

*BULLETIN of the*  
*GERMAN HISTORICAL*  
*INSTITUTE*

Issue No. 21 (Fall 1997)

Series editors:  
Detlef Junker  
Petra Marquardt-Bigman  
Janine S. Micunek

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
1607 New Hampshire Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20009  
Tel. (202) 387-3355  
Fax: (202) 483-3430  
[dhiusa@tribeca.ios.com](mailto:dhiusa@tribeca.ios.com)

Library Hours:  
Monday-Friday, 9 am-5 pm  
and by appointment

© GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE 1997  
All rights reserved.

The Bulletin appears twice a year and is  
available upon request.

## Contents

PREFACE	5
CONFERENCE AND WORKSHOP REPORTS	
“New Approaches to Migration Research: German-Americans in Comparative Perspective.” April 22-24, 1997.	7
“Constitutive Moments of Transatlantic Relations, 1947-52 and 1997-2002. The Marshall Plan at 50: Retrospective, Prospective.” May 22, 1997.	12
“The Culture of Rights: Civil Rights, Participation Rights, and Social Rights in Germany and the United States from the Late 19 <sup>th</sup> Century to the Present.” June 11-14, 1997.	14
“Politics and Propaganda: New Approaches to German-American Relations, 1933-1945.” June 22, 1997.	18
“Universities in Medieval Society.” September 18-20, 1997.	22
„Politik, Gesellschaft und die Institutionalisierung von Geschichtswissenschaft: Deutschland und die USA im Vergleich.“ September 27, 1997.	25
“Science and the Historical Discipline in a Transcultural Perspective, 1850-1950.” October 4-5, 1997.	27
NEW RESEARCH TOPICS AT THE GHI	
“America's Berlin: The Divided City and the Cold War in American Culture, Society, and Politics, 1945-1963.”	31
“American Political and Ideological Influences on the Shaping of the West German Basic Law ( <i>Grundgesetz</i> ) of 1948-49.”	34
INSTITUTE NEWS	
“Germany and the United States in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1990.” Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History 1997	38
“Germany Divided and United, 1945-1989.”	39

Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture 1997	41
Concluding Seminar in Postwar German History	42
Library Report	45
Staff Changes	45
New GHI Publications	46
VISITS AT THE INSTITUTE	
Academic Advisory Council of the GHI	47
MdB Dr. Gerhard Stoltenberg	48
Friedrich Ebert Foundation Stipend Recipients	48
CALENDAR OF EVENTS	
Fall 1997 Lecture Series	50
Annual Lecture 1997	51
Upcoming Conferences and Workshops	51
International Media Conference	52
FRIENDS OF THE GHI	
Friends Dissertation Prize Awarded	55
Sixth Annual Symposium of the Friends of the GHI	58
NOTICES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS	
German-American Center for Visiting Scholars	59
Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History 1998	
“Germany in the Early Modern Era.”	60
GHI Dissertation Scholarships 1999	61
German-American Research Networking (GARN)	61
Call for Papers	62

## Preface

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

It gives me great pleasure and even a considerable amount of pride to report on several new developments at 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, from top to bottom. These changes will further enhance the attractiveness of the German Historical Institute in Washington.

Very profound changes are about to occur on the Institute's fourth floor. As many of you know, these rooms remained empty after the Goethe Institute moved to a new location some time ago. In keeping with its policy of both strengthening and expanding transatlantic relations, the German government has decided to establish and operate a German-American Center for Visiting Scholars, and it will be housed in this space. The Center will open on January 1, 1998, and will receive initial funding for three years. Its main objective is to provide eight, mostly younger academics in the humanities and the social sciences with a place to work and carry out research for a period of up to six months. The Center will provide office space and computers for the scholars, and may also pay them a housing subsidy (see the announcement on page 59).

As the center of political power in the United States, and as one of the historical and cultural nuclei of this country, the metropolitan Washington area is a highly attractive location for both American and German scholars. The archives, libraries, museums, and universities, as well as the government institutions and think tanks, are of great importance to historians, social scientists, political scientists, and economists.

However, younger scholars who wish to utilize the potential of the Washington metropolitan area often lack offices featuring the most up-to-date technical equipment. The gradual retirement of the generation that has laid the groundwork for cooperation between Germany and the United States after World War II is a further reason for the creation of an Institution that will promote German-American partnership and mutual under-

standing. The establishment of this new center will also offer its members an institutional affiliation and a congenial environment for academic work and the broadening of personal contacts.

Three institutions have united to form the society that will found the German-American Center for Visiting Scholars. These are the German-American Academic Council (Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanisches Akademisches Konzil, DAAK), the German Historical Institute in Washington (GHI), and the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies (AICGS). The director of the DAAK will function as the managing director of the society operating the Center, and the visiting scholars will be chosen by a committee composed of representatives from the three involved institutions. The GHI is very pleased to be so closely associated with this new transatlantic initiative. We are sure that the visiting scholars will contribute greatly to the intellectual life, the broad range of scholarship, and the public acclaim of the German Historical Institute.

Finally, as our librarian Iris Golumbeck relates in this bulletin, we have installed new, compact shelving units in the basement. The Institute has thus gained additional space to store its collection of books, which grows by about 1,500 volumes a year, until the year 2008. For the period following that year, a new solution will have to be found to accommodate the intimidating problem of shelf space; that is, if historians will still be using books in the next millennium.

We indeed hope that these exciting developments, as well as our on-going program of activities and events, continue to reinforce and advance the German-American academic community.

Yours sincerely,

*Detlef Junker*

## Conference and Workshop Reports

### **“New Approaches to Migration Research: German-Americans in Comparative Perspective.”**

**Conference at the Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, April 22-24, 1997. Conveners: Wolfgang Helbich and Walter Kamphoefner.**

The efforts of historians on both sides of the Atlantic to explore the intricate history of German settlement and heritage in the United States were continued with this conference. Bringing together senior scholars with younger researchers, Wolfgang Helbich of the Ruhr University in Bochum and Walter Kamphoefner of Texas A&M University planned a program that aimed to place German-Americans in comparative perspectives. The seventeen participants had been asked both to present a paper and to give a comment, a format that contributed to the intense working atmosphere of the meeting. Local support for the conference was provided by the George Bush School of Government and Public Policy and the Texas A&M Departments of History, International Studies, Political Science, Sociology, and Modern Languages.

In the first panel, Georg Fertig (University of Münster) and Simone A. Wegge (Lake Forest College) reviewed the main theses and hypotheses of recent discussions on the motives leading to emigration: the rejection of a simple dichotomy of “push” and “pull” factors; the relativity of explanations based on overpopulation, low income, and kinship networks; and the emphasis on chain migration and information systems across the Atlantic and within the areas of new settlement. Outlining his micro-historical study on Göbrichen in Baden, an emigration village that offered quantifiable sources, Fertig focused on the local incentives to emigrate based on a network of information. Wegge also relied on an immense set of data from the villages of Hessen-Kassel in her attempt to combine the arguments of economists on the “utility maximum problem” and those of historians. Her

results validated both the relative income and the information hypothesis and led to a debate about the ability to differentiate between economic and other factors that effect emigration.

The following panel explored the political world of emigrants in the United States. Willi Paul Adams of the Free University Berlin took up the concept of “ethnic politicians” and applied it to two German-Americans who served in Congress around 1880: Lorenz Brentano, a Republican from Chicago, and Peter Victor Deuster, a Democrat from Milwaukee. Adams rejected the notion that these German-Americans were motivated by monolithic ethnic interests. Based on a collective biography approach, Walter Kamphoefner compared German and Irish mayors in fourteen of the largest cities in the United States between 1820 and 1980. Kamphoefner warned against making generalizations about the differences between the two groups and elaborated more subtle distinctions, such as the Germans’ success with educational issues and alcohol regulation and Irish accomplishments with regard to low-level patronage jobs. Michael Wala (University of Erlangen) focused on the Weimar Republic to investigate efforts to revitalize German ethnic identity in the United States after World War I. He described some of the conflicting attempts made by the Culture Department of the German Foreign Office and the Reichswehr on the one side, and the German diplomats in the United States and institutions for the promotion of German-American exchange on the other side.

The second day of the conference concentrated on problems of the nineteenth century. Wolfgang Helbich investigated the motivational structures and the inter- and intra-ethnic conflicts of German-born Union soldiers during the Civil War. The paper allowed some insights into his current project with Walter Kamphoefner to publish an annotated edition of German Civil War letters. While there were striking contradictions in the collective images of German soldiers, the German units as a whole were affected by ethnic tensions and marked by self-separation without showing any significant sign of patriotic effusions. Consequently, Helbich was skeptical about the use of the term “Americanization” for the German soldiers; he also preferred the term “pluralistic ethnic competition” to “nativism” for characterizing the often hostile social context. Russell A. Kazal (University of Pennsylvania) presented his research on German-Americans in two Philadelphia neighborhoods, Kensington and Germantown. Reappraising



the concept of assimilation, Kazal carefully elaborated the argument that around 1900, German-Americans found a new identity as “old-stock Americans.” They felt as a part of the “old immigrant” group of northwestern Europeans who now socially mixed among the English, Irish, and American-born population and distanced themselves from the “new immigrants” arriving mainly from southern and eastern Europe. Kazal emphasized the accompanying racial discourses that led to a rallying of the “old immigrants” under the common rubric “white.” Ethnicity as a constructed category was also the topic of Tobias Brinkmann (Free University Berlin), as he illuminated the situation of German Jews in Chicago from 1840 to 1918. Brinkmann considered “Germanness” “Jewishness,” and “Americanness” as overlapping but divergent fields of identity. He provided examples from the use of language, the social and associational life, the spiritual movement, and the attitude of Jews from Germany during the Civil War.

The following panel, devoted to the role of religion in the process of German emigration and immigrant life in the United States, did justice to Reinhard R. Doerries’ (University of Erlangen) strong plea to integrate faith and church as non-quantifiable factors into any analysis of emigration. Doerries highlighted the persistence of confessional disputes among German immigrants and the effects of religious affiliations on educational efforts, the *Vereinswesen*, and the chance to gain financial support from denominational groups. The immense potential of new insights that can be achieved by combining emigration research with recent scholarship on the history of church and religion was shown by Kathleen Neils Conzen (University of Chicago) in a fascinating paper on “Immigrant Religion and the Public Sphere: The German Catholic Milieu in America.” Conzen discussed the ability of religion, in particular Catholicism, to structure migratory, adaptive, and political processes. It became clear that Catholicism, both on the individual level and in organizational form, heavily influenced the decision to emigrate and produced Catholic migration chains. Moreover, German Catholics reproduced the socio-religious milieu they had experienced on the old continent in the United States. Of particular interest were also observations on the Catholic use of the Democratic Party against state centralization.

The vast number of regional and micro-historical studies currently being pursued was reflected in the program of the final conference day. Anne Aengenvoort (University of Bonn) presented results of her new research on German settlement in Ohio. The dominating influence of local and denominational ties on the decision to emigrate became as obvious as the “self selectivity” of settlement that followed patterns based on religion and local origins rather than a common ethnic German identity. As part of a larger interdisciplinary project, Myron Gutmann and Sara Pullum from the University of Texas at Austin discussed how immigrant and native farmers in the Great Plains differed with regard to settlement trends and farming practices.

Dirk Hoerder (University of Bremen) opened the discussion for another comprehensive view of the interconnectedness of emigration, immigration, and internal migration in universal, cross-continental comparison. Emphasizing the work-in-progress character and the intention to stimulate further research, Hoerder proposed the use of the term “diaspora” for a new conceptualization of the multidirectional migration from German territories and social ties over space and time that would abandon a German-centered perspective. This stimulating approach provoked a lively discussion on the implications of the term “diaspora.”

“Prescriptions and Perceptions of Labor and Family among Ethnic Groups in the Nineteenth-Century American Middle West” was the topic of John Gjerde from the University of California at Berkeley. Utilizing a highly original approach, Gjerde pointed out that women and children were strongly involved in German farming practices, as opposed to those of other European and American-born farmers. He also made clear how depictions of the time are interwoven with value judgements about proper household relations, discipline, and gender structures within the home. These contemporary accounts represent distinct narratives by which both the immigrants and the American-born population reinforced ethnic boundaries and conflicting political assumptions. Donald A. DeBatts (Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia) presented three case studies conducted with the use of poll books, records of elections by voice, from the second half of the nineteenth century. Representing a rural, a mercantile, and an industrial context, respectively, these case studies demonstrated a peculiar inconsistency of electoral participation and partisanship among the

German population, a generally low voting turnout, and a certain reluctance to engage in politics. DeBatts renewed the demand not to overrate social motives but to recognize political attitudes as leading forces in the behavior of immigrants.

The final panel returned to questions of racial discrimination and language as key areas where ethnicity continues to be negotiated in society. Gabriela F. Arredondo (University of Chicago) delineated the ambiguous place of Mexican-Americans in Chicago from 1916 to 1935. As she convincingly explained, sexual politics and competition between Mexican and Polish men over Polish women, who were seen as an incarnation of “white” female beauty, reflected the quest for racial acceptance. However, there were also strong tendencies among Mexicans to unify their own communities and neglect the formal advantages of becoming American citizens. Paul Fessler (Texas A&M University) stressed the importance of comparisons by remapping the bilingual educational structures of German-American communities one hundred years ago and taking up the current debate about this issue as it relates to the Hispanic population in the United States. Fessler saw an acceptable solution not in “transitional bilingual education” but in the “two-way partial immersion model”—that has, in fact, a precedent in the German-English programs before 1900. The stimulating debate about this proposal demonstrated that historians need to follow current debates to sharpen their analytical consciousness and that everyday politics cannot renounce historical reflection on ethnic diversity.

*Andreas W. Daum*

**“Constitutive Moments of Transatlantic Relations, 1947-52 and 1997-2002. The Marshall Plan at 50: Retrospective, Prospective.”**

**Workshop at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., May 22, 1997. Cosponsored by the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies. Conveners: Carl Lankowski and Wilfried Mausbach.**

Commemorations of the Marshall Plan were abundant this spring. The inspiration for this workshop came from the fact that, fifty years later, interest in the European Recovery Program (ERP) is still more than antiquarian. The ERP provided the essential elements for the organization of Europe and the basis for unprecedented prosperity and peace in the western part of a continent riven by depression and war. Today, the challenge is to unite Europe's eastern part with its luckier western neighbors without losing sight of either the dynamics of European integration or of American interests in Europe. What lessons can we glean from the earlier period?

The symposium was composed of two roundtables: one on the Marshall Plan itself, the other on a comparison of the mid-century situation with current circumstances as the twentieth century comes to a close. Each roundtable featured opening comments by a panel of distinguished scholars. Volker Berghahn (Brown University) spoke about the origins of the Marshall Plan. He stressed the importance of a perception among key players in the late 1940s that something had gone wrong with U.S. participation in Europe in the 1920s. Back then, a destructive German reparations settlement had crippled confidence in European recovery, thereby discouraging private American investment. In contrast, after World War II, the Marshall Plan, according to Berghahn, unleashed initiative in the private sector and encouraged U.S. businessmen to get involved. Although the impact of the Marshall Plan then was primarily psychological, Berghahn disagreed with critics of the plan's importance and was inclined to regard it (with other scholars) as the “crucial margin” in Europe's postwar recovery efforts.

Lincoln Gordon (The Brookings Institution), whose former governmental service includes an appointment as director of the Marshall Plan aid mission in the American embassy in London from 1952 to 1955, consid-

ered another question: To what extent was a federalist form of European unification a goal of the Marshall Plan? Gordon stated that neither the integrationist thrust of European politics after World War II nor an operative military alliance such as NATO would have been possible without the Marshall Plan. However, he strongly criticized scholars who imply that the ERP envisioned integration from the start. Instead, as Gordon remembered, the term “economic integration” was introduced “with a big bang” by Paul Hoffman only at a meeting of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) in October 1949. Moreover, Hoffman was referring to a rather simple concept of integration, namely, the overcoming of trade and commerce barriers. The postwar European institutions implying supra-nationalism were not so much an offspring of American planners trying to cast a United States of Europe in the mold of their own country’s experience, but rather “a protective device growing out of French nationalism and fear of Germany.” As to the future of these institutions, Gordon voiced his skepticism that they will ever be able to transform the continent into a genuine union. However, he credited them with the major accomplishment of making war between France and Germany unthinkable.

Our second roundtable began with a presentation by Charles S. Maier (Harvard University), who outlined structural similarities and dissimilarities in three eras of European reconstruction: post-1919, post-1945, and post-1990. Maier paid particular attention to two similar developments that nonetheless provoked different policy approaches. After both world wars, as after the end of the Cold War, European economies held on to an excessive share of agriculture. But while distressed farmers became main supporters of extremism during the interwar period, the second half of the century was, and still is, characterized by government handouts to these groups to appease their dissatisfaction. Similarly, all three eras Maier investigated had to grapple with changing industrial bases. Already in the 1920s, the American model loomed large, but Europeans remained skeptical and undecided. In contrast, after World War II, the American model was strongly favored throughout Europe. While policy in this respect still seems to be in flux in eastern Europe today, Maier pointed out one particular realm where policies seem to ignore the experience of the 1940s and hark back to the 1920s: the failure to treat labor as a fully qualified partner—which the Marshall Plan certainly did. Moreover, the confidence in institu-

tions to shape economic outcomes so prevalent in Marshall Plan days has given way to an almost general belief among policy makers in the self-regulating promises of the market.

C. Fred Bergsten (Institute for International Economics) rounded up the presentations with a look into the twenty-first century. While the U.S. is becoming more and more interdependent with the global economy, Europe is headed in the opposite direction, with integration resulting in a much smaller external dependency ratio for each country. Bergsten expressed his belief that there will be a move toward convergence between the American and the European models in the next century. In contrast to Gordon, Bergsten was bullish both on European integration, whose voluntary ceding of sovereignty he sees as setting the pattern for decades to come, and on the Euro, whose creation, he believes, will mark a major structural change in the world economy. As after 1945, new forms of joint international management and a substantial increase in transatlantic cooperation will be required to handle the transition.

Each presentation provoked a lively discussion that was further animated by recollections of Robert Bowie, former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Henry “Joe” Fowler, Jacques Reinstein, and Robert Wolfe, among others.

*Wilfried Mausbach*

**“The Culture of Rights: Civil Rights, Participation Rights, and Social Rights in Germany and the United States from the Late 19th Century to the Present.”**

**Conference at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., June 11-14, 1997. Conveners: Manfred Berg and Martin H. Geyer.**

The emergence of modern democracies and their concept of citizenship have been critically shaped by the expansion of individual and collective rights, usually categorized as civil rights and liberties, participation rights, and socioeconomic entitlements. By putting this historical process into a

comparative perspective, the organizers of this conference hoped to open up new discussions about the so-called “rights revolution” in America and its equivalents and repercussions throughout the Western world. Their cultures rooted in the Western tradition of rights, Germany and the United States meet the basic criteria for an instructive comparison. They bear enough similarities to make a comparison possible, but there are also enough differences to make it fruitful. As a general rule, the American tradition has valued the rights and liberties of the individual very highly, whereas in Germany notions of the common good and the interest of the state have often prevailed.

The term “culture of rights” as the leitmotif for this conference has a twofold meaning: As a descriptive term, it refers to the extent and manner in which rights are part of the social and political life of any given society. This part may well be very small in some cases. As a normative concept, the term implies that social and political life should be governed by the recognition of rights based on the principles of equality and reciprocity. In this sense, the expansion and cultivation of rights holds the promise of a more equitable and just society.

The conference brought together twenty scholars from Europe and the United States representing a variety of fields, including the social sciences, legal studies, cultural studies, and, of course, history. In his keynote lecture, Hugh Davis Graham of Vanderbilt University provided an overview of the developments of the political culture of rights in both the United States and postwar Germany. Although both countries face similar problems, Graham argued, Germany has largely adhered to its traditional concept of class-based social integration, whereas in the United States, identity-based cultural issues have sharply transformed the political order since the late 1960s.

The first session dealt with the right to vote. Manfred Berg of the GHI Washington spoke about the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and its discursive strategies to regain suffrage for Black Americans. Peter Ling (University of Nottingham) elaborated on “education for citizenship in Cold War America” with a close look at the activities of the Highlander Folk School in Tennessee and the League of Women Voters to promote democracy at home and abroad. Merith Niehuss (University of the Bundeswehr, Munich) argued that the political participation

of German women after World War II and their perception of the right to vote was largely shaped within the family and reflected the dominant position of men in the family.

The second panel on social rights included four papers. Martin Geyer of the GHI Washington compared concepts of social rights and citizenship as they emerged during World War II in Germany, Britain, and the United States. Eileen Boris of Howard University focused on the role that the Fair Employment Practices Committee played in shaping the fight against racial and gender discrimination in employment. Michael Hughes (Wake Forest University) dealt with the arguments made by Germans who had suffered property damages during the war in support of their demands for sharing the burdens of the war and the restoration of their rightful place in society. David Abraham (University of Miami) addressed the issue of “recognition and redistribution as components of citizenship” in Germany and America and the problems that result from the decreasing capacity of the nation-state to meet the demand for redistribution based on social rights.

In the third session on the rights of immigrants, Hasia Diner of New York University looked at the way Jews have viewed their rights as citizens in America, where they have enjoyed an unprecedented degree of equality and religious freedom. Dietrich Herrmann (Technical University Dresden) discussed the impact and repercussions of the Cold War on immigration legislation in the United States. In his comparison of migrants’ rights in Germany and the United States, Christian Joppke (European University, Florence) focused on the legal theories that have been employed by the courts in determining the rights of aliens and argued that the traditional blood-based German concept of citizenship is rapidly crumbling.

The fourth session on “Racism and the Denial of Rights” featured four contributions. Paul Finkelman (Hamline University) discussed the changing notions of color blindness as a legal and political concept since the late nineteenth century. In his paper on the Nuremberg Laws, Karl Schleunes (University of North Carolina at Greensboro) explored the process of undoing equal rights for Jews in Nazi Germany. Yara-Colette Lemke Muniz de Faria (Technical University Berlin) described the debates on the status of Afro-German children after World War II. Roger Daniels (University of Cincinnati) gave an overview of the rights that were denied to and attained by Asian Americans since the nineteenth century.



The fifth panel addressed issues of rights in the context of multiculturalism and sexual definition. Ann Taylor Allen (University of Louisville) compared the different concepts of women's rights in the American and German women's movements associated with the paradigms of equal rights feminism and social feminism, respectively. The struggle for the rights of gays and lesbians in Germany and the United States was analyzed by Michael Dreyer (University of Jena). Berndt Ostendorf's (University of Munich) paper explored the attitudes of Americans and Germans toward the "politics of difference" and the concomitant quest for minority rights.

In the final session on the state and the individual, Stephen Halbrook of Fairfax, Virginia, argued in favor of "the right to bear arms in defense of human rights against oppression." Margaret Dalton (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa) explored the emerging new right to information in Germany and the United States.

Although the twenty individual papers represented a broad variety of topics, the discussions continued to revolve around key concepts, such as equal opportunity versus equal outcomes, the dual meaning of rights as symbols of inclusion and as instruments in attaining material benefits, and the historical significance of the shift to a concept of rights based on racial and cultural distinctions. The GHI plans to publish the proceedings of this conference in its series with Cambridge University Press.

*Manfred Berg  
Martin H. Geyer*

## **“Politics and Propaganda: New Approaches to German American Relations, 1933-1945.”**

**Panel at the Annual Conference of the Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations (SHAFR), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., June 22, 1997. Participants: Philipp Gassert, Michaela Hönicke, Detlef Junker (chair), Frank Ninkovich, Alex Shannon.**

In his introductory remarks, Detlef Junker (GHI Washington) reminded the audience that the struggle between the National Socialist Third Reich and the United States was a defining moment in modern American history, transforming not only American society but also America's outlook on the world. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his public debates with the isolationist majority in the years preceding the bombing of Pearl Harbor, developed the major components of U.S. global policies in the twentieth century. Warning against the impending world domination by an enemy power, Roosevelt defined U.S. national interests in a global context, including not only traditional principles of free trade and an open world economy, but also global definitions of freedom and self-determination, as well as a new understanding of America's security.

From the German point of view, the mutual relationship was even more central to the development of Germany's domestic and foreign affairs. It was the United States that helped to found the liberal democracies of Weimar and Bonn, provided the crucial support for the process of peaceful unification in 1989–90, and also frustrated the imperial ambitions of the German elites in two world wars. Summarizing the scholarly debate over the past decades, Junker concluded that the three papers presented at the session take advantage of the most recent developments in international history by using culture, ideology, images and popular perceptions, and the creation and transformation of memory to shed new light on German-American relations in the era of World War II.

In his paper entitled “Chaos, Conflict, and Confrontation: Nazi Propaganda in the United States, 1933-1939,” Alex Shannon (Madison, Wisconsin) argued that the existing literature on Nazi movements in the United States places too much emphasis on German plans and intentions while

devoting too little space to the American political culture in which the activities of Nazi propagandists took place. “An American penchant for sensationalism,” both in the press and among politicians, as well as “an almost obsessive fear of radical conspiracies,” led many Americans to believe that a small band of several hundred Nazis posed a major threat to the security of the United States. American reactions to the violations of human rights as well as the persecution of Jews and other minorities in the Third Reich stood at the beginning of an American “brown scare.” It immediately put Nazi propagandists on the defensive, undermining their efforts directed at the American public.

Well-publicized meetings and marches organized by American Nazi groups led to a backlash that culminated in the congressional investigations of the mid-1930s (the Dickstein and Dies committees). Shannon placed these developments in the context of similar events, which were usually directed against the Left, like the “red scare” of 1919, the Fish committee of 1930, and McCarthyism in the 1950s. In conclusion, Shannon argued that, although the Nazis were persistent in their efforts to influence American public opinion until shortly before Pearl Harbor, they never operated effectively within the United States. Above all, they were never a serious threat to American democracy, as some scholars have argued. Nazi propaganda was at best ineffective, at worst destructive.

The second paper, “Why Do Germans So Easily Forfeit Their Freedom? Psychological Interpretations of Nazism in Wartime America,” by Michaela Hönicke (Free University Berlin), analyzed the controversial, well-informed, and often sophisticated debate on Germany within governmental circles as well as among the American public. Hönicke argued that psychologically inspired studies on Germany, which too often have been dismissed as marginal or abstruse, enjoyed a widespread appeal and present some of the most “fascinating and illuminating wartime attempts to understand and represent the ‘German problem.’” They raised the ambiguous nature of the American wartime approach to the Third Reich—which was best captured in the metaphor of disease—to a more explicit level. With their language of deviance and illness, they could disparage, denigrate, and characterize the enemy. At the same time, they addressed the desire to find an adequate “diagnosis” of the German problem and expressed the confidence that it could be “cured.” Whereas most Americans maintained a differentiation between

the Nazi leadership and the majority of the German people, most of the psychologists who published in the field seemed to agree that National Socialist ideology was deeply rooted in German history and culture and would be difficult, if not impossible, to remedy. Within the American government, the Office of War Information (OWI) represented the first approach, whereas the War Department, which prevailed in the internal bureaucratic struggle, emphasized the popular support for Nazism in Germany. In the end, this ambivalence toward the German people would never be resolved. As Hönicke showed in her paper, American observers in Germany in 1945—such as Saul K. Padover, who, in his published accounts of his experiences in Germany, stressed his disillusion with, disgust with, and scorn for the German people—nevertheless recommended a much more optimistic and benevolent attitude toward their superiors.

Looking at mutual perceptions from the German point of view, Philipp Gassert (GHI Washington) presented a paper entitled “‘Almost Like People From Another Planet’: Ordinary Germans View the United States, 1939–1941.” Analyzing the regime’s own popular opinion surveys as well as reports prepared by exile groups, Gassert argued that, in contrast to the anti-American propaganda campaigns of the regime, which tried to build on century-old stereotypes of the United States, many Germans came to a realistic assessment of the overall military situation and understood the impact of the American entry into World War II. Although ordinary Germans tended to share many of the prejudices of the propagandists, the specter of an American intervention in World War II was looming large over the German war effort and dominated German discussions between 1939 and 1941. Two collective experiences were critical in determining such a “realist” perception of the United States: first, the “lessons of 1917,” meaning the decisive impact of the American entry on the outcome of World War I; and second, the “Americanism debate” of the 1920s, which had firmly established the image of the United States as the world’s most advanced society and an economic powerhouse. Ironically, the German leadership seemed to have shared many of the concerns of the general population. In 1944/45, the “American myth” that Nazi propaganda had hoped to destroy was alive and well among the younger generation. Although the circumstances had changed, the situation resembled that of the 1920s, when Germany was divided between those who promoted the Americanization of

Germany and those who rejected Americanism because it seemed to undermine Germany's indigenous culture. It was the breakdown of the National Socialist order, however, that paved the way for a new phase of cooperation between Germany and the United States.

In his commentary, Frank Ninkovich (St. John's University, New York) placed the three papers into the context of the larger debate about culture and international relations. What is the relevance of this new body of research with respect to the analysis of power politics and conflicts among nations, both of which have been considered the centerpiece of diplomatic history? Taking the example of Shannon's paper, Ninkovich asked what impact Nazi propaganda in the United States had on the decision-making process within the American government? How might propaganda have been deployed more effectively, and what does it tell us about the propagandists themselves? Can we define propaganda as an effort to tilt the international flow of communication? Was Nazi propaganda in the United States ineffective, or was it only counterproductive?

Addressing Gassert's contribution, Ninkovich underscored that mutual perceptions between Germany and the United States present a prime example of a history of cultural misunderstanding, because Germans and Americans drew diametrically opposing conclusions from the World War I experience. Whereas Germans seemed to emerge as realists perceiving the global role of the United States actually before the fact, Americans were still debating what the "lessons of 1917" had been and what their role in world politics should be. Furthermore, two cultures seemed to exist within Germany. National Socialist Germany was not as monolithic as it might have been perceived from the outside. In this respect, the German case resembled Japan, where nationalist and internationalist sentiments were always in conflict with one another.

In his comments on Hönicke's paper, Ninkovich stressed the fact that the psychoanalytical approach was a sign of the times. However, what was the political relevance of the discourse about Germany and what does it tell us about postwar planning and the American occupation regime? Furthermore, the usage of the disease metaphor during World War II seemed to be markedly different from, for example, Franklin D. Roosevelt's application of similar language in his famous 1937 Quarantine Speech. Finally, as we know from the existing research on Japan, the rapid transformation of the

image of the American enemy in 1945 was accomplished ideologically. Did a similar development take place in postwar Berlin?

In conclusion, Ninkovich noted that the new cultural history has injected a strand of optimism into a field that always used conflict as its point of departure. The final discussion centered on those issues, particularly on the question of what the meaning of culture for the study of German-American relations in the era of World War II could be.

*Philipp Gassert*

### **“Universities in Medieval Society.”**

**Conference at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., September 18–20, 1997. Conveners: William J. Courtenay and Jürgen Miethke.**

The impact of late medieval society on the internal structures of universities and the influence universities and their graduates exercised in that society are topics that have received greater attention among historians in recent years. The trend toward approaching university history from the standpoint of social history has been particularly strong in Europe and has led to a number of publications that have transformed the research field of late medieval and pre-Reformation education. Some of the major contributors to that discussion have been American and German scholars, many of whom knew each other only through their published work. To correct that deficiency and to bring about greater cooperation and interaction between those two groups of scholars, a conference on universities in medieval society was organized under the auspices of the German Historical Institute in Washington.

Planned almost two years earlier, the conference brought together a group of prominent German and American scholars working in the field of university history. The purpose of the meeting was to explore the social dimension of medieval universities, both the social and geographical background of students at various universities as well as the impact of university education on careers, secular and ecclesiastical government, urban institutions, and royal and princely courts. It gave an opportunity to

discuss the direction of research, to coordinate research efforts between the two national groups, and to plan for future exchange and cooperation.

The American scholars in attendance were John Baldwin of Johns Hopkins University, Uta-Renate Blumenthal of the Catholic University of America, William Courtenay of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Jo Ann Hoepfner Moran of Georgetown University, Howard Kaminsky of Florida International University, Darleen Pryds of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Michael Shank of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Thomas Sullivan of Conception Abbey, Katherine Tachau of the University of Iowa, and John Van Engen, director of the Medieval Institute at Notre Dame. The participants from Germany were Martin Kintzinger of the Free University Berlin, Jürgen Miethke of the University of Heidelberg, Peter Moraw of the University of Giessen, Frank Rexroth of the Humboldt University Berlin, Rainer Schwinges of the University of Bern, Helmut Walther of the University of Jena, and Klaus Wriedt of the University of Osnabrück.

The focus of the first day's meeting was on the social and geographical composition of European universities in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and their influence on the world outside the universities. Welcoming remarks of Detlef Junker, director of the German Historical Institute, opened the conference, and the morning session contained three presentations. In the opening paper William Courtenay examined the numerical strength and influence of German students at Bologna and Paris in the fourteenth century. His paper was followed by the presentation of Rainer Schwinges on the social structure of students and masters at German universities in the late fourteenth and the fifteenth century and the degree to which university education was or was not an avenue of advancement in social status and career opportunity. Klaus Wriedt concluded the morning session with an analysis of the role of university graduates in town government and German society in the fourteenth to the sixteenth century.

The afternoon session included two presentations. The first was by Thomas Sullivan, who examined the merit ranking among students in theology at the University of Paris at the time of licensing to teach theology. The last presentation was by Peter Moraw on the proportion of university students who belonged to the political elite in fifteenth-century

Germany, thus addressing a long-standing question of a numerical rise in social status among students able and willing to attend universities in the late medieval period.

The second day of the conference began with a session devoted to developments in particular faculties in German universities in the late Middle Ages. Helmut Walther spoke on juridical studies in Italy and Germany and the role played by canon law graduates in princely administrations of that period. Katherine Tachau discussed the influence of earlier English and Parisian masters on discussions of the inner senses among German arts masters in the late Middle Ages. Martin Kintzinger looked into the career possibilities of training in the arts (as distinct from the higher faculties) and the role of university arts programs in the training and preparation of school masters.

The final day of the conference broadened the discussion by introducing a number of important related themes. Frank Rexroth examined the rituals associated with the ceremonies that marked the opening of newly founded universities in Germany. Michael Shank reported on the strong interest in astrology in university and court circles in Vienna in the fifteenth century. Darleen Pryds looked at the preaching of King Robert d'Anjou at the University of Naples in the fourteenth century, and the role such sermons played in propagandizing the learning and spirituality of the king. The concluding presentation was by Jürgen Miethke on the influence of the political writings of university-trained masters, particularly Giles of Rome, William of Ockham, and Marsilius of Padua, in shaping political thought in the late Middle Ages.

One of the major accomplishments of the conference was that it brought together, in most cases for the first time, the leading scholars in Germany and the United States who are working on late medieval universities. It gave a chance to compare the research being done in the two countries and to share approaches and methodologies. As was to be expected, there was no unanimity on the extent to which university education aided social mobility in late medieval society, but there was agreement that further prosopographical work needs to be done before a more precise answer can be given to that question. Other areas that were identified as needing further research concerned the production of law graduates in fifteenth-century universities, which grew despite what appears



to have been declining career opportunities at the highest levels of late medieval society; and the interrelation of universities and pre-university training in town schools throughout Germany and Europe.

Perhaps the most important outcome of the conference were the explorations for future scholarly exchange, particularly ways of encouraging and providing opportunities for doctoral students and those at the beginning stages of a professorial career to visit and undertake research in Germany, and for German scholars to come into closer contact with American scholars. Some initial planning began for a future conference on urban schools in late medieval Germany and continental Europe that would bring together German and American scholars who are working on that important pre-university dimension of late medieval education.

The conveners would like to thank Eckhardt Fuchs of the GHI Washington for his support in organizing the conference and helping to make it a success.

*William J. Courtenay*

### **„Politik, Gesellschaft und die Institutionalisierung von Geschichtswissenschaft: Deutschland und die USA im Vergleich.“**

**Panel at the Annual Meeting of the German Studies Association, Bethesda, Maryland, September 27, 1997. Participants: Gerald Diesener, Eckhardt Fuchs (chair), Gabriele Lingelbach, Steffen Sammler.**

On the occasion of the 1997 conference of the German Studies Association, the German Historical Institute sponsored a session under the title “Politics, Society, and the Historical Discipline: The Genesis of Historical Institutions in Germany and the United States.” The aim of the session was to compare different forms of the institutionalization of the historical profession around the turn of the century. Owing to the different cultural traditions and educational systems that exist in the two countries, the genesis and development of historical institutions followed dissimilar patterns. Despite these differences, the creation of a national institutional network played a crucial role in the professionalization of the historical discipline on both

sides of the Atlantic. The founding of their own institutions by historians was not only a sign of the trend to make the study of history more scientific, but was also a means to exclude non-historians, amateurs, or historians who would not follow the mainstream of historical research from the historical community. The existence of academic institutions also offered the possibility to gain public prestige and political influence by creating a national memory. Historians founded, therefore, not only institutes at the universities, but also their own journals, congresses, and national associations.

The three case studies of the session, which dealt with three different forms of historical institutions, addressed the specific social and cultural implications of their establishment. Gabriele Lingelbach (Free University Berlin) delivered a paper on the foundation of the American Historical Association (AHA) in 1884. She demonstrated the changeover of this association and its meetings from an enterprise that initially gathered not only historians but also politicians and amateurs, to an association of well-educated and research-orientated academic historians. On the one hand, these scientific historians developed the methodological standards of their discipline, began editing national historical sources and publishing various bibliographies, and established a journal, the *American Historical Review*. On the other hand, the AHA became the central forum for articulating the social function of history. The AHA played a major role in forming the self-definition of the historical community in the United States before World War I, Lingelbach concluded.

Steffen Sammler (University of Lyon) presented a paper on the founding of the Historical Commissions of German Academies of Sciences (Akademien der Wissenschaften) in the second half of the nineteenth century. These Historical Commissions were a new form of institution that existed in addition to the historical seminars at the universities and local historical societies. Sammler concentrated on the Historical Commission of Saxony and pointed out its uniqueness in remaining independent from the Saxonian academy for a long period of time. He also noted that the Historical Commission was used by Karl Lamprecht to practice new and innovative approaches to history, such as cultural and economic history, outside the Historical Seminar at the University of Leipzig.

Gerald Diesener (Center for Contemporary Historical Research, Potsdam) sketched a broad picture of the development of historical institutions

over the last hundred years. He set out a theoretical framework on how to write a history of the historical institutions, their social and cultural conditions, and their changes over time. In his paper, Diesener highlighted how the national historical congresses in Germany had been shaped by the needs of a historical profession that used these congresses as a competition among different schools of historians, and to gain “cultural capital” among the scientific elite in Germany.

After a short comment by the chair of the session, Eckhardt Fuchs (GHI Washington), the lively discussion focused mainly on the differences between Germany and the United States. Also prominent in the debate was the question of why American historians founded their national association before the Germans did, since the process of professionalization and institutionalization of the historical discipline had started in Germany half a century earlier than it did in the United States. But the participants reached a consensus that it was only during the decades before World War I that the historians in both countries founded their permanent institutions for the same purposes: to make their discipline more scientific, to create a national historical identity, and to elevate their own prestige in society.

*Eckhardt Fuchs*

### **“Science and the Historical Discipline in a Transcultural Perspective, 1850-1950.”**

**Workshop at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., October 4-5, 1997. Cosponsored by the German Historical Institute London. Conveners: Eckhardt Fuchs and Benedikt Stuchtey.**

Developments in international historiography since the end of the nineteenth century have recently stimulated a new interest among historians of historiography. However, historiographers have mostly concentrated on the emergence of national historical communities up to now. They have taken little notice of the development of the historical discipline in an international perspective and have neglected non-Western historical writing in particular.

This workshop tried to break new ground in the study of historiography with its intention to spur interest in such an international and transcultural perspective on the history of the historical discipline. Its purpose was to look back at the origins, the mechanics, and the results of scientific exchanges between different cultures, to compare the processes of professionalization of the historical discipline within these different cultures, and to define the workings of the international relationship between Western and non-Western scientific communities. The twenty-two participants who attended the meeting represent four continents and teach in seven countries. They gave papers on African, European, American, Japanese, Chinese, Latin American, and Indian historiography.

The first session concentrated on theoretical and methodological problems, followed by three sessions that took Great Britain, France, and Germany as points of departure, since it was in these countries where the national historical disciplines were most advanced at the end of the nineteenth century. Two main topics were discussed: the possibilities and the limits of a structural comparison of academic historical disciplines from different cultures on the one hand, and their relationship, perceptions, and influences on the other. One general question was whether the triad of industrialization, modernization, and an increasing emphasis on scientific exploration, which was characteristic of the Occident, can also be applied when analyzing the development of non-Western science and historiography.

After the opening of the conference by Detlef Junker, director of the German Historical Institute in Washington, and introductory remarks by Eckhardt Fuchs (GHI Washington), Jörn Rüsen (Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut Essen) began the first session by addressing the theoretical problem of how to compare cultures in an "intercultural communication." According to Rüsen, ethnocentrism is the main challenge facing intercultural communication. He developed some thoughts on the gap between cultural differences and a universalistic discourse by arguing that this gap might be bridged by historical narratives and their claims of universal truth. Finally, he applied his principles to an intercultural comparative historiography using a theoretical approach to cultural differences that is guided by the idea of cultural specifics. For Rüsen, such an approach could avoid Eurocentrism and the presupposition that excludes cultures from one another.

Stefan Tanaka (University of California, San Diego) then showed how the modernization of Japanese society and its increasing reliance on scientific methods during the period of the Meiji restoration led to a historicization of society, a fully new interpretation of society, which made history and thereby historical writing possible. The “forgetting” of traditional patterns of thinking and their replacement by the metaphor of “childhood” brought, according to Tanaka, a new understanding of human existence to light. The universal and unifying notion of “childhood” became the basic element of a new national historical consciousness. It was used as a symbolic reminder of the existence of the nation and helped to legitimize the nation-state.

In the second session, Carlos Aguirre Rojas (Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico) offered an overview of the reception of French historical writing in Latin America from 1850 to the present. The dominance of German historiography since the second half of the nineteenth century gave way to French influence after World War I. Especially after the 1920s, the Annales school gained particular significance. Almost all writings of the Annales historians were immediately translated and received wide distribution. After 1968, however, American historical science had the greatest impact on Latin American scholars. In Aguirre’s perspective, Latin American historians considered themselves very cosmopolitan and a part of the Western scientific community.

Matthias Middell (University of Leipzig) drew a different picture of the influence of French thought on francophone African historiography. Here, the Annales did not play a decisive role in the genesis of a historical discipline. It was only after 1960 that, under the leadership of a new postcolonial generation, a shift from nationalistic to Marxist concepts took place. Marxism, according to Middell, was the main vehicle for the professionalization of history in Africa. In France, African historiography adopted only a minor role.

The British-African case was quite different. Benedikt Stuchtey (German Historical Institute London) stated in his paper on British imperialism and African historiography that the historical discipline in England developed a strong interest in African history. In South Africa, Boer historical writing can be analyzed using the frontier thesis. Black African historiography, as the example of Nigeria revealed, developed as a professionalized and institutionalized historical science following British models only since

the 1960s. However, historians were radical in the area of application but orthodox in their concepts.

Michael Gottlob (University of Bergamo), in his talk on British and Indian historiography, raised the problems of center and periphery and scientific colonialism. He argued that with James Mill the British treatment of the Indian past was incorporated into the strategy of historicizing the "ahistorical." Later in the nineteenth century this resulted in a confrontation of historical and "ahistorical" societies, which lost its historical components. Indian historians, who first tended to adopt the Western theory of progress, increasingly rejected the imperialistic character of British historiography by presenting India itself as the origin and center of civilization. Some of these historians, seeking to avoid essentialism, confronted the Western ideology of historicization with the empirical reality of colonialism.

In the final session, Gabriele Lingelbach (Free University Berlin) spoke about the German historical discipline and its impact on U.S. historiography. In her analysis of the study of Americans in Germany in the nineteenth century and the establishment of history departments throughout the United States, she argued that there was much less direct influence than previously supposed. This holds true for professional historical institutions outside the universities as well. The "German model" as such never existed, Lingelbach asserted, and American historians misread historicism.

Edward Wang (Rowan State College) focused on the role that German historicism played in China in the first half of the twentieth century. He concentrated on the "scientific history" that owed its concepts primarily to Leopold von Ranke and Gustav Droysen. The historians belonging to this school regarded science as methodology, which was applicable to historical writing. For them, therefore, the method of *Quellenkritik* was the basis of historical science.

The concluding discussion drew attention to the problem of the use and definition of such terms as "universal" or "world history," "transculturalism," and "Eurocentrism." Suggestions were made as to how to overcome the ethnicity that had been touched on in Jörn Rüsen's remarks. It became clear that the inevitability of language barriers makes a globalization without discrimination very difficult.

*Eckhardt Fuchs*  
*Benedikt Stuchtey*

## New Research Topics at the GHI

### **“America's Berlin: The Divided City and the Cold War in American Culture, Society, and Politics, 1945-1963.”**

After World War II, the city of Berlin became a highly contested object of international politics. In the process of the growing confrontation between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union, Berlin marked the dividing line between these antagonistic societies. During this time, the city became America's own unique place for experiencing the boundaries between the global adversaries; and it also became the emblematic incarnation of the controversies and the threats of the Cold War.

Beyond the internationalization of Berlin's status and owing to the American military presence, Berlin's aura reached widely into American society. The United States developed into the main guarantor of this West German island and, even more, generated a close political, intellectual, and emotional relationship with Berlin. Not only for the West German public but also for Americans, the city of Berlin, especially many of its monuments and visual representations—such as the American cargo planes during the Airlift, the blocked Brandenburg Gate, and the Berlin Wall—became icons of the Cold War and helped to dramatize the conflicts of the postwar era.

However, this close relationship, a peculiar kind of *Immediatverhältnis*, was not simply an outcome of the years after 1945. It rather followed an enduring tradition of America's special attention to Berlin as a mirror of both the evil and the positive potential of German history. In the eyes of most Americans, Berlin represented Wilhelmine hubris and Nazi terror as well as urban vitality, cultural innovation, and scholarly achievement. When U.S. troops entered the American sector in July 1945, Berlin had already been embedded in the American cultural memory as an ambivalent symbol of modernity. Furthermore, no other city in Germany has so often been characterized as an “American city” because of its rapid demographic, in-

dustrial, and commercial development, as well as its ethnic diversity and the hectic pace of its urban life.

These preliminary observations outline the scope of this new project at the German Historical Institute. Reversing the traditional perspective of analyzing the American *Berlinpolitik* and its impact on the city, this project will focus on the meaning of Berlin in the United States. My main concern is to uncover what Berlin meant for the Americans, and what these meanings tell us about American society during the Cold War. This study of America's Berlin will illuminate crucial domestic processes that the United States underwent after World War II and that affected its relationship toward Germany. In order to explain the strong ties between the United States and Germany, previous research has favored such interpretative patterns as a special, self-evident community of values and security, a *Werte-und Sicherheitsgemeinschaft*, strategic categories, American "hegemony" or Europe's "Americanization."

Whereas the so-called Americanization of Germany and the reception of American habits of culture and consumption is currently a favorite topic in German historiography, this project investigates the place of Berlin in America's "mental map": In what ways, with what intentions, and to what ends did Berlin—the meanings, the representations, and the historical heritage of the city—become part of the American imagination and integrated as such into the narratives of American history? How did competing Berlin narratives emerge, and which of them reinforced the process of American cultural appropriation of the city? What do these processes reveal about the cultural setting and the geopolitical thinking in the United States between 1945 and 1963? How did Berlin shape America's attitude toward Germany and mold this attitude with a particular geographical reference? To what extent did the reference to Berlin prefigure the thinking about the Cold War in the United States?

Guided by such questions, I would like to propose a new interpretation of the close relationship between the United States and Germany after World War II: America's Berlin illustrates the impact of "invented traditions" and the politics of memory in international relations. Focusing on Berlin in America helps us to understand the creation of common political identities and discursive as well as institutional community-building between the United States and Germany.



In fact, Berlin provided American society with a singular opportunity to understand the Cold War and define its relationship with Germany. Berlin epitomized both the confrontation of the Cold War and the antagonisms of German history. After 1945, political and historical interpretations of Germany could be split along the city's inner boundary and be shifted either to the West or to the East. Reflections on Berlin had a major influence on American discourses that helped to strengthen and legitimize the peculiar, quasi alliance-building between the United States and West Germany. Much more than the Bonn Republic with its elderly chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, Berlin under its dynamic mayors, Ernst Reuter and Willy Brandt, and the particular atmosphere of the frontier city of the Cold War stirred up emotions and generated political and literary fantasies in the United States. Berlin developed into an important reference point for Americans in the debate over the United States' international role and its global mission. The city embodied the crucial test case for the credibility of America's political and nuclear umbrella over Germany. Berlin also became the common ground for a specific group of transatlantic brokers and mediators. This group formed a Berlin lobby in the United States and built the basis for a dense transatlantic network of interpersonal and institutional connections. Personalities such as Lucius D. Clay, Eleanor Dulles, James Riddleberger, and Shepard Stone, as well as U.S. media correspondents played a pivotal role in this network.

A seemingly self-evident, though crucial, argument has to be taken into account on all of these levels of political imagination, symbolic politics, and personal and institutional networks: There is no monolithic American culture or society, but a diversity of social, ethnic, regional, and religious components that developed either distinct attitudes toward Berlin or simply ignored any meaning of this city. In order to cope with the plurality of America's Berlins, the project will not be bound to a strict chronological narrative but will combine narrative and thematic chapters. Chronologically, I will focus on emblematic episodes between 1945 and 1963. The Berlin visit of President John F. Kennedy in 1963 and his famous "Ich bin ein Berliner" speech marked the highpoint of America's symbolic embrace of Berlin and triggered an unprecedented and unparalleled outburst of enthusiasm for America in Berlin.

In addition, the project will deal with particular themes that broaden the spectrum beyond elite politics and the East Coast establishment. These topics include American tourism and popular images of Berlin in travel and tourist literature, the Berlin-related activities of major American foundations, and the meaning of Berlin's visual symbols and rituals. One fact deserves special attention. Between 1945 and 1963 tens of thousands of American soldiers were stationed in Berlin and later returned to the United States to help shape the American imagination on Germany. This particular transfer provides historical analysis with rich primary material to trace the various meanings of Berlin in American society.

Within this framework of analysis, elements of political, intellectual, and cultural history converge. As such, this project is situated within the context of recent efforts made by historians and political scientists to find cultural approaches to the history of international relations. The project on America's Berlin is meant as a contribution to this new debate on cultural dimensions of diplomatic history and on the culture of the Cold War as a formative era of modern history that penetrated societies on both sides of the Atlantic. The author welcomes any further suggestions or critical remarks to this open field of historiographical research in general and with particular respect to Berlin.

*Andreas W. Daum*  
*[e-mail: adaum@idt.net](mailto:adaum@idt.net)*

### **“American Political and Ideological Influences on the Shaping of the West German Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*) of 1948-49.”**

In 1999, the Germans will celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the shaping of their constitution, the *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law). In the public celebrations and academic conferences that are planned, they will have much to be proud of, for the fifty-year history of the Basic Law is without doubt the greatest success story of modern German constitutional history. It is generally accepted that the Basic Law continuously provided West Germany with

a highly successful framework for peace, prosperity, stability, and international recognition before 1990, and that it will continue to do so for the reunited Germany. The role of famous German political leaders of the post-1945 period such as Konrad Adenauer, Kurt Schumacher, Carlo Schmid, and Theodor Heuss in the making of the *Grundgesetz* is well known, as is the introduction of basic rights and a federalist system which grants extensive powers to the German *Länder*.

An aspect of the drafting of the Basic Law that has only recently come to be discussed in detail by historians is the influence of the Western Allies Britain, France, and the United States on the process, which took place in Bonn between September 1948 and May 1949. The main questions to be answered in this research project are: How much American influence was there on the framing of the postwar West German constitution, and in what way was this influence exerted? This book-length project will argue that the American influence was indeed very substantial in the realm of the political decision-making process, as well as in the realms of constitutional theory and political ideology.

The book will be divided into six parts, each of which is organized into three or four shorter chapters. The first part deals with the background of the project and situates the research project within patterns of interpretation evident among the existing secondary works. It also discusses the extensive primary sources that can be found in both American and German archives. These sources include American OMGUS, HICOG, and State Department records located in the National Archives, as well as the papers of leading American decision makers and advisers such as Lucius D. Clay and Carl Joachim Friedrich. German sources include the records of the Parliamentary Council, the Council of Minister Presidents, and other institutions, as well as the papers of Konrad Adenauer, Carlo Schmid, and Anton Pfeiffer, among others.

The second part of the work will deal with the international and the German domestic contexts, encompassing Allied planning for the future of Germany at the London six-power conference of 1948, the intensifying Cold War confrontation, German economic and political problems in 1948, and the drafting of the *Länder* constitutions in the U.S. zone of occupation as early as 1946.

A third part will focus on the American role in the framing of a federal constitution, a process which grew out of the constitutional development in the *Länder*. This part will include a description of American institutions created to initiate, advise, and also control the process, above all the Governmental Structures Branch of OMGUS. Brief portraits of the key American participants and decision makers, some of them well known but many of them never before extensively discussed in the secondary literature, will also be provided. These will include General Lucius D. Clay and the State Department's political adviser Robert Murphy; attention will also be paid to figures active behind the scenes, such as the liaison officers Hans Simons and Edward Litchfield. Plans for the introduction of American constitutional elements into Germany (basic rights, federalism, and a system of judicial review) will also be discussed. A major goal of this part of the project will thus be to discover how the American occupation authorities and liaison personnel influenced the Parliamentary Council, both publicly through published memoranda and secretly through unofficial meetings and impromptu advice.

The book's fourth part will focus on the German role in the shaping of the *Grundgesetz*. It will examine the growing divisions among the German parties, elucidate the goals of various social groups such as the business community, and provide short portraits of some leading German participants in the postwar constitutional reconstruction of West Germany. Some German members of the Parliamentary Council mentioned in this context will be less well known, and their extensive professional and ideological links to America have so far been ignored by historians. Few historians have noted, for instance, that the professor of international law Hermann von Mangoldt (CDU) was the leading German expert on the American constitution in the 1930s and 1940s, or that Rudolf Katz (SPD), who spent the Nazi era in exile in the United States, was instrumental in bringing knowledge about the American Supreme Court to postwar Germany. My main concern here will be to reconstruct how the Germans overcame initial fears of powerlessness and regained a considerable degree of freedom of action by the spring of 1949. The final version of the *Grundgesetz* agreed upon in late April 1949 was very much the result of German decision making-, the overwhelming impression at the beginning of the process in the summer of 1948 had, however, been quite the opposite.

The fifth part of the book will begin by describing the often pronounced disagreements among the western Allies. The discussion will then turn to a narrative account of the actual Allied-German interactions between July 1, 1948, and May 8, 1949, when the *Grundgesetz* was framed amidst an increasingly severe series of conflicts and disagreements that eventually gave way to pragmatic compromises.

The sixth and final part will discuss the control mechanisms designed by the Allies after May 1949 in order to cement the *Grundgesetz*, one of the cornerstones of a stable and prosperous postwar western European order, into place. The most important element of this Allied strategy was the Occupation Statute, referred to by some until 1952 as “Germany’s actual constitution.” The controlling mission of the Allied High Commission and the American institution of HICOG will also be described in some detail.

The book will end with an examination of the Basic Law within the German constitutional tradition, as well as a brief speculation about the future of German-American constitutional relations. The focus will be on the question of how a constitution that was framed in an exceptional legal situation characterized above all by an absence of national sovereignty, and initially ignored by a populace that was preoccupied with issues of day-to-day survival, came to be accepted as an integral part of the German constitutional tradition and as a document benefiting all groups of West German society as well as the citizens of a reunited Germany.

*Edmund Spevack*

## Institute News

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

Of the approximately 140 individual contributions that make up the Institute's Cold War project, over one hundred have arrived. We expect to receive most of the remaining articles within the next two months.

All articles go through our editing process here at the Institute, which includes the following phases: review, resubmission (if necessary), editing, author review, translation, final editing, and then the request for proofs. Especially in the initial review phase, we are assisted by the Lead Essayists, who head the project's thematic sections. They help ensure comprehensive coverage of the topic with a minimum of overlap among the articles, both within their sections and in the project as a whole.

Such coordination was the main goal of our project meeting at the Airlie Conference Center near Warrenton, Virginia, on September 5-7. The Institute's project team met with Lead Essayists Volker Berghahn, Lily Gardner Feldman, Harold James, Wolfgang Krieger, Klaus Schwabe, Thomas Schwartz, and Frank Trommler. Together we reviewed the progress of the project so far, solved problems that had cropped up in some of the sections, and reached a number of decisions on the coverage of specific topics. We all came away from the meeting with a clear idea of what lies ahead as the project continues to evolve.

*Detlef Junker*

## **Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History 1997 “Germany Divided and United, 1945-1989.”**

**German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., and Georgetown University, April 16–19, 1997.**

The Third Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History was hosted this year by both the German Historical Institute and the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown University. The series is also cosponsored by the Conference Group for Central European History and the German-American Academic Council.

From among the fifty applicants (twenty-nine from Europe and twentyone from the U.S.), sixteen doctoral candidates were invited to present their research papers. Professors Maria Höhn (Vassar College), Christoph Kleßmann (Center for Contemporary Historical Research, Potsdam) and Klaus Tenfelde (Ruhr-University Bochum) were invited to participate in the conference as “mentors.” Together with Professor Roger Chickering and Dr. Martin Geyer, they moderated the various sessions and discussed the papers in depth with individual participants.

The three days of the seminar offered plenty of opportunity to discuss the presentations. The scope of the seminar was very broad, including diplomatic, political, social, and cultural history. Comparative perspectives on West and East German issues played a great role; especially important were questions relating to the political and social transformation of the two societies in the 1950s and 1960s. The emergence of a consumer society, problems of “Americanization,” and the legacy of the U.S. past were also intensely debated throughout the seminar.

The Institute is very pleased to announce that the series for doctoral candidates will be continued with a seminar focusing on early modern history. See the announcement on page 60.

The selected participants and their projects were as follows:

Beate Deutzmann (University of Bonn), „Deutschlandpolitische Positionen der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands seit dem Grundlagenvertrag.“

Dagmar Ellerbrock (University of Constance) „Gesundheit und Krankheit im Spannungsfeld zwischen Tradition, Kultur und Politik. Deutsche Traditionen—amerikanische Ambitionen 1945-49.“

Catherine Epstein (Harvard University), “Public Heroes, Secret Traitors: The Purges of East German Old Communists in the Early 1950s.”

Michaela Freund (University of Hamburg), „Prostituierte und Prostitutionsbekämpfung zwischen 1922 und 1956 am Beispiel der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg.“

Gerhard Fürmetz (University of Hannover), „Polizei und Straßenverkehrsdisziplin im bayerischen Nachkriegsalltag (1945-1952). ‘Ausmerzungen von Mißständen’ oder Erziehung zur Sicherheit?“

Curt Garner (Technical University Berlin), „Soziale Spannungen und politischer Konflikt im besetzten Deutschland. Die Entstehung der Gewerkschaft ÖTV 1945-1949 im Widerstreit zwischen gesellschaftlicher Neuordnung und der Verteidigung von Standesinteressen.“

Yara-Colette Lemke Muniz de Faria (Technical University Berlin), „Ghetto oder Pflegenest. Das Albert-Schweitzer-Kinderheim für Mischlingskinder im Brennpunkt einer bundesdeutschen Separationsdebatte 1950-60.“

Kay L. McAdams (Indiana University), “Creating Solidarity: The Freie Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund and Women Workers, 1945-1949.”

Katherine Pence (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor), “‘Schimpf und Schande’: Negotiating a West Berlin Identity Through a State Campaign Against Deviant Consumers”

Patrice Poutrus (Center for Contemporary Historical Research, Potsdam), „Die Erfindung des Goldbroilers oder der unbewußte Übergang von der gescheiterten Gesellschaftsutopie zur mangelhaften Konsumgesellschaft in der DDR (1958-1972).“

Pavel A. Richter (University of Bielefeld), „Revolutionäre Gedanken—revolutionäre Taten? Die kognitive Orientierung der Außerparlamentarischen Opposition in der Bundesrepublik.“



Mark E. Ruff (Brown University), "The DJK-Bruderzwist and the Collapse of Catholic Integralism in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1945-1962."

Mary Elise Sarotte (Yale University), "The SED and Cold War Berlin Negotiations: An Examination of Stasi Involvement, Attitude, and Impact."

Annette Timm (University of Chicago), "The Legacy of *Bevölkerungspolitik*: Venereal Disease Control and Marriage Counseling in East and West Berlin, 1945-1972."

Jeremy Varon (Cornell University), "'In the Belly of the Beast': New Left Armed Struggle in the United States and West Germany."

Jonathan Zatlin (University of California, Berkeley), "The Vehicle of Desire: The Trabant, the Wartburg, and the End of the GDR."

*Martin H. Geyer*

## **Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture 1997**

On May 8, 1997, Professor Michael Zöllner of Bayreuth University presented the Seventh Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture at the German Historical Institute.

Professor Zöllner began his presentation entitled "Religion, Americanization, and the Common Man" by stating how closely his own scholarly work was related to several issues that the late Alois Mertes himself had often dealt with. These included, above all, the relationship between religion and politics. Professor Zöllner noted that his institute at Bayreuth is engaged in what he refers to as "the cultural interpretation of societies," to be achieved by combining the study of religion and the study of politics.

Professor Zöllner divided his lecture at the German Historical Institute into three parts. The first contained some theoretical remarks on the cultural explanation of societies, which has been established and practiced by scholars as diverse as Max Weber, Oswald Spengler, and Samuel Huntington. The second part consisted of the presentation of selected research results, three examples of which were the Puritan ethical and social system, the role of Roman Catholics in America, and the connections between nineteenth-century populism and contemporary religious fundamen-

talism. Finally, Professor Zöller contributed a few words about the merits and the dangers of cultural explanations.

## **Concluding Seminar in Postwar German History**

In 1991 the German Historical Institute and the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies inaugurated a program in postwar German history with a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation. At that time, the end of the Cold War, the dissolution of the GDR, and German reunification were challenging the historical profession to re-evaluate old paradigms. This changing context made a reassessment necessary, and the availability of new sources, especially in the former East Germany but also in Western countries, made it possible. The Volkswagen Foundation Fellowships not only brought together German and American scholars of postwar Germany; they were also given an opportunity to tap the rich resources of the Washington area. The program contributed to a much-needed internationalization of postwar German history and supported multi- and interdisciplinary approaches. After a renewal in 1994, the grant from the Volkswagen Foundation expired this summer. Thus, when this year's VW fellows presented the preliminary results of nine months of research on June 4 and 5 at the GHI, the event also marked the end of an era.

As was the case in last year's concluding workshop, proceedings on both days began with presentations given by distinguished scholars to provide a larger framework for the topics of our fellows. Diethelm Prowe (Carleton College) delivered a most competent survey of the recent literature dealing with German-American relations during the Adenauer era. He focused on four aspects: the fundamental change in international relations during this period from a balance of power concept to an integrationist diplomacy, the formation of transnational elites, the discussion of Americanization vs. modernization, and the debate on Adenauer's foreign policy. The ensuing discussion not only touched on the inevitable question of whether Adenauer was really interested in reunification, but also considered the progression of the German-American relationship from distrust to trust.

An important milestone in this process was the West German Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*) of 1949. Edmund Spevack asserted, on the basis of his

research during the fellowship tenure, that American efforts to influence the Basic Law were very well planned and possibly were even more substantial than previously suspected. In his comment, Raimund Lammersdorf (TU Chemnitz-Zwickau/Harvard University) suggested that Spevack pay more attention to the dialectic of order and chaos in early postwar Germany. Carefully crafted channels of influence might have been hindered by confusion among U.S. authorities, who took pains to make the United States appear not as a military dictator but as a democratic role model.

Not long after the enactment of the Basic Law, Germany became a test case for U.S. Cold War policies, especially for American efforts to secure the long-term viability of the policy of containment. Carl Hodge showed how budgetary conservatism on the part of President Eisenhower led him to favor whatever form of German rearmament the Europeans were willing to accept. Thus, he supported the French-inspired European Defense Community (EDC) when his military advisors doubted its effectiveness. However, he never tied himself to the project as closely as the administration's public assertions made Europeans believe. The failure of the EDC, therefore, did not alter Eisenhower's determination to include German soldiers as a central conventional component of Western Europe's defense in order to lessen the burden on the United States in terms of money and manpower. The emergence of West Germany as a model post-national state contained by a variety of multilateral institutions and the more-than-friendly attitude of the Adenauer government made it easier for Eisenhower to show less patience with Britain and France and win the German defense contribution he sought. Stephen Szabo (Johns Hopkins University) not only praised Hodge's portrayal of the crucial German role in Eisenhower's European security dilemma, but also managed to link the topic to questions about NATO enlargement and a general European security structure after the end of the Cold War.

On the second day of the conference, participants approached the understanding of German and European postwar history from a very different angle. In her opening presentation, Leslie Adelson (Cornell University) looked at the function of minority discourses in postwar German culture by using examples from literature to highlight Jewish-German and Turkish-German themes. Adelson showed that Turkish literature produced in Germany, though not read as "German" culture, tries to ascribe meaning to the

experience of guest workers, and in the process undermines the notion of a homogeneous German culture. Thus, the assumption of fixed national cultures gives way to an understanding of integration that is not focused on assimilation but on something new, where citizenship is not the operating principle, where Turks become German but Germans also Turkish. The ensuing discussion centered on the influence the Cold War might have had on the perception of cultural others and on the perspectives the described discourses might open up for a new European identity after the Cold War.

Jeffrey Peck focused on the construction of German Jewish identity from outside Germany, particularly on the way American attitudes toward the Holocaust reconfigured and even constituted the terms of the debate. He looked at numerous events, from the Six-Day War in 1967 to the television mini-series "Holocaust" in the 1970s, to the Kohl-Reagan visit to the Bitburg cemetery in the 1980s, where German and American discourses on the Holocaust converged. Moreover, he argued that since unification the discussion of the Holocaust is more closely intertwined than ever with the question of Jewish life in Germany in general, and that Americans in particular have been extremely sensitive to Germany's inability to make Jews or, for that matter, guest workers feel "at home." In his commentary, Alan Steinweis (University of Nebraska) pointed out that the Holocaust was not a major subject of discussion in either Germany or the United States prior to the 1960s. Agreeing with Professor Peck, he stressed the importance of the Six-Day War, which gave rise to existential concern among American Jews and elevated the Holocaust to a much more central position in their historical consciousness. This concern eventually led to the assertive institutionalization of Holocaust memory by the American Jewish community. Even more important for German-American relations, however, was the simultaneous embrace of the Holocaust by American popular culture as a morality tale of good versus evil.

Overall, the presentations and the animated discussions throughout the seminar proved once again how necessary it is to discuss postwar German history in an international setting and how important it is to bring together different approaches to the study of this period. The German Historical Institute and the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies are determined, therefore, to continue their successful collaboration. A new

program for postdoctoral fellowships has already been devised, and we are confident that it can be introduced in one of the next bulletins.

*Wilfried Mausbach*

## **Library Report**

In June the library staff completed the creation of a computer catalog of all books and journals held at the Institute. Readers may access this database on the computer in the reading room. The entire catalog will be available on the Institute's homepage in 1998.

In September, the old shelving in the library stacks was replaced with new compact shelving units. This system will provide the library with enough capacity until the year 2008. Readers are still allowed and encouraged to browse on their own.

Our whole collection now consists of about 18,000 volumes and 200 journals, and we are happy that these two improvements will allow us to provide even better service to researchers.

## **Staff Changes**

MANFRED BERG, Research Fellow, has finished his *Habilitationsschrift* on the history the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and returns to the Free University of Berlin in order to complete his *Habilitation* in the field of modern history.

MARTIN GEYER, Deputy Director, has left the Institute to take a position as Professor of Modern History at the University of Munich on September 1. His new address is: Institut für Neuere Geschichte, Wagnmüllerstraße 2311, 80538 München, Germany, [e-mail: U9305092@sunmail.lrz-muenchen.de](mailto:U9305092@sunmail.lrz-muenchen.de)

EDMUND SPEVACK has taken up the position of Research Fellow. Born in Munich, Germany, in 1963, Dr. Spevack studied history and literature at Harvard University (A.B. 1986) and history at the Johns Hopkins Univer-

sity (M.A. 1989, Ph.D. 1992), as well as at the universities of Münster, Bielefeld, Cologne, and Hamburg. Before arriving at the GHI in Washington, he was a visiting assistant professor in American Studies at the University of Stuttgart (1992-93), a lecturer in history and literature at Harvard University (1993-96), and a VW fellow in postwar German history (1996-97) in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Spevack's publications include: *Charles Follen's Search for Nationality and Freedom: Germany and America, 1799-1840* (Harvard University Press, 1997) and articles in *MELUS*; *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*; *The Germanic Review*; *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*; *East European Quarterly*; *German Politics and Society*; *Atlantische Texte*; and in various collections of essays. He has also published book reviews in *Historische Zeitschrift*, *Boston Book Review*, and other journals. His current research project is entitled: *American Political and Ideological Influences on the Shaping of the West German Basic Law (Grundgesetz) of 1948-49*.

Dr. Spevack is a member of the American Historical Association, the German Studies Association, and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Amerikastudien.

## **New GHI Publications**

The Institute is pleased to announce the publication of a paperback edition of *Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss: German Emigrés and American Political Thought after World War II*, edited by Peter Graf Kielmansegg, Horst Mewes, and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt, which is published in our series with Cambridge University Press.

In the Institute's series with the Franz-Steiner-Verlag in Stuttgart, we proudly announce the appearance of Philipp Gassert, *Amerika im Dritten Reich. Ideologie, Propaganda und Volksmeinung 1933-1945*. In addition, Heike Bungert, *Das Nationalkomitee und der Westen. Die Reaktion der Westalliierten auf das NKFD und die Freien Deutschen Bewegungen 1943-1948*, will appear shortly.

See the list of GHI publications at the back of this Bulletin for further information on the two series and on placing orders.

## Visits at the Institute

### **Academic Advisory Council of the GHI**

This year, the annual meeting of the Academic Advisory Council of the German Historical Institute took place in Washington, D.C., on August 27 and 28. The council's main purpose is to advise the director and the members of the Institute on all academic and scholarly matters. The council has eight German and American members and is chaired by Professor Klaus Hildebrand (University of Bonn). The other members are: Professors Margaret L. Anderson (University of California at Berkeley), Johannes Fried (University of Frankfurt), Jürgen Heideking (University of Cologne), Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich (Free University Berlin), Wolfgang Jäger (University of Freiburg), Paul C. Schroeder (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), and Hans-Peter Schwarz (University of Bonn). Also present at the meeting were Ministerialdirigent Volker Knoerich and Regierungsdirektor Dr. Manfred Pusch of the Federal Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology.

On the occasion of the visit, the research fellows of the Institute presented their individual projects and discussed them with the members of the council. Manfred Berg presented the findings of his study, "The Ticket to Freedom': The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Struggle for African-American Voting Rights, 1909-1970," which has just been completed and will be published next year. Peter Becker reported on his project, "Fallen Angels and Impaired Men': The Criminalists' Image of the Criminal in 19th Century Germany," which is near completion. Afterwards Andreas Daum presented a new research project entitled "America's Berlin: The Divided City and the Cold War in American Culture, Society, and Politics, 1945-1963," and Eckhardt Fuchs reported on the progress he has made on his work, which bears the title "The Myth of an International Republic of Letters: Possibilities and Limits of the Scientific Cooperation between Germany and the United States before World War I." In the final session of the morning, Philipp Gassert

gave an outline of his new project, a biography of the former German chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger (1904-1988). took place between the visiting students and the Institute's research fellows. In the afternoon, Thomas Goebel presented his research on "A Case of Democratic Contagion': Direct Democracy in the United States, 1890-1940," Petra Marquardt-Bigman discussed her project on "U.S. Policy toward Sub-Saharan Africa, 1945-1965," and Wilfried Mausbach gave an overview of his research on "Germany, the United States, and the Vietnam War." Finally, Edmund Spevack introduced his study on "American Political and Ideological Influences on the Shaping of the West German Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*) of 1948/49."

### **MdB Dr. Gerhard Stoltenberg**

The member of parliament and deputy director of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Dr. Gerhard Stoltenberg, visited the GHI Washington on May 6, 1997. He engaged the Institute's director and research fellows in a very lively discussion about the history of German-American relations since 1945 and about current problems of the transatlantic relationship. The research fellows profited from Dr. Stoltenberg's insights and especially from the great variety of transatlantic experience that he has gathered in his long political career.

Dr. Stoltenberg's distinguished career in German politics has included service as the minister of defense, minister of finance, and minister for science and research. He was first elected to the Bundestag in 1957 and also served as the minister-president of Schleswig Holstein for eleven years. His scholarly background includes a Ph.D. in history, social studies, and philosophy, as well as a *Habilitation* in political science from the University of Kiel.

### **Friedrich Ebert Foundation Stipend Recipients**

On May 28, a group of twenty highly gifted recipients of scholarships from the Friedrich Ebert Foundation visited the GHI in Washington. The group members were studying political science, economics, and history. After a presentation of the Institute's work by the director, a very lively discussion



took place between the visiting students and the Institute's research fellows. This discussion began with German-American relations in general and later evolved to include nearly all aspects of life in the contemporary United States; it was a *tour d'horizon* related to the main theme of the students' three-day stay in Washington, "American Dream(s)—Revisited."

# Calendar of Events

## Fall 1997 Lecture Series

- October 2      Peter E. Quint (University of Maryland School of Law)  
*Judging the Past: The Prosecution of GDR Border Guards and Officials*
- October 16     Belinda Davis (Rutgers University)  
*How Wilhelmine Germans Became Citizens of Weimar: Toward an Alternative Political History of World War I Germany*
- October 23     Peter Wende (German Historical Institute, London)  
*The Political Philosophy of Nineteenth-Century German Radicalism*
- November 5     Donna Harsch (Carnegie Mellon University)  
*Women, Communists, and Abortion in the German Democratic Republic, 1950–1970*
- November 20   Günter Heydemann (University of Leipzig)  
*Two Dictatorships in Germany, 1933-1989: Problems and Possibilities of a Comparison*
- December 11   Harold James (Princeton University)  
*What Can Chancellor Kohl Learn from Bismarck? Monetary and Fiscal Aspects of Unification in Nineteenth-Century Germany*

## **Annual Lecture 1997**

We are pleased to announce that Professor Thomas A. Brady Jr. of the University of California at Berkeley will deliver the Institute's Eleventh Annual Lecture:

*The Protestant Reformation in German History.*

The lecture will take place in our lecture hall on November 13, 1997. Professor Dr. Heinz Schilling of the Humboldt University Berlin will serve as commentator.

## **Upcoming Conferences and Workshops**

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

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

"The Genesis of Nazi Policy: Structure and Decision-Making Process: New Research on the National Socialist System of Rule." Conference at the University of Florida, Gainesville, April 9-12, 1998. Conveners: Geoffrey Giles and Eberhard Jäckel.

"The International Financial System in the 20th Century: Past and Present." Conference at Princeton University, April 16-18, 1998. Conveners: Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich and Harold James.

"Microhistories of Modernization: Society, Culture, Politics, and Regional Identity in Central Germany." Conference at the University of Toronto, September 1998. Conveners: James Retallack and Thomas Goebel.

"Violence and Normality: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s." Conference in Marienheide, Ger-

many, October 8-11, 1998. Cosponsored by the GHI London. Conveners: Richard Bessel and Martin Geyer.

"Views of the Criminal in Scholarship." Conference in Florence, Italy, October 1998. Conveners: Peter Becker and Richard Wetzell.

"America's War in the World: Vietnam in International and Comparative Perspectives." Conference at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., November 19-22, 1998. Conveners: Lloyd C. Gardner, Andreas Daum, and Wilfried Mausbach.

### **International Media Conference**

Atlantik-Brücke and Deutsche Welle, in cooperation with the German Historical Institute, have organized an international media conference with forty German and American journalists. The conference will take place November 6-8, 1997, at the Institute. Concern about inappropriate reporting in the media of the two countries has prompted the organizing institutions to invite leading American and German journalists for a discussion about their experiences. Furthermore, the rapid development of the "new media"—worldwide television channels, the Internet, etc.—necessitates an exchange of opinions about the future of journalism. The program is as follows:

#### **THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6**

- Opening Dinner: Hosted by Philip A. Odeen, President and CEO, BDM International, Inc., McLean, Virginia  
Chair, National Defense Panel, Washington, D.C.
- Welcome: Dr. Walther Leisler Kiep  
Managing Partner, Gradmann & Holler, Frankfurt Chair,  
Atlantik-Brücke, Bonn and Berlin  
Dieter Weirich  
Director-General, Deutsche Welle, Cologne
- Remarks: Philip A. Odeen

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7

Welcome            Professor Dr. Detlef Junker  
                         Director  
                         German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C.

**First Plenary Session: "Germany's Image in the World"**

Chair:                Dr. Kurt Kister  
                         Deputy Foreign Editor  
                         *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, Munich

Introducers:        Marc Fisher  
                         Editor  
                         *The Washington Post*, Washington, D.C.

                         Leo Wieland  
                         U.S. Correspondent  
                         *FrankfurterAllgemeine Zeitung*, Washington, D.C.

**Second Plenary Session: "The Image of the United States in Germany"**

Chair:                Elizabeth Pond  
                         Freelance Journalist, Bonn

Introducers:        Michael Behrens  
                         Director of English Programs Deutsche Welle, Cologne

                         Frederick Kempe  
                         Editor and Associate Publisher  
                         *The Wall Street Journal Europe*, Brussels  
                         (as of Jan. 1, 1998)

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8

**Third Plenary Session: "The New Media: Bilateral Images in Cyberspace"**

Chair: Torsten Kroop  
Internet Specialist  
Deutsche Welle, Cologne

Introducers: Dr. Thomas Middelhoff  
Member of the Managing Board  
Bertelsmann AG, Gütersloh

Richard Jaroslovsky  
Managing Editor  
*The Wall Street Journal*, New York

# Friends of the GHI

## Friends Dissertation Prize Awarded

A total of fourteen dissertations from all over the United States and Canada were nominated by their supervisors for this prize, following the initial announcements last year. Members of the prize committee included Vernon Lidtke (The Johns Hopkins University), chair, Kathleen Conzen (University of Chicago), and Jonathan Petropoulos (Loyola College in Maryland). After careful evaluation of the applications, the committee read a number of dissertations in their entirety. Ranking them independently of one another, they were then pleased to find that they were unanimous in their choice of the two joint winners.

SANDRA CHANEY completed her doctoral dissertation in 1996 at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, under the direction of Professor Konrad Jarausch. Her title was "Visions and Revisions of Nature: From the Protection of Nature to the Invention of the Environment in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1945-1975." She now teaches in the Department of History and Government at Erskine College in Due West, South Carolina.

Dr. Chaney finds a discursive shift during the postwar decades from a concern about protecting nature (*Naturschutz*) to the broader effort of ensuring the safety and health of humanity in general (*Umweltschutz*). She argues that this period, during which the Federal Republic of Germany became densely populated, highly urbanized, industrialized, and polluted, also saw a decline of the predominantly romantic understanding of nature, heavily influenced by German cultural traditions, and a move to a highly technical and scientific one, shaped by international trends. Germans worried less about protecting nature from the forces of change and more about restoring some parts of their surroundings to a "natural" condition.

Chaney argues that concepts such as "nature" or "the environment" are socially constructed and continually debated. Her discussion uses three case

studies to highlight changing perceptions. The first section demonstrates the emphasis in the first postwar decade on the management of natural resources such as water, soil, and forests with the example of the citizens' initiative against the damming of the Wutach Gorge near Freiburg im Breisgau by a utilities company. In the following period, from 1955 to 1967, conservationists struggled with the negative aspects of economic prosperity, such as haphazard development, pesticides, and other forms of pollution. By the 1960s there was a growing ecological awareness of the increasing danger for both nature *and* people. Conservation became linked to public health and regional planning concerns. The second case study focuses on the canalization of the Mosel for shipping. Although opponents failed here to block the scheme, the protest resulted in cooperation with planners to restore a more "natural" order to the canal.

The third section explores the rise of "environmental" issues in the years 1968 to 1975. Influenced by international trends, including environmental legislation passed in the United States, the SPD/FDP coalition sponsored laws to protect the environment in 1970. The final case study looks at the establishment of the country's first national park in the Bavarian Forest. People now had to accept that human activity had changed nature to such an extent that constant management was necessary in order to keep certain parts of their surroundings "natural."

The FGHI prize committee felt that this dissertation examined a still neglected issue in modern German history in a thoroughly innovative way. The case study approach in particular moved the argument beyond the conventional discussions about the rise of the Green Party or the influence of National Socialist romanticism.

PAUL LERNER worked with Professor István Deák at Columbia University in New York. His 1996 dissertation covered the topic of "Hysterical Men: War, Neurosis and German Mental Medicine, 1914-1921." After one year as a postdoctoral fellow in the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine in London, he is now taking up a teaching position in history at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

The dissertation of Dr. Lerner examines the phenomenon of war neurosis among tens of thousands of German soldiers, beginning in the trenches already in 1914. Doctors were at first puzzled by the symptoms that so



closely paralleled those of female hysteria. Within two years they believed they had found the answer and boasted a virtually guaranteed success rate in curing their patients. Having established a strikingly low frequency of the epidemic among prisoners or the seriously wounded, they declared soldiers behind the front lines, many of whom had not yet seen action, to be more prone to the illness. This hypothesis led them to interpret the neuroses as a flight into illness, either as a physical manifestation of the fears and terrors of war, or as a means of acquiring a pension. The desire to return neurotic soldiers to active duty, or after the war to the labor force, revolutionized German mental medicine: rejected treatments such as the use of electricity or hypnosis were suddenly embraced as miracle cures. A new generation of university-based psychiatrists came to the fore in the midst of what was presented as a national emergency.

Lerner first explains the acceptance of male hysteria in the late nineteenth century as a diagnosis for the victims of industrial trauma. Doctors began to locate the pathological source of post-accident nervous symptoms in the patients' psyche, the diagnosis of which (significantly) made them ineligible for pensions and mandated their return to work. The author sees here a powerful and uniquely German opposition between hysteria and work that displaced the traditional femininity of the disease. Wartime doctors interpreted neuroses in similar terms, viewing the First World War, as it were, as a gigantic industrial accident. Their primary goal was to restore the patients' ability and will to work, thus serving the ends of the state and the military, and also enhancing their own professional status.

The dissertation suggests that the demands of war accelerated the turn away from a mental health approach based on the individual patient toward a collectivistic paradigm. Partly pushed in this direction by the unprecedented numbers of patients, doctors came to view speed and efficiency as the primary medical values. National utility became the focus of therapeutic goals, as neurotic patients were channeled as quickly as possible back into the nation's war economy. Dr. Lerner also demonstrates how university psychiatrists and neurologists moved into the gray area between legal, military, and medical spheres to exercise authority as the self-appointed caretakers of the nation's mental and nervous health. Siding with the state in postwar pension claims suits, they used their new prestige to promote views

of German manhood based on duty, obedience, and, most of all, productivity.

The committee found Dr. Lerner's dissertation to make a most valuable contribution to the ongoing debate on the evolution of German science and medicine from its nineteenth-century liberal origins to its role in medical atrocities of the Third Reich. They were impressed by the way in which Dr. Lerner elucidated the differences among the approaches followed in Germany, England, France, and the United States, and showed how dealing with shell-shocked soldiers was part of a broader rationalization process, which influenced German military, economic, and medical organization.

### **Sixth Annual Symposium of the Friends of the GHI**

In an effort to better acquaint the Friends with the work of the research fellows at the Institute, their sixth annual symposium will feature presentations by two of the fellows, Andreas Daum and Edmund Spevack, as well as the two winners of the Friends Dissertation Prize, Sandra Chaney and Paul Lerner. The event takes place on **November 14, 1997**, in the GHI lecture hall. In the morning, Dr. Daum will give a talk on "The Invention of a Hero: Alexander von Humboldt in the American Public Sphere, 1850-1900," and Dr. Lerner will present "Hysterical Men: War, Memory and German Mental Medicine, 1914-1926." After lunch, Sandra Chaney will speak about "Visions and Revisions of Nature: From *Naturschutz* to *Umweltschutz* 1945-1975," and Edmund Spevack will discuss the topic "Members of the Bonn Parliamentary Council (1948-49) and their Links to the United States of America."

## Notices and Announcements

### German-American Center for Visiting Scholars

The government of the Federal Republic of Germany is currently undertaking new initiatives to strengthen transatlantic relations. As part of that effort, the German-American Academic Council Foundation (GAAC) in Bonn, the German Historical Institute (GHI), and the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies (AICGS), both in Washington, D.C., have jointly established a German-American Center for Visiting Scholars (GACVS). The Center will be located in Washington, D.C.

As of January 1, 1998, the Center will award office space and material support to eight young German and American scholars, particularly those in the humanities and social sciences. The Center may grant housing subsidies. The period of each award will vary from one to six months. The purpose of this award is to aid scholars wishing to do research in Washington who have either received another scholarship or who bring with them other means of support.

A committee from the sponsoring institutions will select the grant recipients. Selections will be made semi-annually. The first application deadline is **November 30, 1997**.

Applications must be in English and should consist of a curriculum vitae and a description of the proposed research project. Please send applications to:

German-American Academic Council Foundation (GAAC)  
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW  
Suite 2020  
Washington, DC 20007  
Tel: (202) 296-2991  
Fax: (202) 833-8514  
[E-mail: gaac@pop.access.digex.net](mailto:gaac@pop.access.digex.net)

## **Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History 1998 “Germany in the Early Modern Era.”**

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 fourth Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History. The conference, once again supported by the German-American Academic Council, will convene in Göttingen between April 22 and 25, 1998.

The conference is meant to bring together young scholars from Germany and North America who are nearing completion of their doctoral degrees. The seminar will focus this time on Germany in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. We plan to invite eight scholars from each side of the Atlantic to debate their doctoral projects, and we shall cover travel costs and lodging expenses. The discussion will be based on papers submitted in advance of the conference. The conference languages will be English and German.

We are now accepting applications from doctoral students whose works fall principally in the early modern era and who will finish their degrees after June 1998. 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 1, 1997**, to:

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

## **GHI Dissertation Scholarships 1999**

The German Historical 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 1999 should be sent to the Director no later than May **31, 1998**, and should contain the following information:

- a curriculum vitae;
- a detailed plan of study, including research proposal, time frame needed to carry it out, 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.

## **German-American Research Networking (GARN)**

The German-American Academic Council Foundation (GAAC) is making funds available for a German-American Research Networking Program (GARN) for individuals who took part in the Transatlantic Doctoral Seminars on Modern German History in 1996 and 1997. The purpose of the GARN program is to strengthen transatlantic contacts by providing an opportunity for closer cooperation on joint research ventures between younger scholars and scientists from the United States and Germany.

Those eligible for application are pairs or groups of scientists and scholars under the age of 40 who participated in the Transatlantic Doctoral Seminars in either 1996 and 1997. There must be at least one American and one German participant among the members of the research team. Coworkers of direct participants may be included in the project activities. While the deadline for applications for this program has passed, further questions may be directed to the Deputy Director of the German Historical Institute.

## Call for Papers

**“America’s War and the World: Vietnam in International and Comparative Perspectives.” Conference at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., November 19-22, 1998. Conveners: Lloyd C. Gardner (Rutgers University), Andreas Daum and Wilfried Mausbach (GHI Washington)**

Almost twenty-five years after the end of the Vietnam War, this conference seeks to put “America’s War” into international perspectives and to reassess its place in the history of world conflicts. First, we want to compare the Vietnam War with other conflicts between centers of power and peripheral states in modern history. Second, we would like to look at the consequences of the United States’ preoccupation with Southeast Asia for the political and economic structure of the international system between 1960 and 1975. Turning to domestic politics, our third major interest is to gauge the influence of the Vietnam War on the domestic political discourses of some of the key allies of the United States during the 1960s and 1970s. Fourth and finally, we intend to trace the impact of the Vietnam War on the culture and collective memory of different states.

The papers will be given in English. We encourage younger scholars and colleagues from Asia to submit proposals. Preference will be given to those papers that include comparative aspects. The German Historical Institute is prepared to cover travel expenses and accommodations for participants.

Proposals should include a short (1-2 pp.) abstract, a curriculum vitae, and a list of publications. Please send proposals by **December 15, 1997**, to:

Vietnam Conference  
German Historical Institute  
1607 New Hampshire Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20009  
tel. (202) 387-3355  
fax (202) 483-3430