. She sketches touching scenes such as the Sabbath meal served to children who had just arrived, but does not conceal the arrogance of some Orthodox children towards their non-religious or Christian foster parents. The author devotes less attention to the situation of children brought up in non-Orthodox, Liberal, or secular homes. One wonders what evidence she can provide for the rather surprising statement that Orthodox children coped better than these with the traumas of flight and separation (p. 112).

Fast contrasts the problems and challenges of the assistance organizations with the situation of the children, their abandonment, anxieties, and huge achievements in adapting. For most, exile meant not only rescue but also trauma. With great sympathy, Fast describes the situation at their reception, the disturbing experience of being chosen by their foster parents, which made the children feel as if they were on the 'market'. Often, foster parents lacked not only knowledge of but also understanding for the needs of the traumatized children and teenagers. That these were often exploited as cheap labour, sometimes also sexually abused, is mentioned only in passing by the author. But she sensitively describes the desperation and hopelessness that drove parents to entrust their children to total strangers. Hardly had they acclimatized, when the rescued children older than 16 suffered another trauma of separation as they were interned as enemy aliens in June 1940.

It is one of the merits of this work that it also looks at baptized children, in Nazi terminology, 'people of mixed race of the first and second degree'. The author devotes a separate chapter to them ('Jewish Christian Children', pp. 115–32), in which she also discusses the situation of the Christian assistance organizations and describes the *Kindertransport* as a catalyst for Christian–Jewish cooperation (p. 131). Unlike most previous accounts, Fast's counts the Jewish children and teenagers who survived the camps or lived through the war with false identities (pp. 133–62) as belonging to the *Kindertransport*. In fact, hundreds of these children were brought to Britain in a second wave, up to 1948, and, despite all difficulties, integrated into British society. Here, too, Rabbi Schonfeld was a driving force. The concluding chapter on the after-effects of the *Kindertransport* makes

clear the long-term mental health problems faced by the children rescued and taken to a foreign country, but does not go beyond previous research on this question.[7]

For this book Fast has drawn on a broad range of published and unpublished memoirs and interviews, which she uses to illustrate the most diverse facets of experience. On the whole, this makes for a highly fragmented account, which indirectly demonstrates the advantages of whole biographical interviews. Longer quotations from the sources would have made it possible to understand the children's behaviour and reactions in their biographical context, and thus to comprehend their individual spaces of experience, something which this synthetic distillation of 'all' experiences cannot achieve. We look in vain for discussions of questions that would lead further, for example, about the reasons for the children's frequently problematic integration, how they processed their experiences, or the concepts of assistance used by the organizations involved, such as those which Claudia Curio, for example, has addressed in analysing the RCM's welfare policy.[8] But this was not the author's intention. In the Foreword she announces that her aim is largely to sum up what is already known (p. xiii). To this extent *Children's Exodus* is directed mainly to readers who want a first, detailed overview of this unique rescue of Jewish children from Nazi Germany.

[7] E.g. Wolfgang Benz, Claudia Curio, and Andrea Hammel (eds.), *Die Kindertransporte 1938/39: Rettung und Integration* (Munich, 2003).

[8] Claudia Curio, 'Die Fürsorgepolitik des Refugee Children's Movement: Ein Instrument der Integration deutsch-jüdischer Flüchtlingskinder in die britische Gesellschaft', *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung*, 10 (2001), 287–308.

BENIGNA SCHÖNHAGEN is Director of the Jüdisches Kulturmuseum Augsburg-Schwaben. Her publications include *Die Synagoge: Orte jüdischer Geschichte und Kultur* (2006); *'Getrennt von allem, was uns geblieben…': Der Weg der Familie Kraus aus Augsburg* (2008); and 'Die zweite jüdische Gemeinde von Augsburg 1861–1943', in Michael Brenner and Sabine Ullmann (eds.), *Die Juden in Schwaben* (2013), 225–49.

TOBIAS SEIDL, *Führerpersönlichkeiten: Deutungen und Interpretationen deutscher Wehrmachtgeneräle in britischer Kriegsgefangenschaft* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2012), 214 pp. ISBN 978 3 506 77382 1. €34.90

Among the millions of words spoken by German prisoners of war and surreptitiously recorded and transcribed in 1939–45 by British intelligence was the lament that 'Twenty Germans have twenty-one different opinions'. Tobias Seidel's monograph on the evolving attitudes and views of seventeen German general officers between May 1943 and May 1944 seeks to confirm that quasi-proverbial insight. Britain's Combined Services Detailed Interrogation Centre (CSDIC) provided hospitable surroundings at Trent Park mansion in north-east London; ample food, drink, and newspapers; and access to BBC and German broadcasts. In return, the apparently unwitting officers talked—for hidden microphones. The resulting transcripts from this and similar British camps amounted to roughly 25,000 pages over the course of the war, and have been collected, retyped as machine-readable text, coded in a complex database, and analysed by a research team led by Sönke Neitzel and Harald Welzer. Numerous publications have resulted, most notably Neitzel's *Tapping Hitler's Generals: Transcripts of Secret Conversations, 1942–1945* (2007; German edn. 2005) and Neitzel and Welzer, *Soldaten: On Fighting, Killing, and Dying. The Secret World War II Tapes of German POWs* (2012; German edn. 2011).

Seidl's part in this enterprise, as set forth in his introduction, is to analyse the recorded remarks of the 1942–3 North African cohort of senior prisoners of war, in order to discern the extent to which *Wehrmacht* general officers shared a common mentality. He sees his work as a challenge to 'older generalizing descriptions of the attitudes and views of German generals in the Second World War', which ostensibly suggest that they shared similar degrees of ideological commitment (p. 148). And the CSDIC transcripts indeed suggest that Seidl's subjects entertained a variety of views on numerous topics—including reverence for, or abhorrence of, Adolf Hitler. But as Seidl concedes, his sample of 'Führer-personalities' is too narrow to permit valid statistical conclusions about the mentality of German general officers as a class. Nor do we know what criteria governed the CSDIC's choice of dialogue snippets to record and transcribe; Seidl's

evidence base and that of the wider transcript project is thus skewed in unknown ways, limiting the interpretive weight that it can bear. Yet he nevertheless insists repeatedly that his seventeen officers show the full 'bandwidth' and, by implication, the distribution of views held by German generals (pp. 26, 82, 142).

Seidl's presentation falls into two principal sections. He first surveys remarks from the entire group on six topics: Germany's allies and enemies; the military effectiveness of the *Wehrmacht* and of its personnel; the Second World War; what it meant to be a German officer; the character of National Socialism and of its leadership; and the outlook for the future. He spices the text with quotations from the transcripts that are often striking, despite the familiarity of most of his cast of characters from Neitzel's *Tapping Hitler's Generals*. Seidl's analysis would nevertheless on occasion have gained in vividness and evidentiary efficacy had he been more specific about the identity of those holding particular opinions.

His second part, by contrast, provides close scrutiny of the views on his chosen topics of five significant individuals, around whom he has constructed a typology: true believers; duty-bound obsessives; the undecided; the converted (to opposition in captivity); and convinced opponents of National Socialism. Seidl's five characters, in typological order, are General Ludwig Crüwell (commander, *Afrikakorps*, September 1941–May 1942); *Generaloberst* Hans-Jürgen von Arnim (commander, 5th Panzer Army, then Army Group Africa, December 1942–May 1943); General Hans Cramer (commander, *Afrikakorps*, March–May 1943); *Generalmajor* of the *Luftwaffe* Gerhard Bassenge (*Luftwaffe* ground commander, Tunisia); and General Wilhelm Ritter von Thoma (commander, *Afrikakorps*, September–October 1942, and one of the army's foremost tank warfare experts).

Agreement between the generals included a 'surprisingly positive' view of the British and to a lesser extent the Americans, despite scorn for the Western powers' tactical and operational timidity and awkwardness in ground combat (pp. 37–8, 40, 86, 97). The Russian army's superior fighting power, staying power, organizational skill, and operational brilliance ('Manstein could not have done it better', p. 41) attracted praise; some officers also noted the resilience and achievements of the Soviet regime (p. 42). But the group viewed allies and racial enemies with less indulgence. The Italians were 'charming people . . . but absolutely the worst soldiers to be found in Europe' (p.

35). The 'Japse' were targets of racist comment (p. 37). And Seidl soberly reports the wholly unsurprising finding that 'a fundamentally positive assessment of the Jews is not to be found in the Trent Park dialogues' (p. 45). Some group members accepted the *Endlösung* 'subliminally' (pp. 73–4); others viewed National Socialist methods as damaging to Germany's reputation and/or shocking in 'extent, brutality, and mechanization' (p. 60). Virtually all nevertheless favoured segregation or 'elimination (*Ausschaltung*)' from Europe as appropriate responses to the purported cosmic malevolence and global hegemonic designs of 'the international Jew' (pp. 45–6, and Arnim, p. 98). Seidl notes that this anti-Semitic mindset did not necessarily comport a positive view of National Socialism, and had evidently been absorbed long before 1933 (p. 46)—no novelty to those familiar with the history of the Prusso-German officer corps.

The generals prized the German soldier's ostensible 'loyalty, sense of duty, toughness verging on cruelty (*Härte*), eagerness for combat (*Einsatzbereitschaft*)', and thus man-for-man superiority over all opponents (p. 47). By contrast they blamed Germany's supreme leadership for the cardinal strategic error that had purportedly cost Germany an otherwise assured general victory: 'England [*sic*] should have been defeated before the attack on the Soviet Union' (p. 102; pp. 51–2, 112, 122). But in reality Germany had lacked the forces and operational concepts required to defeat Britain, even in an attritional air–sea duel lasting for years. And Seidl likewise passes over in silence a consideration far beyond the generals' blinkered strategic horizon: Franklin Delano Roosevelt's unprecedented third term re-election in November 1940, which guaranteed that Germany would soon face the full military–economic might of the United States.

The generals' views of the officer corps, and of their own roles, gravitated around two issues: the generational and ideological split between senior and junior officers; and their own historically unprecedented sworn duty of 'unconditional obedience' to 'the Führer of the German Reich and people, Adolf Hitler'. The conviction that 'the young officers are all slaves of the system' (p. 61; pp. 49–50, 74) was widespread, an unsurprising notion amply demonstrated by the miserable failure of the July 1944 *coup d'état*. But Seidl mentions only fleetingly (pp. 58–9) a further sharp, if most secret, divide that bore heavily on the obsequious acceptance of servitude throughout the commanding heights. Field marshals and *Generaloberste*—including

Hans-Jürgen von Arnim, both before and during his captivity—received from Hitler in person lavish tax-free salary supplements, and in many cases sumptuous 'birthday presents' of cash and country estates.

The oath was indeed much on the generals' minds; they had patently violated Hitler's order to defend Tunisia to the last cartridge. Yet Seidl inexplicably suggests that the August 1934 oath to Hitler's person was similar to that in 'all modern regular armies' (p. 56). He seems unaware that of Germany's three major opponents, only the British vowed loyalty – not 'unconditional obedience' – to an individual, and that the Americans pledged, as they still do, 'to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic'. Nor does Seidl mention the sad fates of the generals' preceding oaths to the Kaiser and to the Weimar constitution, and lets pass without comment Bassenge's Freudian slip or judicious amnesia: 'The oath came in '33, when Hindenburg was still there' (p. 116). Perhaps that made it seem all right in retrospect, but in reality the armed forces high command itself drafted the oath to Hitler as Hindenburg lay dying, and immediately following the murders, using army weapons and support, of the SA leaders, of the evidently dispensable Generals Kurt von Schleicher and Ferdinand von Bredow, and of the Chancellor of Austria, Engelbert Dollfuss, victim of the Vienna Putsch of 25 July 1934. Perhaps ambition, criminal complicity, and bribery of the higher echelons explain faithfulness to Hitler more parsimoniously and credibly than the purported moral binding force of the oath. Its most conspicuous function, both before and after 1945, was to veil the officer corps' shared responsibility for national catastrophe in an aura of honourable conduct.

Many of the generals indeed perceived a dark future: 'Everything [will] fall to pieces unless there's a miracle' (p. 69). Some took a decidedly negative view of the National Socialist Party, except for its role in the hated and despised Weimar Republic (p. 65). Hitler himself polarized opinion; Thoma and several others judged him a lunatic whose megalomaniacal ambition, imperviousness to advice, and overestimation of his own military talent was leading Germany to catastrophe (pp. 52, 78, 135). But the generals comforted themselves with notions almost as delusional as those of their Führer: regime change in Germany might lead swiftly to an Anglo-German coalition against Soviet Russia, and 'England' and the United States might fall

out, opening the road to an Anglo-German alliance against the USA (pp. 39–40).

Seidl sometimes suffers from lack of contextual awareness. He expresses puzzlement (pp. 75–6) that the generals recognized areas of military judgement in which 'unconditional obedience' played only a relative role. Yet such notions were anything but singular; they were a fundamental feature of Prusso-German military culture, derived from the army's mission tactics (*Auftragstaktik*) tradition, and well expressed by Hans Cramer: the oath merely required 'common-sense interpretation and execution of orders' (p. 107). Even flagrant but successful disobedience—in seeming direct violation of the oath—had an honoured place, as the May 1940 dash from the Meuse to the Channel demonstrated.

Seidl's efforts to confirm what appears to be his principal thesis, the alleged lack of homogeneity of views among *Wehrmacht* general officers, are sometimes strained. He claims to have 'refuted' on at least two occasions (pp. 80, 73; p. 172 nn. 544, 523) 'current research (*die Forschung*)', to which he ascribes the views that *Afrikakorps* prisoners were 'deeply committed to NS ideology' and that German troops invariably accepted the National Socialist characterization of the Soviets as sub-human. In the first case, Seidl cites a passage from Renate Held's *Kriegsgefangenschaft in Großbritannien*,[1] a detailed monograph not on German *attitudes* but on British *policy* that merely describes in passing a report by Britain's Political Warfare Executive referring to *Afrikakorps* prisoners in their entirety, not to officers or commanding generals. In the second case, Seidl cites work equally tangential to the issue posed: an essay, largely unconcerned with attitudes toward the Russians, by Thomas Kühne on the decisive importance of the 'myth of *Kameradschaft*' as the key to German combat-unit cohesion.

Seidl concedes in his conclusion that the generals' generational position and shared experiences help explain some similarities of attitude: all had been born between 1888 and 1899, had joined the Imperial German Army as regular officers or officer candidates, and had served in the First World War. The routines, hierarchy, and selective recruitment and promotion systems of the army itself presumably further reinforced a 'consensus in particular attitudes, interpre-

[1] Renate Held, *Kriegsgefangenschaft in Großbritannien: Deutsche Soldaten des Zweiten Weltkriegs in britischem Gewahrsam* (Munich, 2008).

tive patterns, and opinions' (p. 150). But Seidl's evidence hardly substantiates his claim (p. 144) that individual background did not matter: 'neither ancestry, membership in a particular milieu, religion, training, nor career path are reliable predictors of the officers' views (*Deutungen*)'. All except two of the sample of seventeen began their careers in the Prussian army, but the two exceptions —the Bavarians Georg Neuffer and Wilhelm Ritter von Thoma—were conspicuous for their independence of mind. And of the three mentioned as having attended university—Crüwell, Bassenge, and Thoma—the last two proved hostile to the regime. Thoma in particular had fought in the West, East, and Balkans in the First World War, until finally taken prisoner by an American unit in the July 1918 Soissons fighting. He had subsequently studied history, geography, and economics, had travelled widely, had taken part in the suppression of the Beer Hall Putsch in 1923, had commanded the German ground forces in Spain in 1937–9, and had fought in Poland and Soviet Russia. His superiority of insight over his fellows clearly derived in part from a range of knowledge and experience far broader than theirs. In this and other respects, *Führerpersönlichkeiten* would have benefited from greater understanding of context, additional biographical investigation, and a touch more interpretive imagination.

MACGREGOR KNOX held the Stevenson Chair of International History at the LSE from 1994 to 2010. His main fields of research are European international and strategic history, 1890–1945, especially the foreign and military policies of Italy and Germany; comparative history; strategic theory; and dictatorships. His works include *To the Threshold of Power, 1922/33: Origins and Dynamics of the Fascist and National Socialist Dictatorships* (2007–8); *Hitler's Italian Allies: Royal Armed Forces, Fascist Regime, and the War of 1940–43* (2000); *Common Destiny: Dictatorship, Foreign Policy and War in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany* (2000); and, co-edited with Williamson Murray, *The Dynamics of Military Revolution, 1300–2050* (2001).

CLAYTON J. WHISNANT, *Male Homosexuality in West Germany: Between Persecution and Freedom, 1945–69,* Genders and Sexuality in History (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), xii + 262 pp. ISBN 978 0 230 35500 2. £55.00

The history of homosexualities in post-war West Germany has only recently started to attract sustained historiographical attention.[1] For a long time it had been almost forgotten, squeezed, as it is, between the horrible past of Nazi persecution and the glamorous present of gay liberation since the 1970s. Clayton Whisnant, currently Associate Professor of European History at Wofford College in Spartanburg, South Carolina, ably demonstrates in his book how fascinating and fruitful it can be to research the situation and the life of homosexual men in the 1950s and 1960s. The author convincingly argues that 'this era made a positive contribution to the history of German homosexuality, without which it is impossible to imagine gay life in the country today' (p. 204).

Whisnant's study accommodates the current search for homosexual self-understandings that can supplement the identity formations shaped by gay liberation in the 1970s. In this vein, the author convincingly emphasizes the diversity of homosexual life styles in terms of different masculinities, distinct social milieux, and diverging generational groups. Yet his exploration of the post-war history of homosexualities not only enriches our understanding of the multifaceted past of same-sex love, but also contributes to the broader political and social history of post-war West Germany. Whisnant challenges some hitherto cherished views by stressing the longevity of pre-1945 persecution strategies and demonstrating that the Nazi vocabulary legitimizing such discriminatory politics continued to inform government statements well into the 1960s. On the other hand, he also shows how debates about society's relationship to, and treatment of, sexual minorities decisively contributed to West Germany's democratization processes.

Thus there is a great deal to learn from Whisnant's study, which looks at the policing of homosexuals (chapter 1), the political initiatives and self-images prevalent within the homophile movement

[1] Andreas Pretzel and Volker Weiß (eds.), *Ohnmacht und Aufbegehren: Homosexuelle Männer in der frühen Bundesrepublik* (Hamburg, 2010).

(chapter 2), the everyday experiences and practices of homosexual men (chapter 3), and their changing legal position (chapter 4).

Chapter 1 offers a wealth of sometimes surprising detail. People who happened to be included in police lists of alleged homosexuals, for example, ran the risk of having their driving licences withdrawn. Whisnant also offers some interesting observations on therapeutic interventions that disastrously tried to cure homosexuality, but his discussion of psychoanalytical approaches as simultaneously detrimental to, and empowering for, homosexual clients remains problematic. At a more general level, Whisnant identifies different times when and places where persecution was more or less intense. In the 1950s the administration and courts of Hamburg, for example, followed a more lenient policy than their counterparts in Cologne and Munich. The author also identifies a significant shift in homophobic stereotypes underlying, for example, the *Volkswartbund*'s repeated calls for more restrictive policies. While the image of the effeminate weakling dominated the public's perception of homosexual men until the 1940s, the figure of the corrupting predator endangering German youth gained currency in the 1950s.

Chapter 2 meticulously follows the twists and turns of the homophile movement. Whisnant describes various mostly rather short-lived organizations and publications. He also outlines the activities of some prominent figures, such as Hans Giese, Kurt Hiller, and Erwin Haarmann and his assistant, Johannes Werres. Two findings are particularly interesting. First, Whisnant shows how claims for minority protection and minority rights increasingly shaped the arguments of homophile representatives. Second, he discovers that their efforts to improve the societal position of homosexuals came to a sudden end around 1960, when homophile publications and organizations disappeared almost completely. This was due, among other things, to an increase in administrative and judicial restrictions that at least nominally aimed to protect youth. Yet while the official side of the homophile movement withered away, the number of bars and clubs continued to grow. At this point it makes sense to stress, as Whisnant compellingly does, the inseparability of the formal and informal activities of homosexuals. Instead of according political significance only to the official associations, Whisnant's narrative suggests that it was the very interplay between these different dimensions of the homosexual counterpublic that proved decisive for the long-term success of

the homophile movement, that is, for achieving the decriminalization of consensual sex between male adults in the late 1960s.

The third chapter looks at this informal side of homosexual activities. Again concentrating primarily on Hamburg, with occasional detours into cities such as West Berlin and Hanover, Whisnant paints a vivid picture of homosexual meeting spaces, bars, and saunas in the 1950s and 1960s. In light of the chapter's detailed richness it is especially regrettable that the book contains neither photographs nor maps nor any other kind of illustrations. Readers learn a great deal about how housing shortages, emergency accommodation, bombed-out buildings, public toilets that were scarcely lit because of electricity shortages, and post-war conditions in general offered many opportunities for clandestine sex. When these opportunities vanished as a result of West Germany's gradual economic recovery, more and more bars and clubs started to cater for the needs of homosexual customers. The chapter's particular strength lies in showing how this homosexual scene developed internal lines of differentiation. 'Respectable' homophiles, feminine *Tunten*, working-class hustlers, and rough leather men all had their preferred spaces and quarters. Although these scenes were not totally separate, Whisnant shows how they came to be ever more distinct from each other.

The fourth chapter, finally, scrutinizes the reform of the West German criminal code and the decriminalization of male-to-male intercourse in 1969/73. In line with previous research, Whisnant states that these reforms did not primarily grow out of grassroots protests and endeavours, but resulted from the continued efforts of some prominent artists, journalists, politicians, and academics.[2] Among these were Theodor Bovet, Peter von Zahn, Herbert Jäger, and Hans-Joachim Schoeps. In this context Whisnant accords specific significance to discussions among theologians and lawyers. He also highlights the increasing emphasis on a more 'modern' and 'liberal' notion of the state that was no longer to enforce a specific understanding of morality, but to grant its citizens the freedom to decide for themselves what kinds of sexual activity they wanted to engage in.

Two points in Whisnant's account are particularly noteworthy: his emphasis on transnational connections and on the diversity within the homosexual scene. As far as the transnational dimension is

[2] Michael Kandora, 'Homosexualität und Sittengesetz', in Ulrich Herbert (ed.), *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland* (Göttingen, 2002), 379–401.

concerned, the author primarily highlights the Cold War and transatlantic interactions as important frames within which his narrative unfolds. While it is debatable how deeply the 'lavender scare', that is, the fear of homosexual spies working for the Communist enemy, impacted on West Germany (pp. 17, 61), it is undoubtedly true that the minority protection arguments that gained ever more currency during the 1960s were heavily influenced by the debates on ethnic diversity taking place at the same time in the United States (pp. 103, 193). There is another 'transnational' link, however, that might have deserved more attention. Unlike its 'democratic' counterpart in the West, the 'totalitarian' government of East Germany had a more lenient policy towards its homosexual citizens, at least in terms of criminal prosecution. Although this did not go unnoticed in the Federal Republic's homophile magazines of the 1950s and 1960s, it is unfortunately scarcely touched upon by Whisnant.

As far as distinct homosexual identity formations are concerned, Whisnant convincingly highlights the 'internal' differentiations between homophiles, *Tunten*, hustlers, leather men, and others. Because of this heterogeneity the author refuses to use the homogenizing phrase 'homosexual subculture', preferring to speak of gay scenes (p. 5) instead. Especially against this background it is particularly regrettable that Whisnant makes no reference at all to how 'lesbian scenes' might have interacted with their gay counterparts. Recent research has shown how rewarding it can be to take on the admittedly laborious task of casting light on the history of women who loved other women in the 1950s and 1960s.[3] In this and some other respects, the book might have profited if Whisnant had placed even more stress on the multiplicity of different and often contested identifications according to gender and sexuality that co-existed within the gay scenes. When, for example, he writes about gay men attempting to partake in the James Dean version of masculinity (p. 50), he forgets to mention that in those days Dean was considered an effeminate figure by the general adult public. Even more problematic is Whisnant's distinction between an older understanding of homosexuality tied to gender inversion and a more 'modern' definition based on men having sex with men. Of course it is possible to argue that before the 1960s men who had sex with other men were not necessarily consid-

[3] Kirsten Plötz, *Als fehle die bessere Hälfte: 'Alleinstehende' Frauen in der frühen BRD 1949–1969* (Königstein/Ts., 2005).

ered homosexuals if they appeared perfectly masculine. But the reader is left with the impression that there were probably many more understandings of homosexuality and that to reduce them to the somewhat strange opposition between effeminacy and male-to-male intercourse is cutting a complicated story too short. Many leather men, for example, formulated a specifically homosexual and hypermasculine self-image that, in turn, impacted on heterosexual masculinities which then increased the popularity of fitness studios that in turn attracted more and more gay customers.

Finally, a few minor points should be mentioned. Apart from a number of misspellings and small mistakes in writing German words and names, some relevant recent German-language publications are missing from the references.[4] While looking for these references it also became clear how tremendously the absence of a full bibliography diminishes a book's usefulness for research and other academic purposes. To check a particular reference, a short title does not suffice. In order to find the full bibliographical details of a certain book, the reader might have to undertake the time consuming task of skimming through all the endnotes. I am aware that this criticism should be addressed to Palgrave Macmillan, but it should nevertheless be noted here. As a compensation for the 'select' bibliography, however, the book offers a useful index at the end.

Overall, and in spite of these shortcomings, the book makes a valuable contribution to current debates within the field. It is, as far as I can see, the first English-language monograph offering a comprehensive and source-based treatment of the post-war history of male same-sex desire in West Germany. It offers its readers numerous fruitful thoughts and inspiring insights into the history of homosexualities as well as German history.

[4] This applies to the works quoted in nn. 1 and 2 as well as to Burkhardt Riechers, 'Freundschaft und Anständigkeit: Leitbilder im Selbstverständnis männlicher Homosexueller in der frühen Bundesrepublik', *Invertito: Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Homosexualitäten*, 1 (1999), 12–46.

BENNO GAMMERL is a Research Fellow in History of Emotions at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin and is working on the project 'Homosexuality and Emotional Life in Rural West Germany (1960–1990)'. His other research interests include the history of empires, citizenship and nationality, and oral history. He is the author of *Untertanen, Staatsbürger und Andere: Der Umgang mit ethnischer Heterogenität im Britischen Weltreich und im Habsburgerreich, 1867–1918* (2010) and numerous articles.

# CONFERENCE REPORTS

***Missionaries at War: The Impact of Global Conflict on Christian Missions in the Twentieth Century***. Symposium organized by the German Historical Institute London and the Christian Missions in Global History Seminar, Institute of Historical Research, University of London, and held at the GHIL, 9 March 2013.

Rich and varied as it now is, the history of Christian mission in the twentieth century has focused to a remarkably limited extent on the impact of war. Histories of war have made little or no reference to Christian mission. The consequences of global conflict for mission, for mission agencies, and for individual missionaries are as yet too little understood. From a variety of perspectives this symposium examined the interaction of two very different yet also interrelated global phenomena: war and mission. It aimed to present recent and current research on events, institutions, and individuals and to stimulate new lines of historical enquiry into the subject of 'missionaries at war'.

Katharina Stornig from the Leibniz Institute of European History, Mainz, presented the first paper, 'Shifting Relations: Nationality, Gender, and Religion in the Catholic Mission in Colonial Togo, 1914–1918'. She began by outlining some details of her methodology, which included the adoption of a 'micro-history' approach, studying in detail the lives of certain individuals or groups of people in order to shed light on larger events. Here Stornig's focus was on German Roman Catholic nuns in Cameroon and their experiences during that colony's occupation by Britain and France during the First World War. Historians often debate the extent to which indigenous agency may have been enhanced in such circumstances. How did these nuns fare? It appears as if war may have had something of an empowering effect—but this should not be exaggerated. Certainly the loss of priests (through repatriation or internment) left something of a gap in ecclesiastical life. And nuns were compelled to take on new tasks, such as nursing wounded soldiers. At a broader institutional and

The full conference programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.

social level, forced interaction between nationals of combatant countries likely led to blurring of what had previously been a relatively clear distinction between religious and secular colonial authority in Cameroon. There were similar consequences for denominational and even sectarian boundaries. The work of the nuns probably helped to mitigate anti-German sentiment locally at least. However, this did little to prevent the loss of German property (missionary and otherwise) to the Allies during wartime and as a consequence of the post-war peace settlement.

Jo Stanley of Lancaster University gave the next paper, 'With Typewriter and Lifebelt: Women Missionaries Sailing in World War I and World War II'. She explained that her research into missionaries formed part of a larger project, on women's experiences of life at sea during wartime. Enemy action apart, those experiences were influenced by gender norms of the time. Stanley described how the death of a woman missionary at sea in 1915 led to restrictions by missionary societies on overseas travel by women. She then gave further detail, based on contemporary written records, of events during the Second World War, when government proved as reluctant as missionary societies to sanction sea travel by women. By 1914 a career in mission already provided opportunities overseas for many women. And they had taken advantage not only in career terms but also in terms of travel and what might be regarded as broadening of horizons. War obviously restricted those opportunities. Some women did travel, however, and recorded their experiences of life on board ship; and these diaries and 'voyage narratives' constitute a valuable historical resource, containing, as they often do, personal reflection on danger and on the possibility of imminent death.

The following paper, by Rosemary Seton of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London (SOAS), also dealt with women in a restricted or confined environment but in very different circumstances, namely, wartime internment camps in Shanghai and Sumatra. As in relation to women's experiences at sea, historians have gleaned a great deal of information from contemporaneous diaries and subsequently published memoirs. From these and other sources it has been possible to recreate some of the complexity of life as an internee. For some women internment created opportunity for intimacy and friendship and even for artistic expression (such as in the form of a 'voice orchestra' at the Sumatra camp). Such experiences

may not have been typical. Internment camps were rarely purpose built being instead improvised, and conditions worsened appreciably as time went on because of overcrowding, lack of food, and poor or non-existent sanitation. Internees suffered malnutrition and illness and there were deaths from malaria and dysentery. Although personal bonds endured in many instances, tensions also developed among the internees in part due to differences of background and nationality. Women missionaries' experiences of internment under the Japanese was more varied and more complex than portrayed in the 1997 feature film *Paradise Road*, based in part on accounts of life at the Sumatra camp.

The next two papers maintained focus on missionaries in East Asia, who were more affected by war than their counterparts in many other regions during the 1930s and 1940s. Jocelyn Chatterton (University of Sheffield and SOAS) has based her research in part on interviews with former missionaries. Her subject was 'Protestant Medical Missionary Experience and Dilemma under the Japanese in Occupied China'. She considered how missionaries and the medical institutions that they served may have responded to conflicting imperatives: to collaborate in effect with Japanese authority; or to try to adopt an 'apolitical' stance. Chatterton described their dilemma as akin to being in 'no man's land'. The situation was rendered more difficult by the exigencies of war and internment, which meant a chronic shortage of resources including medical supplies. Missionaries sought to resolve the dilemma of service by debating their moral and ethical choices (whether and how to treat Japanese as well as Chinese patients), concluding that medical missions had work of value to do irrespective of wartime conditions. Chatterton also referred to the importance of race in terms of relations not merely between Europeans and enemy Japanese but between Europeans and Chinese. Part of the pre-war structure of mission and medical care in China was predicated upon a set of power relations rooted in racial inequality, and war complicated these relations further.

In a paper also demonstrating the impact upon missionaries of events in China, Simon Forbes (SOAS) examined 'The Response of British-based Missionary Organizations to the Japanese Occupation of Guangzhou in 1938: Resistance or Collaboration'. He emphasized, with reference to Vichy France, how complicated and contested are terms such as 'collaboration' and 'resistance'. And he noted also that

missionaries in 'British-based' organizations might sometimes be nationals of other countries. Referring mainly to the Church Missionary Society and the London Missionary Society Forbes argued that the actions of personnel at Guangzhou in the late 1930s defied ready categorization: they proved capable of adapting (even through deliberate inaction) to unforeseen and unprecedented circumstances. Missionary attitudes varied. Some were covertly supportive of Chinese resistance against Japanese aggression. Others advocated a 'wait and see' approach. In virtually every case they felt compelled to continue with their work as best they could. They had no influence on the political and military situation. And this worsened in December 1941, when most missionaries became enemy aliens in Japanese-occupied territory. Like Jocelyn Chatterton in relation to the Second World War, Forbes also referred to the way in which Sino-Japanese hostilities complicated race and power relations between Western missionaries and those Chinese people over whom they had previously exerted professional (and in some cases ecclesiastical) authority. Though it caused immense hardship for indigenous peoples, war may also have provided some opportunity for greater indigenous responsibility in church affairs as in provision of medical care.

Mike Leigh (SOAS) gave the penultimate paper, which again focused on the Second World War period: 'God and Mr Churchill: Missionaries and Moral Dilemmas in Wartime Burma.' Leigh explained the longstanding nature of Protestant missionary interest in Burma and how this had been characterized by interdenominational rivalry and also by indigenous (mainly Buddhist) suspicion and reaction. The paper focused on Methodist missions, noting their responses to challenges posed firstly by Burmese nationalism and subsequently by threat of Japanese invasion and occupation. As was the case in other denominations, Methodists debated (within and outside synods) how they might stay true to their vocation yet somehow render assistance if possible either to their home nation or to those Burmese suffering from war. Debate helped highlight the difficulty inherent in any choice between 'militancy' and 'pacifism'. At least one missionary (Robert Acheson) sought to resolve this dilemma by undertaking the role of military chaplain. Leigh noted that while pressures of war prompted difficult individual decisions they also raised deeper questions about the relation of mission to empire and to indigenous peoples.

In the final paper, '"Orphans" and "Intervisitation": Protestant Efforts to Sustain Overseas Mission during and after the Second World War', John Stuart of Kingston University explained how denominational and ecumenical networks, mainly Anglo-American in nature, sought to offset the impact of war on missions. There was particular concern for the future of missions run by German organizations, whose personnel had been interned. The International Missionary Council set up an 'orphaned missions' project, the aim of which was to ensure a continuing missionary presence mainly in Asia and Africa. The project raises questions (yet to be addressed fully) about the extent of missionary commitment to indigenisation and devolution. Stuart emphasized the heavy reliance of the ecumenical movement on American resources, financial and otherwise. He gave details of a transatlantic programme of 'intervisitation' in which British and American mission and church personnel undertook exchange visits, to encourage during 1939–41 American participation in the war against Germany and Italy, to bolster ecumenical relationships, and to plan for the post-war world. These various initiatives fed into Protestantism's contribution to the 'reconstruction' of Europe from 1945.

The papers stimulated a wide range of comments and questions. These helped make clear that for all the ground covered during the symposium there remains much to be studied and clarified about missions, missionaries, and war. Historians of mission have not failed to subject the term 'mission' to scrutiny; they have yet to do the same for the term 'war': what have been its implications for mission and missionaries in theological as well as 'practical' and 'policy' terms? The focus on missionaries throughout these papers was so close as to occlude somewhat the complicated, ambiguous, and frankly problematic nature of the relationship between missions and empire. There were empires other than British, of course, and further research might well be undertaken into missionary experiences in, say, the Ottoman Empire. This might also help provide more insight into a wider range of events during 1914–18. The papers paid relatively little sustained attention to the nature of indigenous engagement with mission and missionaries during either world war: what did local people think and how did they act during the events covered here, and at other times before and after as well as during wars? How and where might such information be located, interpreted, and

given the prominence it undoubtedly deserves? Other aspects of indigenous experience might also be explored, such as the role of African and other Christians on pioneer and related military duties in Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East. The success of the symposium was due in part to the papers presented. It was due also to the lively discussion that the papers stimulated.

JOHN STUART (Kingston University)

***Mixed Courts: Dynasty, Politics, and Religion in the Early Modern World***. Conference organized by the Forschungszentrum Gotha of the University of Erfurt and the German Historical Institute London, supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and held in Gotha, 14–16 March 2013.

Given the decades-long dominance of the confessionalization paradigm, it has taken a long time for overlaps between the confessions to come to the attention of research on early modern history. In recent years there has been a growing interest in looking at mixing between the confessions, but royal courts have largely been excluded from this. At least implicitly, it seems to have been assumed that the royal family and its surroundings were largely mono-confessional, although the existence of numerous dynastic connections, court societies of mixed confession, and confessional differences between ruler and ruled do not really support this view.

The international conference 'Mixed Courts', organized by Benjamin Marschke (Humboldt State University), Michael Schaich (German Historical Institute London), and Alexander Schunka (Gotha), was the first to address the problem of multi-confessional early modern royal courts in a comparative perspective. It focused on multi-confessional dynastic relations and their ceremonial, political, and theological consequences. In many cases, the meeting of several confessions at a royal court brought with it special challenges, which not only placed a question mark over dynastic rules of procedure (for example, in marriage negotiations), but also involved a heightened requirement for legitimization, which could lead to new performative acts as well as public and diplomatic controversies.

Eighteen speakers from a total of ten countries presented case studies and papers taking an overarching perspective, ranging from Britain to the Russian Empire, from Sweden to Transylvania, various territories of the Holy Roman Empire, and central Europe. There was a certain chronological emphasis on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which indicates the increasing significance of mixed confessional connections. By including selected non-European courts

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

The full conference programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.

(the Mughal Empire, Siam, the Ottoman Empire), the conference aimed to break the dominance of the three central European Christian confessions and to consider not only multi-confessional but also multi-religious relations. The aim was to expand classical early modern research on the court by the addition of aspects drawn from theological and ecclesiastical history, art history, political and diplomatic history, and the history of ideas.

The first of five sessions focused on the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Ines Peper (Vienna) looked at lines of development related to confessional politics at the court of Charles VI and his wife, Elisabeth Christine of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. In respect of Elisabeth Christine's conversion in 1707, Peper pointed to the seemingly unchanged religious practices of the Viennese court, while also emphasizing the emerging ties of Protestant families to the imperial court. This pointed to the longer-term goal of an interdenominational exercise of power. The possibility of combining religion and dynasty, Peper argued, should in this sense be understood as a political strategy. The instrumentalization of interconfessional marriages for confessional politics was even clearer in the paper by Howard Louthan (University of Florida). He dealt with public perceptions of the marriage between the Reformed Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart in 1613, which was seen by contemporaries as a symbol of European Protestantism against the background of intra-Protestant tensions on the eve of the Thirty Years War. This was also reflected in art and literature. Looking at several bi-confessional marriages at the Saxon court in the eighteenth century, Anne Rous (Gotha/Dresden) established that mixed marriages among princes and the possibility of one partner converting linked the private practice of religion with dynastic questions and *raison d'état*, but also with career ambitions. The background to this was the fragmentation of Wettin territory after the death of John George I, imperial politics, and especially the conversion of Augustus the Strong in the context of the Personal Union with Poland.

While in Lutheran Saxony, Catholic royal marriages and conversions were the issue, the following essays shifted their focus to intra-Protestant marriage ties between Protestant and Reformed partners. Benjamin Marschke's (Humboldt State University) topic was the Reformed–Lutheran marriage strategies of the Brandenburg–Prussian court since the time of the Great Elector, Frederick William I. Mar-

riages between Reformed members of the Hohenzollern dynasty and Lutheran partners not only resulted in temporarily mixed courts, but also created opportunities for interaction with the people, the majority of whom were Lutheran. The marriage negotiations and pacts of the eighteenth century in particular, Marschke argued, increasingly revealed the claim to a Prussian 'pan-Protestantism'. Alexander Schunka's (Gotha/Erfurt) argument went in a similar direction. Analysing a number of smaller courts of the early eighteenth century in the Holy Roman Empire (Württemberg, Hesse-Kassel, Wolfenbüttel, Saxe-Gotha), he worked out the theological implications of mixed marriages and stressed relations with Protestant Irenicism. In close connection with the politics of Brandenburg-Prussia, he said, in many places it was all about positioning within a larger Protestant association or the construction of an international Protestantism.

After the first session, whose five papers had focused on the Holy Roman Empire, the second session took a global perspective, presenting case studies predominantly from Asia. Antje Flüchter (Heidelberg) looked at the problem of the co-existence of several religions in the late sixteenth-century Indian Mughal Empire (Sunni and Shiite Islam, Hinduism and Jainism, and Christian legations and merchants). Flüchter examined the challenges to consensus-building and the regulation of ideas of religious dominance, dynastic chances in the face of religious plurality, and the emergence of syncretistic practices. Speaking on the Kingdom of Siam during the Ayutthayan period under Prasat Thong (ruled 1629–56), Sven Trakulhun (Zurich) referred to the Sakadina system of social hierarchization that made it possible for non-Buddhists to be integrated into court society. Thus the Siamese court was a place which deliberately brought together people of different religions, who could hold important offices regardless of their religious allegiances.

The keynote lecture given by Jeroen Duindam (Leiden) looked at the significance of the monarch's faith and its instrumental function in relation to court and country in a comparative perspective based on Chinese, Ottoman, and European examples. Duindam discussed the situational relationship, which had to be constantly renegotiated and was therefore temporary, of various religious combinations in royal society. As the experiences of European guests at Ottoman and Chinese courts showed, belonging to other religions could sometimes provide access to local centres of power. The sovereign there-

fore had a special responsibility to preserve religious stability in the face of other faiths.

The contributions to the second session showed that religious plurality at courts and monarchical centres of power was a universal phenomenon of the early modern period, even if its specific forms might differ between Asia and Europe because of differing dynastic, political, and social circumstances. The third session turned back to European courts and territories, in particular, those of western and northern Europe. Early modern Britain provided familiar territory for the conference and was the subject of two case studies. Dagmar Freist's paper (Oldenburg) took us into the religious turmoil on the eve of the English Civil War. Charles I's marriage to the Bourbon Henrietta Maria brought the Catholic threat home to both Anglicans and Puritans, and the queen herself made use of this politically. In eighteenth-century Britain, by contrast, the monarchy tended to play down differences within Protestantism, as Michael Schaich (London) underlined. William III, like the Hanoverians George I and George II, was the country's religious leader without having come from the Church of England. In dealing with members of the court who were of other religions and their religious observances, as well as their own non-British origins, these monarchs (for example, George II in respect of the Electorate of Hanover) were forced into confessional 'cross-dressing'. Daniel Riches (Alabama) showed that the dominant motive in planning and consummating mixed marriages at the Swedish court was to benefit the dynasty. From the point of view of the seventeenth-century Vasa dynasty, such marriages were a good opportunity to take Swedish power and influence forward while placing itself at the forefront of efforts for confessional peace in Europe. Therefore the fact that potential marriage partners belonged to a different religion was seen less as an obstacle than as the main attraction in such alliances. Luc Duderloo (Antwerp) emphasized how closely mixed courts were observed within the European dynasties, and showed how effective multi-confessionality could be beyond an individual territory by taking the example of the early seventeenth-century archducal court of Albert and Isabella in the Habsburg Netherlands. As the 'most northerly Catholic court' in Europe it had to maintain close diplomatic relations with the surrounding multi-confessional or Protestant courts (the court of the Stadhalter in the northern Netherlands, London, Düsseldorf). As far

as possible, Catholic contacts were used, which meant that this type of diplomacy did not always run smoothly.

This session made it clear that in the event of mixed marriages, even the predominantly Protestant rulers of northern and north-western Europe had to deal with Catholic influences on an almost permanent basis. Multi-confessionality in the context of the Catholic-dominated courts of western and southern Europe was the topic of the fourth session, which began with Jonathan Spangler (Manchester) speaking on Bourbon marriages in the seventeenth century. While Catherine of Navarre retained her Reformed faith after her marriage with Henry of Lorraine (1599), Elizabeth Charlotte of the Palatinate, given an altered political and confessional situation, changed her faith in 1671 for her marriage with Philippe Duc d'Orléans. It became clear that while mixed marriages could be used as an instrument for gaining power, women were not always prepared to give up their faith for political reasons. Birgit Emich (Erlangen-Nuremberg) looked at relations between the Vatican and non-Catholic or multi-confessional courts. These relations can often only be elucidated by going via diplomatic history, as in the case of Saxony before 1697. Contrary to its official stance, Papal diplomacy certainly maintained contacts with non-Catholic courts and princes and tried, using unofficial channels and making political concessions, to exert its influence.

The final session looked towards eastern Europe, confessionally a particularly heterogeneous area, a factor that also affected the sphere of the courts. Maciej Ptaszński (Warsaw) discussed multi-confessional tendencies at Polish courts in the sixteenth century. Although Polish kings married Catholics, this did not mean that their courts were dominated by a single confession. Many servants of the court were of a different faith. Protestant clergy were especially important under Sigismund Augustus (1548–72), although under Stephen Báthory (1576–86) they were replaced by Jesuits. Graeme Murdock (Dublin) investigated the impact of mixed marriages on domestic and confessional policy, taking as an example the marriage of the Reformed György Rákóczi with the Catholic Zsófia Báthory (1643) in the highly pluralist Principality of Transylvania. Although the authority of the Rákóczi family rested on a Reformed basis, after György's death Zsófia and her son converted back to Catholicism, dismissed the Reformed clergy, and invited Jesuits into their country.

From the point of view of the Reformed Church, neither Estates nor courts were reliable partners. The concluding paper by Lorenz Erren (Moscow) underlined that under certain political and cultural conditions, confessional *propria* could become bargaining chips. He made it clear that in the Russian Empire, theological differences ruled out mixed marriages between members of the Orthodox Church and the Protestant denominations. Peter the Great, however, temporarily broke with traditional religious patterns of thought in order to gain access to European princely houses and continental politics. This resulted in more relaxed relations with non-Orthodox people, making it possible for several members of the Tsar's family to contract marriages with Protestant princely houses.

In his conclusion, Andreas Gestrich (London) presented a typology of mixed courts in the early modern period, emphasizing the variety of ways in which dynasties could deal with confessional pluralism (conversions, religious pluralism, occasional conformity), combined with issues of gender-specific strategies. The concluding discussion also took a political–pragmatic or functional perspective on the phenomenon. It was argued that the strong focus on the court or dynasty and its immediate environment would have to be broken up in favour of a stronger concentration on court personnel, or the impact of multi-confessional dynasties or courts on their territories. Questions such as what happened to their servants when one partner in a marriage converted, or what chances in-laws of a different faith had to influence the entourage (court chaplains, their own royal households) were not entirely neglected in the papers, it was pointed out, but were rather marginally treated.

Even if the conference was not, ultimately, able to present a clear typology of mixed courts, the comparative juxtaposition of many European and non-European case studies made the enormous power and effectiveness of the phenomenon in various areas of early modern political and religious culture clear. The lively discussions among conference participants and the fruitful dialogue between specialists in different territorial historiographies underlined this, and resulted in a valuable first survey of the field. A publication of the conference proceedings is planned.

ANDRÉ BOCHYNSKI (University of Erfurt)
TOBIAS ZOBER (University of Erfurt)

***The European Welfare State in a Global Context***. Conference organized by the University of Frankfurt, the German Historical Institute London, and the London School of Economics and Political Science, and held at the GHIL, 11–13 April 2013.

The transnational and global turn is increasingly affecting writing on the welfare state, a field of research usually closely linked with the nation-state. In April 2013, Christoph Cornelißen (Frankfurt am Main and Gerda Henkel Visiting Professor GHIL/LSE, 2010/11) organized a conference that focused on the European welfare state, discussing its characteristics, the global challenges that it faced, its transnational entanglements, and counterparts in other world regions. In his introduction he emphasized that the welfare state was a European invention, while questioning the narrative of a success story. The aim of the conference was to open up new geographical contexts and to sharpen historical approaches when studying a field dominated by the social sciences. Cornelißen therefore suggested combining a transnational agenda with a cultural approach to the history of the welfare state, something that we still lack.

Opening the conference, Stephan Leibfried (Bremen) surveyed arguments concerning the origins of the welfare state and the changes it underwent. After 1945 most industrial societies were attracted to welfare ideology, which led to a huge expansion of social services and opened a window of opportunity for free trade. Despite emerging criticism of welfare in the 1970s there was no large-scale retrenchment because, among other things, 'needs outpaced cuts'. Pointing to T. H. Marshall's 1949 lecture 'Citizenship and Social Class', Leibfried addressed a key aspect: welfare took different forms in different countries as the role of education as social policy in the Anglo-American world demonstrates. He also showed, referring to Gøsta Esping-Andersen's typology, that welfare systems are composites of more than one type.

The first section explored the differences and similarities between welfare regimes. Christoph Boyer (Salzburg) chose a macro perspective to compare welfare states in Eastern and Western Europe, asking how they coped with industrial and social transformation. Both sides had to balance social and investment policy, leading to stagnation in

The full conference programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.

one case and mass unemployment in the other. This paper raised the question to what extent the welfare state influenced political stability, causing the deconstruction of Communism. While there might be evidence regarding finances, we still know little about individual attitudes to the socialist welfare state.

Béla Tomka (Szeged) argued that there was no master plan for a Communist version of welfare. Pre-war structures merged with socialist principles such as the allocation of social rights in the production process, or price stability as the fourth pillar of social policy. Tomka therefore suggested the term 'hybrid systems'. The constantly changing paths of Eastern European welfare states shaped their transition in the 1990s, leading to a high degree of volatility.

Pauli Kettunen (Helsinki) looked at the Nordic welfare model, emphasizing transnational interdependencies. As cross-national comparisons had been used by experts and politicians since the nineteenth century, the making of welfare states was based on national resources as well as transnational processes. Kettunen stressed the importance of exploring the culture of welfare in order to understand the Nordic model. In Nordic states the term 'welfare society' is preferred to 'welfare state'. Welfare societies in this sense include a normative and moral order, unleashing both integrative and controlling forces.

Giovanni Silvano (Padova) dealt with southern Europe and discussed clientelism as one of the main features of a Mediterranean model. Using the example of the generous Italian pension system, he showed how the inclusion of different social groups meant that the majority of the population was covered, making the system more universalist than selective. Finally, he argued that the Italian welfare state was not a post-war product, but dated back to 1890, when the Crispi Act laid foundations which were further developed during the fascist era.

In his keynote lecture Martin Geyer (Munich) analysed the end of the social democratic consensus which Ralf Dahrendorf had already diagnosed at the end of the 1970s. The search for the causes of this shift led to the periphery of the world of welfare states, the crisis of South America and Africa on the one hand and the rise of the Asian Tiger states on the other. While the latter showed a way of connecting social provision with economic progress, the former had to cut welfare programmes and benefits under the guidance of the Inter-

national Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Geyer argued that these world regions served as laboratories where what was later known as the neo-liberal consensus was developed.

The second section was devoted to the transnational and comparative history of the German welfare models. Nicole Kramer (Frankfurt/Nottingham) first compared different pension systems in Germany, Britain, and Italy. In a second part she analysed international debates on ageing within the Council of Europe and the World Assembly on Ageing. The 1970s were marked not by *less* welfare but by *different* welfare, she argued, which was linked to social movements and private providers, with the state occupying the role of regulator and controller. The example of old age highlighted how different fields of welfare, such as health, pensions, and social care are interconnected.

Johannes Paulmann (Mainz) adopted an entangled approach to German social policy, providing snapshots of four occasions on which German welfare regulations were connected with locations outside Germany. He moved from GDR contract workers returning to Mozambique to the remuneration of Askari First World War veterans in Tanzania in the 1960s, from Vietnamese workers in the GDR transferring money and goods and attempting to increase their income to local contractors employed by Siemens in the construction of the Cahora Bassa dam in Mozambique in 1969. Drawing on these different examples, Paulmann discussed the difficulties of benefits transfers, the role of companies and other actors, the unequal distribution of welfare undermining the universal welfare state, and the justification of entitlement to welfare by reference to 'imagined communities'.

Other papers presented classic comparisons between Germany and Britain while charting new terrain. Felix Römer (London) provided insights into a conceptional history of social justice, focusing on ways of measuring income distribution in Britain and Germany. He highlighted scientific discourses and the role of experts, looking at Anthony Atkinson, John Leonard Nicholson, and other social scientists, and contrasting their methods with German approaches to functional income distribution. Wiebke Wiede (Trier) moved the focus more explicitly to the recipients of welfare, looking at the different practices of British job centres and German employment offices. Where British job centres emphasized independence, charac-

ter training, and skills, their German counterparts were marked by bureaucratization and professionalization.

In the afternoon the perspective widened to include Asia and Africa. Kingo Tamai (Osaka) highlighted the trajectories of Japanese welfare development in a more general way, drawing conclusions about Japan's role in Asian welfare regimes. The other papers assessed the role and legacy of European colonial regimes in Africa, India, and the Indian Ocean, and connected the fields of decolonization, aid, development, and welfare. Andreas Eckert (Berlin) focused on labour in Africa. He highlighted factors that led to the creation of a working class, including the Second World War, the discourse of international organizations, the creation of labour unions, fast growing populations, the demand for labour, and the increasingly precise definitions of urban labour and rural ('tribal') agriculture. Drawing on various examples, such as Senegal, where the *allocation du foyer* was intended to contribute to the stabilization of a male workforce, he showed how problematic the definitions of a formal and informal sector are. The distinction between formal and informal labour is also particularly contentious in the Indian welfare state, whose history Ravi Ahuja (Göttingen) presented as a connected history of India and Britain. He outlined the different debates connected to labour in India between 1918 and the 1970s, which went back to the Beveridge plan of 1944 but also, for example, to the International Labour Organization (ILO). The 1940s saw two universalization schemes (employment act and public distribution act) in reaction to the 1943 Bengal famine, but as in the African cases, many people were effectively excluded from the formal sector.

Two further papers highlighted a specific location and field of welfare in a comparative perspective. Heloise Finch-Boyer (London) examined the example of La Réunion, one of the French *départements d'outre-mer* (DOM), arguing that social legislation was key to French decolonization. She stressed Prime Minister Michel Debré's strategic use of welfare policies in the 1960s, which were intended to create popular support for France. Investment in shanty town development, the extension of health care schemes, and provision for families without reference to race opened the avenue to discussions about citizenship. Ulrike Lindner (Cologne) looked at maternity and child services in British colonies in Subsaharan Africa, in particular, in Tanganyika, Kenya, and Nigeria. She showed how three different

systems developed in the three cases: Nigeria saw an early attempt to professionalize Africans; Kenya relied on hygiene education and community medicine; while Tanganyika outsourced to missionaries, who received mandatory grants. Lindner's paper thus clearly brought the necessity of case specificity to the fore.

Global interdependencies were recalled in the last section, exploring the impact of the Cold War and the role of transnational actors. Tomasz Inglot (Mankato) studied the diffusion of concepts through the iron curtain. The emergency welfare states, as he described Eastern European countries experiencing crises on a regular basis, constantly looked beyond the borders of the bloc. Western welfare states served as points of reference, whether in a competitive way, or as examples from which to learn lessons.

Celia Donert (Liverpool) discussed the ways in which Eastern European welfare states tried to promote their ideas of welfare. She looked at women's social rights and pointed out that bourgeois and socialist visions of gender equality were hotly debated at both the UN Conference on Women in Mexico City and the World Congress of Women in East Berlin. Ultimately, these meetings served as platforms for an alternative feminism interested neither in social rights nor the welfare state.

Christian Johann (Berlin) turned to the ideological opponent by focusing on the United States, which he described as a middle-class welfare state. He explored how the middle class shaped social security programmes and vice versa. His approach dealt with a variety of actors, such as politicians and experts, but also recipients and the staff of welfare bureaucracies.

While many papers touched on the role of supranational organizations, two presentations looked at this issue in more depth. Daniel Maul (Gießen) pointed to the successes of the ILO as a standard-setting agency, bearer of a moral discourse about global prosperity, and clearing house for information. However, the concept of social and economic modernization linked to democratic values came under pressure in the 1970s. To study the global context, he suggested, means to rethink the connection between democracy and the welfare state.

Matthieu Leimgruber (Geneva) shed light on how the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) took over the role of international standard bearer. He gave a detailed

account of the structures and mechanisms of internal social policy debates. It became clear that the replacement of the ILO reflected and enforced the shift in social policy development as the OECD contributed to the growing critique of welfare state expansion.

Kiran Patel's (Maastricht) concluding remarks called for the historicization of the welfare state as a moving target. Most importantly, Patel showed that the transnational expansion of research on the welfare state has to go beyond the state in order to gain a fuller picture of history in non-European societies. This could reunite those working on contemporary history with researchers on the early modern period, when the term 'welfare society' was of much greater importance. Finally, he reflected on the question of what is European by reminding us that the organization of Europe itself is a specific feature. The European Union and its predecessors might not have designed social policy, but they provided a 'hub of knowledge'.

The conference succeeded in defining crucial new perspectives in a well-researched area. The transnational and global approaches brought to the fore modes of examination that will enrich research on welfare states in general. To start with, the conference stressed the need to look at other world regions to explain why the context in Europe is changing. What is going on in the developing world must be taken into account when assessing the hotly debated ruptures of the 1970s and 1980s. Furthermore, the analytical framework of models needs to be systematically complemented by an examination of what Pauli Kettunen and Klaus Petersen have called the 'historical layers of the welfare state'. Finally, an interest in European or global comparisons and interdependencies does not necessarily result in a macro perspective. On the contrary, experiences, mentalities, non-state networks, and images were emphasized as focal points for writing a transnational history of the welfare state. This research agenda also has the potential to fill what Christoph Cornelißen has identified as a lacuna: a cultural history of welfare.

VALESKA HUBER (German Historical Institute London)
NICOLE KRAMER (University of Frankfurt)

***Social Planning in Late Colonial and Postcolonial Societies (1920s–1960s)***. Workshop organized by Valeska Huber and held at the German Historical Institute London, 30–31 May 2013.

'The modern world is a planned world', stated Sir Douglas Veale, Registrar at Oxford and an ex-civil servant, in which 'governments are bound to be more active and interfering than they have been in the past'. Civil servants, he continued, 'must be better instructed, and in particular must learn how to use experts and expert knowledge'.[1] The idea of planning, as expressed in this statement, gained prominence from the 1920s on and reached a climax in the 1950s and 1960s. Planning could, of course, refer to all kinds of domains, from urban layout to infrastructure, but also to entire societies or social phenomena, such as education, health policies, and so forth. Attempts at social planning could be small or large scale; they could be experimental, utopian, or contain practical policy recommendations. While planning is an important paradigm in the contemporary history of Europe and has been fruitfully explored in German and British *Zeitgeschichte*, it has resonated to a lesser extent in colonial and postcolonial history.

The workshop brought together experts on specific regions in order to draw comparisons between late colonial and postcolonial planning experiments, and between different regional configurations. The contributions adopted wide-ranging methodologies towards planning, from the history of ideas to the history of practices, actors, or materialities, highlighting that planning could carry different meanings and implications, and could come with radical or pragmatic political outlooks. Planning as idea and practice was sketched in papers on critics of economic and social planning (Quinn Slobodian, Wellesley College) and on the development of settlement and land reclamation schemes in the Netherlands (Liesbeth van de Grift, Nijmegen). Economic thinkers such as Moritz J. Bonn, Friedrich Hayek, and Lionel Robbins, developed powerful critiques of planning on different grounds, of which the most pervading was, of course, its

The full conference programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.

[1] Oxford University Archives, UR 6/Col/16. file 1, Brief for the Vice-Chancellor, 1 Aug. 1953. Quoted by courtesy of Sarah Stockwell (King's College London) with permission of the OUA.

regulatory and possibly totalitarian streak, connected to fascist or Communist regimes. Yet an analysis of the practices of planning, for instance, in the case of land reclamation and settlement schemes in the Netherlands, shows that many experts in the interwar period did not see planning and democracy as mutually exclusive, something that American commentators of the 1920s and 1930s equally stressed.

The distinction between pragmatic and radically transformative social planning also came up in other domains, such as in the example of agricultural cooperatives in pre- and post-independence India (Corinna Unger, Jacobs University Bremen). This connected the different phases explored during the workshop and illustrated the intricacies of transfer, entanglement, and comparison. The export of European models was, of course, neither straightforward nor unilinear. In the case of cooperatives, German models, such as Raiffeisen, were seen as particularly suitable for changing the behaviour of individuals while at the same time providing a vision of return to 'traditional' life, anti-urbanization, and the transformation of the social fabric without revolution.

The question of tradition and transformation in small-scale settlements was also at the centre of papers on village schemes in late colonial Angola (Samuel Coghe, European University Institute Florence) and Kenya and Algeria (Moritz Feichtinger, University of Berne). In the example of Angola, model villages were envisaged from the 1920s on, highlighting inter- and intra-imperial borrowing and combining medical, agricultural, and demographic planning. As in the case of Indian cooperatives, the planners saw a rural future for Angola as an answer to anxieties about depopulation and labour. While these plans were often not implemented, in the case of the Algerian and Kenyan wars of the 1950s, villagization and forced relocation schemes were devised in order to counter insurgency, but also, as stated in connection with Algerian society, to 'effect in a few months a major social revolution that has taken 500 years or more to achieve in England'. The very different village schemes clearly brought to the fore the tension between modernization and 'traditional life', but also between the plan as (often unrealized) vision and as *ex post* justification of violent social transformation.

What happens when planning translates into reality was assessed in the case of housing projects in the French *département d'outre-mer* La Réunion (Heloise Finch-Boyer, National Maritime Museum Lon-

don). Here, social planning as theoretical and top-down idea was most thoroughly deconstructed through an emphasis on the bureaucracy and materiality of planning, that is, the use of new materials such as concrete or artefacts such as maps. The example made clear how social planning schemes devised in metropolitan France were subverted once they reached local government and bureaucracies, but also how they were adapted by inhabitants through the unexpected use of the new structures and material.

The village and urban planning schemes also triggered debates regarding the scale of planning and the units of social transformation. While the economic thinkers of the interwar period mentioned above had judged that political constructs such as the 'world federation' envisaged by Lionel Robbins were 'too big to plan', other late colonial and postcolonial planners did not shy away from at least nationwide planning. Development plans such as de Gaulle's Constantine Plan of 1958 for Algeria again brought the tension between vision and implementation to the fore. Often interpreted as an attempt to save France's empire, Muriam Haleh Davis (New York University) interpreted it in relation to the emerging EEC and as closely connecting France's 'modernization' and Algeria's 'development', pointing to the competition between the two, for example, in the field of agriculture. The Constantine Plan furthermore illustrated the myriad of actors involved in drawing up a plan. Most of them shared the belief that Islam was central to the question of how Algerian Muslims could be made into producers and consumers, and thus into 'citizens of the twentieth century'.

Large-scale planning became one of the symbols of decolonization with many of the newly decolonized countries adopting five- or ten-year plans aiming at economic growth and social reconstruction. These plans again point to transfer and circulation between the 'first', 'second', and 'third worlds', as such plans were drawn up not only in the Soviet Union or the GDR, but also in India, Nigeria, and many other countries. In the case of Egypt (Valeska Huber, German Historical Institute London), educational and manpower planning came to be seen as particularly crucial for economic take-off. Early computing devices and statistics became central tools for the elaborate manpower projections needed for such planning. They were used to make change visible, transform visions into numbers, and suggest certainty and predictability. These techniques point to the very spe-

cific forms of expertise that planners had to operate in the 1950s and 1960s.

The role of experts was a recurring theme throughout the workshop. How politicians and social scientists, engineers, or doctors interacted proved a complicated matter in the different contexts. The post-war decades saw the emergence of a more standardized circulation of experts and expertise, for instance, through the introduction of development courses at the universities of Cambridge and Oxford (Sarah Stockwell, King's College London). Their analysis can show how the languages of cooperation and development entered the field and how British ideas of governance and plans for decolonization in particular were to be diffused. Through such training courses, but also in international organizations such as the International Institute of Educational Planning and other UN or UNESCO affiliated agencies, certain languages of development were crafted and circulated. Often these were couched in time metaphors such as those encountered in the context of Algeria.

In his conclusion, Frederick Cooper (New York University) not only brought his insight to all individual papers, but also came back to central questions regarding development and its periodization. He stressed the decade of the 1940s as crucial in the unfolding of development thinking in French and British colonial and in international contexts (for instance, the International Labour Organization). He thus connected the two periods covered in the workshop, namely, the 1920s–30s and the 1950s–60s. Cooper also reflected on the complicated definitions of social planning, describing it as a defensive movement aspiring to ease political radicalization, yet often actually creating it. With its aim of generating predictable, measurable outcomes, an aim that clearly set planning apart from other forms of interference, for instance, in the name of the civilizing mission, it presumed a high degree of local knowledge, which was very often not disposable in late colonial contexts. Leading on from this, the concluding discussion orbited around the question of planning and knowledge management and the creation (or fiction) of certainty through statistics and other tools.

VALESKA HUBER (GHIL)

***Forward from the Past: The* Kindertransport *from a Contemporary Perspective***. Symposium organized by the Leo Baeck Institute (LBI) in cooperation with the German Historical Institute London (GHIL), the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies, and Aberystwyth University, School of European Languages, and held at the GHIL on 25 June 2013.

For a long time, the *Kindertransport* was presented as Britain's redemptive answer to the Holocaust. In major narratives of escape, asylum, and generosity the boundaries have been blurred between celebratory commemoration, collective memory, and well-meaning historiography. In recent years new research looking more closely at untold stories, post-war experiences, and methods of memorialization has cast doubt on former assessments.[1] Following this realignment, the symposium 'Forward from the Past: The *Kindertransport* from a Contemporary Perspective', part of a series of events commemorating the 75th anniversary of the *Kindertransport*, brought together international experts to analyse critically the transports to Britain in 1938–9, their aftermath, and representation. The symposium was also attended by a considerable number of representatives of the first and second generation of the *Kindertransport*, creating a fruitful dialogue between research and contemporary witness.

After a welcome by host Andreas Gestrich, Director of the GHIL, Raphael Gross, Director of the LBI, Bea Lewkowicz (Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies, University of London), and Andrea Hammel (Aberystwyth University), the symposium opened with a first panel reflecting the representation of the *Kindertransport* in British historiography. Drawing on unconsidered individual cases and Britain's contemporary immigration policy, Tony Kushner's keynote paper challenged dominant tropes and narrative patterns describing the *Kinder's* journey in the light of escape and redemption. Kushner showed how the memory of the *Kindertransport* has been instrumentalized to portray the emergence of a successful symbiosis

The full programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.

[1] See esp. the collection of articles in Andrea Hammel and Bea Lewkowicz (eds.), *The Kindertransport to Britain 1938/39: New Perspectives*, Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies, 13 (Amsterdam, 2012).

between Britain's generosity and the *Kinder*'s gratitude. According to Kushner, this story does not reflect the full complexity of the *Kinder*'s journeys and lives, which have been anything but perfect. While Kushner highlighted the organization of the *Kindertransport* as a 'remarkable grassroots movement', Rose Holmes shed more light on the often neglected voluntary tradition. Referring to the Quakers' voluntary contribution, she described how the *Kindertransport* was organized, financed, and managed. Holmes emphasized the generosity of the Quakers and their efforts, which were later unfairly claimed by the government itself. Thus, by considering non-governmental help from British citizens, her paper corrected another major narrative. The first panel closed with a paper by Jennifer Craig-Norton which investigated the complex relationships between the carers and the children. She discussed how official letters from carers, compared with the foster child's memory, can serve as an important source. The paper demonstrated that the plight of the children and pressure of time often made it impossible to guarantee the carers' competence. Foster families were barely informed about the past and the fate of the *Kinder*, and often treated them like orphans. Even if carers made great efforts, their generosity did not always outlast the hardship of wartime.

The second panel focused on the experiences and memories of the former *Kinder* after 1945. Elizabeth Heineman outlined a research project questioning the 'happy end' of children who were reunited with their parents after the war. With reference to her own family, Heineman is writing a micro-history in order to show how long-term family dynamics, separation, and the influence of additional elements, such as religion or education, affected relationships in reunited families, sometimes for the worse. While Heineman revealed the richness of her family's literary legacy, Bea Lewkowicz stressed the importance of the AJR Refugee Voices Archive as an invaluable source for new research. The archive contains a collection of 150 filmed interviews with Jewish survivors and refugees from Nazism now living in the UK.[2] Regarding two interviewees, Ursula Gilbert and Susan Einzig, who came to Britain with the *Kindertransport*, Bea Lewkowicz discussed how reflective sections at the end of each interview give particular insights into different ways of coping with an often traumatic past.

[2] See <http://www.refugeevoices.co.uk/>, accessed 10 July 2013.

From the angle of a literary scholar, Andrea Hammel surveyed the narrative layers of three memory texts by former Kindertransportees: Martha Blend's *A Child Alone*, Vera Gissing's *Pearls of Childhood*, and Ruth L. David's *Ein Kind unserer Zeit*. Approaching these works as a 'creative exploration' of the past, Hammel highlighted that, in retrospect, the memoirs constituted specific portrayals of childhood. She described how the techniques featured in the texts, especially the interaction between narrated self (the child) and narrating self, evoked the impression of estrangement and defamiliarization, and represented the experiences of a disturbed identity.

The third panel addressed the experiences of the second generation, which have hitherto received little attention. In brief talks, four representatives of the second generation revealed how the *Kindertransport* affected their family lives and different ways of dealing with their parents' legacy. Melissa Rosenbaum forged a bridge from feelings of shame about being Jewish, initially present in the family, to the importance of her parents' past for their own identity. Gaby Glassman followed on by explicitly addressing psychological and psychoanalytical issues. Dismissing the construction of a hierarchy of suffering, she stressed the subjectivity of suffering and how, in the case of the *Kindertransport*, the children of the *Kinder* could unconsciously associate with the grief of their parents. Karen Goodman, on the other hand, considered her family's past as an appeal to take responsibility. Thus, she said, it had influenced her personal engagement as a social worker for asylum-seeking children. Melissa Hacker, president of the *Kindertransport* Association, explained how the felt difference between children of former Kindertransportees and other Jewish families in New York provided an impetus to find out more about their parents' past. These efforts resulted in the film *My Knees Were Jumping*, parts of which were shown after the talks. Bea Lewkowicz commented on how the film, focusing on the transmission of the drama through the generations, unveiled specific characteristics which defined the family life of former Kindertransportees: the tension between history and imagination, as well as between assimilation and the feeling of being different.

While the second generation experience was conveyed as essentially a transition from personal experience to (cultural) memory, the fourth panel referred to specific memorializations of the *Kindertransport*. The visual representation of the *Kindertransport* was the topic of

a talk by Nathan Abrams. Comparing four documentaries and one fictional film, Abrams analysed prevailing techniques of staging the *Kindertransport* in film. He convincingly demonstrated that using black and white images, or specific motifs, such as biblical reconstructions, contributed to hidden narratives presented by the films. An instance of contrast was seen in the film *Vienna's Lost Daughters* (2010), which resisted many of the prevailing documentary techniques.

The last two presentations discussed the approaches of material culture. Suzanne Bardgett (Imperial War Museum, London) gave insights into the *Kindertransport* section of the IWM's Holocaust exhibition. The exhibition tries to convey an understanding of the personal stories by means of specific artefacts. Judith Vandervelde (Jewish Museum, London) added to this by presenting particularly emotive Jewish artefacts exhibited in the Jewish Museum, London. She also reflected on the curator's role in telling specific stories by selecting and presenting the exhibits. According to Vandervelde, the untold stories which seldom came up for discussion included the apathy of Britain's Jewish community at the time of the *Kindertransport*, anti-Semitism, and the often traumatic evacuation of the children within the UK. These two talks invited debate on the issue of space in both physical and cultural terms. How is it possible to present the *Kindertransport* appropriately within a limited exhibition space? And why are these spaces limited? Does the timeline of the IWM's Holocaust exhibition, stopping in 1945, not dramatically limit the scope of the *Kindertransport* section?

In his concluding remarks, Daniel Wildmann (LBI, London) picked up on the points which came up in the preceding discussion. Highlighting the issues of space, identity, and the (lack of) confidence of British Jewry, as well as the public presence of Anglo-Jewish history and culture in the UK with reference to the *Kindertransport* as still open questions for research, he came full circle to Tony Kushner's starting paper. The sphere of representation in particular makes it clear that the *Kindertransport* still has to fit into certain cultural contexts, limits, and narratives, and that the 'Battle of Britishness' might not be completely over.

The symposium ended with the opening of the exhibition 'Double Exposure: Jewish Refugees from Austria in Britain', designed by Bea

Lewkowicz, and a performance of Hans Gál's 'What a Life!' (Norbert Meyn: tenor; Malcolm Miller: piano).

AARON JOCHIM (University of Heidelberg)

***The Territorial State after 1989: Decline, Transformation, or Persistence?*** Conference organized by Andreas Rödder, Gerda Henkel Visiting Professor 2012/13, supported by the German Historical Institute London, the Gerda Henkel Foundation, and the London School of Economics, and held at the GHIL, 28–29 June 2013.

Not only in Germany, but all over the world, the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 stands for the end of the confrontation between two transnational blocs. With the coming of German unity and the end of the East–West conflict, national borders suddenly became relevant again. In the years after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the disintegration of Yugoslavia, Europe saw the foundation of many new states, as well as wars about national borders. Yet even then, many people already considered the territorial state, a 'system of rule based on borders, citizens, and sovereign power' (Andreas Rödder, Mainz/London), as a nineteenth-century phenomenon that was increasingly insignificant in a globally connected world. European integration took unprecedented strides in the 1990s, opening up the possibility of a new political order beyond national borders. The digital revolution provided new chances for global communication and identity-building. More liberal markets were increasingly withdrawing from regulation by the nation-state. International organizations were opening up the perspective of global governance. Surprisingly, however, the territorial state has made a comeback as a central actor in the financial crisis since 2008. What, therefore, has characterized the development of the territorial state since 1989: decline, transformation, or persistence?

This was the question discussed by an international circle of experts attending a conference held on 28 and 29 June at the German Historical Institute London, and supported by the Gerda Henkel Foundation and the London School of Economics. This conference drew a varied picture of the territorial state, its historical roots, and development in recent history. The conclusions the participants came to were, first, that there can be no question of a decline of the territorial and national state. In world politics, the persistence of the sovereign nation-state and the maintenance of the territorial status quo are

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

The full conference programme can be found under Events and Conferences on the GHIL's website <www.ghil.ac.uk>.

considered prerequisites for international stability and peace. Second, the territorial state has demonstrated its ability to adapt to new challenges in very different areas, mainly associated with a strengthening of national executives. Despite various manifestations of change, therefore, in some areas we are justified in speaking of stronger territoriality. With cyberspace, third, a new transnational space has been created, one that gives the executives of territorial states new chances for unlimited state intervention. These new opportunities, fourth, are often achieved at the expense of civil liberties and democratic control. In democracies too, the relative weakening of state power in favour of the markets comes up against an increasing separation of state power from democratic sovereignty and the rule of law. Fifth, in the field of European integration, where the growing density of regulatory demands has resulted in greater chances and need for discretionary politics, this development paradigmatically reveals itself in the danger of de-democratization.

The starting point and reference for these discussions was Charles S. Maier's (Harvard) opening lecture on the transformation of territoriality. In it Maier, who unfortunately could not attend the conference in person, touched on his earlier argument that the historical age of territoriality has been coming to an end since the final third of the twentieth century. As the territorial state has been increasingly weakened through various manifestations of globalization, he argued, the congruence between political and economic decision space and national identity space, which was a defining feature from the mid nineteenth century to the 1970s, has dwindled.

But did an age of territoriality of this sort ever exist? John Breuilly (London) opened the discussion by questioning this narrative. He suggested that we must distinguish between territoriality as 'organized coercive power' and other ideological and economic resources of power. Since the late eighteenth century, he conceded, there had in fact been a trend towards territorialization but, he said, this was countered by limits placed on territorial penetration and even a tendency towards de-territorialization. As an example, Breuilly named the nineteenth-century informal British empire, which had largely been based on a separation between economic and political coercive power. In China, for example, Britain had secured its commercial power, but had not been able to replace the existing system of rule.

Odd Arne Westad (London) and Partha Chatterjee (Calcutta/New York) also explored the complex relationship between territoriality, sovereignty, and statehood since the early modern period by taking the examples of China and India. Westad stressed that although China has demonstrated strong territorial continuity for two centuries, even today it is not a nation-state. In the tradition of the Chinese empire, it represents more of a 'nationality zoo', he suggested, which resists a Eurocentric approach in the context of the paradigm of the nation-state. In addition, the period 1989–90 did not represent a major turning point in China's development. More important, he thought, was China's transformation into an actor on the world markets since the 1970s, which has been instrumental for China's rise. Since then China has been emphasizing its sovereignty more strongly in international politics. As Chatterjee pointed out, in the case of India we could at best speak of 'flexible sovereignty' until well into the twentieth century. Although the Mughal period's heterogeneous system of rule with its overlapping sovereignties had gradually been replaced by the British system of administration, he said, in large parts of the subcontinent the colonial power did not exercise any sort of direct territorial rule. Similar forms of power can be found in many parts of the world today, he claimed.

One of the main points debated in the discussion was the significance of the territorial state as an actor in the international system after 1989. Jeffrey Engel (Dallas) remarked that at first sight, the nation-state has suffered no apparent loss of significance. There are more territorial states in the world today than ever before, he said, covering the entire land mass of the Earth: 'There is no nowhere anymore.' Even after 1989–90, territorial sovereignty represented the 'fundamental bedrock of peace and stability'. But the question of effective control of national territories is another matter. As Engel showed in relation to US foreign policy since the 1990s, violations of sovereignty, by armed and unarmed drones, for example, have been part of US practice in the war on terror. This, he went on, did not signify any abandonment of classic notions of sovereignty, but reflected the USA's view of itself as guarantor of the international and thus also territorial status quo. US administrations regularly claimed that the USA was acting as a regulatory power only in areas with a lack of state control. By itself legalizing its actions, the USA continued to emphasize its own national sovereignty as against the norms of international law.

The USA is a superpower that strictly defends its own sovereignty, and other states imitate it in this regard. As Chatterjee showed, India, taking its cue from its neighbour China, is trying to be a strong actor in security and economic policy. 'Deepening stateness', he said, is characteristic of India's interest in the recent past and in maintaining its sovereignty at a time of globalization. This applies in the area of migration, for example. Increasing attempts by the state to control migration flows point to more rather than less territoriality, and not only in India.

Similar developments were diagnosed for cyberspace. As Maier stressed, this is a new space, rather like the oceans at one time, that has appeared alongside state-based territoriality: 'what was once the oceanic realm has found a new avatar as cyberspace.' Referring to the current controversy about the actions of the state in digital space, Engel said that this argument is supported by the fact that unlike in the physical world, national borders hardly count in cyberspace, where a 'Wild West mentality' predominates. The discussion suggested that for various reasons, states are attempting to expand their access to cyberspace, in order gradually to 'territorialize' it (Peter Hoeres, Gießen/Mainz). The losers appear to be not nation-states per se, but their citizens, who are defenceless against this development.

Even if national borders provide no protection against drones and attacks in cyberspace, they harbour enough politically explosive power of their own. After the end of the Cold War, Europe in particular experienced numerous military disputes and violent territorial conflicts which, according to Kristina Spohr (London) speak against the decline of territoriality. At the same time, many of the states created after 1990 aspired to join the European Union (EU) because this step also consolidated their territorial claims. Thus they were prepared to give up part of their newly gained national sovereignty in favour of supranational institutions.

Finally, the question of alternatives to today's territorial state was posed by taking the EU as an example. Can solutions for the territorial and transterritorial problems of modern statehood be found in regional integration and federalism? Can the EU be understood as a global 'role model for systems of newly disaggregated sovereignty' (Rödder)? Former Federal Constitutional Court judge Udo di Fabio (Bonn) doubted whether the EU's political system would inevitably supersede the territorial state in Europe. Rather, he suggested, the EU

will remain a contractual community of sovereign territorial states until the European people adopt a European constitution. Until then, EU treaties are tied to the constitutions of member states and can be revoked by sovereign national states. Bill Davies (Washington) also underlined the political significance of the EU's member states. Taking the dynamic development of the EU's legal system as an example, he showed that the sometimes conflictual interplay between European institutions and member states has always shaped the European legal community. For the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, the Federal Constitutional Court provides a safe house by opposing the trend towards constitutionalizing the European Community without a real constitution. The Federal Constitutional Court's motive in this, di Fabio argued, is less to prop up the Federal Republic's national sovereignty than to ensure democratic standards.

As Jonathan White (London) showed, the relationship between the European Community and its member states is not the only defining dualism in the EU. Rather, he argued, the EU is a political system constituted by rules and discretion, and in the Euro crisis we can observe a shift in favour of executive-dominated exceptional action. But this is nothing really new, he went on. Discretion is 'inevitable in every rule-based system' and is related to the accumulation of rules. The larger the supranational rule book, the more space opens up for exceptions—'more rules, more discretion'. Taking the example of the fiscal pact, he argued further that 'executive discretion' autopoietically gives rise to 'rule setting' at European level.

In contrast, di Fabio pointed to the limits of discretionary integration. The present crisis of the EU, he said, urgently demands that we go 'back to the rules'. For democratic reasons, the solution cannot lie in transferring ever more political powers from the member states to supranational, independent agencies, thus removing them from democratic control. We are at a turning point, he suggested, at which the logic of functional integration has obviously run up against a barrier. Questions of democratic legitimacy can no longer be excluded. Instead, what is required is a community of 'open and integrated but sovereign states'. Following on from this, Rödder asked whether governance at European level inevitably leads to a loss of democratic control. This argument was not, in principle, contradicted in the course of the discussion. The relationship between territoriality and democracy was a recurring culmination point of the conference.

Andreas Gestrich (London) pointed out that not all territorial states in the world are democracies, and that the two issues should be analytically separated. Breuilly added, however, that in democratic states there is a close connection between participation, civil rights, and a national identity space that is difficult to dissolve. Against this background, it seems obvious that the future of democracy will be closely linked with the future of territoriality. Do we not also have to ask, as Vladislav Zubok noted, what the transformation of territoriality will mean for the territorial state's 'social contract' with its citizens?

In sum, participants in the discussion generally agreed that the trajectory of the territorial states after 1990 should not be seen as a decline. As Dominik Geppert (Bonn) pointed out in his conclusion, by comparison with earlier research opinion, this view represents a clear 'shift of emphasis' towards the persistence of the nation-state. According to Rödder, there is 'not too much decline'. This, in turn, reflects current political developments, Geppert pointed out. Ultimately, the growing international significance of large territorial states such as Brazil, India, and China means that the end of territorial statehood is receding far into the distance. Economically and politically, the most recent trends seem to be 'more deeply rooted in soil' (Geppert). Maier's contribution to the conference also pointed in a similar direction. Despite all present-day contrary developments, territoriality continues to be the dominant principle, and 'territories at all scales remain the stubborn testing points for power'.

THORSTEN HOLZHAUSER (University of Mainz)
ANDREAS LUTSCH (University of Mainz)

# NOTICEBOARD

**Scholarships Awarded by the GHIL**

Each year the GHIL awards a number of research scholarships to German postgraduate and postdoctoral students to enable them to carry out research in Britain, and to British postgraduates for research visits to Germany. The scholarships are generally awarded for a period of up to six months, depending on the requirements of the research project. British applicants will normally be expected to have completed one year's postgraduate research, and be studying German history or Anglo-German relations. Scholarships are advertised on H-Soz-u-Kult and the GHIL's website. Applications, which should include a CV, educational background, list of publications (where appropriate), and an outline of the project, together with a supervisor's reference confirming the relevance of the proposed archival research, should be addressed to the Administrative Director, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ. During their stay in Britain, German scholars present their projects and the initial results of their research at the GHIL Colloquium. In the second allocation for 2013 the following scholarships have been awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo-German relations.

*Beate Althammer* (Trier), Schuld—Recht—Gerechtigkeit: Begnadigungspraktiken in der Moderne
*Camilo Erlichman* (Edinburgh), Strategies of Rule: Cooperation, Collaboration, and Conflict in the British Zone of Germany 1945–49
*Nils Fehlhaber* (Hanover), Konfrontation und Interaktion: Staatsbesuche zwischen Nationalsozialismus und Faschismus 1931–44
*Ian Gaffney* (Cambridge), Strict Control of *Strichjungen*: Male Prostitution in the Third Reich, 1933–45
*Richard Hölzl* (Göttingen), Conversion—Civilization—Development: Catholic Missionaries between East Africa and Germany, 1880s–1940s

*Arne Hoffrichter* (Göttingen), Das Flüchtlingsdurchgangs- und Notaufnahmelager Uelzen-Bohldamm (1945–63): Schleuse und Wehr im Prozess von Vertreibung und DDR-Flucht
*Silke Körber* (Mainz), Deutschsprachige Verleger im Exil in Großbritannien/USA und ihr Einfluss auf die Entwicklung des populären illustrierten Sachbuchs im 20. Jahrhundert
*Matthias Kuhnert* (Munich), Engagement für die 'Dritte Welt': Die britischen Entwicklungs-NGOs War on Want und Christian Aid und ihre emotionalen Praktiken in der britischen Gesellschaft, 1965–90
*Dominic Merdes* (Brunswick), Die Produktion eines Pharmakons: Eine Kartographie der Kala-Azar und der Antimonialien
*Ben Pope* (Durham), Relations between Townspeople and the Rural Nobility in Late Medieval Germany, Focusing on the Case Study of Nuremberg
*Susanne Schregel* (Weimar), Intelligenz: Zur Sozial- und Politikgeschichte einer sozialen Unterscheidung. Deutschland und Großbritannien, 1880–1990
*Andreas Spreier* (Berlin), Der britische Staat und die politische Gewalt des Nordirlandkonflikts von 1969 bis 1981
*Anne Sudrow* (Potsdam), Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte des kollektiven Wirtschaftens in Westeuropa in den 1970er und 1980er Jahren
*Daniela Wagner* (Hamburg), Aussicht auf das Ende der Welt: Die Fünfzehn Zeichen vor dem Jüngsten Gericht
*Yorick Wirth* (Frankfurt am Main), *Common Law* und *Equity*: Gerichtsbarkeit in England und ihre Reform im 19. Jahrhundert

**Forthcoming Workshops and Conferences**

*Eleventh Workshop on Early Modern German History*. Organized by the German History Society in cooperation with the German Historical Institute London, to be held at the GHIL, 15 Nov. 2013. Conveners: Bridget Heal (University of St Andrews), David Lederer (National University of Ireland, Maynooth), and Angela Schattner (GHIL).

The first workshop ran in 2002 and this event has now established itself as the principal forum for cross-disciplinary discussion of new research on early modern German-speaking Central Europe. Previous themes have included artistic and literary representations, medicine and musicology, as well as political, social, economic, and religious history. Contributions are also welcome from those wishing to range outside the period generally considered as 'early modern' and those engaged in comparative research on other parts of early modern Europe. The day will be organized as a series of themed workshops, each introduced by a panel chair and consisting of two to three short papers followed by discussion. The point of the papers is to present new findings or work-in-progress in summary form, rather than extended detailed discussion. Accordingly, participants are encouraged to keep to 10–15 minutes, highlight major findings or questions, and indicate how work might develop in the future.

*Writing the Lives of the Poor.* Conference to be held at the GHIL, 28–30 Nov. 2013. Conveners: Andreas Gestrich (GHIL), Steven A. King (University of Leicester, Centre for Medical Humanities).

The historiography of the dependent or marginal poor has long drawn on a range of writings—surveys, newspaper reporting, government enquiries, and occasionally biographies collected by the middling sorts—*about* this group. Formalized petitions from (or more usually on behalf of) the powerless to the powerful, seeking alms, appealing for justice, or jostling for admission to various institutions, have also been an important mainstay of welfare studies. In the last fifteen years, however, it has become increasingly clear that the very poorest elements of European, Middle and Far Eastern society were rather more literate than has often been allowed. They wrote auto-

biographies, diaries, stories/fairy stories, or poems, some published but many more still in manuscript form. Above all it has become clear that the poor wrote as individuals or a collective to assert their claims to welfare. In some places their words were mediated by scribes, but it becomes increasingly clear that in others the 'pauper narrative' directly represents the word, thoughts, sentiments, and strategies of the poor themselves. Such documents—part of an expanding range of areas in which the poor of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries were called upon to construct or rehearse their 'story'—present a complex interplay of rhetoric, fact, claims-making, and lies/silences/embellishments. Sensitively used, however, they provide a unique window onto the experience of poverty and the nature of the welfare systems and power structures with which the poor engaged.

This conference, organized jointly between the German Historical Institute London and the University of Leicester Centre for Medical Humanities, will explore the question of how the poor between the seventeenth and twenty-first centuries sought to 'write' their lives. Focusing on particular groups (for instance, the sick poor), countries, or periods, the conference will be particularly interested in issues such as the use of rhetoric and embellishment, interpreting silence in narratives, the concept of honesty, outcomes, and the nature of power relationships within welfare systems.

*The Consumer on the Home Front: World War II Civilian Consumption in Comparative Perspective*. Conference to be held at the GHIL, 5–7 Dec. 2013. Conveners: Hartmut Berghoff (GHI Washington), Andreas Gestrich (GHI London), Nikolaus Katzer (GHI Moscow), Sergey Kudryashov (GHI Moscow), Jan Logemann (GHI Washington), Felix Römer (GHI London).

The home front of the Second World War is increasingly recognized by historians not only as a vital part of military strategies during a war that saw an unparalleled degree of civilian mobilization, but also as a catalyst for broader social developments during the twentieth century. Historians of the United States in particular have looked at the home front's role in spurring on the women's movement or the African–American civil rights struggle. The war, however, was also a

crucial test and catalyst for the emergence of mass consumer societies in the twentieth century. In Germany, for example, Nazi leaders were determined to avoid the civilian protests of the First World War. American political leaders similarly paid close attention to 'the consumer' during the war—this had become increasingly central to Keynesian economic approaches in the aftermath of the Great Depression. In the UK, Labour's post-war expansion and the setting up of the National Health Service were clearly linked to the war experience and the desire for a better life after the deprivation and suffering of war. This conference will look at the role of the consumer and civilian morale in the war efforts of Germany, Japan, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

*Intelligence in World History, c.1500–1918.* Conference to be held at the GHIL, 6–8 Feb. 2014. Conveners: Christopher Andrew (Cambridge), Andreas Gestrich (GHIL), Tobias Graf (Cambridge/Heidelberg), Dan Larsen (Cambridge), Sönke Neitzel (LSE).

For a long time, the history of intelligence has been a poor relation to the study of international relations. On the whole, historians have tended to pay relatively little attention to the kinds of information at the disposal of those who made decisions about war and peace, and even less to the methods by which such decision-makers acquired the intelligence that underpinned the decisions they took. Yet few would question that it did matter what decision-makers knew about the world which they reacted to, shaped, and attempted to control. This state of affairs has begun to change in recent years, not only in the context of twentieth-century intelligence, where a greater interest in intelligence services is being fuelled by the release of previously classified documents, but also in the period before 1900.

The proposed conference will bring together scholars working on intelligence in all corners of the world during what might be called the 'long' early modern period of intelligence services in an attempt to stimulate discussion among historians of a wide range of backgrounds. The organizers hope that such an exchange will shed light on currently ill-understood processes, such as the professionalization of intelligence services and their development into separate branches of increasingly bureaucratized state apparatuses, and stimulate fur-

ther discussion about the contribution which the study of intelligence provides to such meta-narratives as the emergence of modernity. The conference will encompass five thematic sessions: Intelligence and Diplomacy; Intelligence, Warfare, and the Military; Intelligence as Knowledge Production; Intelligence in Public Discourse; and Intelligence Cooperations.

*Making and Breaking the Rules: Discussion, Implementation, and Consequences of Dominican Legislation*. Conference to be held at the GHIL, 6–8 Mar. 2014. Convener: Cornelia Linde (GHIL).

Recent scholarship has started to address underexplored questions concerning the regulative and organizational structures of religious orders in the Middle Ages. Volumes have been dedicated, for instance, to the orders' economic thought and organization as well as to questions of obedience. While a large amount of research has been dedicated to the Franciscans, the Cistercians, and the Cluniacs, the Order of Preachers has been sidelined, despite the wealth of material that is available. This conference will focus exclusively on the Order of Preachers and seeks to examine attempts to introduce order in any area of Dominican life by means of rules and regulations. Among the questions this conference aims to explore are: what circumstances led to the introduction of new legislation and how was it enforced? What (possibly unexpected) results, in turn, did new legislation bring about? What intellectual discussions preceded or followed from these processes? Papers might also examine definitions of obedience, individual cases of disobedience, and the consequences of breaking the rules. This conference is interdisciplinary and open to scholars working in any field of medieval studies. Possible sources include legislative texts issued by the Order of Preachers, intellectual debates within and outside the Order, as well as regulations introduced by other institutions or secular and ecclesiastical rulers aimed specifically at the Dominicans.

# LIBRARY NEWS

**Recent Acquisitions**

Abelshauser, Werner, David A. Gilgen, and Andreas Leutzsch (eds.), *Kulturen der Weltwirtschaft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012)

*Akten deutscher Bischöfe seit 1945: Westliche Besatzungszonen und Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, vol. i: *1945–1947*, 2 pts., ed. Ulrich Helbach,Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe A: Quellen, 54 (Paderborn : Schöningh, 2012); vol. iv: *1956–1960*, ed. Heinz Hürten, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe A: Quellen, 57 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2012)

Aly, Götz (ed.), *Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933–1945*, vol. v: *West- und Nordeuropa, 1940–Juni 1942*, ed. Katja Happe et al. (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Amelina, Anna, Devrimsel D. Nergiz, et al. (eds.), *Beyond Methodological Nationalism: Research Methodologies for Cross-Border Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2012)

Apró, Erzsébet and Agnes Tóth (eds.), *Archivführer zur ungarndeutschen Geschichte in den Komitatsarchiven Ungarns 1670–1950*, Schriften des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, 44 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Arndt, Johannes, *Herrschaftskontrolle durch Öffentlichkeit: Die publizistische Darstellung politischer Konflikte im Heiligen Römischen Reich 1648–1750*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, 224 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013)

Aschmann, Birgit, *Preußens Ruhm und Deutschlands Ehre: Zum nationalen Ehrdiskurs im Vorfeld der preußisch-französischen Kriege des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, 72 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Ashton, Rosemary, *Victorian Bloomsbury* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012)

Augusteijn, Joost and Eric Storm (eds.), *Region and State in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Nation-Building, Regional Identities and Separatism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Bach, Maurizio (ed.), *Der entmachtete Leviathan: Löst sich der souveräne Staat auf?* Zeitschrift für Politik, Sonderband 5 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013)

Bachrach, David S., *Warfare in Tenth-Century Germany*, Warfare in History (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012)

Bankier, David, Dan Michman, et al. (eds.), *Pius XII and the Holocaust: Current State of Research* (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 2012)

Bartels, Christoph and Rainer Slotta (eds.), *Der alteuropäische Bergbau: Von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Geschichte des deutschen Bergbaus, 1 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2012)

Bauerkämper, Arnd, *Das umstrittene Gedächtnis: Die Erinnerung an Nationalsozialismus, Faschismus und Krieg in Europa seit 1945* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2012)

Becker, Julian, *Das britische 'Board of Longitude' 1714–1828*, Schriften zur Ideen- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 9 (Hamburg: Kovac, 2013)

Becker, Rainald, *Nordamerika aus süddeutscher Perspektive: Die Neue Welt in der gelehrten Kommunikation des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Transatlantische Historische Studien, 47 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2012)

Beierl, Florian M., *Carl von Linde: Erfinder, Unternehmer und Tourismuspionier am Obersalzberg* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2012)

Bennett, George Henry, *The Nazi, the Painter and the Forgotten Story of the SS Road* (London: Reaktion Books, 2012)

Berg, Maxine (ed.), *Writing the History of the Global: Challenges for the Twenty-First Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Beyer, Katrin, *Witz und Ironie in der politischen Kultur Englands im Hochmittelalter: Interaktionen und Imaginationen*, Religion und Politik, 2 (Würzburg: Ergon, 2012)

Biskup, Thomas, *Friedrichs Größe: Inszenierungen des Preußenkönigs in Fest und Zeremoniell 1740–1815* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2012)

Böhme, Gernot, *Geschichte im Querblick: Die Weimarer Republik in der Perspektive eines Zeitgenossen* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2012)

Bösch, Frank and Jürgen Danyel (eds.), *Zeitgeschichte: Konzepte und Methoden* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012)

Borgolte, Michael, Julia Dücker, et al. (eds.), *Europa im Geflecht der Welt: Mittelalterliche Migrationen in globalen Bezügen*, Europa im Mittelalter, 20 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012)

Borgolte, Michael, *Stiftung und Memoria*, ed. Tillmann Lohse, Stiftungsgeschichten, 10 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012)

Brandes, Detlef, *'Umvolkung, Umsiedlung, rassische Bestandsaufnahme': NS-'Volkstumspolitik' in den böhmischen Ländern*, Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, 125 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Brandstetter, Marc, *Die NPD unter Udo Voigt: Organisation, Ideologie, Strategie*, Extremismus und Demokratie, 25 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013)

Brandt, Willy, *Der Briefwechsel: Willy Brandt und Günter Grass*, ed. Martin Kölbel (Göttingen: Steidl, 2013)

Braun, Bernd, *Die Reichskanzler der Weimarer Republik: Von Scheidemann bis Schleicher*, Mensch, Zeit, Geschichte (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013)

Braun, Bettina, *Princeps et episcopus: Studien zur Funktion und zum Selbstverständnis der nordwestdeutschen Fürstbischöfe nach dem Westfälischen Frieden*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, 230 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013)

Brenner, Michael and Maximilian Strnad (eds.), *Der Holocaust in der deutschsprachigen Geschichtswissenschaft: Bilanz und Perspektiven*, Dachauer Symposien zur Zeitgeschichte, 12 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012)

Broers, Michael, Peter Hicks, et al. (eds.), *The Napoleonic Empire and the New European Political Culture*, War, Culture and Society, 1750–1850 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Bruch, Rüdiger vom (ed.), *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012)

Burckhardt, Jacob, *Das Zeitalter Friedrichs des Großen*, ed. Ernst Ziegler, with an essay by Hans Pleschinski (Munich: Beck, 2012)

Butzer, Günter and Joachim Jacob (eds.), *Metzler Lexikon literarischer Symbole* (2nd expanded edn. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2012)

Carius, Hendrikje, *Recht durch Eigentum: Frauen vor dem Jenaer Hofgericht (1648–1806)*, Bibliothek Altes Reich, 12 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Cerman, Markus, *Villagers and Lords in Eastern Europe, 1300–1800*, Studies in European History (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Clarke, David and Axel Goodbody (eds.), *The Self in Transition: East German Autobiographical Writing Before and After Unification. Essays in Honour of Dennis Tate*, German Monitor, 75 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2012)

Clavin, Patricia, *Securing the World Economy: The Reinvention of the League of Nations, 1920–1946* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Cocks, Geoffrey Campbell, *The State of Health: Illness in Nazi Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Cohen, Gerard Daniel, *In War's Wake: Europe's Displaced Persons in the Postwar Order*, Oxford Studies in International History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Cohen, Richard I. (ed.), *Visualizing and Exhibiting Jewish Space and History*, Studies in Contemporary Jewry, 26 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Confino, Alon, *Foundational Pasts: The Holocaust as Historical Understanding* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Conze, Eckart, Wencke Meteling, et al. (eds.), *Aristokratismus und Moderne: Adel als politisches und kulturelles Konzept, 1890–1945*, Adelswelten, 1 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2013)

Czerniaków, Adam, *Das Tagebuch des Adam Czerniaków: Im Warschauer Getto 1939–1942*, trans. Silke Lent (Munich: Beck, 2013)

Danley, Mark H. and Patrick J. Speelman (eds.), *The Seven Years' War: Global Views*, History of Warfare, 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2012)

*Datenhandbuch zur deutschen Bildungsgeschichte*, vol. xi: *Die Lehrer an den Schulen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949–2009* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013)

Davis, Christian S., *Colonialism, Antisemitism, and Germans of Jewish Descent in Imperial Germany*, Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012)

Decker, Christian, *Vom Höfling zum städtischen Handwerker: Soziale Beziehungen hugenottischer Eliten und 'gemeiner' Kolonisten in Preußen 1740 bis 1813*, Promt, 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2012)

Dejung, Christof, *Die Fäden des globalen Marktes: Eine Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte des Welthandels am Beispiel der Handelsfirma Gebrüder Volkart 1851–1999*, Industrielle Welt, 85 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2013)

Demshuk, Andrew, *The Lost German East: Forced Migration and the Politics of Memory, 1945–1970* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Dierl, Florian, Zoran Janjetovic, and Karsten Linne, *Pflicht, Zwang und Gewalt: Arbeitsverwaltungen und Arbeitskräftepolitik im deutsch besetzten Polen und Serbien 1939–1944* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2013)

Dingel, Irene (ed.), *Controversia et Confessio*, vol. ii: *Der Adiaphoristische Streit (1548–1560)*, ed. Jan Martin Lies and Hans-Otto Schneider; vol. ix: *Antitrinitarische Streitigkeiten: Die tritheistische Phase (1560–1568)*, ed. Kestutis Daugirdas, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012, 2013)

Dixon, C. Scott, *Contesting the Reformation*, Contesting the Past (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012)

*Dokumente der Einsatzgruppen in der Sowjetunion*, vol. ii: *Deutsche Besatzungsherrschaft in der UdSSR 1941–1945*, ed. Andrej Angrick, Veröffentlichungen der Forschungsstelle Ludwigsburg der Universität Stuttgart, 23 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2013)

Dowe, Dieter, Peter Hengstenberg, et al. (eds.), *Günter Grunwald und die Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung* (Bonn: Dietz, 2012)

Duisberg, Carl, *Carl Duisberg (1861–1935): Briefe eines Industriellen*, ed. Kordula Kühlem, Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, 68 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Eben von Racknitz, Ines, *Die Plünderung des Yuanming yuan: Imperiale Beutenahme im britisch-französischen Chinafeldzug von 1860* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2012)

Ebke, Almuth, *'The Party is Over'? Britische Wirtschaftspolitik und das Narrativ des 'Decline', 1970–1976*, Moderne Geschichte und Politik, 24 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2012)

Eckel, Jan and Samuel Moyn (eds.), *Moral für die Welt? Menschenrechtspolitik in den 1970er Jahren*, Schriftenreihe der FRIAS School of History, 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012)

Ehrenpreis, Stefan, Andreas Gotzmann, et al. (eds.), *Kaiser und Reich in der jüdischen Lokalgeschichte*, Bibliothek Altes Reich, 7 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Etzemüller, Thomas, *Biographien: Lesen, erforschen, erzählen*, Historische Einführungen, 12 (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2012)

Falter, Jürgen W., *Zur Soziographie des Nationalsozialismus: Studien zu den Wählern und Mitgliedern der NSDAP*, Historical Social Research, Supplement 25 (Cologne: Zentrum für Historische Sozialforschung, 2013)

Faulenbach, Bernd, *Geschichte der SPD: Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: Beck, 2012)

Felten, Franz Josef, Harald Müller, et al. (eds.), *Landschaft(en): Begriffe, Formen, Implikationen*, Geschichtliche Landeskunde, 68 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2012)

Fischer, Andreas, *Karl Martell: Der Beginn karolingischer Herrschaft* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012)

Föllmer, Moritz, *Individuality and Modernity in Berlin: Self and Society from Weimar to the Wall*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Foray, Jennifer L., *Visions of Empire in the Nazi-Occupied Netherlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Merten, Ulrich, *Forgotten Voices: The Expulsion of the Germans from Eastern Europe after World War II* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2012)

Foschepoth, Josef, *Überwachtes Deutschland: Post- und Telefonüberwachung in der alten Bundesrepublik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013)

Fournier, Marcel, *Émile Durkheim: A Biography*, trans. David Macey (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013)

Freedman, Jeffrey, *Books Without Borders in Enlightenment Europe: French Cosmopolitanism and German Literary Markets* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012)

Friedrich II. der Grosse König von Preussen, *Friedrich der Große: Potsdamer Ausgabe*, vol. vii: *Werke des Philosophen von Sanssouci: Oden, Episteln, Die Kriegskunst*, ed. Jürgen Overhoff (Berlin: Akdademie Verlag, 2012)

Gess, Felician (ed.), *Akten und Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen*, vol. iv: *1535–1539*, ed. Heiko Jadatz und Christian Winter (Cologne: Böhlau, 2012)

Giersch, Paula, Florian Krobb, et al. (eds.), *Galizien im Diskurs: Inklusion, Exklusion, Repräsentation*, Inklusion, Exklusion, 17 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2012)

Göse, Frank, *Friedrich I. (1657–1713): Ein König in Preußen* (Regensburg: Pustet, 2012)

Gorman, Daniel, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Goschler, Constantin (ed.), *Die Entschädigung von NS-Zwangsarbeit am Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012)

Grass, Günter, *From Germany to Germany: Diary 1990*, trans. Krishna Winston (London: Harvill Secker, 2012)

Gründler, Jens, *Armut und Wahnsinn: 'Arme Irre' und ihre Familien im Spannungsfeld von Psychiatrie und Armenfürsorge in Glasgow, 1875–1921*, Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts London, 72 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Grunwald, Henning, *Courtroom to Revolutionary Stage: Performance and Ideology in Weimar Political Trials* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Guinnane, Timothy W. et al. (eds.), *Die Geschichte der DZ Bank: Das genossenschaftliche Zentralbankwesen vom 19. Jahrhundert bis heute* (Munich: Beck, 2013)

Haak, Sebastian, *The Making of The Good War: Hollywood, das Pentagon und die amerikanische Deutung des Zweiten Weltkriegs 1945–1962*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 76 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2013)

Hagelstein, Karl-Otto, *Eine an sich mittelmäßige Frage: Der deutsch-dänische Konflikt 1864* (Frankfurt am Main : Lang, 2012)

Hahn, Hans-Werner and Marko Kreutzmann (eds.), *Der deutsche Zollverein: Ökonomie und Nation im 19. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2012)

Hahn, Peter-Michael, *Friedrich II. von Preußen: Feldherr, Autokrat und Selbstdarsteller* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013)

Hammerstein, Notker, *Die Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main*, vol. ii: *Nachkriegszeit und Bundesrepublik: 1945–1972* (Neuwied: Metzner, 2012)

Hanisch, Anja, *Die DDR im KSZE-Prozess 1972–1985: Zwischen Ostabhängigkeit, Westabgrenzung und Ausreisebewegung*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 91 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Hanshew, Karrin, *Terror and Democracy in West Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Harries, Patrick and David Maxwell (eds.), *The Spiritual in the Secular: Missionaries and Knowledge about Africa*, Studies in the History of Christian Missions (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2012)

Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard, *Gewalt und Politik im Europa des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Das Politische als Kommunikation, 2 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012)

Heckmann, Dieter with Krzysztof Kwiatkowski (eds.), *Das Elbinger Kriegsbuch (1383–1409): Rechnungen für städtische Aufgebote*, Veröffentlichungen aus den Archiven Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 68 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2013)

Heinz, Alexander, *'Oh German! I thought there was something wrong with you': West Germany in British Perceptions, 1969–1975*, Beiträge zur England-Forschung, 68 (Augsburg: Wißner, 2013)

Hellbeck, Jochen, *Die Stalingrad-Protokolle: Sowjetische Augenzeugen berichten aus der Schlacht* (2nd edn. Frankfurt am Main : Fischer, 2013)

Herold, Heiko, *Reichsgewalt bedeutet Seegewalt: Die Kreuzergeschwader der Kaiserlichen Marine als Instrument der deutschen Kolonial- und Weltpolitik 1885–1901*, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, 74 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Herzog, Markwart, *'Blitzkrieg' im Fußballstadion: Der Spielsystemstreit zwischen dem NS-Sportfunktionär Karl Oberhuber und Reichstrainer Sepp Herberger*, Irseer Dialoge, 16 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012)

Heydenreuter, Reinhard, *Finanzkontrolle in Bayern unterm Hakenkreuz 1933–1945: Der Bayerische Oberste Rechnungshof und die Außenstelle München des Rechnungshofs des Deutschen Reiches* (Munich: Bayerischer Oberster Rechnungshof, 2012)

Hikel, Christine, *Sophies Schwester: Inge Scholl und die Weiße Rose*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 94 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Hikel, Christine and Sylvia Schraut (eds.), *Terrorismus und Geschlecht: Politische Gewalt in Europa seit dem 19. Jahrhundert*, Geschichte und Geschlechter, 61 (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2012)

Hilber, Marina, *Institutionalisierte Geburt: Eine Mikrogeschichte des Gebärhauses*, Histoire, 33 (Bielefeld: transcript, 2012)

Hilton, Matthew and Rana Mitter (eds.), *Transnationalism and Contemporary Global History*, Past and Present Supplements, New Series 8 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Hipfinger, Anita, Josef Löffler, et al. (eds.), *Ordnung durch Tinte und Feder? Genese und Wirkung von Instruktionen im zeitlichen Längsschnitt vom Mittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 60 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2012)

Hirsch, Marianne, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*, Gender and Culture (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012)

Hirscher, Gerhard and Eckhard Jesse (eds.), *Extremismus in Deutschland: Schwerpunkte, Vergleiche, Perspektiven*, Extremismus und Demokratie, 26 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013)

Hirschfeld, Michael, *Die Bischofswahlen im Deutschen Reich 1887 bis 1914: Ein Konfliktfeld zwischen Staat und katholischer Kirche vom Ende des Kulturkampfes bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2012)

Hünermann, Peter (ed.), *Die Dokumente des zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils: Konstitutionen, Dekrete, Erklärungen. Lateinisch-deutsche Studienausgabe* (3rd edn. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2012)

Hyden-Hanscho, Veronika, *Reisende, Migranten, Kulturmanager: Mittlerpersönlichkeiten zwischen Frankreich und dem Wiener Hof 1630–1730*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 221 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013)

Impekoven, Holger, *Die Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung und das Ausländerstudium in Deutschland 1925–1945: Von der 'geräuschlosen Propaganda' zur Ausbildung der 'geistigen Wehr' des 'Neuen Europa'*, Internationale Beziehungen: Theorie und Geschichte, 9 (Göttingen: V & R Unipress, 2013)

Isenmann, Eberhard, *Die deutsche Stadt im Mittelalter 1150–1550: Stadtgestalt, Recht, Verfassung, Stadtregiment, Kirche, Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2012)

James, Harold, *Making the European Monetary Union: The Role of the Committee of Central Bank Governors and the Origins of the European Central Bank*, foreword by Mario Draghi and Jaime Caruana (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2012)

Jessen, Ralph and Lydia Langer (eds.), *Transformations of Retailing in Europe after 1945* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)

Jindra, Zdenek, *Der Bahnbrecher des Stahl- und Eisenbahnzeitalters: Die Firma Fried. Krupp/Essen von der Gründung der Gussstahlfabrik bis zur Entwicklung zum 'Nationalwerk' und weltbekannten Kanonenlieferanten (1811 bis Anfang der 90er Jahre des 19. Jahrhunderts),* Beiträge zur Unternehmensgeschichte, 31 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013)

Kästner, Alexander, *Tödliche Geschichte(n): Selbsttötungen in Kursachsen im Spannungsfeld von Normen und Praktiken (1547–1815),* Konflikte und Kultur, 24 (Constance: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 2012)

Keightley, Emily and Michael Pickering, *The Mnemonic Imagination: Remembering as Creative Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Kennedy, Paul Michael, *Engineers of Victory: The Problem Solvers Who Turned the Tide in the Second World War* (London: Allen Lane, 2013)

Klueting, Harm (ed.), *Das Herzogtum Westfalen*, vol. ii: *Das ehemalige kurkölnische Herzogtum Westfalen im Bereich der heutigen Kreise Hochsauerland, Olpe, Soest und Märkischer Kreis (19. und 20. Jahrhundert)*, 2 pts. (Münster: Aschendorff, 2012)

Kochanski, Halik, *The Eagle Unbowed: Poland and the Poles in the Second World War* (London: Allen Lane, 2012)

Körntgen, Ludger and Dominik Waßenhoven (eds.), *Religion und Politik im Mittelalter: Deutschland und England im Vergleich*, Prinz-Albert-Studien, 29 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013)

Kreutzmüller, Christoph, *Ausverkauf: Die Vernichtung der jüdischen Gewerbetätigkeit in Berlin 1930–1945* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2012)

Kühn, Adriaan, *Kampf um die Vergangenheit als Kampf um die Gegenwart: Die Wiederkehr der 'zwei Spanien'*, Extremismus und Demokratie, 24 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2012)

Kühschelm, Oliver, Franz X. Eder, et al. (eds.), *Konsum und Nation: Zur Geschichte nationalisierender Inszenierungen in der Produktkommunikation*, Histoire, 31 (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2012)

Kunkel, Sönke and Christoph Meyer (eds.), *Aufbruch ins postkoloniale Zeitalter: Globalisierung und die außereuropäische Welt in den 1920er und 1930er Jahren*, Globalgeschichte, 12 (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2012)

Kuß, Susanne, *Deutsches Militär auf kolonialen Kriegsschauplätzen: Eskalation von Gewalt zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Studien zur Kolonialgeschichte, 3 (3rd edn. Berlin: Links, 2012)

Lahme, Jörg, *William Drennan und der Kampf um die irische Unabhängigkeit: Eine politische Biographie (1754–1820)* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012)

Landwehr, Achim (ed.), *Frühe Neue Zeiten: Zeitwissen zwischen Reformation und Revolution*, Mainzer Historische Kulturwissenschaften, 11 (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2012)

Large, David Clay, *Munich 1972: Tragedy, Terror, and Triumph at the Olympic Games* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012)

Leicht, Johannes, *Heinrich Claß 1868–1953: Die politische Biographie eines Alldeutschen* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2012)

Lenger, Friedrich, *European Cities in the Modern Era: 1850–1914*, trans. Joel Golb, Studies in Central European Histories, 57 (Leiden: Brill, 2012)

Liesenberg, Carsten and Harry Stein (eds.), *Deportation und Vernichtung der Thüringer Juden 1942*, Quellen zur Geschichte Thüringens, 39 (Erfurt: Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 2012)

Linde, Cornelia, *How to Correct the Sacra Scriptura? Textual Criticism of the Latin Bible between the Twelfth and Fifteenth Century*, Medium Aevum Monographs, 29 (Oxford: Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 2012)

Lorenz, Einhart, *Willy Brandt: Deutscher, Europäer, Weltbürger* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012)

Manias, Chris, *Race, Science, and the Nation: Reconstructing the Ancient Past in Britain, France and Germany* (New York: Routledge, 2013)

Markner, Reinhard (ed.), *Die Korrespondenz des Illuminatenordens*, vol. ii: *Januar 1782–Juni 1783* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2013)

Maul, Daniel R., *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization: The International Labour Organization, 1940–70* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

McEwan, Dorothea, *Fritz Saxl: Eine Biografie. Aby Warburgs Bibliothekar und erster Direktor des Londoner Warburg Institutes* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2012)

Mecking, Sabine, *Bürgerwille und Gebietsreform: Demokratieentwicklung und Neuordnung von Staat und Gesellschaft in Nordrhein-Westfalen 1965–2000*, Studien zur Zeitgeschichte, 85 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Meinecke, Friedrich, *Werke*, vol. x: *Neue Briefe und Dokumente*, ed. Gisela Bock and Gerhard A. Ritter (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Meyer, Carla, Katja Patzel-Mattern, and Gerrit Jasper Schenk (eds.), *Krisengeschichte(n): 'Krise' als Leitbegriff und Erzählmuster in kulturwissenschaftlicher Perspektive*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 210 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013)

Milert, Werner and Rudolf Tschirbs, *Die andere Demokratie: Betriebliche Interessenvertretung in Deutschland, 1848 bis 2008*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für soziale Bewegungen. Schriftenreihe A: Darstellungen, 52 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2012)

Moddelmog, Claudia, *Königliche Stiftungen des Mittelalters im historischen Wandel: Quedlinburg und Speyer, Königsfelden, Wiener Neustadt und Andernach*, Stiftungsgeschichten, 8 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012)

Mommsen, Theodor, *Theodor Mommsen und Friedrich Althoff: Briefwechsel 1882–1903*, ed. Stefan Rebenich and Gisa Franke, Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, 67 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Mossman, Stephen, Nigel F. Palmer, and Felix Heinzer (eds.), *Schreiben und Lesen in der Stadt: Literaturbetrieb im spätmittelalterlichen Straßburg*, Kulturtopographie des alemannischen Raums, 4 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012)

Müller, Heribert (ed.), *Das Ende des konziliaren Zeitalters (1440–1450): Versuch einer Bilanz*, Schriften des Historischen Kollegs. Kolloquien, 86 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Müller, Rolf-Dieter, *The Unknown Eastern Front: The Wehrmacht and Hitler's Foreign Soldiers*, trans. David Burnett (London: I. B. Tauris, 2012)

Müller-Hill, Werner Otto, *'Man hat es kommen sehen und ist doch erschüttert': Das Kriegstagebuch eines deutschen Heeresrichters 1944/45* (Munich: Siedler, 2012)

Murr, Karl Borromäus and Stephan Resch (eds.), *Lassalles 'südliche Avantgarde': Protokollbuch des Allgemeinen Deutschen Arbeitervereins der Gemeinde Augsburg (1864–1867)*, Archiv für Sozialgeschichte, Beiheft 28 (Bonn: Dietz, 2012)

Ness, Immanuel (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration*, 5 vols. (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013)

Niedhart, Gottfried, *Die Aussenpolitik der Weimarer Republik*, Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, 53 (3rd edn. Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Niethammer, Lutz, *Memory and History: Essays in Contemporary History*, Geschichte, Erinnerung, Politik, 4 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2012)

Nitzsche, Susan, *Wertewandel und politische Parteien in der Republik Irland*, Beiträge zur England-Forschung, 67 (Augsburg: Wißner-Verlag, 2012)

Nüßlein, Timo, *Paul Ludwig Troost (1878–1934)*, Hitlers Architekten, 1 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2012)

Oestmann, Peter, *Geistliche und weltliche Gerichte im Alten Reich: Zuständigkeitsstreitigkeiten und Instanzenzüge*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Höchsten Gerichtsbarkeit im Alten Reich, 61 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2012)

Oltmer, Jochen, *Globale Migration: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Munich: Beck, 2012)

Paravicini, Werner, Torsten Hiltmann, and Frank Viltart (eds.), *La cour de Bourgogne et l'Europe: Le rayonnement et les limites d'un modèle culturel. Actes du colloque international tenu à Paris les 9, 10 et 11 octobre 2007*, Francia, Beiheft 73 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2013)

Peter, Matthias and Hermann Wentker (eds.), *Die KSZE im Ost-West-Konflikt: Internationale Politik und gesellschaftliche Transformation 1975–1990*, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte. Sondernummer (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Geheimreport Deutsches Design: Deutsche Konsumgüter im Visier des britischen Council of Industrial Design (1946)*, ed. Anne Sudrow, Abhandlungen und Berichte, Deutsches Museum, New Series 28 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012)

Pirker, Peter, *Subversion deutscher Herrschaft: Der britische Kriegsgeheimdienst SOE und Österreich*, Zeitgeschichte im Kontext, 6 (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2012)

Plumpe, Werner and Joachim Scholtyseck (eds.), *Der Staat und die Ordnung der Wirtschaft: Vom Kaiserreich bis zur Berliner Republik*, Wissenschaftliche Reihe, Stiftung Bundespräsident-Theodor-Heuss-Haus, 11 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2012)

Potter, Matthew C., *The Inspirational Genius of Germany: British Art and Germanism, 1850–1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012)

Prinz, Michael, *Der Sozialstaat hinter dem Haus: Wirtschaftliche Zukunftserwartungen, Selbstversorgung und regionale Vorbilder. Westfalen und Südwestdeutschland 1920–1960*, Forschungen zur Regionalgeschichte, 69 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2012)

Pritchard, Gareth, *Niemandsland: A History of Unoccupied Germany, 1944–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Raaijmakers, Janneke, *The Making of the Monastic Community of Fulda, c.744–c.900*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Series 4/83 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Railton, Nicholas M., *Pietismus und Revolution: Der badische Pfarrer Jakob Theodor Plitt (1815–1886) und seine Beziehung nach England*, ed. Gerhard Schwinge, Sonderveröffentlichungen des Vereins für Kirchengeschichte in der Evangelischen Landeskirche in Baden, 8 (Heidelberg: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2012)

Reich, Björn, Frank Rexroth, and Matthias Roick (eds.), *Wissen, maßgeschneidert: Experten und Expertenkulturen im Europa der Vormoderne*, Historische Zeitschrift, Beiheft. New Series, 57 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Reinert, Oliver, *An Awkward Issue: Das Thema Europa in den Wahlkämpfen und wahlpolitischen Planungen der britischen Parteien, 1959–1974*, Studien zur Geschichte der Europäischen Integration, 16 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2012)

Reinholdt, Katharina, *Ein Leib in Christo werden: Ehe und Sexualität im Täufertum der Frühen Neuzeit*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, 227 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012)

Richert, Dominik, *The Kaiser's Reluctant Conscript: My Experiences in the War 1914–1918*, trans. David Carrick Sutherland (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2012)

Rieger, Bernhard, *The People's Car: A Global History of the Volkswagen Beetle* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013)

Roper, Lyndal, *Der feiste Doktor: Luther, sein Körper und seine Biographen*, trans. Karin Wördemann, Historische Geisteswissenschaften, 3 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012)

Rusconi, Gian Enrico, *Cavour und Bismarck: Zwei Staatsmänner im Spannungsfeld von Liberalismus und Cäsarismus*, trans. Friederike Hausmann (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Sachsse, Christoph, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland*, vol. iv: *Fürsorge und Wohlfahrtspflege in der Nachkriegszeit 1945–1953* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012)

Schillinger, Jean (ed.), *Louis XIV et le Grand Siècle dans la culture allemande après 1715* (Nancy: Presses University de Nancy, 2012)

Schlumbohm, Jürgen, *Lebendige Phantome: Ein Entbindungshospital und seine Patientinnen, 1751–1830* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012)

Schmitt, Eberhard, *Die Balance der Welt 1: Eine erläuternde Zeittafel zur Globalgeschichte bis zum Jahr 1600*, Dokumente zur Geschichte der europäischen Expansion, 9 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012)

Schmolinsky, Sabine, *Sich schreiben in der Welt des Mittelalters: Begriffe und Konturen einer mediävistischen Selbstzeugnisforschung*, Selbstzeugnisse des Mittelalters und der beginnenden Neuzeit, 4 (Bochum: Winkler, 2012)

Schmotz, Theresa, *Die Leipziger Professorenfamilien im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert: Eine Studie über Herkunft, Vernetzung und Alltagsleben*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sächsischen Geschichte, 35 (Stuttgart: Steiner in Kommission, 2012)

Schönhoven, Klaus and Walter Mühlhausen (eds.), *Der deutsche Sozialstaat im 20. Jahrhundert: Weimarer Republik, DDR und Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Vergleich*, Schriftenreihe der Stiftung Reichspräsident-Friedrich-Ebert-Gedenkstätte, 15 (Bonn: Dietz, 2012)

Scholz, Peter and Johannes Süßmann (eds.), *Adelsbilder von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Historische Zeitschrift, Beiheft. New Series, 58 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Schulz, Andreas and Dieter Zinke, *Die Generale der Waffen-SS und der Polizei*, vol. vi: *Ullmann–Zottmann*, Deutschlands Generale und Admirale, pt. 5, 6 (Bissendorf: Biblio Verlag, 2012)

Schwartz, Michael, *Ethnische 'Säuberungen' in der Moderne: Globale Wechselwirkungen nationalistischer und rassistischer Gewaltpolitik im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 95 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

Scott, Tom, *The City–State in Europe, 1000–1600: Hinterland, Territory, Region* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Seigel, Jerrold E., *Modernity and Bourgeois Life: Society, Politics, and Culture in England, France and Germany since 1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Senge, Konstanze and Rainer Schützeichel (eds.), *Hauptwerke der Emotionssoziologie* (Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2013)

Siemens, Daniel, *The Making of a Nazi Hero: The Murder and the Myth of Horst Wessel*, trans. David Burnett (London: I. B. Tauris, 2013)

Slobodian, Quinn, *Foreign Front: Third World Politics in Sixties West Germany* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2012)

Sösemann, Bernd (ed.), *Friedrich der Große in Europa: Gefeiert und umstritten* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2012)

Stewart, Jules, *Albert: A Life* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2012)

Stöver, Bernd, *Kleine Geschichte Berlins* (Munich: Beck, 2012)

Stoiber, Edmund, *Weil die Welt sich ändert: Politik aus Leidenschaft. Erfahrungen und Perspektiven* (Munich: Siedler, 2012)

Stone, Dan (ed.), *The Holocaust and Historical Methodology*, Making Sense of History, 16 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012)

Szejnmann, Claus-Christian W. and Maiken Umbach (eds.), *Heimat, Region, and Empire: Spatial Identities under National Socialism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Viel, Bernhard, *Egon Friedell: Der geniale Dilettant* (Munich: Beck, 2013)

Weinhauer, Klaus and Jörg Requate (eds.), *Gewalt ohne Ausweg? Terrorismus als Kommunikationsprozess in Europa seit dem 19. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2012)

Weinrich, Arndt, *Der Weltkrieg als Erzieher: Jugend zwischen Weimarer Republik und Nationalsozialismus*, Schriften der Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte, New Series 27 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2013)

Wolf, Gerhard, *Ideologie und Herrschaftsrationalität: Nationalsozialistische Germanisierungspolitik in Polen*, Studien zur Gewaltgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2012)

Wolf, Hubert (ed.), *Eugenio Pacelli als Nuntius in Deutschland: Forschungsperspektiven und Ansätze zu einem internationalen Vergleich*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 121 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2012)

Ziemann, Benjamin, *Contested Commemorations: Republican War Veterans and Weimar Political Culture*, Studies in the Social and Cultural History of Modern Warfare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vol. 10: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds.), *Sozialprotest, Gewalt, Terror: Gewaltanwendung durch politische 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 Klüngel: 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)

Vol. 68: Christiane Reinecke, *Grenzen der Freizügigkeit: Migrationskontrolle in Großbritannien und Deutschland, 1880–1930* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010)

Vol. 69: Andreas Pečar, *Macht der Schrift: Politischer Biblizismus in Schottland zwischen Reformation und Bürgerkrieg (1534–1642)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)

Vol. 70: Andreas Rose, *Zwischen Empire und Kontinent: Britische Außenpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)

Vol. 71: Bernhard Dietz, *Neo-Tories: Britische Konservative im Aufstand gegen Demokratie und politische Moderne (1929–1939)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)

Vol. 72: Jens Gründler, *Armut und Wahnsinn: 'Arme Irren' und ihre Familien im Spannungsfeld von Psychiatrie und Armenfürsorge in Glasgow, 1875–1921* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013)

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

Eckhart Hellmuth (ed.), *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Centur*y (Oxford, 1990)

Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (eds.), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c.1450–1650* (Oxford, 1991)

Rolf Ahmann, Adolf M. Birke, and Michael Howard (eds.), *The Quest for Stability: Problems of West European Security 1918–1957* (Oxford, 1993)

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

John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth (eds.), *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford, 1999)

Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.), *British and German Historiography 1750–1950: Traditions, Perceptions, and Transfers* (Oxford, 2000)

Willibald Steinmetz (ed.), *Private Law and Social Inequality in the Industrial Age: Comparing Legal Cultures in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States* (Oxford, 2000)

Martin H. Geyer and Johannes Paulmann (eds.), *The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Society, and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War* (Oxford, 2001)

Jeremy Noakes, Peter Wende, and Jonathan Wright (eds.), *Britain and Germany in Europe 1949–1990* (Oxford, 2002)

Benedikt Stuchtey and Eckhardt Fuchs (eds.), *Writing World History 1800–2000* (Oxford, 2003)

Dominik Geppert (ed.), *The Postwar Challenge: Cultural, Social, and Political Change in Western Europe, 1945–1958* (Oxford, 2003)

Benedikt Stuchtey (ed.), *Science across the European Empires, 1800–1950* (Oxford, 2005)

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; paperback 2011)

Matthias Reiss and Matt Perry (eds.), *Unemployment and Protest: New Perspectives on Two Centuries of Contention* (Oxford, 2011)

R. J. W. Evans, Michael Schaich, and Peter H. Wilson (eds.), *The Holy Roman Empire, 1495–1806* (Oxford, 2011)

Kerstin Brückweh (ed.), *The Voice of the Citizen Consumer: A History of Market Research, Consumer Movements, and the Political Public Sphere* (Oxford, 2011)

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

# 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)

Werner Paravicini (ed.), *Luxus und Integration: Materielle Hofkultur Westeuropas vom 12. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010)

Lothar Kettenacker and Torsten Riotte (eds.), *The Legacies of Two World Wars: European Societies in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2011)

## 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)

Markus Mösslang, Chris Manias, and Torsten Riotte (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, iv. *1851–1866*, Camden Fifth Series, 37 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2010)

## HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Two Centuries of Anglo-German Relations: A Reappraisal* (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)

2009 Hartmut Kaelble, *The 1970s in Europe: A Period of Disillusionment or Promise?* (London, 2010)

2010 *Not available*

2011 Wolfram Siemann, *Metternich's Britain* (London, 2012)

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

*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)

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