

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

**BULLETIN**

FALL 1995

Issue No. 17

**Editors:** Detlef Junker, Manfred F. Boemeke and Janine S. Micunek.

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

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

**Library Hours:** Monday through Friday, 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and by appointment.

© German Historical Institute, 1995

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

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

**BULLETIN**

FALL 1995

Issue No. 17

**CONTENTS**

I. Preface	5
II. Accounts of Recent Conferences and Workshops	
"Germany in the Age of Empire, 1850-1914." Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar Program in Modern German History 1995. Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., April 26-29.	7
"The American Conquest of Germany, 1944/45." Washington, D.C., May 9.	9
"Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990." Washington, D.C., June 1-2.	11
"Transatlantic History and American Exceptionalism: A Symposium in Memory and in Honor of Erich Angermann." Washington, D.C., June 6-8.	13
"Losing the Order of History: Some Aspects of Historical Studies in the Intersection of Modernity, Postmodernity, and the Discussion on Memory." Washington, D.C., September 7.	15
"Political Myth, Symbolic Politics, and the Shaping of German National Identity in the 19th and 20th Centuries: The Case of Herman the German." Washington, D.C., September 14.	17
III. Institute News	
Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture: A Summary	19
GHI Summer Program 1995	19
1995/96 Fellows in Postwar German History	22

Staff Changes	23
New Internet Address	23
Recent Publications of the Institute	23
IV Calendar of Events	
Fall 1995 Lecture Series	24
Ninth Annual Lecture	24
Upcoming Conferences and Workshops	25
V. Friends of the GHI Washington	
The Friends' Third Annual Symposium: Report	26
Fourth Annual Symposium	29
VI. Notices and Announcements	
Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar 1996	30
AICGS/GHI Fellowships in Postwar German History 1996/97	30
"The Culture of Rights": Call for Papers	31
GHI Dissertation Scholarships 1997	32
VII. Miscellaneous	
Panel at Annual Meeting of German Studies Association	33

## **I. Preface**

Dear Friends and Colleagues:

On the occasion of the publication of this year's fall Bulletin, I would like to inform you again about certain events and developments at the German Historical Institute that may be of interest to you.

In the previous Bulletin, I elaborated on the attempt of the GHI to do justice at one and the same time to two demands: the dictate of diversity and the need to concentrate on and emphasize certain scholarly activities. Today, I would like to share with you some observations about the development of our research focus on the history of Germany and the United States during the Cold War. This Bulletin contains a report on the brainstorming of a small group of scholars from Germany and the United States who met in Washington on June 1 and 2 to discuss the central project of this research focus, a two-volume handbook on "Germany and the United States in the Age of the Cold War." In a very frank and productive exchange of ideas, the scholars from both sides of the Atlantic came to agree on common principles governing the organization, scope, and structure of the handbook. Among the most important results was the realization that the year 1968 constitutes a watershed for German-American relations as well as for the Cold War in general. Thus, the first volume of the handbook is intended to cover the period up to about 1968, the second volume the years between 1968 and the unification of Germany. This periodization reaffirms the basic hypothesis underlying the conference planned by the GHI for March 23-25, 1996, in Berlin, which will bring together scholars from Germany, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, and Spain to explore the theme of "1968."

As part of our overall research agenda, we are currently discussing a proposal to compile a bibliography of all oral history interviews that were determined to have been conducted with contemporary witnesses of German-American relations after 1945. The Institute was approached with this suggestion during the annual meeting of the German Studies Association in Chicago. A detailed report about the session sponsored by the GHI, entitled "Oral History and German-American Relations since World War II," can be found in this issue. We would be extremely grateful for any suggestions or comments regarding this project.

A number of additional activities of the Institute during 1995 were also closely connected with this research program. In our Spring Lec-

ture Series, six well-known American historians presented their research findings under the overall theme of "50 Years Later: Historians View the Aftermath of World War II." The lecturers were Elizabeth D. Heineman (Bowling Green State University): "West German Reflections on Women and the Nazi Era"; Frank Ninkovich (St. John's University): "What Was the German Problem?"; Jeffrey M. Diefendorf (University of New Hampshire): "Ruins, Reconstruction, and Remembrance: The Aftermath of World War II"; Eric Weitz (St. Olaf College): "The 'German' in the German Democratic Republic: Soviet Interests and Weimar Legacies"; Marc Trachtenberg (University of Pennsylvania): "The Origins of the Cold War: New Light After 50 Years?"; Max Holland (Washington, D.C.): "A Twentieth-Century Encounter: Germany and John J. McCloy."

Dr. Klaus-Dietmar Henke (Berlin) was the featured speaker in a workshop on "The American Conquest of Germany, 1944/45"; and Professor Wolfgang Krieger (Marburg) had many attentive listeners when he delivered the Fifth Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture, entitled "The Germans and the Nuclear Question."

The Fourth Annual Symposium of the Friends of the German Historical Institute will address the issue of "*Stunde Null*: The End and the Beginning Fifty Years Ago."

Last but not least, I would like to point out that the three 1995/96 fellows of the Joint AICGS/GHI Program on Postwar German History, as well as five of the twelve 1995 recipients of a GHI Dissertation Scholarship emphasize in their research the period after 1945.

Yours sincerely,

*Detlef Junker*

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

### **"Germany in the Age of Empire, 1850-1914."**

*Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History 1995. Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., April 26-29, 1995.*

The idea to hold a series of conferences for German and North American doctoral students was conceived in 1990-91 by Professors Hartmut Lehmann (then director of the GHI) and Roger Chickering of Georgetown University and was implemented under the directorship of Professor Hartmut Keil in 1994. So far intended to run for three consecutive years, the program is made possible by the cooperation and financial support of the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown, the Conference Group for Central European History, the German-American Academic Council, and the GHI Washington.

The first selection committee, comprised of Professors Roger Chickering; James Harris (University of Maryland), representing the Conference Group for Central European History; and Detlef Junker, director of the GHI, met in December 1994 and selected eight students from North America and eight students from Germany working on projects dealing with "Germany in the Age of Empire, 1850-1914." Four established historians were invited to serve as mentors: Kathleen Canning (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor), Vernon Lidtke (Johns Hopkins University), Gangholf Hübinger (Europa-Universität Viadrina), and Klaus Tenfelde (Universität Bielefeld).

The conference convened at Georgetown University from April 26 to 29, 1995. The format chosen called for all papers to be distributed and read by the participants prior to the meeting, therefore allowing the panels to begin with remarks by two commentators rather than with presentations of the authors. The lively discussions in the two languages suggested the rewards of this approach.

#### Papers presented:

Andreas Daum, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, "Wissenschafts-popularisierung in Deutschland 1848-1914"

Jennifer Jenkins, University of Michigan, "Bourgeois Culture—Peoples Culture: Volksbildung in Hamburg"

Morten Reitmeyer, Universität Hannover, "Bankiers im Kaiserreich"

- Karsten Borgmann, Humboldt Universität Berlin, "Kunstkenner und Connoisseurs in der deutschen und amerikanischen Gesellschaft der Jahrhundertwende"
- Ralf Forsbach, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, "Kinderlen-Wächter und die deutsche Außenpolitik"
- Dirk Bönker, Johns Hopkins University, "Fashioning a Post-Kehrite Narrative: A New Look at Wilhelmine Battlefleet Building"
- Sean Dobson, Columbia University, "Authority, Legitimacy and Revolution in Leipzig, 1910-1920"
- Jürgen Schmidt, FU Berlin, "Soziale Kontakte und politische Partizipation in Bürgertum und Arbeiterschaft in Erfurt 1871-1914"
- Iris Schröder, Universität Bielefeld, "Frauenfrage, Frauenbewegung und kommunale soziale Reform"
- Patricia Mazón, Stanford University, "Academic Citizenship and Masculinity in the German World of Learning"
- Pascal Grosse, FU Berlin, "Eingeborene, Untertanen oder Bürger? Afrikaner aus den Kolonien in Deutschland 1885-1914"
- Krista O'Donnell, SUNY Binghamton, "'Die Baas is banja mooi!' The German Colonial State and the Regulation of Household Labor in Deutsch-Südwestafrika"
- John Lowry, Yale University, "The Catholic Center and German Colonial Politics in the Era Stuebel, 1900-1905"
- Ken Reynolds, McGill University, "The German Supreme Court and Its Effective Power, 1806-1879"
- Jeffrey Schneider, Cornell University, "'Auf den soldatischen Geist freudiger Unterwerfung'. Rethinking Prussian-German Militarism through Heinrich Mann's Untertan"
- Jacob Vogel, FU Berlin, "Nationale Militärfeiern und Kult der 'Nation in Waffen'. Deutschland und Frankreich 1871-1914."

Several features of the conference were noteworthy. The American contingent (and the American applicant pool, in general) contained more women; their papers were more concerned with issues of gender and cultural history. The German papers, on the other hand, reflected a greater concern with issues of prosopography and social history. These differences of emphasis were remarked on and stimulated the discussions.

All the participants remarked on the substantial benefits, academic as well as personal, brought about by the transatlantic exchange. Not

least because of this, the series will be continued (see "Announcements").

*Roger Chickering  
Martin H. Geyer*

**"The American Conquest of Germany, 1944/45"**

*Workshop at the German Historical Institute with Klaus-Dietmar Henke and Volker R. Berghahn on May 9, 1995. Co-sponsored by the Washington office of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.*

To commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War in Europe, Klaus-Dietmar Henke, head of the Department for Education and Research at the Federal Authority for the Files of the former East German Security Police, presented the findings of his exhaustive research on German-American relations during the final months of the war, between the summers of 1944 and 1945. Drawing on the insights that he has developed at much greater length in his fascinating and pathbreaking new book, *Die amerikanische Besetzung Deutschlands* (Munich, 1995), Henke argued convincingly that, if the Second World War was a "good war" for the Americans, it was followed by a "good occupation" for those Germans who happened to be conquered by American troops. The military conquest of Germany was followed by an American moral conquest that, with its constructive approach and its fairness, went far beyond the expectations and imaginations of the exhausted German people. Ultimately, the success story of German-American relations in the fifty years since the war's end cannot be explained without considering the benign nature of the American conquest of Germany in 1944/45.

Henke highlighted his conviction that despite the Allies' realization that the Third Reich would not collapse, as the German Empire had done in 1918, a "Carthaginian peace" never became a serious policy option. Most changes in American postwar planning in 1944 were largely rhetorical, and the Morgenthau Plan never became the guiding principle of the American occupation. This was largely due to "something very natural," as Henke put it, namely, the emerging common interests of the conqueror and the conquered. The Germans had to get on with their lives, whereas the Americans had to find the ways and means to stabilize and run the occupied territory.

On the American side, this process, as problematic as it appears in retrospect, was facilitated by the continuing American distinction between the German people and the Nazi leadership, the latter of which it held to be solely responsible for the war. Nevertheless, Henke refused to characterize the Americans as naive and rather stressed the sincerity of the denazification effort.

On the German side, the increasingly terroristic nature of the Nazi regime and the specter of the Russian occupation in the East convinced a large number of troops and officials that it was time to surrender to the Americans in order to survive the end of the war. This lesson, Henke reminded us, was quickly forgotten after the war, when many Germans started to portray themselves as victims and refused to admit that they had served a criminal regime until the very end.

In his perceptive and thought-provoking comment, Volker Berghahn, Professor of History at Brown University, largely agreed with Henke's account. He argued that a fair historical judgment of the humane nature of the American conquest of Germany in 1945 does not so much require a comparison with the Red Army's conquest of eastern Germany but rather with the brutal precedent set by the German occupational forces in eastern Europe after 1939. Berghahn also emphasized the historical continuities within German-American relations and pointed out that the "moral" conquest of Germans by Americans after 1945 should be seen in its long-term context of an earlier history of the cultural "Americanization" of Germany (and Europe). Starting before the First World War, this process had reached an initial peak during the stabilization period of the Weimar Republic. Therefore, American troops and "conquerors" could build on a collective German experience of exposure to American culture and values when they arrived in Germany in 1945.

*Philipp Gassert*

## **"Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990"**

*Washington, D.C., June 1-2, 1995. Workshop participants: Volker Berghahn, Lily Gardner-Feldman, Philipp Gassert, Martin H. Geyer, Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich, Detlef Junker, Wolfgang Krieger, Jeff Schutts, Klaus Schwabe, Thomas Schwartz, Bernd Stöver, Hubert Zimmermann, Vladislav M. Zubok.*

As part of its current focus on the history of the Cold War, the GHI is planning to produce a handbook on "Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990." A workshop on this subject was meant to explore and discuss all possible aspects relating to the content and form of this reference work.

On the first day of the workshop, five of the participants delivered papers: Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich on economic relations, Wolfgang Krieger on security and the atomic question, Volker Berghahn on cultural relations, Thomas A. Schwartz on Cold War history of the 1940s and 1950s, and Klaus Schwabe on that of the 1960s and 1970s. In addition, Detlef Junker read a detailed proposal by Hans-Peter Schwarz, who could not attend. From the papers and the subsequent discussions, a preliminary concept of the handbook emerged. Most participants agreed that, in order to capture the breadth and depth of German-American relations between 1945 and 1990, the handbook would have to address a very broad range of issues, encompassing not only political relations and diplomacy, but also military planning and security, trade, global economic cooperation, cultural and societal relations, and comparative studies of domestic developments. This implies that the handbook will become a truly interdisciplinary project aimed at attracting contributions from historians, political scientists, economists, and sociologists, as well as scholars from other fields.

On the second day, the more formal aspects of the project were discussed in greater detail. A questionnaire that had been mailed to the participants beforehand served as a springboard for an intensive and very fruitful debate. Early on in the discussion, the participants noted that the year 1968 represented an important watershed, not only in the domestic history of both nations, but also with regard to the structure of the international system. From the viewpoint of international economic cooperation, for example, the beginning of the demise of the Bretton Woods System came with the splitting of the London gold market and the so-called "Blessing Letter" of 1968, marking a clear

turning point in the ability of the dollar to dominate the international monetary system. In security policy, to give another example, the Harmel Report of 1967 and the signing of the Nonproliferation Treaty in 1968 were the initial steps toward detente and a major shift in Soviet-American relations—which, in the end, would fundamentally alter the nature of the German-American relationship. Accordingly, the participants agreed that the handbook should consist of two volumes, with the first covering the period up to 1968 and the second dealing with the years from 1968 to 1990.

In addition, a broad consensus was reached that the basic structure of the handbook should combine a systematic with a chronological approach. By dealing with German-American relations in the postwar era from a variety of perspectives and without privileging one over the other, the handbook could very well become an example for a new approach to the study of international relations history. Accordingly, each of the two volumes would be subdivided into five chapters (politics, the economy, security, culture, and societal issues). Within these chapters, approximately 150 individual entries (e.g., GATT, labor unions, tourism, film, Hallstein Doctrine) would deal with a broad range of topics in a more chronological fashion. Finally, a master entry (e.g., "Cultural Relations, 1968-1990"; "Political Relations, 1945-1968") would synthesize the findings of each chapter, place the chapter within its historical context, and allow for reflection on the mutual influences of the five fields within a given timeframe (e.g., cultural and political relations, 1968-1990). In addition, the master entries would contain a guide to the literature and would outline areas of future research.

Building on the decisions that were reached during the workshop, a small editorial committee has started to work on the handbook project. We would like to hear from anyone who is working in one of the areas that will be covered in the handbook. If you are interested in making a contribution, please send a short description of your research and a statement on how you might contribute to: Philipp Gassert, Handbook Project, German Historical Institute, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20009, Fax: (202) 483-3430.

*Philipp Gassert*

## **"Transatlantic History and American Exceptionalism: A Symposium in Memory and in Honor of Erich Angermann"**

*Washington, D.C., June 8-10, 1995. Conveners: Hermann Wellenreuther, Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt. Funded in part by a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation.*

Prof. Dr. Erich Angermann (1927-1992) was a German historian of America and founding father of the German Historical Institute in Washington. His scholarly work and teachings at the University of Cologne centered on an understanding of American history as an integral part of European and world history. From the mid-1970s onward, he developed and encouraged research concepts that used comparative analysis and multilateral enquiries.

Thus, "Transatlantic History and American Exceptionalism" provided an opportunity to discuss significant common aspects of nineteenth- and twentieth-century American and European history and to examine the concepts of comparative historical developments suggested by Angermann. The paradigm of "American exceptionalism" served as the investigative counterpart. The broad range of topics discussed included religion, ideologies, migration, foreign policy, and economics.

The conference brought together students, friends, and colleagues of Erich Angermann's from the United States, Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, many of whom met each other for the first time on this occasion. Thanks to the presence of Ursula Angermann, the meeting also came to be an opportunity to exchange personal recollections.

The opening session recalled Angermann's instrumental contributions to the founding of the Institute in 1987 that evolved from a series of symposia on comparative aspects of German and American history between 1980 and 1986. With most of the American historians present who, throughout the founding phase of the Institute, had furnished indispensable help and advice, these brief tributes testified to the continuing importance of fostering and maintaining a transatlantic scholarly community.

Particular highlights of the symposium included Hartmut Lehmann's comparative assessment of secularization in Europe and Christianization in the United States during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and Wolfgang Mommsen's discussion of Max Weber's perception of America. Perhaps not surprisingly, the uniqueness of American exceptionalism was questioned by many participants, most notably by Hans Guggisberg. Carl Degler's contribution emphasized the common nature of reli-

gious objections to Darwinism in Germany and the United States. Gerald Stourzh, in his rich exposition on comparative constitutional developments in England, the United States, and continental Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, called attention both to the English roots of American constitutional law and the separate American constitutionalization of individual rights. The evolving theme of the complementary character of exceptionalism and common transnational developments was reinforced by Karl Otmar von Aretin's discussion of ideology as an institutional defense of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century European monarchies as well as by Gerhard Weinberg's lucid comparison of Hitler and Roosevelt.

The participants of the meeting conducted their deliberations in terms that were largely independent from categories of the respective national historiographies. Hence, the fifth panel, as well as the concluding roundtable discussion, turned to the subject of national history. A final assessment of the influence of the various concepts constant throughout the conference was given, and Hermann Wellenreuther presented a summary of Angermann's "historical world."

The proceedings thus elucidated material on the complementary nature of comparative historical research in regard to its relationship to the study of national history. The underlying questions of the conference referred more to the multifaceted nature of comparative historical research rather than attempting to outline a strict methodological canon. The array of historical case studies presented seeks to encourage further comparative research along these lines.

*Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt*

### Conference Program:

#### *Session I: Transatlantic Faiths and Beliefs*

Chair: Eberhard Weis

Old Religions, New Religions and the Role of Religion in Europe and America in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, Hartmut Lehmann; Darwinism: A Challenge to Christianity and Science in Europe and America, Carl Degler; Nationalism as a Civil Religion in the Thoughts of Abraham Lincoln, Carl Schurz and Bismarck, Hans L. Trefousse; Comments: Hans R. Guggisberg, Reinhard R. Doerries

#### *Session II: Transatlantic Ideologies and the Perception of the Other*

Chair: Gerhard A. Ritter

Liberal Democracy as a Culture of Rights: Great Britain, the United States and Continental Europe, Gerald Stourzh; American Exceptionalism: Republicanism as

Ideology, Ari Hoogenboom; European Exceptionalism: Monarchism as Ideology, Karl Otmar Frhr. v. Aretin; Comments: James H. Hutson, Vera Nunning

*Session III: People in the Transatlantic World: The Perception of Self*

Chair: Gerhard Weinberg

Xenophobia and Social Change in American and German History, Kenneth Kusmer; German-Americans as Citizens of Two Worlds, Kathleen Conzen; The Perception of Self in American and German Movies in the Twentieth Century, Daniel J. Leab; Comments: Silke Lehmann, Christian Ostermann

*Session IV: Transatlantic Politics and Economics*

Chair: Peter Krüger

Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Adolf Hitler: A Contemporary Comparison Revisited, Gerhard L. Weinberg; The Banker's Role in the Transatlantic Financial World: The Role of J.P. Morgan & Co. in Financing the Allies, 1914-1916, Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt; Europe and the United States: The Transatlantic Axis in Max Weber's Sociological Theory, Wolfgang Mommsen; Comments: Ragnhild Fiebig-von Hase, Hans-Jürgen Schröder

*Session V: Transatlantic History and American Exceptionalism*

Chair: Mack Walker

Transatlantic History as National History? Thoughts on German Post-Second World War Historiography, Peter Krüger; American Exceptionalism as National History? Hans R. Guggisberg; Erich Angermann's Historical World, Hermann Wellenreuther; Comment: Mack Walker

**"Losing the Order of History: Some Aspects of Historical Studies in the Intersection of Modernity, Postmodernity, and the Discussion on Memory."**

*Workshop at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., September 7, 1995.*

This workshop brought together two prolific and outspoken scholars from Germany and the United States: Professor Jörn Rüsen, currently executive director of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies at the University of Bielefeld, and Professor Peter Novick, professor of history at the University of Chicago. Whereas Jörn Rüsen—in his career as a professor of theory of history, modern history, and general history at the universities of Braunschweig, Berlin, Bochum, and Bielefeld—has tirelessly promoted the cause of history, philosophy, and, above all, the cause of reason, Peter Novick is known to any American historian who thinks about this profession since the publication in 1987 of his prize-winning book *That Noble Dream: 'The Objectivity Question' and the*

*American Historical Profession*, which has triggered scores of discussions, reviews, and conference panels.

Rüsen presented a complex and catholic paper entitled: "Losing the Order of History: Some Aspects of Historical Studies in the Intersection of Modernity, Postmodernity, and the Discussion on Memory." According to Rüsen, historical studies as an academic discipline today are faced by a profound challenge. The discourse on public memory and on postmodernism has brought under attack the ideal and concept of objectivity in historical studies. These discourses are at the same time transcending and neglecting those strategies and methods of dealing with the past that constitute historical studies as a scholarly discipline. Historical memory "appears simply as an agent of ideology, presenting history according to the interests and needs of elites, as a weapon in the struggle of power used by those who have the power to define the semantic terms of trade in the field of constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing collective identity."

As an answer to this challenge Rüsen presented and elaborated on a matrix of historical studies based on the three volumes of his *Grundzüge einer Historik*. This matrix is meant to embody the three essential parts of a modern "metahistory": the political strategy of collective memory, the cognitive strategy of producing historical knowledge, and the aesthetic strategy of historical representation.

In his comment Peter Novick disagreed almost completely with Rüsen's approach. This could have been virtually predicted, since in *That Noble Dream*, he combines the social and political history of the profession with an epistemological thesis, the rise and fall of the ideal of objectivity. In the last chapter Novick presented the following conclusion: "As a broad community of discourse, as a community of scholars united by common aims, common standards, and common purposes, the discipline of history had ceased to exist. Convergence on anything, let alone a subject as highly charged as 'the objectivity question', was out of the question. The profession was as described in the last verse of the Book of Judges: 'In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes.'"

In his critique Novick specifically suggested that historians eliminate the word "objectivity" and rather be content with the notion of "plausibility"; no longer talk about the reconstruction of history, but the construction of stories; and be extremely circumspect in using the term "postmodernism."

During the workshop it became clear to the participants that the general approach of the two speakers, their intellectual traditions and modes of reasoning were oceans apart. To American observers the German tradition of *Historik* as represented by Rüsen might seem to be completely outmoded; to German observers the American tradition as represented by Novick might fall behind a level of analytical precision once reached by German philosophers, historians, or sociologists like Max Weber. This state of affairs should suffice to plan a conference bringing together historians and philosophers of history from Germany and the United States.

*Detlef Junker*

**"Political Myth, Symbolic Politics, and the Shaping of German National Identity in the 19th and 20th Centuries: The Case of Herman the German."**

*Workshop with Andreas Dörner. Washington, D.C., September 14.*

*Convener: Dietmar Schirmer.*

The fact that national identities—as collective identities in general—are not the effect of natural predisposition nor an outcome of historic determination can be considered a truism. Much less obvious is the answer to the question of how the social and cultural processes of identity formation actually work in a given historical context. At this workshop, political scientist Andreas Dörner (University of Magdeburg) presented and discussed the results of his major study on a particular aspect of the shaping of German national identity since the late eighteenth century: the construction, popularization, and transformation of "Herman the German" as the single most important figure within German national mythology.

Dörner's starting point was Napoleon's occupation of Germany. In order to mobilize the nationally unconscious masses against the French occupiers, Prussia's military elite turned to the symbolic politics of national identification. The symbolic capital at hand was a cultural tradition of fictional and historical narration that had developed through the centuries. The task was to politicize and popularize the stock of this tradition. As it turned out, Herman the German—a mythological figure referring to the Germanic soldier Arminius who led a tribal rebellion against the Roman occupants which culminated in a battle at the Teuto-

burg forest—provided the narration that could most successfully be exploited for the purposes of national identity building.

The career of the myth of Herman remained closely linked to the political and social history of German nationalism. In bold theses, Dörner analyzed the multiple redefinitions of the myth and their correlation to the respective redefinitions of the scope, intentions, and functions of German nationalism in general. By focusing on the two most important representations of Herman and his narrative—Heinrich von Kleist's play "*Die Hermannsschlacht*" and the Herman monument in Detmold—Dörner presented the history of the myth through the doomed revolution of 1848, the German Empire, the Weimar Republic, and the National Socialist regime, until its decline after World War II.

The lively and extended debate on Dörner's very well-received presentation focused largely on theoretical and methodological questions about the systematic status of political symbolism within the broader context of political and social history. The overall consensus was that a meaningful and relevant analysis of symbolic politics always has to take into account the social context in which it takes place in order to avoid falling back to an old-fashioned and socially irrelevant intellectual history. A second major part of the discussion dealt with the somewhat speculative but nevertheless fascinating question of whether or not the history of the Herman myth can be told as a grand narrative of German history at large.

*Dietmar Schirmer*

### **III. Institute News**

#### **Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture 1995: A Summary**

On May 31, 1995, Professor Wolfgang Krieger of the Stiftung Wissenschaft and Politik, Ebenhausen, and the University of Munich presented the Institute's Fifth Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture. As in the past years, the lecture elicited great interest.

In his presentation on "The Germans and the Nuclear Question," Professor Krieger addressed several different issues that Alois Mertes himself had dealt with intensively: first, how the unfolding of the nuclear age affected Germany's international position at different stages of the Cold War; second, how West German political leaders sought to deal with the issues arising from the nuclear arms race between the superpowers—a race that, to a considerable extent, took place on German soil with direct reference to the superpower struggle over Germany; and, third, how the German public viewed nuclear weapons issues.

Starting with the failed efforts of German scientists during World War II to build an atomic bomb and the peculiar ways this failure was camouflaged by an outrage of the same scientists directed at the "inferior moral quality of the Americans," Professor Krieger looked at the controversial debates over nuclear armament of the *Bundeswehr* since the 1950s, its implications for the West German *Ostpolitik*, and the impact of nuclear policy on institutions and research. As Krieger argued, compared to its Western neighbors, Germany's non-nuclear status allowed the academic community and the country as a whole to think less about fundamental questions of war and peace and weakened a "realist" approach of foreign policy not only in academic circles but also among the public at large.

As has been the case with the earlier lectures, Professor Krieger's address will be published in the Institute's series of Occasional Papers.

*Martin H. Geyer*

#### **GHI Summer Program 1995**

For the sixth time, with funding from the VW Foundation, the Institute sponsored a summer program in paleography and archival studies for advanced graduate students from the United States and Germany. The 1995 program took eighteen doctoral students on a three-and-a-half-

week tour—with stops along the way-of archives and other research institutions relevant to the study of late modern German history. It consisted of a handwriting course, a lecture series, and visits to numerous federal, state, local, and specialized archives. The program began June 5 and ended June 28.

We began in the Ruhr region, where we were hosted by the history faculty of Ruhr University in Bochum. Prof. Hans Mommsen welcomed the group at his university's international conference center, the "Beckmannshof," where he lectured on the renazification of Germany during the final year of World War II. During our stay in the Ruhr area, we visited archives in Dortmund and Essen. Several of the participants also had the chance to visit Bochum's mining museum, the one-of-a-kind Bergbaumuseum.

From Bochum we headed west to Düsseldorf, where we were treated to an excellent introduction to the holdings of the main state archive of North-Rhine Westphalia. The director, Prof. Dr. Otfried Dascher, organized meetings with members of his staff as well as a fascinating tour through the facilities. Leaving Düsseldorf at the end of the day, we motored along the autobahn to Koblenz. Our ten-day stay in Koblenz was hosted by the Bundesarchiv and the Landeshauptarchiv. Prof. Dr. Friedrich Kahlenberg, the president of the Bundesarchiv, greeted the group warmly, and Dr. Michael Hollmann gave us a thoroughgoing tour of the building and introduced the participants to the mysteries of reading administrative documents. The course in German paleography was taught by Dr. Walter Rummel, who, as in years past, succeeded in guiding the beginners as well as more advanced students through the thicket of various historical forms of German handwriting (e.g., *Sütterlin*).

Leaving the Deutsches Eck, we traveled next to the two German capitals, Bonn and Berlin. In Bonn we visited the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung and the Politisches Archiv of the Foreign Office. We then traveled by train to Berlin and detrained at the Zoo Station. Once ensconced in Berlin, we took the S-Bahn to Potsdam, where we visited the Forschungsschwerpunkt Zeithistorische Studien. Prof. Konrad Jarausch of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill gave a stimulating talk on the problems and politics of doing research on the history of the German Democratic Republic. He was joined by colleagues of the center, who in turn presented the various research projects now underway. The director of the Bundesarchiv Potsdam attempted to bring the group up to speed with regard to the changes

taking place in the Bundesarchiv, especially the relocation of huge numbers of record groups (for example, from Koblenz to Potsdam or Lichterfelde).

At the Freie Universität we heard two provocative and interesting lectures by Profs. Wolfgang Wippermann, who spoke about minorities in German history, and Bernd Söseman, who discussed the role of diaries and the promises and pitfalls of making critical editions of such sources. Once again, our visits to the Landesarchiv Berlin and the former SED archive were successful. However, the former SED archive and library are scheduled to be relocated soon to Lichterfelde in the western part of Berlin.

At each institution we visited, archivists and/or librarians talked to the group about the history and use of their respective collections, about their facilities, and about the special problems of preservation, restoration, and acquisition. Throughout the program, the participants had ample opportunity to get to learn about each other's dissertation projects and to share information and tips on source material and on more profane matters.

Institutions visited:

Krupp Archiv, Villa Hügel, Essen

Ruhr Universität Bochum, lectures by Prof. Dr. Hans Mommsen and Prof. Dr. Adelheid von Saldern

Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv and Mikrofilmarchiv, Dortmund Nordrhein-Westfälisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Düsseldorf Bundesarchiv Koblenz

Archiv der Sozialen Demokratie der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung and Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes, Bonn Forschungsschwerpunkt Zeithistorische Studien and Bundesarchiv II, Potsdam

Freie Universität Berlin, lectures by Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wippermann and Prof. Dr. Bernd Söseman

Universitätsarchiv and Archiv des Deutschen Instituts für Körperkultur, Leipzig

Stiftungsarchiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der ehemaligen DDR im Bundesarchiv and Landesarchiv Berlin

The Institute would like to thank the Volkswagen-Stiftung for its generous support of the Summer Program over the past six years. The program has enabled over ninety Ph.D. students from the United States

and Germany to learn about the workings of German archives from the inside, expose them to many different kinds of research institutions, and introduce them to German handwriting since the fifteenth century. Above all, the program has allowed participants to cultivate contacts and friendships among members of the next generation of German historians.

Please note that, as of this writing, no Summer Program for 1996 has been planned.

*Daniel S. Mattern*

### **1995/96 Fellows in Postwar German History**

With a grant from the Volkswagen-Stiftung, the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies and the GHI have begun the second year of the renewed joint program in postwar German history. Three scholars have taken up residential fellowships at the institutes to conduct their research in Washington, D.C. Their projects, while not closely related, all look at Germany's domestic policy developments after 1945.

Dr. Richard Beyler, Research Center for Science, History and Theory, Berlin, works on science policy and democratization in post-1945 Germany. His particular focus will be the interaction between West German policy makers and influential scientists vis-à-vis American officials and scientists after 1945. He resides at the German Historical Institute.

Dr. Jan-Herman Brinks, State University Groningen, The Netherlands, examines the anti-fascist foundation myth of the GDR between 1945 and 1961. He looks at both the ideology of anti-fascism and its implementation. He resides at the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies.

Dr. Maria Mitchell, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, PA, focuses her research on Christian democracy in occupied Germany and will investigate in particular the role of the Allies in the early postwar history of the German Christian Democratic Party. She resides at the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies.

Under the auspices of the program, both institutes will conduct workshops and seminars with the fellows and other interested scholars. Please call for further details.

## **Staff Changes**

Matthias Judt, Research Fellow, has returned to Berlin, where he is pursuing independent research.

Dietmar Schirmer, Research Fellow, resumed his position as *Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter* at the Otto-Suhr-Institut of the FU Berlin.

## **New Internet Address**

The GHI has a new internet address: [dhiusa@tribeca.ios.com](mailto:dhiusa@tribeca.ios.com).

We do not have our own gopher or home page at the current time; however, we would like to remind people that many of our in-house publications are available on the H-German gopher.

## **Recent Publications of the Institute**

We would like to announce the appearance of the following publications in our series with Cambridge University Press and with the Franz Steiner Verlag:

Dirk Hoerder and Jörg Nagler, eds., *People in Transit: German Migrations in Comparative Perspective, 1820-1930*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

R. Po-chia Hsia and Hartmut Lehmann, eds., *In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Sibylle Quack, ed., *Between Sorrow and Strength: Women Refugees of the Nazi Period*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Mitchell G. Ash and Alfons Söllner, eds., *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Emigré German-speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Ute Mehnert, *Deutschland, Amerika und die "Gelbe Gefahr". Zur Karriere eines Schlagworts in der Großen Politik 1905-1917*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.

Jürgen Heß, Hartmut Lehmann, and Volker Sellin (Hrsg.), *Heidelberg 1945/46*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.

## IV. Calendar of Events

### Fall 1995 Lecture Series

#### *THE GERMAN WELFARE STATE IN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE*

- September 13 Young Sun Hong (SUNY, Stony Brook) "World War I, Citizenship, and the Welfare State in Germany"
- September 28 Kathryn Kish Sklar (SUNY, Binghamton) "Florence Kelley, German Political Culture and Social Welfare, 1880-1930"
- October 11 Edward D. Berkowitz (George Washington University, Washington, D.C.) "The History of Social Welfare in America: A Comparative Analysis"
- October 26 David F. Crew (University of Texas, Austin) "The Meaning of Welfare in the Weimar Republic"
- November 8 Allan Mitchell (University of California, San Diego) "Reflections on a Spittoon: German and French Approaches to Welfare Reform in the Late Nineteenth Century"
- December 7 Peter Baldwin (University of California, Los Angeles) "The Postwar German Welfare State: Between Restoration and Reform"

### Annual Lecture 1996

On Thursday, November 16, Professor Patrick J. Geary will deliver the ninth Annual Lecture on the topic "The German Middle Ages in America." Prof. Geary is currently the Director of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at UCLA. A comment on the lecture will be given by Prof. Dr. Otto Gerhard Oexle, Director of the Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte in Göttingen.

### **Upcoming Conferences and Workshops**

The following scholarly conferences and workshops have been planned for 1996:

"1968." Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, May 23-25. Conveners: Carole Fink and Detlef Junker.

"Imagination, Ritual, Memory, Historiography: Conceptions of the Past in the Middle Ages." Heidelberg, September 5-8. Conveners: Johannes Fried and Patrick Geary.

"Republicanism and Liberalism in the United States and Germany from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Nineteenth Centuries." University of Wisconsin, Madison, October 3-5. Conveners: Jürgen Heideking, John Kaminski, and Peter Becker.

"How Total was the Great War? Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States, 1914-1918." Münchenwieler/Beme, October 9-12. Conveners: Stig Förster, Roger Chickering, and Manfred F. Boemeke.

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

## **V. Friends of the German Historical Institute**

### **The Friends' Third Annual Symposium: Report**

"Archives and Historical Research: The Crucial Partnership."  
November 17, 1994. Washington, D.C.

The 1994 Friends' Symposium addressed questions of close concern to all scholars associated with the Institute, namely, doing historical research in archives. The symposium had three goals: to inform historians about recent changes in the availability of archival records; to discuss some of the problems faced by scholars; and, more unusually, to allow scholars to listen to some of the increasing problems facing archivists.

After being welcomed by Professor Vernon Lidtke, chair of the Friends, and Professor Detlef Junker, director of the Institute, Professor Geoffrey Giles introduced the morning session. Dr. Michael Kurtz from the National Archives began by explaining the current situation regarding the latter's holdings from the former Berlin Document Center. Forty thousand reels of microfilm had arrived in July 1994, and the first four series of films, covering records of the SS, had been copied and would be available to the public beginning December 12, 1994, at the new facility of the National Archives in College Park, Maryland. An information package will accompany each series as it is released. The target date for completing the production of user copies from the master film is May 1996, which means that some 2,000 reels must be copied each month. Addressing fears of possible restrictions on access, Dr. Kurtz stated categorically the judgment of both archivists and lawyers at the National Archives and the Department of Justice that "the BDC records must be open, open to all, and open for copies." Furthermore, American law does not permit the future closure or restriction of any record once it has been freely available.

The vice president of the Bundesarchiv, Dr. Siegfried Büttner, followed with a crisp overview of the enormous tasks facing the German Federal Archives since unification, entitled "The Bundesarchiv since October 1990: Is It Going to be a National Archives?" He addressed especially the strength of federalism in Germany, which has led to the depositing of papers from the branch offices of national agencies not in the Bundesarchiv but in state archives, a unique

situation in the archival world. Dr. Büttner discussed the special problems arising from the collapse of the GDR, where what were clearly state papers had been lodged in a private archive, that of the SED. Using helpful charts, he outlined the significant organizational upheaval that unification had brought with it. In the short space of three-and-a-half years, the number of branch offices of the Bundesarchiv had grown from seven to twenty-five, though some reduction in this number is planned. The number of staff increased from 380 to 900. Suddenly, the amount of paper holdings almost doubled, the amount of film more than doubled. And many of these new acquisitions had been poorly stored, leading to massive tasks for the conservation experts as well as the archivists.

Dr. Büttner also addressed the question of access to records under the provisions of the German Federal Archives law, notably as it affected the holdings of the former Berlin Document Center but also the files of the East German government. He stressed that users must guarantee to show respect for the legitimate interests of living persons. For scholarly historians, he did not foresee any problems or limitations and looked forward to continuing international cooperation between our two countries.

Professor Marion Deshmukh Department of History, (George Mason Univ.) provided an informative overview of the fate of captured German war art. This intriguing topic was brought alive even more with some slides of the art in question. Almost 9,000 works of art had been shipped to Washington in 1947, produced principally by artists in the *Propagandakompanien* of the armed services. Prof. Deshmukh considered the art from a critical standpoint and found only a minority of the works to be blatantly propagandistic. Faced with rising conservation costs as the ravages of age began to take their toll on these works of art, the Reagan government decided to ship back to Germany the majority of the collection, keeping only certain propaganda pictures and all portraits of Nazi leaders. This transfer took place in the spring of 1986, at a time when conservation costs alone were running at \$30,000 per annum. Although the main purpose of most of these paintings was to record the life of the soldier, often in an idealized, though not blatantly propagandistic fashion, the archive in Germany where they are now stored is not open to the public.

Next, Dr. Rainer Hering, an archivist at the Staatsarchiv Hamburg, presented an insider's view of the challenges and problems facing state archives today. The sheer tonnage of documents arriving at archives to

be sorted, conserved, and indexed increases substantially every year. The norm used to be 400 linear meters per year; in 1993 accessions at Hamburg totaled 1,000 meters. The introduction of recycled paper into offices points to future problems for the conservation of documents. Furthermore, user-friendliness has led to a greater influx of users! No longer just doctoral students, but now undergraduates and even high-school students come knocking on the archivist's door for help with projects and papers. All this results in a crying need for increased personnel in what remains an extended period of budgetary reductions. The task of the archivist, receiving sets of materials, is much more difficult than in the past, because institutions and agencies that formerly trained records officers to organize documents now rarely do so. Electronic documents create their own problems, and archivists are only just beginning to grapple with the possible solutions. Dr. Hering's paper was a salutary reminder to historians who take archives for granted that these repositories cannot continue to operate in their current fashion without the positive support and input of the scholars who use them.

Professor Paul Schwartz (College of Law, Univ. of Arkansas) shared some comparative thoughts on the nature of data protection laws in both Germany and the U.S. Though similar in appearance and intent, the laws tend to be applied less enthusiastically in the United States. They are often roundly criticized: by politicians, who believe that the laws protect perpetrators; and by historians, who feel that they allow bureaucracies and certain individuals to escape scrutiny. Case law is important on both sides of the Atlantic. The 1977 *Wayland v. Roe* decision handed down a constitutional right to information privacy (in this case, regarding pharmaceutical data), but, following the classic eighteenth-century view, it only applied to state action, not private action. Similarly, in the United States, the Freedom of Information Act only applies to federal archives, not private ones. That said, the American public archives have a tradition of unusual openness. Whereas the policy in the U.S. tends to be "keep everything, release everything," the German *Bundesarchivgesetz* contains the notion of a deliberate *selection* of records of permanent value. And whereas the norm in Germany is to release archival materials only thirty years after the death of the person concerned, U.S. policy works the other way round and calls for the withholding of access only if there is evidence of a clear invasion of privacy. Prof. Schwartz concluded with some remarks on the complications brought about in Germany by the millions of Stasi files.

A lively discussion followed both the morning and afternoon sessions, and all agreed that there had been much food for thought for the historians present, who felt privileged to learn new aspects of apparently familiar territory by hearing about it from a variety of different perspectives.

The papers will be published in the Institute's Occasional Papers series.

*Geoffrey J. Giles*

*University of Florida*

*Chair, Executive Committee, Friends of the GHI*

#### **Fourth Annual Symposium**

*"Stunde Null: The End and the Beginning Fifty Years Ago,"* the Friends 1995 Symposium, will take place on Friday, November 17, at the Institute. The program features papers by Konrad H. Jarausch, Uta Gerhardt, Rebecca Boehling, and Jeffry M. Diefendorf, among others.

## **VI. Notices and Announcements**

### **Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History 1996**

The German Historical Institute in Washington, the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown University, and the Conference Group for Central European History are pleased to announce the second transatlantic doctoral seminar in German history. The conference, again supported by the German-American Academic Council, will convene in Germany between April 17 and 20, 1996, and will bring together young scholars from Germany and North America who are nearing completion of their doctoral degrees. We plan to invite about a half-dozen scholars from each side of the Atlantic for three days' discussion of their doctoral projects. The bases of discussions will be papers submitted in advance of the conference. The languages of the seminars will be German and English. The program will cover all travel costs and lodging expenses in Germany. In the case of North American scholars, we will support a one-week stay in Germany.

The theme of this conference will be "Germany in the Age of Two World Wars, 1914-1945." We are now accepting applications from doctoral students whose work falls principally in this era and who will finish their degrees *after* June 1996. Applications should include a short (2-3 pp.) project description, a resume, and a letter of reference from the major advisor. Please send applications by **December 15, 1995**, to:

Transatlantic Doctoral Seminars German  
Historical Institute c/o Christa Brown  
1607 New Hampshire Ave., N.W. Washington,  
DC 20009 USA

### **AICGS/GHI Fellowships in Postwar German History 1996-97**

With a grant from the Volkswagen-Stiftung, the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies of The Johns Hopkins University in Washington/Baltimore and the GHI in Washington are offering three resident research fellowships for the 1996-97 academic year. The fellowships are open to junior-level (ca. \$25,000) and advanced-level (ca. \$30,000) scholars. Historians and political scientists specializing in post-World War II German history and German-American relations, par-

ticularly the period 1945-1955, are eligible. A Ph.D. is required. The program welcomes applicants from eastern Germany and proposals dealing with the history of the GDR.

Successful applicants are expected to conduct their research using archival resources of the Washington area. They will give introductory and concluding talks for the intellectual community of the two institutes. Residency should begin no later than October 1, 1996.

Applications, which must be written in English, should contain the following:

- a curriculum vitae, including a list of publications;
- a project proposal of no more than ten pages, including statement of purpose, hypotheses, methodology, resources to be used in the Washington area, and relationship to prior research;
- three letters of recommendation, in sealed envelopes, accompanying the application;
- information concerning annual salary, sabbatical leave, or other research support.

Applications should be received no later than **January 1, 1996**, and should be addressed to: VW Fellowship Committee, AICGS, 1400 16th Street, N.W., Suite 420, Washington, DC 20036-2217, USA. Award decisions will be made by about March 15, 1996.

### **"The Culture of Rights": Call for Papers**

The Institute is currently planning a conference on "'The Culture of Rights': Civil Rights, Participation Rights, and Social Rights in Germany and the United States from the Late 19th Century to the Present," which will be held at the Institute in June 1997.

The emergence of modern, western-style democracies and their concept of citizenship have arguably been shaped by the expansion of individual and collective rights, conventionally subdivided into civil rights and liberties, participatory rights, and socio-economic entitlements. In comparing the American and the German "cultures of rights," the conference will address the social, political, and cultural construction of rights in terms of class, race, ethnicity, gender, market access, the common good, etc., and the specific historical forces and configurations that have led to their recognition or denial. Topics may include "freedom of speech," the "right to vote," the "right to work," "group entitlements," or "affirmative action," but other suggestions are also welcome.

If you are working in one of these fields, we would like to hear from you. Please submit a brief proposal (up to two pages) by March 31, 1996. Proposals from junior scholars are especially encouraged. Please direct all correspondence to:

German Historical Institute  
c/o Manfred Berg/Martin Geyer  
1607 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20009 USA  
Fax: (202) 483-3430  
E-Mail: mgeyer@tribeca.ios.com

### **GHI Dissertation Scholarships 1997**

The Institute offers scholarships for up to six months to doctoral students working on topics related to the Institute's general scope of interest. Applications for 1997, addressed to "GHI Dissertation Scholarships," should be received by **May 31, 1996**, and should contain the following information:

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

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

## VII. Miscellaneous

### **Panel at Annual Meeting of the German Studies Association**

The Institute sponsored a session entitled "Oral History and German-American Relations since World War II" at the GSA's 1995 Annual Meeting in Chicago. The session presented papers by Harald Leder, Maria Hohn, and Donita M. Moorhus, with a commentary by Edward N. Peterson. Ms. Moorhus and Robert P. Grathwol moderated and organized the panel.

The papers all dealt with the presence of American military forces in Germany since 1945. The presenters explored the value of oral history interviews in specific research topics, raised methodological issues involved in the use of oral history, and affirmed its potential for enriching our understanding of the interaction between Germans and Americans over the past fifty years.

Harald Leder's paper examined "U.S. Army Youth Activities and the German Response: Nuremberg, 1945-1960." Leder's research addresses a program called German Youth Activities (GYA), which began as spontaneous and uncoordinated engagement in sports and club activities of American soldiers and young Germans in defeated Germany. When Leder began to interview people in the Nuremberg area who had been active in GYA, he uncovered a network of other participants, received documentation from the private and personal collections of the interviewees, and found leads to additional documentation in German and American records. He also encountered a sharp contrast between the official documents and the memories of the participants. Documents and reports dwelled on the problems and shortcomings of the program, whereas participants remember the positive influences and the excitement that participation brought to them personally. Leder concluded that, without the use of oral history, "a different and maybe rather distorted picture of the [GYA] program might prevail."

Maria Hohn uncovered a similar dichotomy, a "dramatic difference between the recollections of our *Zeitzeugen* and the records of the state and federal archives." Her presentation, entitled "'Nun erzählen Sie doch mal ...!' Oral History and German-American Relations during the Golden Fifties," focused on the Rhineland-Palatinate. She wanted to assess what impact the large American military presence had on the day-to-day lives of the people in the mostly rural regions of this area west of the Rhine. The archival records reflected concern and anxiety

over the "false gods of 'work, money, pleasure'" over "Americanization," which led to an unwanted "standardization and leveling" of social life and to a transformation of the population that had heretofore been "*arm, aber anständig*." Oral history interviews revealed, by contrast, memories of the excitement that the American soldiers had brought to the lives of provincial Germans, along with an unprecedented prosperity throughout the region. The witnesses remember delighting in American jazz and rock 'n' roll music. They recalled their impressions of American marriages in which husbands took an active part in child care and household chores, and in which women played a more significant role in family matters than in traditional German homes. Höhn concluded that "had I relied on [the written record] alone, my study of the 1950s in the Rhineland-Palatinate would have been a very different one," with few traces of the positive experiences that led oral history participants spontaneously to label the period "the 'roaring fifties' or the 'golden fifties.'"

Donita Moorhus approached her topic as an oral historian schooled in the guidelines developed by the Oral History Association for conducting, processing, and depositing oral history interviews and for developing oral history projects. She argued that, in conjunction with more traditional research techniques, oral history represents an appropriate methodology for gathering evidence on German-American relations since World War II. Many individuals have used or are using interviews as a part of their topical research projects. Regrettably, the interviews produced for individual projects often remain unprocessed, undeposited, and therefore unknown and inaccessible to other scholars. Large collections of oral histories of military personnel who have served in Germany, undertaken by history programs supported by the military services, remain unknown to academic scholars working on German-American relations. To rectify these difficulties, Moorhus proposed an oral history project with three components: 1) promoting approved oral history methodology through publications and workshops that publicize the Oral History Association's guidelines; 2) identifying projects in both Germany and the United States dealing with German-American relations; and 3) preparing a bibliography of such interviews and collections open for use by scholars, researchers, and teachers. She also invited the GHI to take the lead in developing a program that would enhance the quality and the availability of oral history testimony on the topic.

After a commentary by Prof. Peterson, who not only has published in the field of the American occupation in Germany and was an Ameri-

can GI in Germany in 1945, and a lively discussion, the final word went to the Institute's director, Detlef Junker. He acknowledged that the papers had prompted him to think anew about the potential of oral history as a research tool, as an instrument for gathering otherwise inaccessible testimony, and about the role of the GHI in promoting its use.

*Robert P. Grathwol*