

# CONFERENCES, SYMPOSIA, SEMINARS

---

## YOUNG SCHOLARS FORUM 2002

### WAR AND SOCIETY:

### GERMANY AND EUROPE IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Seminar at the GHI, March 21–24, 2002. Made possible by a grant from the Allianz AG and co-sponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States. Convener: Christoph Strupp (GHI). Moderators: Roger Chickering (Georgetown University), Deborah Cohen (American University), Ute Frevert (Universität Bielefeld), Gerhard Hirschfeld (Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte/ Universität Stuttgart), Christof Mauch (GHI), Gerhard L. Weinberg (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), and Richard F. Wetzell (GHI).

In March 2002 the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., held its second Young Scholars Forum for American doctoral students and recent Ph.D. recipients in modern German and European history. The Young Scholars Forum has the character of a workshop and concentrates on a different topic each year. In 2002 it featured projects dealing with questions of “War and Society.” It brought together fourteen participants from across the U.S.A. and one graduate student from France for a weekend of scholarly discussion and exchange. They had the opportunity to present their research and to benefit from the comments and insights of their colleagues and distinguished senior scholars from both sides of the Atlantic. This year four professors – Deborah Cohen, Ute Frevert, Gerhard Hirschfeld, and Gerhard Weinberg – acted as mentors and – together with Roger Chickering, Christof Mauch, Richard Wetzell, and the convener of the Forum, Christoph Strupp – chaired the eight panels of the conference. The papers had been predistributed in the form of a conference reader. The sessions were therefore devoted to questions and discussions. Each of the panels featured two papers introduced not by the authors themselves but by two of their fellow students acting as commentators. Different viewpoints and critical questions stimulated discussion right from the beginning of every panel. This year’s Young Scholars Forum was made possible through generous grants from the Allianz AG, Munich, and the German Marshall Fund of the United States. The organizers are particularly grateful for their support.

The topic of this year’s Young Scholars Forum, War and Society, is far from being only of historical interest. Military violence with all its con-

sequences for nations and societies remains a powerful political factor. The papers presented at the Young Scholars Forum addressed many subjects that have recently been discussed in the evening news and the morning papers, including guerilla warfare, war coverage by the media, defining and dealing with prisoners of war, the influence of war on intellectual debates in Europe and the USA, problems of transition from war to peace, and commemorative cultures.

The positive response to the call for papers showed the broad interest in the subject among American scholars. Most of the proposals, and thus most of the papers presented at the conference, focused on the first half of the twentieth century and the period of the world wars. The papers demonstrated a broad range of methodological and thematic approaches to military history and the history of warfare. And even though it was not the goal of the Forum to establish conceptual frameworks, methodological guidelines or master narratives for the “new” military history or the history of violence, the papers proved once again that over the past two decades military history has clearly emancipated itself from its beginnings as an auxiliary science for generals and high commands. Historians today deal with the relationship between war and society from the perspectives of political, social, economic, cultural, and gender history, and they take advantage of the broadest possible range of sources.

The opening panel featured two papers dealing with militarism and youth. Bryan Ganaway presented his research on military toys in Germany. In the course of the nineteenth century these evolved from utilitarian objects of a small elite into mass market articles designed to affirm and teach the nation. Technical improvements and pedagogical views that stressed the possibility of transmitting adult values to children both contributed to this change. Through military toys and miniatures, it became possible to participate at least symbolically in the wars of the nineteenth century, and not necessarily on the German side alone. With World War I, military toys became less broadly European and more aggressively and characteristically German in character. Ganaway also addressed the question whether children actually perceived the symbolic meaning of their toys – memoir literature indicates that boys liked to be medieval heroes or cowboys and Indians just as much as nationalist citizen soldiers.

In the second paper Andrew Donson discussed the military training of sixteen and seventeen-year-old males in World War I. Noting that participation was voluntary, he argued that the continuously high rates of participation in these training programs, even among working class youth, are indicators of strong support for the war. Even though the recreational and social dimensions clearly played a role in the popularity of the programs, Donson regarded them primarily as an opportunity for

young people to express their patriotism and to be part of a nationalist spectacle. He closed with the suggestion that the military youth companies offered an easy transition into right-wing paramilitary violence after 1918. In the discussion, other possible reasons for participation in military training were offered, such as getting away from daily routines or the hope for a better preparation for service at the front. The discussion of both papers revolved around the question of whether children were in fact indoctrinated by nationalist ideology and adult martial values. Historians face great difficulties in proving the motives for playing with military toys or joining military training companies and assessing their psychological effects.

The second panel dealt with several aspects of war and language. In his paper on German colonial wars and the mass media, Bradley D. Naranch dealt with the “dirty little wars of Imperial German history” and the way the middle-class public in Germany experienced their realities. Because of the geographical distance, these wars were perceived as “virtual conflicts.” On the other hand, war correspondents, with the help of the newly invented telegraph, were for the first time able to have their reports printed just days after the events happened and thus limited the effectiveness of state censorship. Their eye-witness reports influenced the German colonial debate and were used by supporters and opponents of the Imperial colonial policy alike. The language of war and military violence they developed stressed the cultural and racial dimensions of the colonial conflicts and left no room for sympathy with their indigenous victims.

Aaron Cohen sketched the totalitarian “language of war” in Germany and Russia during World War I and II. He came to the conclusion that on a purely linguistic level there were remarkable similarities in the form and content of official propaganda during the Second World War, which was shaped by the experiences of both countries in the First World War. Simplistic differentiations between friends and enemies, the degradation of the enemies as beasts, social outcasts, or ancient barbarians, and the justification of the war as a defense of the cultural values of one’s own society can be found on both sides in both wars. The goal of the war language was, of course, the mobilization of the public in the interest of the war. During World War II, language was subject to far greater institutional control than during preceding periods. While Nazi language distinguished in an emotional way between the “Volk” and its enemies (Jews, Communists, and others), Russian war language focused on the working class (-party) and the (future) Soviet reality. Participants discussed the importance of new technologies for the transmission of propaganda, its reception by different audiences, and the difficult relationship of reality and language in general.

The third panel consisted of two papers that were more loosely related. First, Daniel Krebs presented his research on German prisoners of war in the American war of independence. About 6000 German mercenaries were captured during that conflict. Based on letters and diaries, Krebs described the process of capture and the transition from being soldiers to being prisoners of war through certain rituals of surrender. These rituals stood in for international laws on warfare and prisoners of war, which were at that time sketchy at best. While Congress set some general rules in May 1776, the administration of the prisoners had to be left to local authorities. Generally the prisoners were treated well, kept in regions with a high percentage of German settlers, and could even work for money. Because of a serious labor shortage, the prisoners of war were quickly regarded as potential immigrants. In the discussion, Krebs stressed the differences between the treatment of captured German and British soldiers, and the absence of ideological factors, which played an important role in the treatment of prisoners of war in the twentieth century.

In his paper on the problems of guerilla and interethnic war in the Austrian-Hungarian *Militärgeneralgouvernement* of Serbia in 1917, Jonathan Gumz took the participants back to the early twentieth century. The Habsburg's occupation of Serbia can be seen as the persistence of an older absolutist form of rule that did little to win over the population of that territory even though the *Militärgeneralgouvernement*, concerned with its image, avoided large-scale violence in its counter-guerilla actions. The situation was complicated by the mix of ethnic groups and religions in the region, with the Austrian government supporting Muslims and Albanians in the south in their struggle against Bulgarians and Serbs. Gumz focused on aspects of World War I that, in the face of the industrialized mass warfare of the western front, have been largely overlooked. He stressed the borderland character of the occupied territories and made clear that, contrary to the western and eastern front, this occupation was never meant to lead to annexation.

The fourth panel focused on two papers dealing with World War I and its aftermath from local and comparative perspectives. In his research on the cities of Béziers (France) and Northampton (England), Pierre Purseigle shed light on the importance of local elites for the social mobilization for war. They acted as local transmitters of the national propaganda efforts by adjusting the messages to local cultural codes. Mourning and remembrance served as prime examples of how local identities and national events interacted. Purseigle also discussed advantages and limits of the comparative approach he has chosen.

Adam R. Seipp compared the demobilization process in Munich and Manchester in 1918–19. Power structures were put to the test during the

tumultuous first months of the *Räterepublik* in Munich and the strike-ridden winter of 1919 in England. Both cities will serve as case-studies in a project that focuses on the new role of state and citizenship, the changed understanding of politics, and the way authorities coped with the general demand for “order” in the post World War I period. Both papers successfully attempted to “make the picture more complex” by challenging established narratives on the national level, but were confronted with problems of contextualizing their findings and justifying the selection of their examples.

Because one of the originally selected participants had to cancel, the fifth panel consisted solely of a paper presented by David J. Bielanski on Weimar paramilitary violence and the cult of the dead that arose in Germany after World War I. Bielanski explored the masculine features of the “new man” that were based on the experiences of the front soldiers and revolved around concepts of duty and service to the nation. They were prominently visible in paramilitary organizations like the socialist *Reichsbanner* and the nationalist *Stahlhelm*. Violence was a key element in the identity of their members; fights in the streets replaced the fight in the trenches. Those killed in these battles were easily incorporated into the cult of the dead.

The papers of the sixth panel dealt with the relationship between intellectuals, science and war. James A. Good showed how the American reception of German idealism – most notably the philosophy of G. W. F. Hegel – was influenced by war. The American Civil War and the German wars of unification stimulated American interest in German culture and the liberal values of its system of education: *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*. John Dewey embraced Hegelianism as a student in the 1880s and later, as a professor at the Universities of Michigan and Chicago. After the turn of the century Hegelianism gradually lost its influence, and during World War I Hegel’s political philosophy was held responsible for the German militarism. Dewey criticized German idealism – Kant and Hegel – in his book *German Philosophy and Politics* (1915). Good argued that while Dewey was certainly unable to convincingly prove a correlation between abstract philosophical ideas and the policies of the German government, his changed perception of German culture has to be seen mainly as a disillusionment with the German intellectual tradition in the light of German propaganda rhetoric.

Steven P. Remy discussed his research on the University of Heidelberg in the Third Reich and disproved the “Heidelberg myth” of the universities as victims of the regime. Focusing on the activities of departments and prominent professors during World War II, he showed that the regime could count on the support of its universities and research institutions through war-related publications, courses, and lectures as

well as technological innovations, weapons research, *Raumforschung*, and medical services. Resistance among professors or students was rare in Heidelberg. Beside ideological commonalities, the large-scale financial support of scientific research by various government and military institutions was of crucial importance. The discussion of both papers raised very broad questions about the relationship between intellectuals and society. It became clear that intellectuals or university professors do not work in a vacuum. They respond easily to massive social disturbances like wars, and outside factors deeply influence the production of knowledge.

The seventh panel brought together papers by Wendy Maxon and Monica A. Black. Wendy Maxon explored the topics of mechanization and bestialization in German culture after World War I and demonstrated the value of art works for historical research. She focused on the works of artists such as Oskar Schlemmer, Rudolf Schlichter, Heinrich Davringhausen, and George Grosz. They were occupied with the effects that the industrialized slaughter had on the soldier's body, especially on the western front. They represented different views on general debates over the human body that played an important role in German culture of the 1920s. Their disturbing images of robots and human flesh contrasted with a new awareness of sports, conditioned bodies, nutrition, and health in general.

Monica A. Black presented her research project on perceptions of death among German soldiers during World War II. Based on a reading of letters from the front, which were dominated by elements of the Christian narrative of suffering, death, judgement, and resurrection and victimization, she argued that religious convictions largely survived under the Nazi regime. The totalitarian ideology had not superseded Christianity, but on the eastern front the two coincided as the enemy was described as godless, anti-Christian, and bestial. German soldiers viewed themselves as defenders of Christian culture. The discussion concentrated on soldier's letters as a source that is difficult to use because of the masses of material and the randomness of preservation in the archives, but that nevertheless remains one of the most fruitful sources for the history of wartime mentalities.

The last panel dealt with German history after 1945. Andrew Oppenheimer discussed West German pacifism. The fate of the German Peace Society (GPS), founded in 1892 and relicensed in November 1945, illustrates the obstacles to a simple continuity in pacifist thought and activism. During the Cold War, the society's educational work could not be based on the Weimar-era ideals of anti-militarism. In the anti-communist climate of the late 1940s and early 1950s, the GPS had difficulties dealing with the communist wing of its organization. It adapted to general

liberal-democratic values of the West, but continued to oppose rearmament and the integration of the Federal Republic into NATO.

Finally, Kristin Rebien presented her research on the *Gruppe 47*, the influential network of writers around the author Hans-Werner Richter. All the members of the group fought in World War II and dealt with the war and its consequences in their writings. The myth of the *Stunde Null* that influenced the social and political development of the Federal Republic, was also decisive for the *Gruppe 47*. Their self-image and their success was based on the notion of a “new beginning” and their self-proclaimed status as a cultural elite. Even though publishers refrained from publishing new authors for a number of reasons in the immediate post-war years, the *Gruppe 47*, through its affiliation with critics and publishers, managed to achieve a unique position in the literary market. The discussion of both papers centered on various questions of political and cultural continuity and discontinuity after 1945.

The final discussion of the Young Scholars Forum raised a number of important general questions with regard to the history of war. The broad spectrum of topics and methodological approaches presented at the conference was clearly seen as an asset. The participants interpreted war as a “social situation” rather than as a historical event, and this paved the way for valuable discussions of the problems of pre- and post-war societies and called into question the notion of wars as historical watersheds. Almost all the papers were also marked by an interest in the representation and perception of history rather than history itself. Some of the papers on German history in the first half of the twentieth century were influenced by a revived notion of a German *Sonderweg*, which proved once again the necessity and the value of comparative research and interdisciplinary approaches. The Young Scholars Forum certainly helped to lay the ground for this. Quite unintentionally, the selection of papers also worked in favor of a separation of the history of war in early modern history from the developments in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which likewise called for more comparative or collaborative research. The quality of the papers and the readiness of all participants and the invited scholars from Germany and the United States to engage in discussions in a dedicated and friendly manner was very impressive. It made the weekend at the GHI in Washington a success.

*Christoph Strupp*

### **Participants and Their Topics**

DAVID BIELANSKI, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, “Wartime Memories and Post-War Victims: Weimar Paramilitary Violence and the Cult of the Dead”

- MONICA A. BLACK, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, “*Gott mit uns: Perceptions of Death Among Wehrmacht Soldiers, 1939–1941*”
- AARON J. COHEN, California State University, “The Language Of War: Exhortation, Condemnation, And Symbolism In German And Russian Public Culture During The World Wars”
- ANDREW DONSON, Marquette University, “What Was the Compulsion to be a Soldier? The Military Training of Male Youth in the First World War”
- BRYAN GANAWAY, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, “The Military Miniature Scenario in the Long Nineteenth Century”
- JAMES A. GOOD, Rice University, “War and the Reception of German Idealism”
- JONATHAN GUMZ, University of Chicago, “*The Militärgeneralgouvernement Serbien* in 1917: In the Midst of Guerilla War and Interethnic War”
- DANIEL KREBS, Emory University, “*‘Aller Mut und Herzhaftigkeit, die sonst den Soldaten belebten, war uns entfallen’* – German Prisoners of War in the American War of Independence”
- WENDY MAXON, University of California, San Diego, “*Eisen und Fleisch: The First World War and Images of Mechanization and Animalization in German Culture*”
- BRADLEY D. NARANCH, Johns Hopkins University, “Telegraphing Race: German Colonial Wars and the Mass Media, 1890–1907”
- ANDREW OPPENHEIMER, University of Chicago, “Perpetual Peace at the Crossroads: Pacifism and West German Political Culture, 1945–1951”
- PIERRE PURSEIGLE, Université de Toulouse II, “Imperial Societies and Local Communities at War: The WWI Experience of England and France”
- KRISTIN REBIEN, Stanford University, “World War II and *Stunde Null* – Revisiting the Myth of the New Beginning”
- STEVEN P. REMY, Ohio State University, “Fighting Science: German University Professors and War, 1939–1945”
- ADAM R. SEIPP, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, “Between Peace and Order: Demobilization, International Politics, and Urban Protest in Munich and Manchester, 1918–1919”

## LATIN AMERICA, NORTH AMERICA, AND EUROPE: INTERNATIONAL ENCOUNTERS AND RELATIONS IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Conference held in conjunction with the Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Council for Latin American Studies, Portland, Oregon, April 10–13, 2002. Conveners: Christof Mauch (GHI) and Friedrich Schuler (Portland State University). Participants: Walther Bernecker (University of Erlangen-Nürnberg), Ragnhild Fiebig von Hase (University of Cologne), Thomas Fischer (University of Erlangen-Nürnberg), Claudia Haake (University of Bielefeld), Friedrich Katz (University of Chicago), Alan Knight (St. Anthony's College, Oxford), Uta Kresse Raina (Temple University), David Lazar (GHI), Uwe Lübken (University of Cologne), Ray Sadler (New Mexico State University) Thomas Schoonover (University of Southwestern Louisiana).

Over the years, the GHI has organized numerous conferences in the area of transatlantic history focusing on the manifold interactions between the United States and Europe. The annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Council for Latin American Studies (RMCLAS) provided an opportunity to take a broader perspective. In collaboration with RMCLAS, the GHI invited several European scholars to share their thoughts on the three-way interactions between North America, Europe, and Latin America with experts on Latin America from the U.S. While most of the papers presented at the conference "Latin America, North America and Europe: International Encounters and Relations in Historical Perspective" focused on U.S.-European rivalry for influence in Latin America, much of the discussion centered on Latin American responses to that rivalry.

The first session of the conference was devoted to "German Interests in Latin America." In her paper "Clio and the German Danger 1896–1914," Ragnhild Fiebig von Hase suggested that historians' discussions of the question whether Imperial Germany posed a challenge to the Monroe Doctrine or a threat to U.S. interests in Latin America in the years immediately preceding World War I have been skewed by preoccupation with other issues. German historians long tended to subordinate analysis of German policy toward Latin America to consideration of Germany's dealings with the other great powers and the origins of the first world war. American scholars, meanwhile, have tended to link the question of the "German threat" to the question of the long-term influence of President Theodore Roosevelt's Latin America policy.

Fiebig von Hase's paper was followed by a case study of the differing goals two German governments pursued in their dealings with a Latin

American nation. Friedrich Katz opened his paper "A Comparison: German Policy Toward Mexico During Imperial Germany and the Third Reich" by noting that Mexico generally played a minor role in German policy in Latin America. In contrast to several other Latin American nations, pre-World War I Mexico had very limited economic dealings with Germany and comparatively few German settlers - the focal points of Imperial Germany's interest in Latin America. German interest in Mexico suddenly increased, according to Katz, with the Mexican revolution - during which Germany proposed establishing a de facto German-British-U.S. protectorate in Mexico - and the outbreak of the World War I, when Germany sought to provoke conflict between the U.S. and Mexico to divert U.S. attention from Europe. During the 1930s, Katz went on to argue, there was initially little basis for expanding ties between Hitler's right-wing government and the leftist Mexican government of Lázaro Cárdenas. A new impetus in German-Mexican relations came, however, in the wake of the Mexican government's nationalization of the oil industry in 1938; faced with a boycott by foreign oil companies, the Mexican government was willing to barter oil for industrial products with Germany. Cárdenas nonetheless remained fundamentally anti-Nazi - his was the only government to protest the German-Austrian *Anschluss* - and Mexico was eventually to join with the United States in declaring war on Germany.

The second session of the conference explored "U.S., British, and German Imperialism in Latin America." Alan Knight made the case for the utility of the notion of "informal imperialism" in his paper "British and U.S. Imperialism in Latin America: A Comparison." Britain's relations with Latin America after about 1850, Knight argued, illustrate the exercise of informal imperial control to advance the imperial power's economic interests. Before roughly 1840, Britain had tried to use coercion to secure favorable terms for trade and investment in the region, but with little success. After 1850, Latin American elites, for reasons of their own self-interest, became increasingly receptive to British economic influence. Britain was thereafter able to obtain much of what it had earlier sought by way of economic advantage; although coercion did not figure in Britain's dealings with the nations of Latin America, Knight stressed, there was a marked imbalance of power that worked in Britain's favor. The United States' relations with Latin America, he went on to argue, exemplify the defensive function of informal imperialism. Until the end of the Cold War, U.S. policy toward Latin America was shaped by a preoccupation with perceived external threats to U.S. interests in the region - fascism in the 1930s and 40s, for example, and communism in the following decades. The U.S. was more interested in trying to shape the social and political order in Latin America than Britain was, Knight noted, and U.S. policy had moralistic and missionary undercurrents missing from British policy.

Looking at the work of German scholars on Andean cultures, Uta Kresse Raina invoked another form of imperialism in her paper "Anthropology and Archaeology as Means for Intellectual Conquest in the Andes, 1850-1920." Germany had only very limited political and economic ties to the Andean nations, but the region was a major focus of German "intellectual imperialism," according to Kresse Raina. German self-identity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was built upon the notion of the Germans as a people with ancient roots, and that notion strongly influenced the work of German scholars who studied ancient cultures, be it the Greeks or the Incas. Drawing a sharp contrast between a "noble" Inca past and a less glorious, ethnically mixed present, German anthropologists and archaeologists appropriated the Andean past for the construction of a German identity.

The two papers presented during the third session of the conference, "Concepts and Cultural Space," pointed to some of the difficulties - archival in one case, conceptual in the other - in studying the points of intersection between U.S., European, and Latin American history. In his paper "Finding Master Spy Abwehr Agent August Lüning in Havana, 1942 and 2002," Thomas Schoonover outlined the challenges of trying to piece together an account of Lüning's covert career and eventual arrest from the surviving records. Although Lüning's superiors were apparently dissatisfied with the information he provided them, and although he was undone largely by his own bumbling and clumsiness, U.S. counterintelligence officials were quick to portray Lüning as a serious threat to the Allied war effort and his arrest as a major blow to Nazi espionage. In the second paper of the session, "Genocide: Different Approaches to the Application of a European Concept in Latin America and the United States," Claudia Haake sketched the history of the term "genocide" and the ways it has been applied in studies of the indigenous peoples of North and South America. The term was coined by the Polish legal scholar Raphael Lemkin toward the end of World War II to describe the Nazi regime's policy of mass murder directed at specific groups. A central issue in early discussions of the concept of genocide, Haake noted, was the question whether intent was a necessary defining element. Some of the scholars and activists who have applied the term to the experiences of Native American groups have argued against the necessity of demonstrating intent in applying the concept of genocide or have side-stepped the issue by focusing on numbers and avoiding precise definitions. Voicing dissatisfaction with the often emotional tone and frequent vagueness in discussions of possible instances of genocide in the Americas, Haake closed by suggesting that a firm definition of genocide is still needed before the question whether genocide did in fact occur in the Americas can be decided.

The two papers presented during the fourth session, "European and U.S. Competition in Latin America," were conceived as twin case studies

of great power economic rivalry. Walther Bernecker, sketching the competition between Great Britain and the United States in Mexico, called attention to the impact of the differences in Spanish, British, and U.S. colonial economic policy. Thomas Fischer placed U.S.-German competition for economic advantage in Colombia within the context of regional economic differentiation within Colombia itself.

The subject of the closing session of the conference was "Japan and Germany in Latin America in the Interwar Period and World War II." Uwe Lübken's paper "Playing the Cultural Game: Nelson Rockefeller and the German Threat to Latin America" set out the dilemma U.S. policy makers confronted as they sought ways to counter Nazi and Fascist influence in Latin America in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Too direct a response, Lübken explained, might prompt Latin American governments and publics to suspect the U.S. was reverting to either the policy of the "Big Stick" or dollar diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy, on the other hand, seemed to offer a method for achieving traditional diplomatic goals through indirect means. The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA) was created in 1940 under the direction of Nelson Rockefeller to serve as a channel to provide private groups with governmental funding to showcase U.S. culture in Latin America. Even with the OCIAA, however, the U.S. did not have a long-term policy for achieving long-term goals through cultural diplomacy in Latin America. U.S. cultural policy in Latin America, according to Lübken, remained first and foremost a response to the perceived fascist threat.

The conference closed with Friedrich Schuler's paper on "Japan in Latin America, 1933-1939." Schuler began by explaining his interest in reconsidering the terms and categories that have been used in writing Latin American history. The case of the development of the Japanese government's trade policy toward Latin America during the 1930s suggests, in his view, that the unfolding of events and decisions was much more haphazard than historical accounts indicate. The start of Japan's war on China coincided with the collapse of diplomatic efforts to address the Depression in the early 1930s, but it was only later in the decade that the Japanese government tried to direct trade with Latin America to serve the needs of its war effort. Japanese policy developed, Schuler argued, in opportunistic response to developments such as the U.S.-British embargo of Peru or the threat of protectionist measures on the part of Japan's Latin American trading partners: the eventual subordination of trade policy to the war effort was not preordained.

The organizers are planning to publish a collection of essays based upon the conference.

*David Lazar*

MID-ATLANTIC GERMAN HISTORY SEMINAR  
“THE GOLDEN HUNGER YEARS”:  
MUSIC AND SUPERPOWER RIVALRY IN OCCUPIED BERLIN

On Saturday, April 20, 2002, members of the Mid-Atlantic German History Seminar met for a luncheon and discussion which centered on a paper submitted by Elizabeth Janik: “‘The Golden Hunger Years:’ Music and Superpower Rivalry in Occupied Berlin.” Janik, currently a post-doctoral Teaching Fellow at George Mason University, will be joining the history faculty at James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia, in the fall of 2002. She recently completed her Ph.D. under the supervision of Professor Roger Chickering, Georgetown University. Her paper was part of her larger study, now under revision for eventual publication.

In her paper, Janik described and analyzed American and Soviet arts policies, focusing on music, an area of culture often neglected in postwar and occupation historical accounts. She concentrated on Berlin and especially the role of American and Soviet military occupiers in fostering competing visions of culture. As Janik suggested: “In competition with each other and seeking the loyalties of their German charges, the Allies encouraged Berlin to become a lively—and heavily subsidized—city of the arts.” She concluded by noting that by the end of the occupation period, both east and west Berlin had symphony orchestras, radio stations, and universities, all of which would serve as institutional carriers of competing political, social, and cultural visions during the Cold War.

A lively discussion followed, which was made especially interesting and informative since a number of participants (including Robert Wolfe and Charles Herber) had been U.S. Army soldiers or OMGUS officers in Germany during these postwar years. Henry Friedlander also vividly described the post-World War II scene as he recalled it. These insightful observations about Berlin’s cultural climate were very illuminating.

In 1969, Vernon Lidtke (Johns Hopkins University) conceived of the idea of an informal historians’ group meeting occasionally to present work-in-progress. He along with William Fletcher (University of Delaware) and other Washington, DC-Baltimore area professors first met in the spring of 1971 at Johns Hopkins University. James Harris (University of Maryland) presented the first paper. Thus, the Mid-Atlantic German History Seminar was founded over thirty years ago to promote scholarship in German history. An informal association of academics, government employees with a background in German history, and museum officials, the group has been meeting regularly two times annually, in the

fall and in the spring. Participants offer to present a work-in-progress, such as a book chapter or article, and these are submitted in advance of the luncheon meeting. Over seventy individuals are on the Mid-Atlantic German History Seminar's mailing list. For many years, Professor Thomas Helde (Georgetown University) coordinated the effort, followed by James Harris (University of Maryland). Currently Marion Deshmukh (George Mason University) is the group's coordinator.

With the spring 2002 meeting, a new relationship begins with the German Historical Institute. Dr. Christof Mauch, the GHI's director, graciously offered to host the annual spring meeting of the Seminar. This will provide a central and convenient location. Normally, the various area universities of its participants host the Seminar meetings. In the past, the meetings were held at virtually all the Washington, DC universities (Catholic, George Washington, Georgetown, American, University of Maryland, George Mason University). But meetings have also been held at Prince Georges Community College, the Holocaust Museum, Towson University, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Delaware. Seminar participants come from universities as far as Hofstra, Rutgers, Virginia Commonwealth, and the University of Richmond. Thus the new relationship between the Mid-Atlantic Seminar and the German Historical Institute will be a welcome partnership. For more information about the Seminar, please contact Marion Deshmukh (Department of History & Art History, George Mason University) at (703) 993-2149 or via e-mail at [mdeshmuk@gmu.edu](mailto:mdeshmuk@gmu.edu).

*Marion Deshmukh*

EXPERT CULTURES AND SOCIAL ENGINEERING  
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY:  
SCIENTISTS, SCHOLARS, AND INSTITUTIONAL POLITICS  
BETWEEN GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

Conference at the GHI, April 26–27, 2002. Conveners: Philipp Loeser (GHI/AICGS) and Christoph Strupp (GHI). Participants: David Cahan (University of Nebraska), Eckhardt Fuchs (University of Mannheim), Christie C. Hanzlik-Green (University of Wisconsin), Thomas A. Howard (Gordon College), Jochen Kirchhoff (German Museum Munich), Gabriele Lingelbach (University of Trier), Christof Mauch (GHI), Dorothy Ross (Johns Hopkins University), Jeffrey Sklansky (Oregon State University), Frank Trommler (University of Pennsylvania), Andreas Westerwinter (University of Leipzig/University of Paris IV).

The development of nineteenth-century scholarly research was characterized by expansion, specialization, and increasingly self-referential modes of operation. The rise of research universities, first in Europe and with some delay in the United States, had a tremendous impact. A new professional apparatus with a seminar system, laboratories, reference tools, and scientific journals shaped professional activities. Distinct sets of methodologies and legitimation strategies developed within each discipline. As a result, the overall focus shifted from the universal orientation of humanist education to specialized professional training. The ideals of *Bildung* and cosmopolitan scholarship were still held in high esteem, but they were at odds with the development of relatively autonomous expert cultures. Many of the new forms of knowledge were difficult to integrate into the general education of the individual. At the same time, the influence of academics on culture and society seemed to decline; they had increasing difficulty in making themselves heard outside their own fields of study. The success story of the research university can also be read as the story of the alienation of many of the individuals involved. Professional careers at universities drifted apart from those in politics, law, or the business world. Interests beyond the field of academics could no longer be articulated directly and with immediate results.

The conference at the GHI explored how individuals sought to participate in the engineering of culture and society and how they established themselves as authorities beyond their scholarly disciplines, even as the drift towards formal expertise counteracted this goal. Within this general perspective, the conference focused on two sets of questions. First and foremost, the participants from Germany and the United States

looked at the rise of expert cultures in the second half of the nineteenth century and discussed this phenomenon from different angles. The expert as a new social type enabled individuals to define their personalities solely with respect to a self-referential, methodologically self-sustained system of disciplinary thinking and experimentation. This development challenged previous notions such as the participation in the public sphere or the classical type of *Bildung*. Wherever the participants in this conference probed their material in this regard, a turbulent if inconclusive struggle of different sets of values emerged—the old gentleman ideal, a utilitarian focus on professional training, obligations with regard to the functioning of public life, and the idealist, self-referential concepts of German *Wissenschaft* or modern science. The second set of questions concerned a transatlantic differential: The migration of German concepts and educational frameworks to the U.S., studied through a comparative approach that everyone felt was necessary. In the second half of the nineteenth century, German professors appointed to American universities and Americans trained in Germany found themselves in the middle of a dynamics of changing institutions, curricula, and individual roles inside and outside the university system. They had to redefine their work's relation to society and this process invariably impacted the latter. The participants sought to address relevant processes of transfer and mediation as complex, contingent adaptations, appropriations, and interpretations involving a source culture and a target culture (the U.S.). The aspect of social engineering, that is the preoccupation with questions of how a society should function and how related goals could best be achieved with the educational instruments at hand, played an important part in many instances of cultural transfer.

New institutional developments in the educational system of the United States between 1860 and 1900 were often related to German models. This is obviously true for the research university as the dominant innovation of the time, but it also applies to smaller institutional changes and elements of scientific professionalization in general. Gabriele Lingelbach discussed several unsuccessful attempts to establish "Schools of Political Science" within the research university of the late nineteenth century. The intention of historians such as Andrew D. White, Charles K. Adams, and Herbert B. Adams at Cornell, Michigan, and Johns Hopkins was to provide university-level training for future politicians, journalists, and other key figures of public life. The projects revealed a desire for social relevance, but never lasted long, presumably because of their contested utilitarian outlook. The inherent processes of specialization marginalized the impact of the humanities on politics and ethics, and a new discipline such as political science seemed to be an obvious place for those interested in public service careers. But despite the American civil

service reform of the 1880s, politics was not yet considered a profession and thus not linked to a need for professional training. At least until after the turn of the century, the idea of professionally trained politicians was at odds with the self-image of the U.S. as a democratic, open, and meritocratic society.

Jochen Kirchhoff analyzed transfer processes with regard to the discipline of agricultural chemistry. He pointed out that national particularities that were contingent upon historical context shaped the formation of different expert cultures in Germany and the United States. Although the initiation to German *Wissenschaft* played an important role for individual American researchers studying abroad (mainly in Göttingen with F. Wöhler), the introduction of agricultural chemistry as a scientific discipline in the United States from the 1840s on had much more to do with practical reasoning. Quality control of fertilizing substances was a major issue, and it took more than twenty years before a system of state experimental stations was finally complemented by scientific research at universities. The early German and subsequently American agricultural chemists drew their prestige as experts not so much from abstract research but from their role in the examination procedures and the practical value of their knowledge. Christie C. Hanzlik-Green made a strong case for the indebtedness of the system of University Extension in Wisconsin between 1890 and 1920 to German concepts of the university. What started out as a progressive educational instrument, aimed at the workforce and heavily dependent on the skill of its few popular orators, entered into a crisis in the late 1890s and was revived only when Louis Reber, a German-trained engineer, took charge. He installed a centralized, bureaucratic structure, drawing heavily on German ideals of the state universities as central authorities in the production of knowledge. The concept proved to be viable and was adopted by numerous other American states. Andreas Westerwinter recounted the complex makings of American "New Psychology" between 1870 and 1910. A slow shift from German to French paradigms of research and educational institutionalization corresponded to generational differences among American psychologists and, notably, generational differences in interests and outlooks among American graduate students at Wilhelm Wundt's famous laboratory in Leipzig. The faithful transfer and even the acceptance of German-style research could by no means be taken for granted. On the contrary, a selective and idiosyncratic reception enabled American universities to generate considerable creative potentials of their own.

Individuals often faced epistemological and ethical conundrums. Should a search for truth be displaced by a focus on the coherence and consistency of scientific research? Could the public duties of an American citizen be reconciled with the self-referentiality of modern science? Chris-

troph Strupp took a close look at the career of Andrew D. White, the founding president of Cornell University since 1868. A number of crucial problems of the time are epitomized in this case. The moral duties of the cultivated gentleman had to be aligned with a focus on the practical value of education and a tendency of expert cultures to withdraw into secluded niches of specialization. During an extended stay in Europe (1853–56), White had discovered his love for historical scholarship, but his lack of formal training and his energetic personality prevented him from becoming a specialist in a narrow sub-field of the discipline. Until his death in 1917, he was a wanderer between the worlds of scholarship, university administration, politics, business, and the American diplomatic service. His progressive and present-minded concept of history, his interest in educating future public leaders, and his anti-sectarian position with regard to higher education all heavily influenced the educational program of Cornell University. Even though not completely untouched by European influences, it became a university with a specifically American character that tried to respond to the problems of American higher education and the demands of a changing American society.

David Cahan investigated the eminent German physicist Hermann von Helmholtz and his influence on American graduate students and scholars studying and doing research with him at his prestigious physics institutes in Heidelberg (1863–71) and Berlin (1878–94). With inspirational force—and a remarkable command of English, which was superior to his American students' command of German—Helmholtz managed to combine the expertise of the specialist and a drive towards intellectual unity. Helmholtz's name gained fame beyond Germany early on, through translations of his popular public lectures and his membership in the American Academy of Science (1868). Even though his qualities as a teacher are disputed, his institutes were "networking arenas" of crucial importance for foreign students and scientists. Here they could pursue their research in total academic freedom. Cahan showed in detail how most of Helmholtz's American students, among them Henry Rowland (later a physicist at Johns Hopkins University), Dewitt Bristol Brace (University of Nebraska), and Michael Pupin (Columbia University), pursued distinguished careers in the United States.

In his presentation on Henry Adams, Philipp Loeser argued that despite Adams's key position in the formation of history as an academic discipline in the United States (Adams conducted the first graduate seminar in medieval history in the early 1870s and was a pioneer in archival studies), he was not the founding father of American history departments that some historical accounts have claimed him to be. Adams took modernist uncertainties very seriously and underwent a shift from scientific to aesthetically based thinking, most profoundly expressed in his well-

known autobiography *The Education of Henry Adams*. Adams admired and benefitted from the German model of scholarship, but he could not fully appreciate the drive toward specialization and lack of general inspiration in the individual disciplines.

Jeffrey Sklansky examined G. Stanley Hall, the founder of child and educational psychology in the United States, and his recasting of pertinent problems of modernization in terms of educational reform. Hall reevaluated social conflicts, such as the diminishing of the eighteenth-century ideal of the masterful self, the deepening divide between mental and manual labor through processes of specialization, and the abstention of the researcher from political and moral problems, as the “growing pains of a nation coming of age.” He viewed this dualistically as a development from childhood to adulthood and from savagery to civilization. His studies in Berlin and Leipzig in the late 1860s and 1870s convinced him that German “scientific philosophy” and the educational system of the Bismarck state—with its research universities and compulsory primary schools—might prove valuable for the development of an American people still immature in its reaction towards modernity. He hoped for a reconciliation of intellect and willpower, empirical learning and spiritual growth with recourse to German moral responsibility and totalizing world views.

Significantly, most case studies dealt with Americans who had gained academic experience in Germany and then returned to the United States. This certainly reflects on the United States’ lack of appeal for educated Europeans. But nevertheless some German academics went to the U.S. Thomas A. Howard’s presentation on “German Theological *Wissenschaft* in America” argued persuasively that several cultural mediators of the nineteenth century brought a significant amount of German theology to the United States and successfully complemented the transfer of secularized German *Wissenschaft* with religious impulses, however controversial at the time. In Germany itself, theologians easily managed to integrate new scientific approaches and remained culturally influential throughout the entire nineteenth century. In America, next to Edward Robinson, who spent four years at German universities in the late 1820s, it was primarily the theologian Philip Schaff who acted as driving force and self-proclaimed “missionary of science.” Schaff had been born in Switzerland but was educated at German universities. In 1844 he took up a teaching position at the seminary of the German Reformed Church in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, and moved to the Union Theological Seminary in New York in 1870. He saw himself as a mediator between German academic culture and the American tradition of political liberty and religious voluntarism. Although he was a leading exponent of modern scientific church and religious history at American universities, he re-

mained equally committed to orthodox protestantism and Christian values and attempted to harmonize science and belief.

Eckhardt Fuchs chose the 1904 Universal Exposition at St. Louis as the starting point for observations on contemporary theories of knowledge transfer and practices of intercultural exchange. A "Congress of Arts and Science" that included German professors from a variety of disciplines had been structurally outlined by the Harvard psychology professor Hugo Münsterberg. It turned out to suffer heavily from translation problems and inabilities to enter into a dialogue on both the German and the American side. Münsterberg's notion of a "double entry" into both cultures at the same time did not pay off, nor did the fiction of the "impartial observer" prove productive in a communicative context that depended on stereotypical complexity reductions.

All the papers inspired lively discussions, further stimulated by insightful commentaries on the presentations of Sklansky, Howard, and Loeser by Dorothy Ross and Frank Trommler. The conference benefitted greatly from the broad spectrum of disciplines from the humanities and the natural and social sciences that were discussed. Comparisons could be drawn and connections became visible that are otherwise easily overlooked. The final discussion revolved around questions of terminology, periodization, and the driving forces behind processes of cultural transfer and institutional change. The expert clearly is a social type that developed in the late nineteenth century, but he is difficult to distinguish from the specialist and the professional and needs further terminological clarification. Everybody also agreed that the beginning of the German influence in American culture and its intensity varies from discipline to discipline. Whether influential individuals managed to introduce new subjects and methodologies on their own or whether they acted as agents of larger cultural trends needs further in-depth research. The biographical approach of the conference helped to keep the papers focused, but it is certainly not the only possible approach. It is equally difficult to measure the results of processes of cultural transfer in terms of success or failure. Sidelines and dead ends must be taken into consideration. It was not the goal of the conference to come to conclusive results at this point, but rather to contribute through a fresh perspective to an on-going debate in one of the most interesting subfields of the history of science. This was certainly achieved and the conveners are looking forward to further exploration in follow-up projects.

*Philipp Loeser  
and Christoph Strupp*

## EIGHTH TRANSATLANTIC DOCTORAL SEMINAR: GERMAN HISTORY, 1945–1990

Seminar hosted by the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung (ZZF), Potsdam, May 1–4, 2002. Co-sponsored by the GHI and the BMW Center for German and European Studies, Georgetown University. Conveners: Roger Chickering (Georgetown University) and Richard F. Wetzell (GHI). Moderators: Andreas Daum (Harvard University), Manfred Görtemaker (Universität Potsdam), Elizabeth Heineman (University of Iowa), Ulrich Herbert (Universität Freiburg), Konrad Jarausch (ZZF), Christoph Kleßmann (ZZF).

For the eighth time, the Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History brought together sixteen doctoral students from North America and from Germany to present and discuss their dissertation projects with one another and with faculty mentors from both sides of the Atlantic. Since this year's seminar was dedicated to German history from 1945 to 1990, it also had the virtue of bringing together historians working on West Germany with those working on East Germany. It was graciously hosted by the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung (ZZF) in Potsdam. The seminar began with an opening lecture from the co-director of the ZZF, Prof. Konrad Jarausch, on "A Double Burden: The Politics of the Past and German Identity," in which he explored the connections between the debates about the East German and Nazi dictatorships and argued that Germany's culture of historical self-criticism ought to be balanced with a historical sense of Germany's positive accomplishments in order to allow a "democratic patriotism" to develop.

The first panel brought together two papers that examined the early postwar histories of East Germany and Poland in comparative perspective. Jan Behrend's paper examined the history of propaganda in East Germany and Poland from 1944/45 to 1957, focusing on the question to what extent the propaganda strategies of the two regimes succeeded in creating *Vertrauen* (trust) in the regime among the population. Although the nature of the available sources makes it difficult to assess the reception and effectiveness of propaganda efforts, Behrend's argued that sudden changes in propaganda strategy, which occurred in both countries, led to irritated reactions in the population. The lack of open communication, he concluded, meant that "Soviet-type" systems suffered from a very limited scope of *Vertrauen*. David Tompkins compared the early history of music festivals in the GDR and Poland, from 1948 to 1957. Music, he argued, was a key element in the communist parties' "softer" forms of control. The communist parties in both countries sought to har-

nass music for ideological purposes by pushing for “socialist-realist” music, but encountered some resistance from composers interested in more avant-garde “formalist” works and from audiences who could simply leave concert halls empty if the musical program strayed too far from popular tastes. On balance, the SED was more successful in imposing its vision than the communist party in Poland, where composers gained considerable autonomy after 1953. The first panel’s discussion focused on the difficulties of determining popular attitudes in dictatorial regimes and of distinguishing between pragmatic adaptation and genuine consent; differences between *Vertrauen* and other forms of legitimacy; and the importance of negotiations over the meaning of terms like “socialist realism.”

The second panel dealt with West German history during the 1960s and 1970s. Peter Kramper’s paper examined the history of the trade-union-owned “Neue Heimat” and its transformation, over the course of the 1960s, from a developer of housing projects into a *Städtebaukonzern*, a company involved in urban development more generally. This transformation, Kramper argued, was both the last initiative that the Neue Heimat legitimated in terms of “meeting demand” (*Bedarfsdeckung*) and its first step toward assuming a particular role in the social market economy. Keith Alexander’s paper dealt with the increasing acceptance of parliamentary democracy in the West German left by examining how one of the “K-Groups,” the antiparliamentary, revolutionary KPD-Rote Fahne, came to join in the formation of a parliamentary party, Berlin’s Alternative Liste, which ran in the 1979 election and entered the West Berlin Abgeordnetenhaus the same year. The ensuing discussion raised several important issues: whether the papers demonstrated the increasing acceptance of parliamentary democracy (by the K-Groups) and the market economy (by the Neue Heimat); whether the transformation of the K-Groups should be attributed primarily to the appeal of parliamentary democracy or to the biographical path of K-Group members; the relative weight of ideology and biography in the history of the K-Groups; and whether the reasons for the urban-development ambitions of the Neue Heimat included political hostility to the architecture of the Kaiserreich and a process of *Verwissenschaftlichung*.

The third panel examined two different kinds of cross-border traffic. Simone Derix’s paper analyzed the role of images (*Bilder*) in official state visits in West Germany in the 1950s. The Federal Republic might have seemed short on symbols because it cultivated a “pathos of soberness” that was designed to project distance from the pomp of the Nazi regime. Nevertheless, in its arrangements for state visits, Derix argued, the Federal Republic sought to promote two images in particular: Germany’s successful rebuilding, visualized through visits to model factories, and

the division of Germany, visualized through visits to Berlin. In her paper, Edith Sheffer offered a “microhistory of German division” by examining the border relations between two neighboring Franconian towns (Sonneberg and Neustadt) that became separated by the inter-German border. Exploding the myth that the border was fortified by the East against Western objections, Sheffer showed that the German population and the occupying forces on both sides contributed to making the border increasingly impermeable for a variety of reasons, including both economic self-interest and hostility toward refugees on the Western side. The discussion raised the questions of how one can combine cultural and political history, and to what extent both papers represented new approaches to writing the history of the Cold War.

The fourth panel dealt with two instances of “social engineering” in West and East Germany. Ruth Rosenberger’s paper studied the entry of industrial psychologists (*Betriebspsychologen*) and human resources specialists (*Personalexperten*) into West German companies during the period 1945–1975 as an instance of the scientization (*Verwissenschaftlichung*) of the social. The impact of these experts, Rosenberger argued, was Janus-faced. On the one hand, management used psychological expertise to rationalize production; on the other hand, the principle of dialogical communication that these experts promoted also had the potential to humanize the workplace. The second paper, by Gregory Witkowski, also dealt with the arrival of a new actor in an economic institution: in this case, the arrival of industrial workers on East German collective farms. Examining the East German campaign to recruit industrial workers to work on farms during the 1950s, Witkowski demonstrated how the various interests of the participants—workers and farmers—consistently frustrated the state’s planning goals. The GDR, he argued, is best understood as an “educational dictatorship,” whose power was limited by a measure of *Eigen-Sinn*—individual interests rather than outright resistance—of the population. In the discussion, it was argued that both papers dealt with processes of modernization that addressed specifically German deficits: hierarchical structures in industrial enterprises and an insufficiently modernized agricultural sector. It was also suggested that the interest of enterprises in human-resources specialists fluctuated with the labor market. Finally, the question was asked: Did these papers suggest that West German methods of social engineering were sophisticated (wrapping rationalization in the mantle of humanization), whereas East German methods were generally clumsy and therefore ineffective?

The fifth panel brought together two papers on history and memory in East Germany. David Marshall presented an overview of his dissertation on East Berlin’s Museum für deutsche Geschichte. In the 1950s and 1960s, Marshall argued, the museum focused primarily on German na-

tional history and engaged in harsh Cold War rhetoric against West Germany. After 1970, the museum shifted its focus toward international socialism, emphasized German-Soviet relations, and started to promote a "separate GDR historical identity." In his paper, Jon Berndt Olsen examined three examples of early East German "memory work": the reconstruction of the Gedenkstätte der Sozialisten in the Friedrichsfelde cemetery, designed to link the SED to the tradition of the German labor movement; the centennial commemoration of the 1848 Revolution, which stressed supposed analogies between 1848 and the current situation in Germany; and the 1948 traveling exhibit "The Other Germany," which portrayed the SED's current struggle as an extension of the fight against fascism. In sum, Olsen argued, the SED attempted to appropriate existing "memory rituals" and to "transfer the counter-memory of a select group of individuals onto the collective memory" of the East German population. The ensuing discussion called attention to: the fact that the politics of history and memory in both Germanies were always shaped by competition between the two German states; the need to analyze the interaction of public memory culture and the development of history as a discipline; and the benefits of moving beyond national histories when studying the politics of history.

The sixth panel addressed two important aspects of social and economic life in East Germany. According to Molly Wilkinson Johnson, the SED regarded organized sports as an important tool for building a "socialist culture" (defined by "productivity, health, and military preparedness") and for "structuring the leisure time" of its citizens. Examining the campaign to mobilize the Leipzig population for "voluntary work actions" to build a sports stadium, she argued that the campaign's success demonstrated the GDR's "progress in fostering citizens' identification with the state," but also observed that the available sources make it difficult to determine people's motivations for participating in such campaigns. Philipp Heldmann examined GDR consumer goods policy during the 1960s, using the example of clothing. His analysis stressed four "weaknesses" of the regime: the leadership's policies were often contradictory; the bureaucracy often did not implement the leadership's wishes; the planning bureaucracy had limited control over the economy; and, finally, the regime depended on a measure of cooperation from the population—and was keenly aware that the availability of certain consumer goods was crucial to secure such cooperation. Heldmann concluded that far from being dictated from above, consumer goods policy was characterized by a fair amount of "bargaining" and "negotiation" among different actors, including the population. The discussion suggested that the different goals of the regime's sports policy—creating socialist personalities, structuring leisure time, and training a corps of athletes for the

Olympics—might have been in tension with one another and raised the question how changes in priority changed sports policy over time. The discussion also addressed the question whether the notion of “weaknesses” of the regime was useful for analyzing the GDR.

The seventh panel examined two aspects of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—coming to terms with the Nazi past—in West Germany. Jürgen Zieher’s paper examined how the legacy of the Holocaust was dealt with in Dortmund, Düsseldorf, and Cologne from 1945 to 1960. Public commemoration of the Holocaust, he showed, was mostly limited to the Jewish communities in these cities and a very small, but active non-Jewish section of the public. Most of the population and city officials were silent about the murder of the Jews. Local officials became more willing to participate in commemorations of the Holocaust in the second half of the 1950s, but they did this in order to make a superficial peace with the survivors and to absolve themselves, rather than to honestly confront their history. Daniel Morat’s paper provided an overview of his dissertation about Martin Heidegger, Ernst Jünger, and Friedrich Georg Jünger and how these intellectuals dealt with the Nazi past—and their own role in it—after 1945. Morat argued that after 1945 all three thinkers managed to distance themselves from National Socialism by reinterpreting their relationship to technological modernity, which they now interpreted as part of an “age of nihilism.” In the biographical crisis situation they faced after 1945, this intellectual strategy allowed them to relativize the importance of National Socialism, which became merely one instance of the more general phenomenon of nihilism, and to recast their own role as that of intellectuals who were working to overcome this nihilism by acting as “seismographs.” The discussion raised a number of issues: Did the papers assume a normative path of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*? If so, it was suggested, one ought to examine the social function of *Verdrängung* (repression), which might have been necessary after 1945. There also was a debate about the terms “Conservative Revolution” and *Abstandsdenken*, which can be seen as tainted by their apologetic use and implications.

The last panel was devoted to two aspects of West German reactions to the constant threat of war—nuclear war in particular—during the Cold War. Nicholas Steneck’s paper examined the origins of West Germany’s first civil defense law, which was passed in 1957. Tracing the interaction of expert planners, parliamentary politics, and public opinion in the shaping of civil policy, Steneck argued that the civil defense law of 1957 was deeply flawed. Its mandates remained unfunded because the Adenauer government was unwilling to commit sufficient federal funds and sought to shift the costs to the private sector and to state and local governments; and the content of the civil defense plans (which contained no provisions for mass evacuations) showed that the civil defense planners were still

fighting the last war and failed to take the nuclear threat seriously. As a result, critics charged that the law simply provided an illusion of civil defense rather than any actual protection. Katrin Köhl presented an overview of her comparative study of the development of “conflict resolution studies” in the U.S. and *Friedens- und Konfliktforschung* in West Germany. Using the concept of *Erfahrungsgeschichte*, Köhl argued that once the immense stockpile of weapons of mass destruction in East and West were experienced as creating a situation of permanent danger, research on war and peace underwent a major shift, which took the form of two different *Denkstile* (styles of thought) in the U.S. and Germany. In the U.S., the desire to expand the room for manoeuver in international relations led political scientists to move beyond the conceptual dichotomy of “war” and “peace” by focusing on “conflict” and “conflict resolution,” and the question of how to create an international system of arms control. West German research, by contrast, was shaped by the perception that the nuclear threat had eliminated all room for manoeuver in politics, which led West German political scientists to stress the danger of a superpower “pax atomica” and to develop the notion of *organisierte Friedlosigkeit*—a state that was neither war nor peace—as a key concept in West German peace research. The discussion focused on: the pros and cons of *Erfahrungsgeschichte*; the relevance of the fact that West Germany and the U.S. did not experience a “hot” war after 1945; the role of *Friedensforschung* as a weapon in the Cold War; and the importance of the Korean War and the German *Atomdebatte* for both civil defense debates and peace research.

Like most of the seminar, the concluding discussion was characterized by lively debate. The suggestion that the papers on East Germany had mostly been narratives of failure and those on West Germany mostly narratives of success met with disagreement from most participants, who insisted that the papers on both German states told more complicated stories. Several authors of papers on the early period of the GDR observed that they were primarily interested in explaining the stability of the system for forty years rather than its failure. It also became clear that the division between German and American participants had turned out to be less important than the division between those working on the West Germany and those working on East Germany. Significantly, even though several papers presented comparative studies, no one presented comparisons between the two German states. Whether they were working on the FRG or the GDR, most participants reported that they knew little about research on the “other” German state and were glad that the TDS had brought those working on West and East Germany together. The differences between American and German dissertation topics noted at previous seminars had diminished. Whereas in previous years cultural history was mostly an American enterprise, cultural history was well

represented among this year's German papers as well. One crucial difference between the two academic cultures was repeatedly noted, however: the existence of temporary *Sonderforschungsbereiche* at German universities. Several of the German dissertations presented were part of *Sonderforschungsbereiche* on particular topics and reflected these affiliations in their conceptual frameworks. Finally, it was observed that the papers and the discussions were remarkably unideological. The great debates in German historiography, which were often about causality and hence about ideology, were clearly a matter of the past for the new generation of German historians. The participants seemed primarily interested in writing studies that draw a complex picture of postwar German history. This made for interesting papers and a great experience of genuine intellectual exchange at the seminar.

Richard F. Wetzell

### Participants and Their Topics

KEITH ALEXANDER (University of Maryland), *The K-Groups and the Alternative Liste Berlin*

JAN BEHREND (Universität Bielefeld), *Erfundene Freundschaft. Eine vergleichende Studie zur Propagandageschichte in der Volksrepublik Polen und der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (1944/45–1957)*

SIMONE DERIX (Universität Köln), *Performative Politik. Die 'Bilder' der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in den Staatsbesuchen der 1950er Jahre*

PHILIPP HELDMANN (Universität Köln), *Herrschaft, Wirtschaft, Anoraks. Konsumpolitik in der DDR der Sechzigerjahre am Beispiel Bekleidung*

MOLLY WILKINSON JOHNSON (University of Illinois, Urbana), *Voluntary Campaigns, Sports, and Mass Participation in the 'Building of Socialism' in Leipzig in the 1950s*

KATRIN KÖHL (Universität Tübingen), *Kriegserfahrung und Friedensforschung. Die Entstehung der Friedens- und Konfliktforschung in den USA und Westdeutschland in der Situation des Kalten Krieges*

PETER KRAMPER (Universität Freiburg), *'Dienst am Fortschritt': Die NEUE HEIMAT auf dem Weg zum Städtebau 1962–1969*

DAVID MARSHALL (University of California, Riverside), *Das Museum für Deutsche Geschichte: A Study of History and Identity in the German Democratic Republic, 1952–1970*

DANIEL MORAT (Universität Göttingen), *Seismographen der Technik? Martin Heidegger, die Brüder Jünger und der lange Abschied vom Nationalsozialismus*

JON OLSEN (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), *Mobilizing Memory and Tailoring Truth in the SBZ*

RUTH ROSENBERGER (Universität Trier), *Psychologen und Personalpolitik in westdeutschen Unternehmen 1945–1975*

EDITH SHEFFER (University of California, Berkeley), *Checkpoint Burned Bridge: The Cold War over the Green Border, 1945–52*

NICHOLAS STENECK (Ohio State University), *Protecting the Population: West Germany and the 1. ZBG, 1950–1957*

DAVID TOMPKINS (Columbia University), *Mobilization, Control and Ideological Formation: Music Festivals in the GDR and Poland*

GREGORY WITKOWSKI (University at Buffalo), *Planned Perceptions: State Policy and Personal Interests in the Socialist Transformation of the East German Countryside*

JÜRGEN ZIEHER (TU Berlin), *Erinnern versus Verdrängen. Der Umgang mit dem Holocaust in Dortmund, Düsseldorf und Köln von 1945 bis 1960*

## JOHN F. KENNEDY AND BERLIN: FROM THE WALL TO THE 1963 VISIT

Symposium at the Goethe Institute Inter Nationes, Washington D.C., May 8, 2002. Conveners: Werner Ott/Sylvia Blume (Goethe Institute/Inter Nationes), Christof Mauch/Bernd Schäfer (GHI), Gerhard Groß/Wolfram Hoppenstedt (Bundeskanzler-Willy-Brandt-Stiftung, Berlin). Speaker: Egon Bahr (Bonn).

The question, or more correctly, the permanent crisis surrounding the city of Berlin played a central role in John F. Kennedy's short presidency, all the way from the 1961 building of the wall to his triumphant 1963 visit. Commemorating the latter in the lead-up to its upcoming fortieth anniversary, the Goethe Institute in Washington put on display the photo exhibit "JFK in Germany" from April 2 to May 31, 2002. In conjunction with the Goethe Institute, the GHI and the Chancellor Willy Brandt Foundation (Berlin) organized a public discussion with Egon Bahr on May 8.

During the cold war tensions in the decisive early 1960s, Egon Bahr, the later architect of West Germany's *Ostpolitik*, was Press Secretary and a close confidant of West Berlin's mayor Willy Brandt in the city hall of Berlin-Schöneberg. Welcomed by Werner Ott (Goethe Institute), Christof Mauch (GHI) and Gerhard Groß (Willy Brandt Foundation) and moderated by Bernd Schäfer (GHI), Egon Bahr related his experiences with Kennedy and U.S. foreign policy to a large and highly attentive audience in the Goethe Institut.

In a captivating narrative Bahr laid out the dramatic unfolding of events in Berlin between August 12–20, 1961 from the perspective of Willy Brandt and his advisers. Bahr focused on the German perception of American reactions to the encircling of West Berlin by a barbed wire fence, which was to be replaced three days later by the construction of a concrete wall. Describing the astonishment of the West Berliners, including their political leadership, about the seeming passivity and equanimity of President John F. Kennedy in the face of this East German answer to the refugee stream into West Berlin, Bahr prepared the ground for his explanation of how West Germans had to come to terms with the *realpolitik* of the superpowers.

In fact, this prevalent cold war pattern was a self-protecting mechanism to avert a "hot war," which would inevitably have gone nuclear on a battlefield like Europe. The Germans in West and East, as well as informed politicians like Brandt and Bahr, were apparently not aware how dangerous the "Second Berlin Crisis," instigated by the GDR and the Soviet Union in 1958, had become by mid-1961. The meaning of John F. Kennedy's sigh of relief, "a wall is a hell of a lot better than a war," entered West German minds with considerable delay, if at all.

From Willy Brandt's fury after his return from the Western Allies' Berlin headquarters ("they are all cowards"), to the West Berliners barely getting used to the permanence of a fortified border towards East Berlin and the GDR, to the visit of U.S. Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson handing over a letter from President Kennedy and asking where to buy Brandt's slippers, Bahr depicted, in sometimes drastic terms, the story of how West German politicians learned a stern lesson: The major nuclear powers were not willing to risk a confrontation over German reunification. What is more, for an indefinite period, they regarded the division of Germany as an element of stability in Europe as long as ideological tensions and an arms race between the U.S.S.R and the U.S. persisted.

In order to overcome German division in the long run, West Germans had to take initiatives of their own to promote accommodation with Moscow and Eastern Europe and at the same time lay the foundations for gradual changes within the Eastern bloc to make borders more transparent. In his narrative, Egon Bahr subsequently portrayed the lessons from this week in August 1961 as the tentative beginning of what would two years later evolve into *Ostpolitik* inspired by his own "change through rapprochement" speech in Tutzing in 1963. During this process Kennedy and his administration, for both of whom Egon Bahr had high praise, supported prospective European leaders like Willy Brandt. In order to change the stalemate of the status quo in Europe and tackle the "German question," the Germans themselves had to adapt to *realpolitik*. This meant nothing less than to accept the status quo for the time being and to strive peacefully to modify it in the distant future.

In his remarks, Egon Bahr anecdotically confirmed the contemporary notion of a striking connection between the personalities of the U.S. President and West Berlin's mayor, culminating in Kennedy's triumphant visit to West Berlin in June 1963. From his personal perspective, Bahr described the relationship with the Kennedy administration as the best that a West German government ever had with a Washington government led by Democrats. Usually Bonn governments got along better with Republicans, Bahr opined, citing his close and confidential exchanges with Henry Kissinger and his staff after 1969. Quite in contrast to the years 1961–1963, however, Brandt's and Bahr's appreciation for Washington was, to put it mildly, not met with reciprocity by President Richard Nixon.

Egon Bahr's sometimes stunning and always lively presentation on the formative period of post-1961 American-German relations was received with great applause. A reception followed where many old friends from Washington were eager to meet the German politician, who had truly shaped German history and German-American relations over the course of his political career – and, besides, had just turned 80 in April 2002.

*Bernd Schäfer*

## AMERICAN DÉTENTE AND GERMAN OSTPOLITIK, 1969–1972

Conference at the GHI, May 9 and 10, 2002. Co-sponsored by the Bundeskanzler-Willy-Brandt-Stiftung, Berlin, the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP), Washington D.C., and the Parallel History Project on NATO and Warsaw Pact (PHP), Washington D.C./Zurich/Vienna/Florence/Oslo. Conveners: Bernd Schäfer (GHI) and Carsten Tessmer (Bundeskanzler-Willy-Brandt-Stiftung). Participants: Egon Bahr (Bonn), David Binder (New York Times), Chen Jian (University of Virginia), Jonathan Dean (Union of Concerned Scientists), David C. Geyer (U.S. Department of State), Hope M. Harrison (George Washington University), Wjatscheslaw Keworkow (Bonn), Melvyn P. Leffler (University of Virginia), Vojtech Mastny (PHP, National Security Archive), Christof Mauch (GHI), Gottfried Niedhart (Universität Mannheim), Christian Ostermann (CWIHP, Woodrow Wilson International Center), Mary E. Sarotte (Cambridge University, UK), Douglas E. Selvage (U.S. Department of State), Kenneth N. Skoug (Alexandria, VA), Helmut Sonnenfeldt (The Brookings Institution), James S. Sutterlin (International Studies at Yale University).

On the night of the West German election in September 1969, U.S. President Richard Nixon called Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger in Bonn and prematurely congratulated him on his electoral victory. But since the CDU/CSU, which the White House regarded as their “friends” in Germany, failed to win an absolute majority of seats in parliament, a SPD/FDP coalition headed by Willy Brandt came to power, much to the consternation of Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger. This new government soon started foreign policy initiatives and negotiations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, leading to highly contentious domestic debates in West Germany and finally to the ratification of treaties with Moscow, Warsaw, and East Berlin in 1972/1973. The architect, promoter, and chief executor of this self-reliant and assertive new German *Ostpolitik* was Egon Bahr, Minister of State at the German Federal Chancellery throughout Willy Brandt’s chancellorship from 1969 to 1974. This *Ostpolitik* changed the dynamics of German-American relations. Reactions within the frequently baffled Nixon administration ranged from serious reservations in the White House to solid support in the State Department. Initially, the American government, which had pursued its own tactical “detente” with Moscow before Brandt came into power, had not been enthusiastic about similar activities by European allies. These were regarded as rival concepts coming into conflict with U.S. policy. This pat-

tern was modified, however, when the Nixon White House became so entangled in “linkages” and “reverse linkages” with Moscow and Beijing, that West Germany’s treaties with the East and a quadripartite agreement on Berlin became identical with U.S. interests in 1971/72.

Commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the dramatic weeks of April and May 1972, when Willy Brandt barely survived a no-confidence motion and secured the parliamentary passage of the treaties with the East (*Ostverträge*) a few weeks later, the GHI and the Bundeskanzler-Willy-Brandt-Stiftung hosted a two-day conference with an international group of scholars and contemporary participants in the events. Co-sponsoring this event and furthering its outreach into the scholarly “cold war history community” were the Washington-based Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP) at the National Security Archive and the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP) at the Woodrow Wilson International Center. The conference participants were welcomed by Christof Mauch (GHI) and Gerhard Groß (Bundeskanzler-Willy-Brandt-Stiftung) on behalf of the hosts, Vojtech Mastny (PHP) and Christian Ostermann (CWIHP) for the co-sponsors, and by Bernd Schäfer (GHI) for the conveners.

The first day of the conference was devoted to presentations by scholars, followed by discussions with the audience, in which many of the contemporary participants present shared their impressions with the historians. The morning session began with a paper by Hope M. Harrison on the significance of the 1961 construction of the Berlin Wall. She convincingly outlined the U.S. commitment to West, not East Berlin and the implied recognition of a Soviet sphere of influence. This led to long-lasting effects on certain West German political leaders and paved the way for *Ostpolitik* many years later. Vojtech Mastny placed the Brandt/Bahr negotiations between 1969 and 1972 into the wider context of superpower relations by presenting a critical assessment of U.S. realpolitik concerning relations with the Soviet Union during those years. Whereas the Nixon administration reassured the USSR that it would respect its sphere of influence in Europe, the Western European advocates of détente pursued a potentially destabilizing policy towards the East by emphasizing bilateral treaties and multilateral endeavours like the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Chen Jian gave a vivid description of the “Chinese factor” by analyzing Mao’s motives for the Chinese-American rapprochement of 1971/72 and pointing out the distracting effect this historic turnaround had on the Soviet Union. In fact, the Chinese “threat,” as it was perceived in Moscow, alleviated Soviet concerns about accommodation with West Germany and Western Europe and instigated a policy favorable towards “détente” in Europe. How all these international strategic implications came into play over Germany,

was demonstrated by David C. Geyer's analysis of the 1971 Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin. Drawing extensively on U.S. sources that were declassified over the last few years, he showed how the White House used backchannels not just to outmaneuver the State Department, but also to secretly negotiate with the Soviets and the West Germans on an unprecedented diplomatic level. This session was moderated and concluded by Melvyn P. Leffler, who presented an assessment of the U.S. policy of détente, which he considered just another form of "containment," but now undertaken from an American position of extreme "weakness" due to the Vietnam involvement and domestic political factors.

The afternoon session, chaired by Gottfried Niedhart, focussed on the content and origins of the actual *Ostverträge*. Whereas Carsten Tessmer highlighted the first cornerstone of this complex, the 1970 Moscow Treaty with its mutual renunciation of force, Douglas E. Selvage discussed the trials and tribulations of Warsaw's Wladyslaw Gomulka in his relations with East Berlin and Moscow since the early 1960s on the basis of Polish sources. The discriminations that the Poles were experiencing from their Western and Eastern neighbours, who were nominally their allies, finally pushed them into economic rapprochement with West Germany and the 1970 Warsaw Treaty in order to preserve precarious stability at home. Mary E. Sarotte had to cancel her appearance but forwarded her paper on "International Politics and the Basic Treaty," which was read to the audience. Sarotte credited Western policymakers with helping to ease the Cold War division of Europe by obtaining East German signatures on the Basic Treaty, thus skillfully playing upon public relations and, most of all, the Sino-Soviet conflict. Bernd Schäfer shed light on the intense domestic debate over *Ostpolitik* by focussing on the relationship between the CDU/CDU opposition parties and the Nixon administration. Stressing the "traditional friendship" between American governments and the CDU/CSU, Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger sought to stay neutral on Bonn's partisan quarrels in public, even as they quietly hoped for a political alternative to Willy Brandt. In an ironic twist, however, in the end they needed Brandt's foreign policy success in order to pursue their agenda of Nixon's reelection. As a result, Bonn's opposition leader, Rainer Barzel, who had extremely close ties with U.S. officials, learned painful lessons in Washington's realpolitik.

On the second day, an attentive audience enjoyed the privilege of listening to often revealing statements by former political actors on the *Ostpolitik* stage from West Germany, the Soviet Union, and the United States. David Binder, the Bonn Correspondent for the *New York Times* between 1967 and 1973, moderated the morning session and introduced Egon Bahr, Willy Brandt's chief negotiator of the treaties with Moscow,

Warsaw, and East Berlin. Bahr gave a lively and personal overview of *Ostpolitik* from its beginnings in the 1960s all the way through German unification in 1989/90. Attending every session of the conference, he frequently enlightened participants with his insightful comments drawing on his wealth of experience in diplomatic negotiations. He was followed by Wjatscheslaw Keworkow, a retired general of the Committee for State Security (KGB) of the Soviet Union. In front of a U.S. audience for the first time, this Russian participant, who long stayed out of the public spotlight for obvious reasons, discussed his mission as KGB chief Yuriy Andropov's liaison to the Bonn government and Egon Bahr in the years after 1969. This secret channel between the Soviet and West German governments, which Moscow had established to bypass the parallel structures of official foreign office diplomacy, remained intact in different forms until 1990.

The German and Soviet perspectives were followed by four statements from former high-ranking officials in the competing Washington foreign-policy bureaucracies of the White House and the State Department. Opening the field was Helmut Sonnenfeldt, formerly Senior Staff Member at the National Security Council (NSC) and a close confidant of Henry Kissinger's in German as well as European and Soviet affairs. Unfortunately Martin J. Hillenbrand, former Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Germany, had to cancel his participation. The State Department perspective on *Ostpolitik* and the inner tensions of the administration were nonetheless vividly presented by James S. Sutterlin and Kenneth N. Skoug, who, respectively, served as Director and Deputy Director at the German desk of the Bureau of European Affairs in the State Department. The panel concluded with a presentation by Jonathan S. Dean, who had been an extremely well-informed officer at the U.S. Embassy in Bonn due to his excellent contacts with German politicians on all sides of the partisan divide.

These statements as well as parts of the discussion from the second conference day were taped with the consent of the participants, who rewarded the audience with insightful and, for the most part, frank assessments and narratives. Since bringing together historians and contemporary historical actors is always a risky experiment, the organizers were particularly happy that the conference was a success. The conference proceedings as well as excerpts of the transcripts will be published as a GHI in-house publication and will also be posted on the webpages of the PHP and CWIHP.

*Bernd Schäfer*

## SUMMER SEMINAR IN GERMANY 2002

For the tenth time since 1990, the GHI, with the generous financial and administrative support of the German Department at the University of Wisconsin–Madison and the Nanovic Institute for European Studies at the University of Notre Dame, held its Summer Seminar in Germany for advanced graduate students. Between June 2 and June 15, thirteen participants from eight American universities and from five different disciplines attended events aimed at preparing them for their prospective dissertation research trips. The group visited research institutions in four different German cities and had conversations with German and American scholars about research methods and working in German archives and libraries.

As in the past three years, the program began its itinerary in Koblenz. The Landeshauptarchiv of the state of Rheinland-Pfalz served as our home base. Students spent five mornings working through historical documents written in old German script. The instructor for this intensive exercise was the inimitable Walter Rummel, who took the students through the paces of deciphering and decoding handwritten documents from the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries. During the first week, the participants also visited the Bundesarchiv, where Tilman Koops introduced the Reichskammergericht collection and Hans-Dieter Kreikamp gave us a tour of the impressive facilities on the Karthause.

Philipp Gassert of the University of Heidelberg joined us in the middle of the week to discuss his current research project, a biography of former West German chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger. Gassert's presentation was meant to explore the methods and methodology of writing contemporary history, as well as answer students' questions about working in archives and tracking down elusive sources.

The last item on the week's agenda was a trip to Mannheim and the Deutsches Spracharchiv. Here, Peter Wagener introduced us to a database of recordings of German dialects and speech patterns, accessible in part through the Internet. Since the middle of the last century, linguists have collected bits and pieces of spoken German from throughout the country. It proved fascinating to listen to these "speech events" and to rediscover the variety of spoken German, something often lost sight of in the era of *Denglish*.

On Saturday the group relocated downriver to Cologne. That afternoon we met with Norbert Finzsch, a professor at the University of Cologne, and one of his graduate students, Eva Bischoff. The campus of the university was unusually quiet on account of an ongoing student strike

that was protesting the proposed introduction of student fees at universities in the state of Nordrhein-Westfalen. A Ph.D. student, Bischoff presented her dissertation project, titled "Menschenfresser – Totmacher: Zur Genealogie von Alterität zwischen 1900 und 1933." Bischoff is looking at the history and societal discourse surrounding a group of criminals in the Weimar Republic, who were accused of cannibalism ("white cannibals"). Following the presentation, the group engaged in a lively discussion of the topic and the methods and theory involved.

On Monday we spent the day at the Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln where archivists Eberhard Illner and Joachim Deeters were our hosts. In our tour of this extensive and venerable archive, we learned about how a modern city archive goes about its business of not only conserving the official public record but also actively pursuing the acquisition of ephemera and personal papers of prominent individuals. Because Cologne has played such an important part in the cultural life of Germany, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the collections here are wonderfully rich and varied. Our visit to the Historisches Archiv prompted the students to reflect on various ways of tracking down materials related to their individual projects.

The next day we visited the Historisches Archiv des Erzbistums Köln. Our host, Joachim Oepen, briefly described the relation between church history and German history, using the example of the Cologne archbishopric. Oepen showed how church records have been reshuffled in response to administrative processes and political events. He also stressed the value of church records for different kinds of projects. In conclusion, Oepen gave the students a chance to practice their newly acquired skills at reading old German script, as well as demonstrated by example what finding aids can and cannot tell you about the holdings of a particular collection.

The last leg of our journey began with a five-hour train trip across central Germany, from west to east, to the small, former residential city of Gotha in the Free State of Thuringia. Again this year we were hosted by the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, housed in the Schloss Friedenstein and part of the University of Erfurt. The first morning, Rupert Schaab, the library's head, gave the participants a fascinating tour of the stacks, exposing everyone to this amazing collection of manuscripts and published books. The history of the library dates back to the seventeenth century, when Duke Ernst der Fromme began building the collection, parts of which came to Gotha as spoils of the Thirty Years' War. The library contains over half a million printed books, of which nearly 350,000 were published before 1900. In addition, the library is home to nearly 10,000 volumes of manuscripts, including rare materials brought back from the

Orient. Noteworthy also are the collection of Protestant hymnals and the large collection of bound eulogies. In addition to exploring the Forschungsbibliothek's holdings, the students also received brief introductions to the German library system, medieval manuscripts, early modern personal papers, and the first published books (incunables). Cornelia Hopf, one of the library's helpful and knowledgeable staff members, assisted with these presentations.

On Wednesday afternoon the group traveled to Weimar. At the Goethe National Museum, Ulrike Müller-Harang led us on a tour of the permanent exhibit, emphasizing in particular the ideas behind the assemblage of various artifacts from Goethe's life and cultural community. At the Goethe-Schiller-Archiv Weimar, Director Jochen Goltz showed us around the facility. In the evening the group traveled to Schnepfenthal in the Thuringian Forest where we were treated to the hospitality of Ursula Lehmkuhl, vice president of the University of Erfurt, and her husband Wolfgang Helbich, a retired professor from the University of Bochum. Everyone enjoyed a wonderful evening of conversation, debate, and delicious food and drink.

Continuing our speakers' series, Cordula Grewe from the GHI and Warren Breckman from the University of Pennsylvania gave presentations on their respective work. Grewe is an art historian working on nineteenth-century German religious painting. Breckman is an intellectual historian who talked about his book on Marx and the young Hegelians. Both discussed method and methodology with the participants, touching on the pitfalls and promises of doing independent archival research. A lively question-and-answer session followed.

The final event of the Summer Seminar came in the form of a presentation by Juliane Bransch. She is currently working on the third volume of the diaries of Friedrich I, duke of Saxony-Gotha-Coburg. Two volumes have already appeared in print, containing transcriptions of the diaries. The third volume will contain commentary and explanatory notes. Bransch explained how she set about learning how to read Friedrich's often difficult handwriting, then to decipher the diary entries, and finally to track down the various personalities and topics contained therein.

The GHI would like to thank its American collaborators and its numerous German partners for helping to make the tenth Summer Seminar in Germany a success. For information on the 2003 program, see the "Announcements" section of this issue.

*Daniel Mattern*



Lunch at "Zur Malzmühle" in Cologne, with Dr. Eberhard Illners of the Historisches Stadtarchiv

## Participants and Their Projects

CHRISTOPHER C.W. BAUERMEISTER, History, Purdue University; dissertation topic: "Enlightenment and Administrative Reform in Electoral Hanover"

SHANNON E. HUNT, History, University of Virginia; dissertation topic: "The German Court, the Crisis of Aristocracy, and the Civilizing Process: A Study of Challenges to German Aristocratic Court Culture in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries"

HOI-EUN KIM, History, Harvard University; dissertation topic: "Physicians on the Move: German Physicians in Meiji-Japan and Japanese Medical Students in Imperial Germany"

JONATHAN KREGOR, Music History, Harvard University; dissertation topic: "Virtuosity, Performativity, and Bourgeois Culture: French Music in the Formation of a German Identity, 1848–1871"

ANTJE KRÜGER, German Literature, University of Wisconsin–Madison; dissertation topic: "Trivial Literature as Public Discourse in the Eighteenth Century"

KIMBERLY A. MILLER, German Linguistics, University of Wisconsin–Madison; dissertation topic: "Loss of Case in Low German"

JEANNE-MARIE MUSTO, Art History, Bryn Mawr College; dissertation topic: "Shaping a Discipline and a Nation: The Early Art History of Speyer Cathedral"

LARA OSTARIC, Philosophy, University of Notre Dame; dissertation topic: "The Concept of Genius in Kant's Philosophy"

DAVID J. PIZZO, History, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; dissertation topic: "German Conquest, Hehe Resistance, and Colonial Power: The German–Hehe War in Southern Tanganyika, 1891–1898"

THOMAS A. RYLKO, History, University of Delaware; dissertation topic: "Mass Politics and National Identity in Catholic Germany, 1870–1880"

ADAM R. SEIPP, History, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; dissertation topic: "Between Peace and Order: Demobilization, International Politics, and Urban Protest in Europe, 1917–1921"

LAURA C. SMITH, German Linguistics, University of Wisconsin–Madison; dissertation topic: "Prosodic Change in Germanic: A Template Approach"

LAURA STOKES, History, University of Virginia; dissertation topic: "Patterns from Chaos: German and Swiss Witch Trials, 1430–1530"