

**GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**BULLETIN**

FALL 1996

Issue No. 19

**Editors:** Detlef Junker, Petra Marquardt-Bigman, Janine S. Micunek

**Address:** German Historical Institute  
1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20009 Tel.: (202) 387-3355  
Fax: (202) 483-3430

**Hours:** Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

**Library Hours:** Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and by appointment.

© German Historical Institute, 1996

The BULLETIN appears twice a year and is available free upon request.

**GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**BULLETIN**

FALL 1996

Issue No. 19

**CONTENTS**

I. Preface	5
II. Accounts of Recent Conferences and Workshops	
"Germany in the Age of Two Wars, 1914-1945." Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History. Bochum, April 17-20, 1996.	7
"Fritz Stern: An Appreciation." Washington, D.C., April 26, 1996.	9
"1968: The World Transformed." Berlin, May 23-25, 1996.	11
"Imagination, Ritual, Memory, Historiography: Conceptions of the Past in the Middle Ages." Heidelberg, September 5-7, 1996.	15
"Republicanism and Liberalism in America and the German States, 1750-1850." Madison, Wisconsin, October 3-6, 1996.	19
III. New Topics of Research at the Institute	
"An Oral History of the Office of Strategic Services." (Petra Marquardt-Bigman)	24

#### IV. Institute News

"Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990. A Handbook" Status Report)	26
1996/97 Fellow in Postwar German History	27
Staff Changes	28

#### V. Calendar of Events

Fall 1996 Lecture Series	31
Annual Lecture 1996	31
Annual Symposium of the Friends of the German Historical Institute	32
Conferences and Workshops Planned for 1996/97	32

#### VI. Notices and Announcements

GHI Dissertation Scholarships 1998	34
Editor/Copy Editor for Cold War Handbook Project	34

## **I. Preface**

Dear Friends and Colleagues:

Since its founding in 1987, the German Historical Institute's main purpose has been to promote the transatlantic exchange of people and ideas in the historical sciences and the humanities. By organizing conferences, seminars, workshops, and lectures, the Institute has brought together scholars from different cultural backgrounds, primarily from the United States and Germany but also from a considerable number of other European countries, as well as from all over the world.

Recently, we sat down to add up the number of scholars who have cooperated with the Institute since I became director in October 1994. We were surprised to discover that, by the end of 1996, we will have worked with 818 scholars. Coming from a variety of academic disciplines, these scholars have either contributed to one of our publications or presented a paper at one of our conferences or seminars, or both. More than 45 percent of the grand total of 818 scholars were American, 40.5 percent were German, and 13.7 percent belonged to other national groups. Breaking down this number further, we found that most of the topics presented at the Institute or at one of our conferences over the past two years dealt with German history (31.7 percent); followed by international relations (25.7 percent); American history (15.9 percent); and German-American relations, German immigration, and German-American history (12.8 percent combined). Contributors to our publications were working in the fields of German-American relations (33.9 percent), German history (21.4 percent), international relations (17.2 percent), and American history (12.2 percent).

Despite the concentration of activity in three or four areas, we have always promoted a broad research agenda and a variety of methodological approaches. These have ranged from diplomatic history to gender studies, from immigration to the theory of history, and from studies devoted to the history of art to world trade and the global economy. As you look through this issue of the Bulletin; you will learn that, in 1996 alone, the Institute has sponsored conferences covering such diverse programs as the historiography of the Middle Ages and the "cultural revolution" of 1968.

Whereas some of this scholarship has appeared in the Institute's two book series and in our in-house series of publications, much more has been written that originated at one of our conferences and was published subsequently elsewhere. Furthermore, we can only approximate the number of phone calls and letters handled by our library staff and research fellows concerning scholarly literature, specific topics of historical inquiry, and practical information on archival research and the study of history in Germany. I myself have had the privilege to meet many fine scholars and friends who contributed substantially to the intellectual climate of the Institute.

As the German Historical Institute in Washington approaches its tenth anniversary, we hope to continue supporting the ongoing research of the transatlantic community of scholars, wherever and whenever that is possible.

Yours sincerely,

*Detlef Junker*

## **II. Accounts of Recent Conferences and Workshops**

### **"Germany in the Age of Two Wars, 1914-1945." Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History.**

*Institut zur Erforschung der Europäischen Arbeiterbewegung, Ruhr University, Bochum, April 17-20, 1996. Cosponsored by the Center for German and European Studies, Georgetown University; the Conference Group for Central European History; and the German-American Academic Council.*

The Second Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar was hosted by Professor Klaus Tenfelde, director of the Institut zur Erforschung der Arbeiterbewegung, who was also one of the mentors of the first conference in 1995. Owing to the efforts of Professor Tenfelde and his staff, the conference was well organized and proceeded smoothly.

From among the fifty-seven applicants, sixteen North American and German doctoral candidates were invited to present their research papers, which had been distributed to all participants prior to the meeting in Bochum. This arrangement allowed the panels to begin with remarks by two commentators and open up soon afterwards for discussion. The three mentors chosen to participate in this year's seminar were: Belinda Davis (Rutgers University), Rudy Koshar (University of Wisconsin, Madison), and Hans Mommsen (Ruhr University, Bochum). Roger Chickering (Georgetown University), Professor Tenfelde, and Martin H. Geyer (GHI, Washington, D.C.) also served as moderators of the sessions.

The three days' discussions revolved around both methodological and conceptual issues, often touching on questions concerning different "cultures of research" in the two countries. In the end, the participants agreed that they were not too far apart with regard to their interests and questions. Traditional terms and explanations were challenged. There was an obvious interest in cultural history, which introduces new themes to the research agenda. Peukert's concept of the "crisis of classical modernity" and Jeffrey Herf's term "reactionary modernism" were debated intensively, especially with regard to the peculiarities of political, social, and intellectual devel-

opments in twentieth-century German history. The turning point of World War I, the rise of National Socialism, and the violence unleashed by these events both at home and in the occupied territories were common themes.

The Institute is very pleased to announce that the series will be continued with the theme "Germany Divided and United, 1945-1989."

Papers presented:

Deborah Cohen (University of California, Berkeley), "The Nation Accused: Disabled Veterans and the State Regulation of Charity."

Eve Duffy (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), "Science and Progress on Display: The Deutsche Museum, 1925-1945."

Andrew Gaskiewicz (State University of New York, Stony Brook), "Nazi Modernism? The Life and Work of the Film Director Wilfried Basse."

Christian Gerlach (Technical University, Berlin), "Deutsche Arbeits-einsatzpolitik und Massenverbrechen im besetzten Weißrußland 1941-1944."

Bernd Holtwick (University of Bielefeld), "Anatomie eines Gespenstes. Die 'Panik im Mittelstand' am Beispiel der Handwerker im Kammerbezirk Bielefeld 1929-1935."

Daniel Inkelas (Northwestern University), "Reshaping the Land to Strengthen the Volk: Race, Nature, and SS Landscape Planning in Annexed Poland, 1939-1944."

Annette Klerks (Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf), "'Politische Geographie-Kriegsgeographie-Geopolitik'. Die deutschen Geographen und der Erste Weltkrieg."

Oliver Liang (Johns Hopkins University), "Criminal Biology in Germany, 1888-1945."

Anne Lipp (University of Tübingen), "Friedenssehnsucht und Durch-haltebereitschaft. Wahrnehmungen und Erfahrungen deutscher Soldaten im Ersten Weltkrieg."

Armin Nolzen (Ruhr University, Bochum), "Struktur und Funktion der Ortsgruppen der NSDAP 1933-1945."

Rainer Ohliger (Humboldt University, Berlin), "Deutschland als gedachte Heimat. Die Mobilisierung der Auslandsdeutschen in der Zwischenkriegszeit."

Joseph Perry (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), "Frontweihnachten 1914-1917: A Community of Longing."

Rebecca Ratcliff (University of California, Berkeley), "Secure in Self-Deception: The Problems of Bureaucratic Culture in German WWII Intelligence Organization and Cooperation."

Sven Reichardt (Free University, Berlin), "Politische Gewalt und totales Milieu: Eine Fallstudie zu den Organisationsprinzipien der Berliner SA."

Daniel Walther (University of Pennsylvania), "Struggle for Survival: The Southwestern German Community and Education, 1919-1939."

Benjamin Ziemann (University of Bielefeld), "Verweigerungsformen von Frontsoldaten in der deutschen Armee 1914-1918."

*Martin H. Geyer*

### **"Fritz Stern: An Appreciation."**

*Washington, D.C., April 26, 1996. Cosponsored by the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, the German Historical Institute, and the German Marshall Fund of the United States. Conveners: Marion F. Deshmukh, Jerry Z. Muller.*

Approximately ninety persons gathered at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., to attend a symposium and banquet to honor the work and activities of Professor Fritz Stern, University Professor at Columbia University. As many readers of this Bulletin know, Professor Stern has had a distinguished career in academia as well as in international affairs. His many writings include *The Variety of History*; *The Politics of Cultural Despair*; *The Failure of Illiberalism*; *Gold and Iron*; *Bismarck, Bleichruder, and the Building of the German Empire*; and *Dreams and Delusions*. The symposium was organized by two of his former students, Marion F. Deshmukh (George Mason University) and Jerry Z. Muller (Catholic

University of America), and its intent was to highlight Stern's scholarly and academic contributions as well as to note his influence both in the United States and Europe as a public intellectual. Since Stern turned seventy in 1996 and retired from full-time teaching in June, the time was propitious for such a commemoration. Those in attendance included former students, colleagues, and family members.

The program began with introductory remarks by Detlef Junker (GHI, Washington, D.C.), Jackson Janes (American Institute for Contemporary German Studies), and Marion Deshmukh. Three renowned scholars delivered papers that evaluated the historiographical context within which Stern wrote his major works and their subsequent intellectual potency. Jerry Muller spoke about the *The Politics of Cultural Despair*; David Sorkin (University of Wisconsin) gave a presentation on Stern's history of German Jewry; and Kenneth Barkin (University of California, Riverside) recalled "Fritz Stern's Portrait of Bismarck." Each discussed the influences on Stern and suggested how historians and others have since conceived of nineteenth- and twentieth-century history as a result of Stern's complex image of Germany. At the end of the session, Stern commented on the three evaluations.

The evening was devoted to reminiscences, reflections, and ruminations about Stern the man, mentor, student, friend, and colleague. His Ph.D. advisor, Jacques Barzun, sent in a humorous testimonial detailing some last-minute revisions of the thesis. Other written testimonials were contributed by David Landes (Harvard University), who had initially worked with Stern on the dual biography of Bismarck and Bleichröder, by the former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, and by Gerald Feldman, professor of history at the University of California, Berkeley, and director of its Center for German and European Studies. Jay Winter, a former undergraduate student of Stern's, contributed a poem about Stern at his Swiss retreat, Sils Maria. Colleagues and associates spoke warmly of their friendship with and admiration of Stern. These included Ralf Dahrendorf, Warden of Nuffield College, Oxford; Ambassador Richard Holbrooke; Marion Gräfin Dönhoff, publisher of *Die Zeit*;

Senator Bill Bradley (New Jersey); Frank Loy, Chairman of the Board, League of Conservation Voters; and Orest Ranum, Professor of History, Johns Hopkins University. Former students and colleagues also offered remembrances during the course of a delightful evening.

The papers and reminiscences will be published soon as part of the German Historical Institute's Occasional Papers series.

*Marion F. Deshmukh*

*Jerry Z. Muller*

### **"1968: The World Transformed."**

*Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, May 23-25, 1996. Conveners: Carole Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker.*

The year 1968, like the years 1776, 1789, 1848, 1914, and 1945, has become a symbolic date in world history and signals an important juncture in the era that stretches from World War II to the end of the Cold War. The events of that year challenged not only the domestic status quo and the two major military alliances but also the power relationships among the "First," "Second," and "Third" Worlds. Beginning with the Tet Offensive in Vietnam, the capture of the American ship *Pueblo* by the North Koreans, and the gold crisis of March 1968, America's role as a world leader seemed to be in question. At the same time, the Soviet Union was challenged by the Prague Spring. Culminating in the so-called Paris May of 1968, protest movements from Berkeley to Berlin, from Mexico City to Tokyo, represented an almost universal challenge to the Cold War's stale ideology and rigid structures, and the legitimacy of its social and cultural hierarchies. This conference brought together thirty-five scholars from the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, and the United States at the Wissenschaftszentrum in Berlin to analyze the diplomatic, economic, political, social, cultural, and intellectual significance of the events of that year.

The discussions of the first day centered on international relations and the world economy. Chaired by Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich (Free University of Berlin), the first panel looked at the "Shift in the World Economy" that occurred during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Diane Kunz (Yale University) focused on the economic consequences in the U.S., Ludger Lindlar (Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung) researched those in Germany, Koichi Hamada (Yale University) addressed the situation in Japan, and Padma Desai (Columbia University) discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the Soviet Empire. Finally, in a paper on "Change of Sovereignty: International Oil Policy, 1960-1973," Jens Hohensee (Alfried Krupp von Bohlen and Halbach Stiftung) analyzed developments in the international oil market. Although the significance of the Declaratory Statement of OPEC in June 1968 was only grasped by a few experts, nothing was as symbolic for the end of the "easy affluence" enjoyed by Western societies during the 1960s and 1970s.

Chaired by Detlef Junker (GHI, Washington, D.C.), the second panel on the structure of the international system in 1968 continued and broadened the themes of the preceding section. Papers by George C. Herring (University of Kentucky) on "Tet 1968 and the Crisis of Hegemony" and Mark Kramer (Harvard University) on "The Czechoslovak Crisis and the Brezhnev Doctrine" discussed the ways in which the dominance of the two superpowers was challenged during the course of 1968. How the Soviet Union and the United States dealt with the crisis in their empires had an immediate impact on states like China, as Nancy Tucker (Georgetown University) argued in her paper, in part because Mao decided to stop the cultural revolution in order to focus on external affairs. Furthermore, Gottfried Niedhart (University of Mannheim) described the emergence of West Germany's *Ostpolitik* during the late 1960s.

On the second day, the focus turned to internal developments in different countries. Dieter Rucht of the Wissenschaftszentrum chaired the third panel on "The Legacy of 1968 in Domestic Politics." Papers by David Brinkley (Columbia University), Ulrich K. Preuß (University of Bremen), and Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey (University of Bielefeld) showed how the rise of new social movements, new

lifestyles, and subcultures altered the political and cultural climate in Western Europe and America during the late 1960s and early 1970s. At the same time, the cultural revolution of the 1960s contributed significantly to the fall of the liberal New Deal consensus and to the development of the political Right in America, while in Europe either Social Democracy or the Old Left reigned supreme over New Left radicalism. However, as Jerzy Eisler (École Polonaise, Paris) argued in his paper on March 1968 in Poland, and as Martin Traine (University of Cologne) demonstrated in his presentation on "1968: Latin American Revolution Reaches Europe," there was a fundamental difference in political culture and historical outlook between the Western and Communist worlds, between industrialized societies and the developing world, even though protest movements might have resembled each other. Paris and Prague were never quite the same; students in Poland and Czechoslovakia were demanding nothing less than basic civil rights, which were all but taken for granted in West Germany and the United States. Whereas the clashes between students and police in Córdoba and Mexico City reminded contemporaries and historians of Berlin and Paris, reality in these cities was quite different from that in their European and North American counterparts.

Similarities and differences were also the focus of the fourth panel on "Social Ferment," which was chaired by Luisa Passerini of the European University Institute in Florence. This session dealt with some of the larger questions concerning 1968, not from a national but from an explicitly comparative perspective. Stuart Hilwig (Ohio State University) presented a paper on "The Revolt Against the Establishment: Students versus the Press in West Germany and Italy." Manfred Berg (GHI, Washington, D.C.) examined race relations of the time. Gerd-Rainer Horn (Western Oregon State College) discussed the working class in France, Italy, Spain, Czechoslovakia. And, in her paper, "A Radical Aspiration to Freedom: Feminist Theory and the Legacy of 1968," Rosi Braidotti (University of Utrecht) treated what was perhaps the most complex issue raised by 1968. Stressing the similarities between the feminist movements on both sides of the Atlantic, Braidotti argued that

radical feminism was not only a rebellion against traditional forms and images of power as paternal authority in the family, state, and society, but also "an attack against the mystique of the revolutionary chief or leader."

This comparative outlook was broadened during the discussions of the third day. The fifth panel of the conference, which was chaired by Keath Reader (University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne), investigated "Sounds and Visual Images of 1968." Video and film presentations by David Culbert (Louisiana State University) and by Jan Bernard and Zdena Škapová of the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague brought back some of the excitement and anxieties of the time. In 1968 television made a huge difference, Culbert concluded, because, in a moment of doubt and uncertainty, it provided people with evidence to justify a change in policy. In Prague radio was the single most important means of communication for the Czechoslovak people and even helped to dispatch protesters to stem the tide of the Warsaw Pact invasion. Film and literature were also instrumental in transforming the Czech political scene, as Škapová pointed out in her paper. How visual images can tell us more about the specific ways in which societies dealt with the cultural and social transformations of the late 1960s was demonstrated by Michael Seidman (University of North Carolina, Wilmington) in his paper, "Soyez réalistes, demandez l'impossible: Radical Art in France and the USA in 1968." Finally, Barbara Tischler (Columbia University) recreated the atmosphere of the late 1960s by playing samples of that period's music during her presentation.

The last section of the conference, "1968: Assumptions and Consequences," was chaired by Carole Fink (Rutgers University). Its aim was to evaluate and summarize many of the hidden agendas and unspoken assumptions that made 1968 such a symbolic and important year. Again, a comparative approach was taken by Harold Marcuse (University of California, Santa Barbara) in his contribution on "1968 and the Holocaust: West Germany, the United States, Israel," as well as by Lawrence Winner (State University of New York, Albany). Both Wittner's paper, "The Nuclear Threat Ignored: How and Why the Campaign Against the Bomb Disinte-

grated in the late 1960s," and the following paper by Andreas Reichstein (North German Broadcasting Corp., Hamburg), "The Last Cold War Frontier: Space," demonstrated that 1968 was not only the beginning of a new era, but also signalled the end of issues and movements that had played a significant role in the preceding one. Finally, both Rüdiger Bubner of the University of Heidelberg and Konrad H. Jarausch of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill explored the significance of that year from the vantage point of the most recent developments in world history. Why 1968 mattered and how it fit into the larger picture of the development of postwar societies was the focus of the final discussion. While perhaps neither the hopes nor the worst fears of the contemporaries had come true, the year nonetheless marked a turning point in recent history by creating a legacy—both real and symbolic—that shapes political consciousness to this day.

Revised versions of the conference papers, in addition to other scholarly articles, will be published in the Institute's series with Cambridge University Press under the title "1968: The World Transformed."

*Philipp Gassert*

**"Imagination, Ritual, Memory, Historiography: Conceptions of the Past in the Middle Ages."**

*Internationales Wissenschaftsforum of the University of Heidelberg, September 5-7, 1996. Conveners: Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, and Patrick J. Geary.*

In the last decade, both in Germany and in North America, medievalists have come to focus their attention on the representation and recollection of ritual action in narrative and archival texts, popular literature, art, and music. The German tradition has focused largely on historiography, liturgical and extra-liturgical forms of the remembrance of the dead, and royal and imperial ritual. Americans have applied approaches developed in process-oriented social and

cultural anthropology to a wider social spectrum. However, both historical traditions are informed by French cultural and social history of the past quarter-century and share important common epistemological concerns about the relationship between perception and representation, both by contemporaries as well as by modern historians. This colloquium, which brought together nine American scholars and an equal number of Germans, offered representatives of both traditions the opportunity to learn from each other in formal presentations and in the animated discussions that ensued.

The lectures engaged the themes of the conference from multiple perspectives. Rituals were the focus of six speakers. Philippe Buc (Stanford University) shifted the focus of debates about "bad rituals," or ritual events that seemed to go wrong, from the putative events themselves to the narrations of these events by authors ideologically involved in the process of creating meanings through the structuring of their accounts. Gerd Althoff (University of Bonn) explored how the stable vocabulary of ritual expression, essential for the communication of social and political relationships, could undergo subtle but necessary changes as parties, sensitive to the "rules of the game," could nevertheless improvise within the generally accepted norms of ritual action. Felice Lifschitz (Florida International University) spoke on the role of women in fifth-century martyrs' cults, arguing that the rhetoric of Episcopal authorities concerning moving relics from private to public control was actually intended to remove these cults from the open access afforded by women who had developed and maintained them. Margot Fassler (Yale University) demonstrated the continuities and tensions as a pseudo-Augustinian, anti-Jewish sermon became the basis first for liturgy and then for a series of prophets plays put on during Advent. In these plays, the dynamics of Christian-Jewish polemic were acted out, both in liturgy and in popular religious theater performed by young clerics. John Bernhardt (San Jose State University) reexamined the ideological construction of Henry II within the tradition of divine appointment, family continuity, and election. Stephan Weinfurter (University of Munich) also looked at the ideological representation of Henry II in art and in texts as a new and

daring appropriation and combination of the images of Moses and Aaron—new self-presentations that carried with them a willingness to break with traditional royal comportment.

Five participants addressed the issue of collective memory. Otto Gerhard Oexle (Max-Planck-Institut, Göttingen) presented a panoramic survey of the study of memory and memorializing in the past generation of German, French, and English-language scholarship as a "total social phenomenon," constituting and informing social groupings and articulating social and cultural processes. Bernard Jussen (Max-Planck-Institut, Göttingen) studied the popular development of the image of the unfaithful widow from late antiquity through the Middle Ages, arguing that the variations in a folkloric theme across differing registers of transmission took place in dynamic relationship to the role of widows constructed by competing lay and religious ideologies of women and marriage. John Freed (Illinois State University) examined the family portrait of the counts of Falkenstein, the Rodenegg frescoes, and the *Frauendienst* of Ulrich of Liechtenstein as expressions, in the realm of imaginative art and literature, of anxieties about personal and family status in an aristocratic world on the border between ministerial and free noble status. David Nirenberg (Rice University) explored the interrelationship between, on the one hand, medieval remembrance of the Jewish massacres in the Rhineland during the First Crusade and the much larger and more devastating ones in fourteenth-century Spain and, on the other hand, twentieth-century Jewish historians who have progressively emphasized the former and deemphasized the latter in their own response to the Holocaust. Bernd Schneidmüller (University of Bamberg) investigated a different kind of memory, that of families, regions, and urban communities, as they elaborated continuities that disguised ruptures and eliminated alternative, competing ways of presenting the past as programmatic for the present and the future.

Historiographical memory was the central theme of four presentations. Amy Remensnyder (Brown University), focusing on monastic communities of southern France, analyzed how origin narratives, elaborated in chronicles, charters, and hagiography, as well as in

sculptural programs and iconography, created myths tying local communities to distant Frankish rulers. Actual French monarchs exploited these myths in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to anchor royal power in the region. Beate Schuster (Paris Nanterre) offered a reading of Odo of Deuil's account of the crusade of Louis VII that places this text in a complex intellectual tradition drawing on Cistercian ideology and Byzantine accounts of the crusade. The account manipulates national stereotypes to present a subtle critique of the German, French, and Byzantine rulers, a critique that was so much at variance with emerging royal ideology that it found no place in official Capetian memorialization. Hans-Werner Goetz (University of Hamburg) presented a schema of the comprehension of time, interval, and change in medieval *Gesta episcoporum*, arguing that in the work of twelfth- and thirteenth-century authors, a tension existed between the desire to attribute historical facts to their correct date and the tendency to eliminate all differences between times and epochs in order to link events by genetic and typological understanding. Richard Landes (Boston University) developed a methodology for recognizing the significance of deliberate silences and distortions in accounts of millenarian movements, arguing that intentional rewriting of such movements after their failure results in the virtual disappearance of the voice of those who had opposed the movements or claimed to have done so. Nevertheless, he argued that the rhythm of change in calendrical systems and in the disavowal of millennial expectations are themselves evidence of such movements' vitality.

Two papers focused on the representation of the past in legal proceedings. Hanna Vollrath (University of Bochum) reexamined the traditional interpretation of royal judgments against counts and dukes for contumacy in Germany and France to suggest that such court proceedings, far from operating according to abstract notions of royal law, actually covered a wide spectrum of maneuvers and negotiations clothed in the language of legal procedure. Patrick Geary (UCLA) discussed a series of court cases from the tenth and eleventh centuries that turned on the manipulation of written and oral testimony (written testimony was "vocalized"; oral testimony was

"fictionalized" as text) to demonstrate the interrelationship between orality and textuality in the construction of the past.

*Patrick J. Geary*

**"Republicanism and Liberalism in America and the German States, 1750-1850."**

*Madison, Wisconsin, October 3-6, 1996. Cosponsored by the Thyssen Foundation. Conveners: Peter Becker, Jürgen Heideking, James Henretta, and John Kaminski.*

This conference brought together more than thirty scholars from the United States and Germany. The participants engaged in a lively discussion of comparative approaches to the study of republicanism and liberalism, reaching far beyond constitutional and political history. The event was organized in collaboration with the Department of Anglo-American History at the University of Cologne, the Department of History at the University of Maryland at College Park, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and the Max Kade Institute in Madison.

The conveners invited representatives of a wide variety of historical specialties with the aim of fostering a new understanding of the role that republicanism and liberalism played in the formation of America and the German states. The conference program reflected the conviction that American constitutional history, social and intellectual history, as well as political science and religious history all need to be taken into account in order to gain a full understanding of the political, economic, and social processes that shaped the United States and the individual states in Germany as they approached the nineteenth century.

In his keynote lecture, entitled "'Wir nennen es Gemeininn': Republic and Republicanism in German Political Debates in the Nineteenth Century," Rudolf Vierhaus (Max-Planck-Institut, Göttingen) analyzed meanings of the term "republicanism" peculiar to Germany. He pointed out that, across the political spectrum, this concept had been associated with public spirit rather than with a specific type of

government. Therefore, it was seen as something that had to be fostered within the German citizenry in order to build a critical mass toward the reform of the political system. With his approach, Vierhaus succeeded in identifying a substantial difference between German and Anglo-Saxon concepts of citizenship, which he sees as being closely linked to the German approach to republicanism. The persona of the law-abiding, mature, and very loyal citizen—that is, one who embodies *Gemeinsinn*—remains an integral part of the German political system.

The meanings of republicanism in political thought were again addressed in the first session, "Intellectual Aspects of Republicanism." Hans E. Bödeker (Max-Planck-Institut, Göttingen) located the meaning of "republic" within a wider German political discourse in the second half of the eighteenth century. Paul A. Rahe (Yale University/Oklahoma State University) traced republicanism through the political discourse of the Western world, paying special attention to the use of this concept by Montesquieu. Otto Dann (University of Cologne) then discussed the place of Kant's usage of the term in German political thought.

In the second session on "State Formation in the Eighteenth Century," three case studies explored the use and instrumental value of republicanism and liberalism. Willi Paul Adams (Free University, Berlin) examined the early American state constitutions and analyzed them as authentic documents of the American commitment to republicanism. A. Gregg Roeber (Penn. State University) used a comparative approach to bring in ecclesiastical components of the political discourse and to look at the institutional settings and discursive reflection on poor relief systems. Stephan Wolf (University of Mannheim) used a biographical approach to analyze the career and writings of Abraham Yates, Jr.

The focus of the third session, entitled "The Rise of Liberalism," shifted toward the early nineteenth century with a discussion of institutional, social, and political contexts of the rise of this political ideology in Germany and in America. Using the tools of biographical and institutional history, Barbara Vogel (University of Hamburg) highlighted the relevance of liberal concepts for setting the bureau-

cratic agenda between 1810 and 1814. Jonathan Knudsen (Wellesley College) pursued these issues further by researching the ways in which liberals in Berlin tried to find their niche within an emerging culture of illiberalism and how they tried to uphold a positive tradition in the bureaucratic reform movement. From a microanalytical perspective, Robert E. Shalhope (University of Oklahoma) looked at the ways in which two groups with different socioeconomic and cultural profiles shaped the political life in a Vermont township.

On the basis of thematic case studies, the next three sessions looked at the ways in which gender studies, economic theory, and cultural studies might enrich the reconstruction of liberalism and republicanism as more than mere political concepts. In "Gender and Ideology," Vera Nünning (University of Cologne) and Rosemarie Zagarri (George Mason University) questioned the exclusive link between male writings and the promotion of republican and liberal ideas. In "Politics and Sentiment: Catherine Macaulay's Republicanism," Nünning presented Macaulay as a successful historian, political writer, and activist involved in the improvement of women's position in society. Zagarri presented a similar line of argument in her paper on "Mercy Otis Warren's Jeffersonian Republicanism," in which she argued that her female hero was a successful historian and political writer. This thesis was based on Warren's claim for a new role for women in a republic, one founded on a classical republicanism that was informed by liberal ideas and was melded with notions derived from the Scottish enlightenment.

The session on "Dimensions of Political Philosophy" explored the discourses on race, money, and sexuality and their relevance for an understanding of the politics of liberalism vis-à-vis their conservative counterparts. Isabel V. Hull (Cornell University) analyzed the hegemony of early liberal thought over fundamental conceptions of civil society by looking at its influence on conservative ideology. She used the issue of sexuality as her main focus, as it was intertwined with the debate on the nature of civil society. Michael O'Malley (George Mason University) explored the hidden meanings of the discourse on the value of money in American classical liberal thought. His main argument pointed out that essentialist arguments closely

linked the issue of money to racial discrimination on a metaphorical basis. Amy Dru Stanley (University of Chicago) united these strands—sexuality, race, and the marketplace—by arguing that the highly gendered and emotionally loaded discourse of the movement underscored the idea that ownership of another human being contradicted the liberal principles governing the political discourse of the time.

The session on "Legal and National Identity" featured two papers that adopted a comparative approach. When Jürgen Heideking (University of Cologne) looked at "Festive Culture and National Identity in America and Germany, 1760-1860," he noticed an intriguing paradox: that Americans celebrated national holidays but failed to preserve a unifying festive culture, whereas Germans, with different political views, tried to construct a German nation on a symbolic level through festivals and celebrations. The celebrations of Germany and America were, however, dominated by their regional, decentralized nature, which permitted their adaptation to represent a variety of objectives. Robert J. Steinfeld (State University of New York, Buffalo) traced the different choices that were made in Germany, England, and America to implement free markets and liberal ideas, while simultaneously preventing workers from leaving their workplace on their own volition, especially before the expiration of a formal labor contract.

The final session, which dealt with "Political Ideology in the Nineteenth Century," returned to issues of politics and constitutionality. Paul Nolte (University of Bielefeld) undertook the ambitious project of establishing a generalized framework for a comparison between the development of American and German political parties in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Jacob Katz Cogan (Princeton University) revisited the issue of the American constitution. He looked at the difficulties facing legislators dealing with the popular sovereignty clause as soon as it no longer referred simply to a corporate people but had to be defined in more concrete terms. In a biographical and regional study, James Henretta (University of Maryland, College Park) traced the replacement of the republican establishment by a liberal, democratic one. The latter, however, had

to face another challenge precisely at its moment of triumph; namely, the emergence of an immigrant society divided by class.

The proceedings of the conference will be published in a volume of the Institute's series with Cambridge University Press.

*Peter Becker*

### **III. New Topics of Research at the Institute**

#### **"An Oral History of the Office of Strategic Services" (Petra Marquardt-Bigman)**

When the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) began to transfer the records of its predecessor, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), to the National Archives in Washington, D.C., some fifteen years ago, researchers were given access to a vast and unique body of documentation containing invaluable source materials, not only for scholars interested in U.S. wartime intelligence but also for those working on World War II in general. While the value of these materials for historical research can hardly be overestimated, the preserved files of the OSS obviously tell only part of the eventful story of this remarkable agency. Established under the exigencies of war as the first central intelligence agency in U.S. history, the OSS not only made innovative, if often controversial, contributions to the American war effort, but it also left a legacy that—no less controversial than the organization from which it derived—had considerable impact on the postwar development of the U.S. intelligence community and, in particular, on its successor, the CIA. But the OSS veterans who eventually came to serve as CIA directors are only the most visible and best-known mediators of this legacy, which proved influential far beyond the sphere of intelligence, since it was brought to bear upon a variety of fields in academia, public life, and policy, in which OSS veterans excelled.

The recollections of those who helped to shape this legacy during the war, and who transmitted and transformed it in the postwar period, thus constitute more than an indispensable complement to the OSS documents. Most obviously, they could help with the historian's ever-present problem of how to bring archival sources to life and evaluate them not only with the wisdom of hindsight but also in the context of their time. However, the relevance of the OSS experience is by no means limited to research on World War II. It is certainly essential to anyone interested in the development of the U.S. intelligence community in the postwar period. Particularly at a time when

there is much cause to reexamine the origins of the Cold War, the recollections of OSS veterans may well help researchers to gain a broader understanding of the complex developments that turned a wartime alliance into a dangerous antagonism.

To date, there has been no systematic attempt to document the experiences of OSS members. The objective of this project is to provide a representative sample of these experiences by interviewing OSS members from various branches (e.g., Research and Analysis, Counterespionage, Morale Operations). The project is sponsored by the CIA's Center for the Study of Intelligence and carried out by a team of scholars who have worked on various aspects of OSS activity and intelligence history. According to their expertise, team members will prepare and conduct interviews, which will first cover a basic questionnaire and then address a series of specific questions relating to the individual interviewee's work. As a member of the team, I will primarily interview OSS veterans who worked in the Research and Analysis Branch, which was responsible for providing background research and political analysis to policy makers and the military. The documentation assembled in the course of this project will be deposited in the Special Collections Division of the Lauinger Library at Georgetown University, where transcripts of the interviews will be available to any interested researcher.

#### **IV. Institute News**

##### **"Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990. A Handbook." (Status Report)**

Since the summer of 1995, the Institute's main scholarly project has been its two-volume handbook, entitled "Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990." In June 1995 a group of distinguished scholars in the German-American field gathered in Washington to discuss the outline and the objective of such a project. In the meantime, we have made considerable progress on the handbook (see the reports in Bulletin nos. 17 and 18). Volker Berghahn, Christoph Buchheim, Lily Gardner Feldman, Wolfgang Krieger, Diane B. Kunz, Klaus Schwabe, Thomas A. Schwartz, Hans-Peter Schwarz, and Frank Trommler have all agreed to serve as general advisors and to write major synthetic essays. These essays will introduce the reader to the different sections of the handbook. In addition, more than 120 authors have joined us in writing individual entries on a variety of issues important within the field of German-American relations, such as containment, intelligence cooperation, investments and multinational corporations, the American reception of German literature, and anti-Americanism.

Currently, we are working with the individual authors to clarify the content of their contributions and to avoid duplication in the handbook. For this purpose, Professor Wolfgang Krieger of the University of Marburg assembled eight authors contributing to the section on security and a small number of outside experts for a meeting that took place at the Institute between September 26 and 28, 1996. The participants discussed, among other subjects, the transfer of military knowledge and technology immediately following World War II, the military aspects of German rearmament in the 1950s, the impact of the Vietnam War on German-American relations, and the significance of U.S. and NATO strategies for this bilateral relationship. The meeting proved to be extremely useful for structuring this section of the handbook and helping the contributors set their own papers within the framework of the larger project.

Finally, we are pleased to report that two renowned publishing houses have agreed to publish the GHI Cold War handbook. The German edition will be printed by the Oldenbourg Verlag (Munich), and the English version is scheduled to appear in the Institute's series with Cambridge University Press. We are confident that "Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1949" will be on the market in 1999—in time for the tenth anniversary of the end of the Cold War and the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Federal Republic.

*Detlef Junker, Philipp Gassert, Wilfried Mausbach*

### **1996/97 Fellows in Postwar German History**

With a grant from the Volkswagen-Stiftung, the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies and the GHI have begun the third and final year of the renewed joint program in postwar German history. In September, three scholars have taken up residential fellowships at the institutes to conduct research on the political and cultural history of postwar Germany, utilizing the Washington area's rich archival resources for their projects:

**Carl C. Hodge** of Okanagan University College, Canada, works on the popular ethics of European security during the first decade of the Cold War. He is particularly interested in the establishment of bipartisan security platforms in Germany and the United States, which were designed to cultivate popular support for the construction of a military alliance to confront the perceived threat to West European security posed by the Soviet Union. Dr. Hodge resides at the GHI.

**Jeffrey M. Peck** of the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown University is investigating the cultural dialectic of the relationship between "Germans" and "foreigners." Specifically, he will look at the level in which words and images about these groups and their relationships are constituted, granted power, dispersed, and exchanged in everyday cultural discourses. He thereby intends to locate the places where tensions between the two groups arise. Dr.

Peck resides at the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies.

**Edmund Spevack** of Harvard University is examining American influences on the shaping of the West German Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*) of 1949. Drawing mainly on the records of the American military government and the U.S. High Commissioner in Germany, which are located in the National Archives in nearby College Park, he attempts a detailed reconstruction of the actual American impact on the framing of the *Grundgesetz*. Dr. Spevack resides at the GHI.

The three fellows presented outlines of their research projects at an introductory seminar, which took place on October 30, 1996, at the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies. Further seminars and workshops may be conducted with the fellows and other interested scholars before June 1997. Please call either the GHI (tel. 202/387-3355) or the AICGS (tel. 202/332-9312) for details.

### **Staff Changes**

We welcome the following new members of the GHI:

**Andreas W. Daum**, Research Fellow, born in Cologne. Studied history, political science, and art history at the Universities of Cologne and Munich and at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia; M.A. 1990; Dr. phil. 1995. *Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter* at the Institute of Modern History, University of Munich, 1990-1996. Mellon Resident Research Fellow at the American Philosophical Society, 1992.

Publications: *Wissenschaftspopularisierung in Deutschland. Bürgerliche Gesellschaft, Öffentlichkeit and Naturwissenschaften 1848-1914* (forthcoming, 1997); articles on nineteenth-century cultural and media history.

Current interests: Twentieth-century U.S. diplomats and Germany; Americans and national socialism; international history of popular science and the public sphere since the eighteenth century.

Memberships: American Historical Association, History of Science Society, and Verband der Historiker Deutschlands.

**Petra Marquardt-Bigman**, Research Fellow and Editor of the Institute's book series "Transatlantische Historische Studien," born in Schlatt, Baden-Württemberg. Studied history, English, and German philology at Tübingen University, Dr. phil. 1991. Married to David Bigman.

Previous professional positions at the Department of Contemporary History, University of Tübingen, Germany, and The Cummings Center for Russian and East European Studies, Tel Aviv University, Israel.

Scholarships/Fellowships: Visiting Researcher, Georgetown University (1986/87); Scholarship of the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. (1988); Fellowship at the Wiener Library, Tel Aviv University, Israel (1989/90).

Publications: "Nachdenken über ein demokratisches Deutschland. Der Beitrag der Research and Analysis Branch zur Planung der amerikanischen Deutschlandpolitik." In *Geheimdienstkrieg gegen Deutschland. Subversion, Propaganda und politische Planungen des amerikanischen Geheimdienstes im Zweiten Weltkrieg*, edited by Jürgen Heideking and Christof Mauch, 122-41. Göttingen, 1993. "Amerikanische Geheimdienstanalysen des nationalsozialistischen Deutschlands." *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für Deutsche Geschichte* (1994): 325-44. *Amerikanische Geheimdienstanalysen über Deutschland 1942-1949*. (Studien zur Zeitgeschichte.) Munich, 1995.

Research projects: U.S. Policy toward sub-Saharan Africa in the period of decolonization (1945-1965); oral history of the Office of Strategic Services (a collaborative project sponsored by the Central Intelligence Agency's Center for the Study of Intelligence).

**Bärbel Thomas**, Foreign Language Assistant, born in Benneckenstein, Harz, grew up in Hagen, Germany. Has been living in the Washington area since 1970. Worked for a number of years for the Federal Republic of Germany, Office of Defense Admini-

stration USA and Canada, in Washington, D.C., and for the past five years for the law firm of Pierson & Burnett.

The following staff members have recently left the Institute:

**Bärbel Bernhardt**, Foreign Language Assistant, is pursuing other career interests.

**Manfred F. Boemeke**, Research Fellow and Editor, has assumed the position of Head of Publications at the United Nations University in Tokyo, Japan.

**Ulrike Skorsetz**, Research Fellow, is continuing her research project at the University of Jena.

## V. Calendar of Events Fall 1996

### Lecture Series

- September 26 David C. Large (Montana State University) *Citizens in Uniform: The Politics of West German Rearmament*
- October 15 Geoffrey C. Cocks (Albion College) *Psyche and Swastika: The Göring Institute In and Out of History*
- October 24 Norman M. Naimark (Stanford University) *The Soviet Occupation Administration in Germany, 1945-1949*
- November 7 Alan Steinweis (University of Nebraska at Lincoln) *German Artists between Dictatorship and Democracy, 1918-1990*
- November 21 Paul W. Schroeder (University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign) *Prussia and Austria, 1780-1848: Episode or Model?*
- December 5 Carole Fink (Ohio State University) *The Weimar Analogy: The History and Political Myth of the Weimar Republic*

### Annual Lecture 1996

The Institute's Tenth Annual Lecture will be delivered by Professor Eberhard Kolb of the University of Cologne under the title "Was Hitler's Seizure of Power on January 30, 1933, Inevitable?" A comment will be given by Professor Henry A. Turner, Jr., of Yale University. The event will take place in the Institute's lecture hall on Thursday, November 14, 1996.

## **Annual Symposium of the Friends of the German Historical Institute**

The Friends of the GHI will host their Fifth Annual Symposium, entitled "The Culture of Historical Learning," on November 15, 1996. Participants will include Omer Bartov of Rutgers University, Alfred Kelly of Hamilton College, Rudy Koshar of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and Rüdiger von Bruch of the Humboldt University of Berlin, who is currently the Visiting Konrad Adenauer Professor at the Center for German and European Studies, Georgetown University.

### **Conferences and Workshops Planned for 1996/97**

"The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Politics, and Society until World War I." Conference at the GHI London, December 12-15, 1996. Cosponsored by the GHI London. Conveners: Martin H. Geyer and Johannes Paulmann.

"Germany Divided and United, 1945-1989." Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History. Washington, D.C., April 16-17, 1997. Cosponsored by the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown University, the German-American Academic Council, and the Conference Group for Central European History.

"Immigration and Communication: Comparative Perspectives on German Immigration to America." Conference at the Texas A&M University, April 22-24, 1997. Conveners: Wolfgang Helbich and Walter Kamphoefner.

"The Culture of Rights: Civil Rights, Participation Rights and Social Rights in Germany and the United States from the Late 19th Century to the Present." Conference at the GHI in Washington, D.C., June 11-14, 1997. Conveners: Manfred Berg and Martin H. Geyer.

"Universities in Medieval Society." Conference at the GHI in Washington, D.C., September 18-20, 1997. Conveners: William J. Courtenay and Jürgen Miethke.

"The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848: Episode or Model?"  
Conference at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, October 31-  
November 2, 1997. Conveners: Peter Krüger and Paul W. Schroeder.

"The Historical Discipline in a Transcultural Perspective, 1850-1950."  
Workshop at the GHI in Washington, D.C., October 1997. Cosponsored by  
the GHI London. Convener: Eckhardt Fuchs.

"Remapping the German Past: Grand Narrative, Causality, and Post-  
modernism." Conference at the GHI in Washington, D.C., December 4-7,  
1997. Conveners: Eckhardt Fuchs and Detlef Junker.

## **VI. Notices and Announcements**

### **GHI Dissertation Scholarships 1998**

The Institute offers scholarships for up to six months to doctoral students working on topics related to the Institute's general scope of interest. Applications for 1998, addressed to "GHI Dissertation Scholarships," should be received by **May 31, 1997**, and should contain the following information:

- a curriculum vitae;
- a detailed plan of study, including research proposal, locations in the United States to be visited, and length of time needed for research trip;
- a letter of recommendation from the doctoral advisor.

American students applying for these scholarships should be working on topics of German history for which they need to evaluate source materials located in the United States.

### **Editor/Copy Editor for Cold War Handbook Project**

The GHI is currently looking for a highly qualified editor/copy editor to work on our handbook project, "Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990." The successful applicant should be a native English speaker with a background in post-1945 international relations, German-American history, and/or comparative history. Fluency in German and word processing skills are also required. A Ph.D. and editorial experience are preferred. The appointment is for two years beginning January 1, 1997, and will be made contingent upon budgetary approval. The salary range is \$35,000 to \$43,000. Please send a cover letter and curriculum vitae with references by **December 1, 1996**, to: Prof. Dr. Detlef Junker, Director, German Historical Institute, 1607 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC, 20009.