

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

Issue No. 23 (Fall 1998)

Series editors:  
Detlef Junker  
Annette M. Marciel  
Daniel S. Mattern

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

Library Hours:  
Monday-Friday, 9 am-5 pm

© GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE 1998.  
All rights reserved.

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

# Contents

## Preface

### Conference and Workshop Reports 1

“The International Financial System: Past and Present.” Princeton, N.J.,  
April 16–17, 1998. 3

“A Challenge for the United States and Europe: The Vision of an Atlantic Civilization.”  
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1998. 6

“Memory, Democracy, and the Mediated Nation: Political Cultures and Regional  
Identities in Germany, 1848–1998.” Toronto, Canada, September 18-20, 1998. 8

“The Plurality of Publics: Metropolitan Culture and Performance in Germany  
Around 1900.” Salt Lake City, October 9, 1998. 16

“Ostpolitik: Domestic and International Dimensions, 1962–1974.” Salt Lake City,  
October 9, 1998. 17

“Fact or Fiction? The Historical Profession and James Bacque.” Salt Lake City,  
October 9, 1998. 19

“Violence and Normality: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe  
During the 1940s and 1950s.” Marienheide, October 8-11, 1998. 22

“The Criminal and His Scientists: A Symposium on the History of Criminology.”  
Florence, Italy, October 15–18, 1998. 32

“Germany and African Americans: A Comparative Perspective.” Chapel Hill,  
North Carolina, November 2, 1998. 34

### New Research Topics at the GHI

“Kurt Georg Kiesinger, 1904–1988: A Political Biography.” 38

### Archive Report

“Postwar Germany and American Foreign Policy: The Foreign Affairs Cluster  
at the National Archives and Records Administration.” 42

## Institute News

Collaborative Research Program for Postdoctoral Scholars	50
Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History, 1998	51
Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture, 1998	54
Recipients of the GHI's Dissertation Scholarships, 1999	60
Library Report	61
Staff Changes	62

## Visits to the Institute

German History and Art History Students at the GHI	64
--	----

## Calendar of Events

Fall 1998 Lecture Series	65
Upcoming Conferences and Workshops	65
Second International Media Conference	66

## Friends of the GHI

Seventh Annual Symposium of the Friends of the GHI	68
--	----

## Notices and Announcements

Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History, 1999	69
Summer Program, 1999	70
GHI Dissertation Scholarships	71
The GHI's New Habilitation Scholarships	71
Recipients of GACVS Research Grants, 1998/1999	72

## Preface

Dear friends and colleagues:

Nineteen ninety-eight has been a year of important innovation at the German Historical Institute. I already reported to you about some of these changes in the spring issue of the Bulletin. In this issue, I would like to introduce a new collaborative research program for postdoctoral scholars on the topic "Cold War and Globalization: Continuity and Change in Germany and the United States," established jointly by the GHI and the American Institute of Contemporary German Studies (AICGS). The program is supported by the German-American Academic Council (GAAC) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). The purpose of this program is to foster communication and collaboration between scholars from Germany and the United States. Detailed information on this program can be found on page 50.

This year also was one of remembrance and taking stock of the Institute's activities and accomplishments since its founding in 1987. By now you should have received a copy of *The German Historical Institute, 1987-1997: A Ten-Year Report*. This report, issue no. 10 in our Reference Guide series, documents the Institute's major areas of research as well as the multifaceted, GHI-sponsored endeavors undertaken by European and North American historians. We would be grateful if you would take a moment to send us any comments you might have on our past accomplishments or suggestions you might have for our future work.

As some of you might know, we are obligated to provide regular reports of our activities to our Academic Advisory Council (*Beirat*), our Board of Trustees (*Stiftungsrat*), and to the Federal Ministry for Education, Science, Research, and Tech-

nology in Bonn. This year the Institute, like all the other German Historical Institutes worldwide, will be further evaluated by another institution, the Council on Science (*Wissenschaftsrat*). Established in 1957 by an agreement between the German federal government and the individual federal states, the purpose of the Council, among other things, is to evaluate scientific or scholarly institutions, including universities, that receive federal funds. Evaluations by the Council can have a significant structural and budgetary impact on the institutions being assessed.

A working group consisting of members of the Council and headed by its current chairman, Prof. Winfried Schulze from the University of Munich, will visit the Institute on December 15, 1998, to conduct its evaluation. The group will meet with the directorship of the Institute and the research fellows to discuss the GHI's major programs and scholarly achievements.

Yours sincerely,

*Detlef Junker*

## Conference and Workshop Reports

---

### “The International Financial System: Past and Present.”

Conference at Princeton, N.J., organized by the German Historical Institute in conjunction with the Princeton University History Department and Woodrow Wilson School, April 16–17, 1998. Conveners: Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich (Free University of Berlin) and Harold James (Princeton University).

This conference, organized by Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich (Free University of Berlin) and Harold James (Princeton University), aimed to unite scholars of different disciplinary backgrounds and generational experiences with U.S. and German policymakers in a survey of key issues in the evolution of the international financial system over the past century. The conference nearly coincided with the fiftieth anniversaries of the European Recovery (or Marshall) Plan (first adumbrated by Secretary of State George Marshall in a speech at Princeton University’s Alumni Day in January 1947) and the German currency reform of 1948.

The conference looked at German-American relations through a number of key episodes (the issue of reparations after World War I, the United States’ role in the currency reform of 1948, and the security relationship in the 1950s). Helmut Schlesinger, the former president of the Bundesbank, and Paul Volcker, the former chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, underlined the bilateral aspect of the conference and presented their thoughts on the role of the United States in the world economy. Volcker’s strikingly gloomy evening presentation about the limitations and dangers of heightened capital mobility in the 1990s proved quite prophetic in retrospect.

One of the goals of the conference was to integrate historical approaches to the subject with political science and economics

methodologies. Eric Helleiner showed how recent the association of a single currency with national sovereignty is, and he used nineteenth-century debates on this issue to offer a challenging reinterpretation of contemporary issues. The economist William Branson (Princeton University) then applied these debates to an analysis of the experience of post-Soviet successor states. Stephen A. Schuker (University of Virginia) pleaded for a more historical and political approach to the problems of the interwar gold standard than he found in the prevailing economic literature on the connections between the gold standard and the Great Depression. He showed how great power interests were channeled through economic conflicts and described the British interest in the operation of the League of Nations. Michael Bordo (Rutgers University) commented on the mechanisms for adjustment within the gold-exchange standard, and Jakob Tanner (University of Zurich) investigated the position of neutral countries, especially Switzerland, in respect to the reordering of the world economy after 1945.

Many of the papers took quite specific historical experiences as a way of examining present dilemmas and policy debates. Marc Flandreau (OFCE, Paris) analyzed the credit-rating procedures applied to sovereign debt by the *Crédit Lyonnais* bank at the end of the nineteenth century as a way of understanding the efficiency of market actors in judging credit risk. Mira Wilkins (Florida International University) evaluated the contributions of individual firms to international capital transfers in the first era of globalization. Kenneth Mouré (University of California at Santa Barbara) assessed the different options for a stabilization policy by the *Banque de France* in the 1920s. Giulio Gallarotti (Wesleyan University) considered what political and social circumstances were needed for the self-limitation of a system such as the gold standard to be effective. Rolf Caesar (University of Hohenheim) presented a rather skeptical picture of the historical origins of the European Economic and Monetary Union, and Peter Kenen (Princeton University) provided a more upbeat commentary.

At the chronological center of the conference were issues concerned with the effectiveness of the institutional reordering of



the world economy after World War II. The two major contemporary biographers of John Maynard Keynes, Robert Skidelsky (Social Market Foundation and Warwick University) and Donald Moggridge (University of Toronto), debated how far Keynes's vision was realized before Bretton Woods. Skidelsky emphasized the power-political elements of the roles that Britain and the United States played in the postwar economy. Charles Kindleberger and Taylor Ostrander, who both had direct roles in the economic reconstruction of Germany after the war, analyzed the American contribution to currency reform. Knut Borchardt (University of Munich) offered some comments on how an external agent, such as the military occupation authorities, can generate the preconditions for effective reform. Because several of the participants in the German debate on the contribution of the currency reform to the German economic recovery or "miracle" were present—Werner Abelshauser (University of Bielefeld), Helge Berger (Princeton University), and Knut Borchardt—the Kindleberger-Ostrander paper provoked a very lively debate.

The final session of the conference was devoted to Louis Pauly's (University of Toronto) comprehensive overview of the architecture of the international financial institutions themselves, from the League of Nations to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Pauly saw the IMF as stepping into the shoes of the League and inheriting many of its problems. This interpretation was fiercely contested by Jacques Polak, who had worked for both the League and the Fund. This discussion of whether international institutions can tame market chaos or whether they actually produce it is clearly one of immense present concern. If the implications of this debate are to be analyzed, a clear understanding of the social and political circumstances of the failures and successes of the past is indispensable. In this sense, the conference was an important contribution to an understanding of present difficulties and crises.

*Harold James*

“A Challenge for the United States and Europe: The Vision of an Atlantic Civilization.”

Workshop at the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., May 27, 1998. Conveners: Christian Hacke (University of the Bundeswehr, Hamburg), Robert Gerald Livingston (GHI), and Detlef Junker (GHI).

What are the prospects of an Atlantic civilization after the end of the Cold War? What are the challenges facing the West in the twenty-first century? And what will be the role of the Federal Republic of Germany within the transatlantic community? These were some of the questions Christian Hacke (University of the Bundeswehr, Hamburg) raised in a workshop at the GHI. Invoking Hannah Arendt’s seminal studies on revolution and other classics of social and political thought, Hacke argued that an Atlantic civilization might be the last chance for the countries of the West to flourish in an increasingly diverse and interconnected world. After the collapse of communism in 1989–91, a new era that resembles Robert Palmer’s “Age of Democratic Revolution” seems to loom on the horizon.

According to Hacke, the prospects for an Atlantic civilization have never been brighter. The West has reached the peak of its power and faces no serious economic or political competitors. Liberal democracy triumphed in Western Europe after the defeat of National Socialism. Thanks largely to the efforts of the United States, West Germans were given the chance to rejoin Western civilization. The revolutionary changes of 1989–91 enlarged the vision of a democratic, unified, and peaceful Europe. Today, without the “gentle hegemony” of the United States, the West would lack a sense of direction and the willingness to make political decisions.

Since 1990 a unified Germany has played a new role in world politics. Germany continues to mediate between France and the United States, but it no longer can play the role of junior partner in the Franco-German relationship. Germany would be

well advised to move more toward Great Britain and the latter's more pragmatic vision of European integration. Europe has so far proven to be ineffective as an actor in world politics and will continue to depend on the cooperation of the United States to realize any aspirations toward a global role. Transatlantic links therefore are essential to Europe's future development.

Finally, as Hacke stressed in the concluding and central point of his paper, a constructive competition that transcends political, economic, and military matters will be the essence of an Atlantic civilization. Economic competition, in particular, should not be seen as a threat but as an opportunity to build closer links. A constructive rivalry will produce "better debates and wiser decisions." Different perspectives and approaches will strengthen the transatlantic partnership. The twenty-first century will become the age of an Atlantic civilization if "American power and interests are combined with European traditions and values in a new and visionary manner."

In his commentary Robert Gerald Livingston (GHI) stressed the importance of institutions to achieve closer cooperation among Western countries. NATO has been revitalized by its new mission in Bosnia, and its enlargement has been the single most important success of Clinton's foreign policy. However, Livingston also observed a certain "hubris" among American policymakers and tendencies toward a neo-Reaganite unilateralism. Yet Europeans should not overlook the fact that the United States thinks of itself as a power with global responsibilities. Transatlantic relations is only one of many important factors in U.S. foreign policy. As a consequence, dreams of an eighteenth-century style transatlantic community are increasingly outdated. Furthermore, Europeans and Americans might have different views of the precise purpose of organizations such as NATO. The expansion of NATO, for example, is seen by many Americans as a way to project U.S. power into Central Asia and the Middle East. As America's relative power shrinks, however, Europe will have an

opportunity to play a more substantial role while keeping the Americans committed to their NATO allies.

*Philipp Gassert*

“Memory, Democracy, and the Mediated Nation: Political Cultures and Regional Identities in Germany, 1848–1998.”

Conference at the University of Toronto, September 18–20, 1998. Conveners: James Retallack (University of Toronto) and Thomas Goebel (GHI).

For a long time the history of modern Germany was written largely in terms of the history of Prussia, a reflection of the dominant role of Prussia in German politics, especially from the 1860s to 1945. Over the last two or three decades, however, more and more historians have devoted their attention to other regions in Germany. Their work has highlighted the manifold historical trajectories that marked the evolution of the many different regions in Germany, which experienced diverse patterns of industrial development, political mobilization, social modernization, and cultural evolution. At first, most of the work of these historians focused primarily on the states in the south and southwest of Germany. With the opening of East German archives after reunification, new and important research was begun on the history of the new federal states, especially the history of Saxony. This conference brought together historians of regional history to explore themes of Germany’s local and regional identities, national solidarity, and popular representation at the local and national levels.

The conference commenced with a public lecture at the Goethe Institute of Toronto on “Divided Memories,” which was delivered by Sigrid Meuschel (University of Leipzig). She traced public and scholarly discussions of the concept of “totalitarianism” since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. With the attempts to come to terms with the history of the communist regime in East Germany, the idea of “totalitarianism,” first

widely discussed in the 1950s as a way to identify commonalities between fascist and communist regimes, has re-entered the German public discourse. Vigorous discussions among historians and social scientists revolve around the question of whether divergent types of repressive regimes can be grouped together under the broader rubric of totalitarianism. Meuschel sketched the various positions in the debate and pointed to the distinctly political role of the concept in public discussions. An intense debate followed her presentation, revealing that many participants were highly skeptical of a concept that seems to overlook the large differences between National Socialism and East German communism.

The first working session of the conference dealt largely with the role of Saxony during the process of German unification in the 1860s and after 1871. Following the repression of the revolution of 1848–9 Saxony was governed by a highly conservative regime that lasted well into the 1860s. After a brief liberal interlude Saxon conservatives regained control of the state government. Reform efforts followed a pattern of “revolution from above,” familiar from other German states (James Retallack, University of Toronto). Even after 1871 Saxons retained a strong sense of regional identity that was not easily compatible with the rise of German nationalism. But the rise of a socialist party in Saxony—and in Germany as a whole—slowly altered political allegiances and lines of conflict. The leading political parties in the state regrouped around the themes of antisocialism and nationalism, a set of interests and concerns that brought them into closer alliance with conservative elements in Prussia and other German states (Siegfried Weichlein, Humboldt University, Berlin). The integration of Saxony into Germany was not an easy or straightforward process; but the crystallization of lines of political conflict facilitated the rise of national orientations and sentiments.

The discussion following the first group of papers introduced many of the themes that would run through the entire conference. Until recently regional history in Germany

was largely identified with the history of specific states and territories (*Landesgeschichte*). Increasing interest in questions of the construction of identities, the linguistic turn in history and other disciplines, and the increasing attention paid to the constitutive role of language in creating mentalities and personal attachments has invalidated this older tradition of historical writing. Regions almost never coincided with territories defined by clearly demarcated boundaries. Instead, the construction and elaboration of local and regional identities, and their interaction with national ones, involve a complex set of economic, social, and cultural factors—articulated and constantly negotiated through the medium of language and examined through personal and collective memories—that defy easy superimposition on geographical maps. At the same time, regional identities can never function independently of “material factors.” The nuts and bolts of regional history—the transportation networks, the economic structures, the social milieus, the migration patterns, and the dynamics of war and geopolitics—shaped collective identities in Saxony and beyond.

The second session concentrated on the fate of liberals and socialists after the failed revolution of 1848. Christian Jansen (Ruhr University, Bochum) showed that the leading Saxon liberals found themselves in a difficult political situation during the restoration of conservative rule. Some remained loyal to their old political visions and allegiances and some made their peace with the new regime, whereas others searched for ways to reach out to the rising socialist movement. But a unified and vibrant liberal movement did not reappear in Saxony. Liberals remained divided among themselves, unable to forge a coherent political vision between the extremes on the political spectrum. One aspect of this failure of liberalism was the disappearance of the Saxon People’s Party in the mid-1860s. Conceived as a broad, progressive reform group able to span the growing gap between liberals and the labor movement, the party collapsed after only a few years. Liberals no longer were able to create stable alliances with a socialist movement that chafed under liberal domination and founded its own independent

organizations. The liberal milieu in Saxony simply was not stable enough to withstand the growing polarization of the political system (Karsten Rudolph). Yet even the socialist milieu was far from unified and homogeneous. From 1870 to 1930 a strong socialist milieu developed in Saxony, particularly in Leipzig. A large number of trade unions, political associations, sports clubs, cultural organizations, and consumer cooperatives emerged that linked workers and their families. But, as Thomas Adam (University of Leipzig) showed in his presentation, this seemingly proletarian milieu always included a substantial number of white-collar workers, lower-level civil servants, and even some small entrepreneurs. The socialist milieu was much less in opposition to bourgeois culture as is often argued; rather, it performed an integrative function without developing a consistently socialist cultural program.

The third session took up the theme "From Neighborhood to Nation." Celia Applegate (University of Rochester) investigated the writings of two well-known German authors of the nineteenth century, Gustav Freytag and Wilhelm Riehl, in order to trace their concepts of regionalism and regional identity. Whereas Freytag championed national unification under Prussian leadership, Riehl was much more cognizant of the power of separatist and regional loyalties. In a comparison of the accomplishments of municipal governments and liberal rule in Dresden and Munich, Karl Heinrich Pohl (University of Kiel) made an interesting point regarding the extent of "modernization" that marked urban governance in different regions. Measured by its social policies, the local government in Munich was decidedly more progressive than the one in Dresden. This comparative approach enabled participants to place developments in one region into a broader perspective. In his paper on the cooperative movement in Saxony, Brett Fairbairn (University of Saskatchewan) emphasized the connections between local efforts to organize cooperative ventures and regional and national movements pursuing the same goals on a broader scale. Yet cooperatives also contributed to the growing cleavage between social classes in Saxony. The labor movement and the middle class

developed separate cooperative movements that gave expression to the different social and political ideologies of their milieus. Any sense of local or regional identity that local governments or cooperatives could sometimes create was constantly counteracted by the growing gap between different social groups.

The fourth session focused on a more narrowly defined time frame—the 1920s and the rise of National Socialism. As was made clear by the papers of Benjamin Lapp (Montclair College) and Larry Eugene Jones (Canisius College), Saxon politics during the 1920s exemplified the general crisis of Weimar. A coalition government of socialists and communists in the state was squelched by force by the *Reichsexekution* of 1923, an event that traumatized conservatives and leftists. Partly in response to this event, the Saxon party system fragmented at an earlier date than in the rest of Germany. The established bourgeois parties proved incapable of organizing and holding on to middle-class voters. Instead, new parties emerged that claimed to represent the specific interests of small sectors of the electorate. On the right, a number of paramilitary and right-wing organizations were formed that increased the pressure on the political middle. The Nazis adeptly filled this void. As demonstrated by Claus-Christian Szejnmann (Middlesex University), Saxony was one of the early important strongholds of the NSDAP. Nazi success here was not only a reflection of the disorganization and the bickering of the bourgeois parties but also a result of the persistent and often skillful efforts of National Socialists to spread their propaganda. The success of the Nazi Party was based on the mobilization of a substantial part of the Saxon electorate, on their ability to present what seemed to be a coherent vision before an electorate increasingly disenchanted with the existing alternatives.

The fifth session took up the roles of religion and civic culture, particularly by focusing on the experiences of Jews in Saxony and other German regions. A paper by Simone Lässig (Technical University of Dresden) contrasted the emancipation of Jews in Saxony with trends in the small state of Anhalt-Dessau. The latter territory was somewhat of an ideal-typical example of



enlightened absolutism, where the legal emancipation of Jews came remarkably early under the leadership of the local rulers. By contrast, emancipation in Saxony followed the model of a slow, bureaucratic reform from above that one encounters in most German states in the nineteenth century. Lässig demonstrated how profoundly the cultural and social lives of Jews were affected by the patterns of their legal and political emancipation.

Other papers dealing with religion focused on the crucial role of Jewish entrepreneurs and performers in the German circus between 1890 and 1933 (Marline Otte, University of Toronto), on divergent patterns of community building among Jews and Catholics in Imperial Germany (Till van Rahden, University of Bielefeld), and the relations between National Socialism and Protestantism (Richard Steigmann-Gall, University of Toronto). Two other papers re-evaluated Saxony's reputation for political conservatism after 1850. Andreas Neemann (University of Tübingen) argued that the 1850s were not quite as reactionary in Saxony as often argued. A number of reform laws affecting agriculture, urban occupations, and the civil code were enacted during the 1850s and 1860s under the Beust regime. Although excluded from political power, Saxon liberals saw many of their ideas adopted by a government that tried to achieve a balance between the repression of political dissent and the slow modernization of the state. For the period of the Wilhelmine empire, Marven Krug (amazon.com, Seattle) showed that the seemingly draconian laws restricting political and other assemblies were only selectively enforced. By looking at the records of a policeman charged with the enforcement of the assembly laws one can see how few assemblies were dissolved. Instead, the number of political clubs active in Leipzig increased steadily, and only few of them were affected by police intervention. Even under the most stringent laws of any German state, civic life in Saxony flourished.

The final session focused on the challenge of writing regional history today. Thomas Kühne (University of Konstanz) argued that despite the regional orientation of much recent historical

scholarship, few historians study a region on its own terms. All too often regional history is employed to illustrate deviations from a national pattern or to add some local texture to a familiar national story. In particular, the conceptions of the very idea of region by the historical actors are only rarely examined closely. The concept of region, still often identified with territories and states, must be examined over time to identify the shifting historical realities of regional identities. Regions are never stable artifacts but are themselves subject to change and conflicting interpretation. In much the same fashion that nation building was a constitutive process of the nineteenth century, regions also have been created and built.

In his contribution, Thomas Mergel (Ruhr University, Bochum) examined the concept of milieu, one of the most salient terms in regional history and one that played a crucial role in the conference discussions. In most varieties of milieu theory, class, regional, and religious allegiances are perceived as stepping-stones on the way to the formation of national milieus. Such an approach, however, seriously underestimates the persistence and power of these “pre-modern” forms of sociocultural milieu. By analyzing the experiences and the milieus of Catholics, workers, and the bourgeoisie in Germany, Mergel argued that regionality was a central component in the development of milieus. For all three groups, a national milieu simply did not exist during the Wilhelmine empire. Each social group was divided into different regional milieus, from Catholics in Bavaria and the Rhineland to workers in Berlin or Hamburg. Regional differentiation was not an ephemeral state of affairs to be overcome by the inexorable tendencies toward nationalization; rather, they were fundamental aspects of the very identity of the three groups. One could belong to a national labor movement without sacrificing one’s regional sense of belonging. It is this interaction between local and regional milieus and the larger national context that makes the analysis of processes of identity formation so complex and multifaceted.

Roger Chickering (Georgetown University) analyzed the experiences of Freiburg im Breisgau during World War I. One

would assume that the setting of a “total war” would undermine local diversity because centralized government and general mobilization would affect the whole country in similar ways. But the war affected regions and towns very differently, sometimes reinforcing local solidarities, sometimes eroding them. Local history thus has to serve as an important complement to the study of total war. Bernd Weisbrod (University of Göttingen) then explored some of the reasons why regional history so far has not had much appeal to writers of contemporary German history. Here it is the old tradition of *Landesgeschichte* that still dominates discussions. The strong political bent of contemporary history, oriented toward the nation-state and international relations, has further reduced the appeal of regional history. The conference then concluded with presentations by Lucian Hölscher (Ruhr University, Bochum), Michael Kater (York University), and Volker Gransow (Free University of Berlin) that offered some final remarks on the themes of memory and the mediated nation that ran through all the discussions.

Thanks to the generous support of several sponsors— the University of Toronto, York University, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the Goethe Institute of Toronto, the German Embassy in Canada, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the GHI—about forty historians, many of them from Germany and the United States, could be brought to Toronto. The proceedings of the conference were further enhanced by the contributions of many graduate students from the University of Toronto, who contributed shorter position papers and who actively participated in the discussions. With the publication of many of the papers one can confidently expect that the conference will make a lasting contribution to the practice of regional history in Germany and beyond.

*Thomas Goebel*

## “The Plurality of Publics: Metropolitan Culture and Performance in Germany Around 1900.”

Panel at the Annual Meeting of the German Studies Association in Salt Lake City, October 9, 1998. Participants: David Blackbourn (Harvard University), Sierra Bruckner (University of Iowa), Andreas Daum (GHI), and Belinda Davis (Rutgers University).

Chaired by David Blackbourn, the panel took new steps beyond the old controversies surrounding the famous model of the public sphere (*Öffentlichkeit*) that Jürgen Habermas proposed a generation ago. The three papers examined performance and visual demonstration as integral elements of public life in pre-World War I Germany. The papers thereby highlighted the diversity within German society as to how to display and negotiate social, political, and ideological identities in public spaces.

Andreas Daum investigated the “Scientific Theater” in Berlin during the last decade of the nineteenth century. As part of the “Urania,” a new educational institution, the Scientific Theater spectacularized views of natural phenomena on the stage and attracted mass audiences. The performances demonstrated the fin-de-siècle’s drive for the visualization of knowledge, which blurred the lines between reality and representation. These plays produced images of a harmonious, panoramic nature that nourished the quest for an authentic experience of the natural world propagated by contemporary cultural critics.

Sierra Bruckner examined the Berlin ethnographic exhibitions, the *Völkerschauen*. She argued that scientific thought and popular entertainment coalesced in these exhibitions to construct a public sphere in which a multifaceted debate about modernity took place. Commercial ethnography functioned as a site where popular scientific knowledge was produced but also as a sphere where civic values and social norms were symbolically reproduced and negotiated.

Belinda Davis explored the ways in which the proliferation of newspapers and the expansion of their readership transformed

the notion of the public sphere in Germany during World War I. The expanded press not only provided for a broader literary *Öffentlichkeit* but also widely disseminated the image of the streets. In particular, this street scenery (*Straßenbild*) evoked the image of poor women standing in line for food, frequently erupting in desperate unrest. The circulation of these images directly raised the questions of the legitimacy of the public order.

In his comment, Professor Blackbourn reflected on the recent shift of attention among historians to local sites of the public sphere. He questioned the significance of the fin-de-siècle as a time span, and he asked about the specific character of metropolitan and capital culture. Blackbourn also addressed the question of the agents and the social composition of the *Öffentlichkeit*, and he provided each speaker with valuable comments on their individual topics. In sum, this panel attracted an extraordinary level of interest at the conference. The session filled one of the largest conference rooms and prompted a number of questions from the audience.

*Andreas W. Daum*

#### “Ostpolitik: Domestic and International Dimensions, 1962–1974.”

Panel at the Annual Meeting of the German Studies Association in Salt Lake City, October 9, 1998. Participants: Carole Fink (Ohio State University), Philipp Gassert (GHI), Detlef Junker (GHI), Klaus Larres (Queen’s University, Belfast), Mary Elise Sarotte (Harvard University).

In his introductory remarks Detlef Junker (GHI) reminded the audience of recent debates on the meaning of Ostpolitik, on its long-term effects, and whether it paved the way for unification or helped to stabilize the Eastern Bloc.

In his paper titled “The Difficult Beginnings of Ostpolitik During the Grand Coalition, 1966–1969: The Domestic and

International Framework,” Philipp Gassert (GHI) argued that the ultimate success of Ostpolitik after 1969 could be understood by analyzing the less favorable conditions during the 1966–9 period. Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger and Foreign Minister Willy Brandt were faced with the staunch opposition of East Germany to any arrangement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the nations of Eastern Europe that did not accept the demands of East German party leader Walter Ulbricht. Furthermore, the chancellor’s own party, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), did not wholeheartedly support the new course toward the East. Finally, the Soviet Union was preoccupied with the crisis in the CSSR. The suppression of the Prague Spring in 1968–9 and its de facto acceptance by Western powers, however, led to a decisive change in the attitudes of the Soviet Union toward the West and paved the way for a more successful West German Ostpolitik.

In her presentation on “The International Context of Ostpolitik” Mary Elise Sarotte (Harvard University) argued that Ostpolitik carried more weight in the international political context of detente than previously assumed. The ratification of the Moscow and Warsaw treaties was the highest foreign policy priority of the USSR in 1971–2. To achieve this goal Moscow made numerous concessions to West Germany and refrained from canceling the 1972 Moscow Summit between Nixon and Brezhnev despite the mining of Haiphong harbor. In terms of East Germany, Brezhnev played a kind of “double game,” discouraging talks between the GDR and the Federal Republic while avidly pursuing his own accord with the West Germans.

Klaus Larres (Queen’s University, Belfast) presented a paper on “Willy Brandt’s Foolish Flirtations with the Russians: The United States and West German Ostpolitik.” According to Larres, Ostpolitik presented the Nixon administration with a dilemma. Whereas to Washington the revision of Bonn’s policy toward the East had been long overdue, there was constant fear of a new “Rapallo,” the prospect of a secret deal between Brandt and the Russians that would turn Germany away from the West.

Although these fears were unfounded, it was only after 1972 that American politicians realized that Brandt was not seeking a quick road to unification.

In her comment, Carole Fink (Ohio State University) situated Ostpolitik within the framework of the Cold War and world politics of the time, including the role of China. Fink highlighted three perspectives that need to be taken into consideration when discussing Ostpolitik, namely, that of the West, that of the Eastern Bloc, and that of the relationship between the two Germanies.

*Philipp Gassert*

### “Fact or Fiction? The Historical Profession and James Bacque.”

Roundtable discussion at the Annual Meeting of the German Studies Association, Salt Lake City, October 9, 1998. Sponsored by the GHI. Participants: Günter Bischof (University of New Orleans), Dewey A. Browder (Austin Peay State University), Wilfried Mausbach (GHI), Hans-Jürgen Schröder (University of Giessen), Christof Strauß (University of Heidelberg), Richard D. Wiggers (Georgetown University).

The topic of discussion for this panel centered on James Bacque’s allegation, made in his recent, controversial book *Crimes and Mercies*, that American authorities deliberately starved to death as many as nine million German civilians after World War II.

Wilfried Mausbach (GHI) challenged Bacque’s contention that the infamous Morgenthau Plan informed American actions. First, Mausbach demonstrated that the notion of turning Germany into a huge “farm” was never part of American postwar planning; second, that the United States’ occupation directive (JCS 1067) was not cast in Morgenthau’s mold; and third, that the negative elements of JCS 1067 were deliberately postponed, and thereby in effect dismissed, by Military Government officers in the field. Instead of evaluating the

available evidence, Bacque's dramaturgy pits villains against heroes and surrenders scholarly differentiation to populism.

Günter Bischof (University of New Orleans) viewed Bacque's thesis as part of the trend toward a "paranoid style" in writing recent history. This style is characterized by five elements: the image of a huge conspiracy, a self-bestowed duty to save civilization from apocalypse, a manichean worldview of absolute good versus absolute evil, the conviction that traitors make history, and the amassing of evidence to prove a preconceived thesis. Bischof found traces of all these elements in Bacque's writing, and he bemoaned the publishing industry's zest for "conspiracy history."

Christof Strauß (University of Heidelberg) examined Bacque's thesis that approximately one million German POWs perished in American and French camps by taking a close look at two Prisoner of War Temporary Enclosures (PWTEs) in Heilbronn. Strauß found that conditions in these camps indeed did not meet the requirements of the Geneva Convention of 1929. However, to interpret this as evidence of a centrally planned and implemented policy of starvation neglects overall conditions in Germany and Europe in the wake of the war and overestimates to a considerable extent the occupation authorities' scope of action. Strauß argued that, contrary to Bacque's assertion, the Americans did allow aid to be delivered to the inmates by representatives of the German churches, and the International Red Cross also was allowed to visit the camps. Moreover, between May and December 1945 some 300,000 POWs passed through the Heilbronn PWTEs, and death lists show that only 283 of them died. This seems to indicate not only that Bacque's research was poor but also that his overall estimates of deaths are way too high.

Dewey A. Browder (Austin Peay State University) corroborated this information. He showed that Bacque manipulated statistics by adding expellees and repatriated POWs to an early 1946 census that actually already included more than 1.5 million expellees and repatriates in addition to the



unrepatriated POWs. In counting these people twice, Bacque finds that there should have been nearly 74 million people in Germany in 1950, and he cries mass murder when that year's census falls short by 6 million. Browder explained that he personally pointed out this mistake to Bacque while the Canadian author was revising his manuscript for publication in English. Bacque, however, failed to correct his information.

Finally, Richard D. Wiggers (Georgetown University) provided an analysis of eyewitness accounts by authors who were neither Germans nor U.S. Military Government employees. He found that these third-party observers reported and often criticized Allied policy toward and treatment of the German people. Thus, if there was a conspiracy to hide the truth, as Bacque alleges, it failed miserably. Moreover, a close, comprehensive, and unbiased reading of independent eyewitness accounts suggests that a mass death of millions of Germans by starvation simply did not occur in postwar Germany.

The lively discussion, moderated by Hans -Jürgen Schröder (University of Giessen), addressed Bacque's motivation for writing fiction disguised as fact. It was pointed out that Bacque obviously really believes he has discovered something important and is encouraged by people in Germany who suffered after 1945 and who feel that their experience of victimization has gotten short shrift in the history of this period. However, his neglect of crucial evidence suggests either that he is unable to acknowledge criticism or that he willfully ignores information in an effort to cash in on a sensationalist thesis. The latter supposition led participants to discuss the quixotic nature of efforts by professional historians to challenge populist histories promoted by a sensation-driven publishing industry. Some also wondered whether even the most ludicrous claims merit refutation. There seemed to be an overall agreement, however, that historians have a duty to correct gross distortions and refute wild allegations.

*Wilfried Mausbach*

## “Violence and Normality: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s.”

Conference at Marienheide, October –11, 1998. Co-sponsored by the GHI Washington and the GHI London. Conveners: Richard Bessel (York University), Martin H. Geyer (University of Munich), and Dirk Schumann (University of Bielefeld).

During the decade following the outbreak of World War II more people were killed by their fellow human beings than ever before. This “decade of violence” was followed by a “decade of normality,” marked by relative peace, stability, and conservatism not only in the political arena but also in terms of social and cultural life. In recent years the economic and political reconstruction of postwar Europe has been exhaustively studied. However, the long-term effects of the experience of the mass violence of the 1940s have only begun to be analyzed. Developing approaches to this field of historical inquiry was the aim of this conference. More than twenty historians and social scientists from France, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States gathered at Schloß Gimborn near Marienheide to explore the theoretical, methodological, and empirical issues that surround this subject.

The conference began with a session chaired by Dirk Schumann (Bielefeld), wherein two keynote papers were presented. The first was a general sketch by Richard Bessel (York) of the themes of the conference. He stressed that the subject of discussion was the second great postwar transition of the twentieth century and outlined two main assumptions that had informed the planning for the conference. The first was that, important though the question of how people were led into fascism and war may be, the perhaps even more crucial question concerns how people emerged from them and attempted, with various degrees of success, to (re-)build a “normal” existence. The second was that the experiences, mentalities, and psychologies of

the individuals involved are at least as relevant to the history of postwar Europe as are the more familiar political and economic developments.

In the second introductory contribution Alice Förster (Bern) discussed how the psychiatric concept of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) might help us understand the postwar societies of the 1950s. Förster outlined how the concept was developed in the treatment of American veterans of the Vietnam War, described the wide range of symptoms associated with PTSD, and pointed out that more recent studies have broadened the scope of the concept to include other groups demonstrating PTSD symptoms, such as civilians involved in armed conflicts and, retrospectively, American soldiers who served in World War II. She went on to point out the relevance of the concept for the survivors of World War II by noting the high numbers of soldiers and civilians affected by wartime violence and the typical PTSD symptoms of nightmares and feelings of detachment that come up in postwar testimonies of survivors.

This provoked a lively discussion that centered around two points in particular. The first concerned the question of what could be considered “normal” if those suffering the symptoms of PTSD were considered to be abnormal. This concern implied a pivotal theoretical point that was central to the conference theme: If a research concept is based on a definition of “normality” that applies to both victims and perpetrators in the same manner, what can be gained from it for the analysis of the wide range of different experiences during and after World War II? The second critical point concerned the focus of the PTSD concept on the individual and whether a concept that describes individual behavior can tell us much generally about society and specifically about how societies as a whole came to terms with the traumatic experiences of the war.

The second session, chaired by Bernd Weisbrod (Göttingen), focused on forms and discourses of public mourning and commemoration of the victims of the war. In the

first contribution Sabine Behrenbeck (Cologne) noted that in both postwar German states, despite their differences, it was the dead members of the former *Volksgemeinschaft* who were commemorated in public ceremonies; the principal victims of Nazi persecution, the Jews, were not mentioned explicitly. In the German Democratic Republic (GDR) a commemoration calendar emerged that placed the victory of the Soviet troops and the Communist victims of Nazi persecution at center stage, whereas in the Federal Republic public mourning concentrated on the *Volkstrauertag* in November and blurred the distinctions between soldiers and civilians, perpetrators and victims, by eventually including even the German POWs. It was only after the mid-1960s that Jewish victims were given their own place in the public memories of both German states. In the discussion, several participants pointed out that private and semiprivate forms of mourning and commemoration—for example, caring for individual graves—also were an important part of collective efforts to come to terms with the immediate past.

In his paper Ido de Haan (Amsterdam) focused on “coming to terms with the persecution of the Jews” and added the Dutch and French experiences. He concluded that in these countries too there was no specific place in public memory for the victims of the Holocaust. In the Netherlands public discourse focused on the history of occupation and resistance, whereas the persecution of Jews was regarded as a German affair. In France, Jews were defined as part of the republican nation and thus became indistinguishable as part of the resistance movement (although in France, unlike their counterparts in the Netherlands, they were entitled to receive compensation for the persecution they suffered). De Haan also asserted that a model of public mourning that posits a gradual progression from silence to memory is insufficient. Rather, such a model needs to allow for shifts between memory and silence, depending on the political context, a point that was taken up in the discussion, where several participants questioned the adequacy of the term “silence” for what unfolded. It also was noted that the Holocaust, as a

European event, generated practices of mourning and commemoration that transcended national boundaries.

The third session, chaired by Svenja Goltermann (Bielefeld), concerned the various strategies of women and men to cope with their experiences of violence after the war. How women in Germany tried to reclaim a sense of identity and agency from discourses that centered on fertility and maternity, and the “reconstruction of desire” were the themes of the contribution by Atina Grossmann (New York). Here she contrasted the relative unwillingness of German women, who saw themselves as victims of war and occupation, to bear children with the tremendous upsurge in births among Jewish women survivors in the displaced-persons camps in Germany. Whereas for German women—many of whom had been raped— not having children allowed them to re-create the material conditions of normality, for the Jewish survivors childbearing both offered an opportunity to be and feel “normal” and “fostered a kind of productive forgetting” after the horrors of the recent past. Among the points raised in discussion was the degree of continuity linking perceptions of Jewish displaced persons to the *Ostjuden* (Jews from eastern Europe) in Weimar Germany and to older stereotypes, which underscored that not all postwar phenomena and perceptions were the result of the war experience alone.

In the paper that followed, Andrea Petö (Budapest) discussed the traumatic experiences of Hungarian women who had been raped by Soviet soldiers. Although a public “conspiracy of silence” developed after 1945 due to the political circumstances, the victims themselves developed an “economy of emotions” that enabled them to distance themselves from the acts of rape. The rapes helped to create a myth of Hungarian victimhood, which played down the Hungarian contribution to Nazi rule in Europe and helped shape an anti-Soviet identity.

With the contribution by Joanna Bourke (London) attention shifted to men’s agency and men’s experience, generally and to the act of killing specifically. Focusing on evidence left by British

soldiers, Bourke contrasted contemporary fears revolving around the stereotyped figure of the “veteran” that suggested that returning soldiers, brutalized by their experiences, would pose a serious danger to public order, with the ways soldiers found to distance themselves from the horrors of war and their own behavior by creating “ordered sensible narratives” for their experiences.

The fourth session, chaired by Atina Grossmann, continued the discussions of gender experiences by turning to issues of marriage and family. Dagmar Herzog (East Lansing, Mich.) presented the thesis that the 1950s in Germany were less sexually repressed than often portrayed and that the same could be said for the Nazi period, thereby supporting Ludwig von Friedeburg’s 1953 thesis that a steady liberalization of attitudes toward marriage and family had been taking place since the beginning of the twentieth century. Drawing on a wide range of sources, including marriage counseling texts and opinion polls, Herzog demonstrated that during the late 1940s and early 1950s there was a high level of consent to premarital sex, that information on sex practices was easily available, and that the first mail-order service for pornographic material was a great success. This changed in the late 1950s when the influence of conservative forces increased, particularly that of the Catholic Church, which had denounced Nazism as too permissive in sexual matters; “the later 1950s,” according to Herzog, “have come to stand in for the whole of the 1950s.”

Pat Thane (Sussex), whose paper set developments in the family life of postwar Europe within a broad social and economic perspective, confirmed Herzog’s thesis for Britain. There too the 1950s brought about a further loosening of codes of sexual conduct, whereas other features of social life— such as demographic changes and very low unemployment rates after the war— marked a break with prewar experience. Thane also stressed the importance of class: The postwar economic boom and the changes it generated affected most of all the working class, where for the first time parents could expect that their children would have better lives than they did and where

working-class families in particular saw a trend toward greater stability in their lives.

In the fifth session, also chaired by Dirk Schumann, the changes during the postwar years connected with the economic boom were explored from different perspectives, i.e., work and consumption. Drawing on his studies of Germany during the 1950s and early 1960s, Michael Wildt (Hamburg) noted both the ruptures of the postwar period and the continuities of the prewar and war years. Anxieties about a possible third world war were ever-present during the 1950s, leading to constant efforts to stockpile extra food at home, and thrift remained a valued quality through the 1950s— although the fact that consumers increasingly bought on credit suggests that things look different when one examines everyday practice. “With work” a pivotal value, long working hours were accepted, which had a negative effect on family life but on the whole contributed to a sense of confidence and a “normality” that meant “being able to make plans”— a point that echoed Pat Thane’s comments. For West Germans, moreover, being able to participate in mass consumption also meant becoming westernized; as Wildt concluded, they thereby became “democrats as consumers.” In the discussion that followed there was agreement that mass consumption played an important role in generating societal stability in all western European countries and even, to some degree, in eastern Europe as well. In this respect the 1950s were a period of convergence for western European societies, although it was pointed out that participating in mass consumption did not mean that the same range and volume of goods was available to all groups in society.

In his paper Jakob Tanner (Zürich) discussed diet after World War II, outlining how the system of food supply came under pressure, due first to the shortage of food and rationing—an endeavor to impose some standard of normal life in a violent and abnormal situation—second to the perception of hunger as violence against the body, and later through the (re-)emergence of the desire to be slim. The mid-1950s were, in Tanner’s view,

the decisive years, seeing the takeoff of a new consumption-driven model in which saving on food could enable a family to purchase consumer durables. Tanner also illustrated, in a speculative and fascinating manner, how postwar fantasies of the “new tall, slim body” were linked with fears of atomic warfare by the grotesque and banal identification of sexually attractive women as “superanatomic bombs.” Referring mainly to German examples, Alf Lüdtke (Göttingen) concluded the session by exploring the meanings and emotions related to “work” in the 1950s. In particular he stressed the continuities that related the aesthetics of “work” in the 1950s to those in the 1930s. *Deutsche Wertarbeit* again became a chiffre for the capacities and achievements of German society, while the notion of “work” also was linked to promises of a better future and adventure. In the discussion it was noted, however, that the experience of the “black market” did not necessarily fit this argument and that the experience of slave labor, shared by many men and women in countries under German occupation, shaped attitudes toward “work” rather differently from those of the German population after 1945.

The focus of the conference shifted to political culture in the sixth session, chaired by Martin H. Geyer (Munich). In the first paper, Damian van Melis (Berlin) presented the thesis that the Catholic Church viewed itself as victorious after the war, as a “victor among the ruins.” While glossing over the silence at Nazi crimes, the Church interpreted the violence of the war as the result of the disobedience of God and turning away from the Church, just as the violence of the Spanish Civil War had been perceived as a result of the disobedience of the Church. The Church was concerned more with reaffirming its traditional worldview and moral rules than with taking serious issue with the violence of the war years, especially with the Holocaust. Questions were raised in the subsequent discussion about whether the Catholic responses to the violence were in fact so monolithic— for example, in the Netherlands and Belgium important discussions took place about Catholic (and Jewish)



martyrs; the importance of the Church's influence over schools should not be overlooked.

In his paper Pieter Lagrou (Paris) contrasted the two world wars in France, Belgium, and the Netherlands and pointed to the difficulty of constructing homogeneous national memory after 1945. In contrast to World War I and to the experiences in Eastern Europe during World War II, the actual fighting in the countries Lagrou discussed was over very quickly; collaboration and resistance, deportation and persecution of the Jews, not the daily confrontation with violent death, marked most of wartime. Here Lagrou affirmed the thesis put forward by Behrenbeck and de Haan that in public remembrance the Jews were excluded from national memory, and he suggested a fascinating paradox: that although in World War I a relatively homogeneous experience was followed by divergence, the divergent experiences of World War II were followed by greater uniformity. Violence, according to Lagrou, "was collectivized in memory" after World War II, whereby certain symbols and ceremonies became common to all, even though they did not have common experiences. Participants in the discussion stressed the differences among the Netherlands, which had not fought in World War I, and Belgium and France, which did. The importance to France of the wars in Indochina and Algeria also were highlighted. At the same time it was pointed out that there were developments that cut across national boundaries—the murder of the Jews and, in a very different manner, the economic organization of the war machine.

Finally, Donald Sassoon (London) described for Italy the problems of constructing a national narrative of the war years. There the Communists were virtually in charge of who was in the resistance, and of the resistance narrative, and created a national narrative in which most people were unable to recognize themselves and that obliterated the possibility of creating local narratives. Sassoon placed particular emphasis on the "myth of the good Italian," who had been involved in the war and Fascist crimes only by accident, that eventually served as a unifying myth that cut across party lines, although at the price of

obliterating Italy's history of anti-Semitism and its colonial history. In the subsequent discussion the similarities and differences between the "good Serbian" and "decent German" (which did not effectively serve as a nationally integrating figure because his secondary virtues helped make genocide possible) were debated. Furthermore, it was argued that personal and regional narratives could follow patterns different from the national ones, which led to the general point that there always were different levels on which myths and narratives were constructed.

The seventh session, chaired by Richard Bessel, explored the broad field of the culture of everyday life, thereby taking up some of the themes of previous sessions from a different perspective. Drawing on Walter Benjamin's reflections on art in the industrial age, Paul Betts (Charlotte, N.C.) examined how the legacy of *Bauhaus* was used in both Germanys after 1945. In the Federal Republic an "aesthetization of economics" gave industrial design a new prominence and engendered the shaping of all sorts of consumer products in an explicitly "modern" fashion, whereas the public presentation of politics remained muted. In the GDR there was no break with the past aesthetization of politics, but there were efforts to design consumer goods in a manner clearly distinguished from the Nazi years. The subsequent discussion centered on the models for industrial design: Apart from the references to the Weimar *Bauhaus*, there also were references to French and Belgian models, as well as to American ones.

In his contribution Alon Confino (Charlottesville, Va.) offered the thesis that the re-emergence of tourism in Germany after 1945 was not, as usually claimed, a hallmark of a new culture of mass consumption. Rather, it was not just a continuation of a tradition from the 1930s that only had been interrupted for five years but also (as contemporary statements of former German soldiers demonstrated) an attempt to remember the days of war without being politically incorrect. This changed in the course of the 1950s, when a younger generation of tourists who had not been in the Wehrmacht traveled to the sites of Nazi

crimes in order to pay respect to the victims. In the lively discussion that followed it was pointed out that most former soldiers did not travel; if they did, they tended to visit places not connected with their war experiences. Most German tourists remained in Germany or visited Austria; Eastern Europe, where most German soldiers spent most of the war, was not on the tourist map of the 1950s.

The final session, also chaired by Richard Bessel, began with Bernd Weisbrod's attempt to reinterpret some of the pivotal terms discussed at the conference. Rather than juxtapose "violence" and "normality," Weisbrod proposed the terms "liminality" and "security of life experience." Focusing on individual experience, Weisbrod stressed the ruptures rather than the continuities between the war and the postwar years and pointed to the changed perceptions of time, language, and memory. Once the war ended, time acquired a new meaning as the pace of life became slower and steadier once again; the language was now one of survivors who expressed their stories in terms of crises and luck, and a new language of conservatism emerged after 1945 that focused on terms of reassurance and confidence; and memory was split— attached in part to mutilated and raped bodies, in part to scarred cities, and in part to private economies of emotions, all of which had to be reconciled with the official memories of the war years when it came to rebuilding society after 1945. Strategies of "self-decontamination," as Weisbrod put it, had to be developed; there could be no rebuilding of society with a rebuilding of the self. "It was," Weisbrod concluded, "not just the past but the present which was another country." A lively debate followed, centering on how general developments of the postwar era— such as emergent mass consumption and the new welfare state— can be studied from a perspective that focuses on the individual. Thus, the final discussion returned to the fundamental issues raised by Alice Förster's contribution at the beginning of the conference.

Weisbrod's concluding remarks, and the intense discussions that the conference provoked from beginning to end, pointed

simultaneously to the complexity of the subject and its importance in the shaping of the world in which we live. More than most, this conference was exploratory: It was an attempt to map out new paths toward an understanding of perhaps the most important transition of our century, and in that it proved extremely successful.

*Richard Bessel  
Dirk Schumann*

“The Criminal and His Scientists: A Symposium on the History of Criminology.”

Conference at the European University Institute in Florence, October 15–18, 1998. Co-sponsors: GHI, the European University Institute, Florence, the Centre de Recherches Sociologiques sur le Droit et les Institutions Penales (CESDIP), and the Groupe Europeene de Recherches sur les Normativites. Conveners: Peter Becker (European University Institute, Florence) and Richard F. Wetzell (University of Maryland at College Park).

The conference brought together thirty-five scholars from several countries. About half of the participants came from Europe (England, France, and Germany), a third from the United States, and a few from as far away as Argentina, Australia, and Japan. The conference began with a keynote speech by Peter Strasser (University of Graz), which provided a wide-ranging analysis of the history of criminological thought from Cesare Lombroso to the present.

The first two panels examined the variety of criminological discourses that took shape in the first half of the nineteenth century, including criminal statistics (Herbert Reinke, University of Wuppertal), the “criminology” of the Victorian judiciary (Martin Wiener, Rice University), the “invention” of juvenile delinquency (Bernd Weisbrod, University of Göttingen), the German police’s “gaze at the underworld” (Peter Becker, European University Institute, Florence), Jewish views on Jews and crime (Michael Berkowitz, University College, London), and

the impact of the French Revolution on criminological thought in France (Marc Renneville, University of Paris). Here the discussion focused on the relationship between discourses and institutional practices, and on the question as to what extent there was a shift in criminological master narratives from the mid- to the late nineteenth century.

The third and fourth panels took a comparative look at turn-of-the-century criminology and the impact of Lombroso's theories on the "born criminal" in Italy (Mary Gibson, John Jay College of Criminal Justice), Germany (Mariacarla Gadebusch, University of Greifswald), France (Laurent Mucchielli, CESDIP), Australia (Stephen Garton, University of Sydney), Japan (Yoji Nakatani, Tokyo Institute of Psychiatry), the United States (Nicole Rafter, Northeastern University), and Argentina (Ricardo Salvatore, Universita Torcuato di Tella, Buenos Aires). The papers and discussions for both panels emphasized the need for a highly differentiated assessment of Lombroso's impact but also demonstrated powerful similarities among the various national experiences.

The fifth panel investigated the production of criminological knowledge, including the tools and techniques criminologists used (David Horn), the role of tattoos in criminological thought (Jane Caplan, Bryn Mawr College), and the reception, reproduction, and contestation of criminological discourse in the autobiographical writings of prison inmates (Philippe Artieres, Paris). Here, papers and discussion stressed that criminology was situated among competing discourses. This theme was pursued in the next panel, which examined at the larger context of turn-of-the-century German criminology, including its connection with discourses on moral reform (Andrew Lees, Rutgers University, Camden), drinking and temperance (Geoffrey J. Giles, University of Florida), and on the way in which press reporting on the murder of a child in Berlin promoted certain ways of seeing the city (Peter Fritzsche, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign). The seventh panel followed the development of German criminology in the first half of the twentieth century, examining psychoanalytic criminology

(Gabriel Finder, Susquehanna College), Bavaria's Criminal-Biological Service (Oliver Liang, Johns Hopkins University), the image of the criminal and the detective in Fritz Lang's films (Joachim Linder, Munich), and the general development of German criminology during the Weimar and Nazi years (Richard F. Wetzell, University of Maryland at College Park). Here, the discussion included debates on the specificity of the German national experience and the question of to what extent the Nazi "racial state" was or was not the logical outcome of a certain type of biologically determined thought. These themes were followed up in the final panel, which presented two case studies of the relationship between criminology and penal policy, examining the history of prison labor in the United States (Norbert Finzsch, University of Hamburg) and the role of criminological discourse in the Nazi treatment of gypsies and juvenile delinquents (Michael Kater, York University).

In conclusion, the conference's lively and wide-ranging discussions demonstrated that the history of criminology is enormously enriched by international and comparative perspectives.

*Richard F. Wetzell*

#### "Germany and African Americans: A Comparative Perspective."

Conference held at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, November 2, 1998. Co-sponsored by the Institute of African American Research and the GHI. Convener: Gerald Horne (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

On November 2, 1998, a distinguished group of younger scholars from Germany and the United States gathered at the Sonja Haynes Stone Black Cultural Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) to discuss various topics in the field of African American Studies. In particular, they looked at German encounters with African Americans and the impact of German ideas on African-American scholars. The conference was

organized by Professor Gerald Horne, the director of the Sonya Haynes Stone Black Cultural Center.

Following introductory remarks by Horne and Christof Mauch (GHI), Hartmut Keil (University of Leipzig) introduced his research on German-Americans and African Americans in the mid-nineteenth century. Keil argued that German immigrants adopted a rather positive or friendly attitude toward the African American community, and he identified a number of key reasons for this. He found that some German cultural and political traditions dovetailed nicely with antislavery and abolitionist sentiments, although his main focus was on practical social relations. Keil stressed the near absence of direct occupational competition between African Americans and German-Americans (in contrast to Irish-Americans), the differences in socioeconomic status, and patterns of proximity in urban neighborhoods. These specific factors, Keil concluded, reduced the likelihood of racial tensions, at least in the antebellum period, whereas after the Civil War racism was adopted by German immigrants as “a gradual learning process and integral part of, or even precondition to, becoming integrated into American society.” The commentator, Michael West (UNC), applied the concept of “whiteness” to Keil’s interpretation and reflected on the differences between antislavery and pro-black attitudes among Germans.

The second paper was delivered by Manfred Berg (Free University of Berlin), who presented a chapter of his forthcoming book on the NAACP, *A Ticket to Freedom*. He discussed the strategy debates concerning re-enfranchisement during the early 1960s within the civil rights movement. He based his thesis on the competition and rivalries between the NAACP, which supported voter registration, and competing smaller organizations, which favored nonviolent direct action. He argued that the nonviolent mass protests of the early 1960s provided a “positive flank effect,” while “the NAACP voter registration campaigns, although its results are hard to quantify, made a substantial contribution to the re-enfranchisement of southern blacks in the two-and-a-half decades after the Second

World War.” The commentator, Genna Rae McNeil (UNC), saw more of a “continuum” than a “dichotomy.” She added that the NAACP took different actions and changed its approach over time. She also stressed regional variations, whereas other conference participants discussed civil rights issues within the larger context of the Cold War.

The third paper was given by Maria Höhn (Vassar College). She discussed the attitudes of black GIs and Germans in the 1950s and 1960s. Her provocative thesis was based on the way in which American racial attitudes “informed and enforced German attitudes.” In particular, she discussed the American military’s implicit and often explicit approval of racial discrimination, which exacerbated German prejudices and their tendencies to stigmatize as prostitution the sexual relations between German women and black soldiers. In his comment military historian Richard Kohn (UNC) countered that American commanders were committed to a policy of integration; he also stressed that American beliefs and practices may have permitted German racism but never caused it.

In her paper on “Rethinking Race After National Socialism,” Heide Fehrenbach (Emory University) focused on postwar German discourses of race. She used the West German feature film *Toxi: Die Geschichte eines Mischlingskindes* (one of Germany’s top ten films of 1952) to explore the continuities and differences in the representation of race across the divide of 1945. In her complex analysis Fehrenbach discussed the issue of *Mischlingskinder* (children of multiracial background) on numerous levels, including German diplomatic negotiations about terminating the Occupation Statute and the Federal Republic’s claim to establish jurisdiction in the area of civil law over all inhabitants within West German borders. Among other points Fehrenbach found that “the instrumentalization of race for the rehabilitation of German identity was a dominant feature of the emerging liberal discourse in 1950s West Germany.” In his comment Daniel Letwin (Pennsylvania State University) interpreted the film as an episode of how the Germans became “white or more white.” Rather than



focusing on postwar German discourses, Letwin drew challenging parallels between postwar Germany and the period of Reconstruction in the United States. He emphasized white attitudes, behavioral patterns, and government policies toward African Americans in the United States.

In the final paper of the conference Axel Schäfer (University of Halle-Wittenberg) analyzed the impact that W.E.B. Du Bois's experience in Germany (in 1892) had on his social, political, and philosophical outlook. Schäfer contended that Du Bois's work under Gustav Schmoller led him away from a liberal model of social change and toward a progressive-historicist view. By subscribing to a philosophy that encouraged individuals to see their own condition not as predetermined but as historically constructed, Du Bois distanced himself from the belief that civil rights were necessarily the main avenue to equality and justice. Instead, he stressed the cultural dependency of ethics and focused on social ethics as a path to develop or even change black American culture. Reginald Hildebrand (UNC) emphasized that Schäfer deserved credit for highlighting the important influence that Schmoller's seminar had on Du Bois. At the same time he cautioned Schäfer not to pay too much attention to the German Historical School and mistake the "voyage to Berlin" for a "road to Damascus." Furthermore, he questioned Schäfer's thesis that Du Bois distanced himself from the idea of extending civil rights or even turned away from progressivism as a result of his intellectual journey across the Atlantic.

Finally, Clarence Taylor (Florida International University) presented his strong views on contemporary racism in Germany from an African American perspective. He was a Fulbright professor at the University of Chemnitz in 1996-7, where he experienced an "almost official policy of harassment" and of "criminalizing immigrants." A lively discussion ensued.

*Christof Mauch*

## New Research Topics at the GHI

---

### “Kurt Georg Kiesinger, 1904–1988: A Political Biography.”

West Germany's third chancellor has received scant attention in contemporary historical literature. Some observers have even called Kurt Georg Kiesinger, who held the chancellorship from 1966 to 1969, the “forgotten chancellor.” In a public opinion poll that was conducted several years ago, most western and eastern Germans either could not remember Kiesinger's name or even mistook the former chancellor for a former U.S. secretary of state. Moreover, historical interest in the Grand Coalition government between the Christian Democratic Party (CDU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD), which Kiesinger headed, has never been strong. The two major political parties have tended to ignore their role in what was, after all, a limited and seemingly not very successful experiment. Therefore, it is not surprising that a comprehensive scholarly biography of Kiesinger has yet to be written.

Born in 1904, Kiesinger was a member of that “lost generation” whose life and career mirrored the extreme developments in Germany's twentieth-century history. As with every chancellor before Helmut Kohl, Kiesinger's role during the years between 1933 and 1945 was of enormous political significance for his postwar career, especially after he had been nominated for the chancellorship in 1966. That he was the only chancellor to have been a member of the Nazi Party is the first thing most people recall about him. Although the basic facts of Kiesinger's biography during the Third Reich are well known, it is still necessary to revisit the details of this period of his life. His somewhat mysterious decision to enter the party after Hitler had

come to power, his disenchantment with Nazi ideology after 1933, his refusal to exploit the many career opportunities that the Third Reich offered young German academics, and his work in the Foreign Office after 1940 should all be looked at carefully. The years between 1933 and 1945 yield important clues to Kiesinger's character and, to a certain degree, define his political career after 1945. More important, Kiesinger's biography is an instructive example of how postwar German politics was shaped by collective and individual efforts to deal with the Nazi Past. *Vergangenheitspolitik*, in its West German and East German variations, will serve as an important leitmotif in the planned Kiesinger biography.

Whereas the controversies surrounding Kiesinger's past did not subside until he left office, his postwar career reflects some of the most positive developments in German history after World War II. Kiesinger was not among the men and women of the "first hour" in 1945–6, but soon after he had been fully exonerated by the denazification authorities, he joined the CDU and became a leading member of the newly elected Bundestag. Kiesinger played a central role in shaping the rules and institutions of the new parliament, and he made substantial contributions to the laws governing Germany's constitutional court, the Bundesverfassungsgericht. As chair of the foreign affairs committee he served as one of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's parliamentary foremen and helped defend the policy of integrating the Federal Republic into transatlantic and European institutions.

Passed over on several occasions for important cabinet and other posts, Kiesinger returned to his home state of BadenWürttemberg, where he served as minister president from 1958 to 1966. During his years in Stuttgart, which many judge to be the most successful part of his political career, he helped modernize what had historically been an economically backward province. Furthermore, Kiesinger was one of the leaders of the movement to expand Germany's university system during the 1960s. Between 1947 and 1966 Kiesinger became a staunch

democrat, an eloquent defender of Germany's integration into the West, a committed European, and a conservative modernizer. His career embodied the shifting ideological and cultural outlook of the Federal Republic. The theme of Westernization therefore provides a second leitmotif for this study.

Historians are turning their attention toward the late 1960s as more primary source material becomes available. The Grand Coalition succeeded in passing important and lasting legislation, such as the reform of the penal code, the emergency legislation and tax reform, a reform of Germany's pension system, and laws providing new economic policy tools to the federal government, among others. In addition, the years of the Grand Coalition saw the culmination of the student movement in West Germany. Kiesinger's reactions (and those of his colleagues) to the unrest of the late 1960s provide fascinating insights into a surprisingly well-meaning "establishment." Furthermore, the years of the Grand Coalition witnessed an important transition in German foreign policy and inter-German relations. Kiesinger and Willy Brandt rebuilt the seriously deteriorated relations between West Germany and its two closest allies, France and the United States. They also started a new German Ostpolitik, which would pave the way to the successful arrangements with Eastern Europe in the early 1970s. Kiesinger's tenure as chancellor provides a third central theme to the book.

In recent years the writing of contemporary German history has seen a remarkable renaissance in the genre of political biography. The best recent biographies have successfully steered away from the traditional- albeit frequently unjustly criticized—"great men image" of historical biography. By using a single person as a focal point to reflect fundamental developments in postwar German history, recent studies have convincingly demonstrated the validity and importance of the biographical approach. Kiesinger seems to be particularly well suited to address some of the larger issues in twentieth-century German history. To many the late chancellor was a symbol of the legacies of the Third Reich; yet Kiesinger's remarkable

political career after 1945 underscores the discontinuous elements as well. To a certain degree Kiesinger represents the highly ambivalent and complicated transformation of West German political culture that took place during the Cold War. Kiesinger not only was a consummate representative of Germany's new foreign policy, but he also was a promoter of domestic modernization.

The biographical approach might help us to discover connections with the seemingly unconnected realms of politics that structural, institutional, or social history might not bring out as clearly. His education policy, for example, was in part motivated by a belief, shared by many of his contemporaries, that German universities were falling behind their American counterparts. Furthermore, Kiesinger considered himself to be a European and a member of an emerging transatlantic elite. But he also was a person with strong regional and national roots, integrating a diverse set of identities that seems to have become the norm in this age of globalization. Thus, a Kiesinger biography might not only fill a "gap" in the existing literature, but it also might address major historical issues. I welcome any suggestions or criticisms with respect to the larger historiographical and methodological questions involved in this study of Kiesinger's life and times.

*Philipp Gassert*

## Archive Report

---

### “Postwar Germany and American Foreign Policy: The Foreign Affairs Cluster at the National Archives and Records Administration.”

The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) has custody of the permanently valuable, noncurrent records of the United States federal government, records that document the activities of the United States abroad as well as at home. Among NARA's holdings are a great number of files pertaining to Germany after World War II. Because it is impossible to mention here all potential sources of information concerning Germany at the National Archives here, I shall concentrate on the records that comprise the Foreign Affairs Cluster. The Foreign Affairs Cluster consists of the records of twenty-four civilian agencies of the U.S. federal government that formulated and implemented American foreign policy. Of these agencies, the following record groups are the most crucial to understanding American relations with postwar Germany and are the best starting point when using NARA. Moreover, they contain a significant amount of newly released material available to researchers only over the course of the last three years.

#### General Records of the Department of State (RG 59)

This record group is perhaps the most important body of material for scholars of German history. Consisting of a central file and the files maintained by the Department of State's various bureaus and offices, it includes dispatches, memoranda, letters, telegrams, newspaper clippings, policy statements, working papers, and other documents. Researchers should begin with the Department's central file.

For the years after World War II the central file is divided into three filing schemes: The first filing scheme covers the years 1945–9 and is organized into eight major classes, for example Class 7, Political Relations Between States, and Class 8, Internal Affairs of States. Within each class, records are arranged by country and thereunder according to a decimal scheme of subject classification. There is a single file category for Germany.

In 1950 the Department implemented a new classification scheme. From January of that year through January of 1963, the central file is organized into nine major classifications, for example Class 5, International Informational, Cultural, and Educational Relations; Class 6, International Political Relations; Class 7, Internal Political and Military Affairs; Class 8, Internal Economic, Industrial and Social Affairs; and Class 9, Internal Communication, Transportation and Scientific Affairs. Within each class, records are arranged by country and thereunder according to a decimal scheme of subject classification. Whereas there are some files for Germany as a whole, most of the records are divided into files pertaining to the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. Researchers should note that although it has many similarities to the preceding system, this filing scheme has major differences; they should consult the filing manual prior to requesting records.

The final scheme covers the period February 1963 through July 1973 and is radically different. Called the Subject-Numeric system, records are arranged into seven major categories, including Economics, Politics and Defense, and Social. Each major category is subdivided into minor categories and then arranged by country. Scholars of Germany should look for records filed under Germany, East or Germany, West and occasionally Berlin. Researchers are advised that this portion of the central file is open for research only through 1969. It is anticipated that the remaining years will be available for research by the beginning of 1999.

Although considerably more difficult to use, the records maintained by Department of State offices and bureaus are well

worth examining. Often referred to as lot files, the office files are organized along geographic or functional lines and contain material similar to that in the central file. The office files, however, are more likely to contain preliminary drafts of documents, thereby providing researchers with a glimpse of policy as it was evolving.

The records of the Bureau of European Affairs are the most significant geographic office files. Although there is information pertaining to Germany it is dispersed through many of the Bureau's general files, researchers may wish to pay particular attention to the records of the Office of German Affairs. Three significant series, for example, contain documents pertaining to German Democratic Republic, 1949–62; Berlin, 1957–63; and the Federal Republic of Germany, 1960–2.

Researchers also should examine the records of several of the Department's functional offices, especially those of the Bureau of Public Affairs and the Executive Secretariat. The records of the Bureau of Public Affairs cover the years 1945–63 and contain a great deal of information pertaining to American cultural and informational programs in postwar Germany; they also document educational exchange programs between the two countries. Those of the Executive Secretariat contain several noteworthy series, including country files maintained by the Department of State's Policy Planning Staff (called the Policy Planning Council after 1962), dated 1947–65. The records of the Executive Secretariat also include two large series of conference files and briefing books that contain background material for visits of American officials abroad and of foreign dignitaries to the United States, and often include minutes of conversations held at those meetings. These two series cover the years 1949–76, and Germany is well documented in both.

#### Records of Foreign Service Posts of the Department of State (RG 84)

This record group contains records created or collected by American embassies and consulates abroad. Although no



substitute for the Department's central office records, the documents in this record group provide a useful supplement to them, especially for scholars of German history. The post-World War II occupation period resulted in the creation of two unique sets of records pertaining to Germany. The first set is the records of the Office of the Political Advisor (POLAD) to the Military Government. The POLAD records consist of files maintained at the POLAD offices in Berlin and Frankfurt. The records of the Berlin office are by far the more voluminous and cover the years 1945-9, whereas those of the Frankfurt office document 1946-9. Both offices consist of a large central file arranged by the Department of State's foreign service-post filing scheme and several smaller series.

The second unique set of records is those files maintained by the U.S. Mission to Berlin. The Mission's general records cover primarily the years 1945-52. Rather than a single, large central file, these records are divided into numerous small series, such as the records of the Building and Housing Committee, the Education and Religious Affairs Committee, the Public Health Committee, the Local Government Committee, and the Labor Committee. The Mission's records also include the files of the American representative to the Allied Kommandatura (AK), 1945-90. These records are voluminous; the two most significant series are a massive central file arranged by the AK committee and files of the AK's Legal Committee pertaining to political affairs and international treaties. Researchers should note that there are virtually no finding aids for the AK records at this time.

The records of the U.S. embassy in Bonn and the American consulates in West Germany round out this record group. The declassified records of the U.S. embassy in Bonn currently cover the years 1949-61. In addition, there are records for the American consulates at Baden-Baden, 1946-8; Berlin, 1945-8 and 1953-5; Bremen, 1946-64; Düsseldorf, 1950-61; Frankfurt, 1949-61; Hamburg, 1946-64; Munich, 1946-58; and Stuttgart, 1946-61. The most important series for every post is its central file. Each central file is divided into several chronological segments

and thereunder according to the Department of State's foreign service post filing scheme. Please note that the Department changed the foreign service-post filing scheme in 1950, and researchers will need to consult appropriate filing manuals prior to ordering records.

#### Records of the United States High Commissioner to Germany (RG 466)

The occupation also resulted in the creation of another unique body of records, those of the U.S. High Commissioner (HICOG). Documenting the years 1949–55, the HICOG files are divided into two major sections, headquarters records and *Land* records. Arranged by HICOG office, the headquarters' records reflect all the occupation government's activities. Major office records include those of the Executive Director and Executive Secretary, Economic Affairs, General Counsel, Political Affairs, and U.S. Secretariat to the Allied High Commission.

Records pertaining to the four *Länder* document the activities of HICOG in each state. The records for Bavaria, Hessen and Baden-Württemberg each have a large central file maintained by the *Land* commissioner's office that provides the best overview of HICOG's activities on the state level. In addition, the records for those three states and Bremen contain records created by the state offices of HICOG's divisions, such as the Legal Affairs, Public Affairs, and Economic Affairs Divisions. Virtually all these records are now declassified and available to researchers.

#### Records of the United States Information Agency (RG 306)

The United States Information Agency (USIA) was created in 1953 to serve as the primary agent of American cultural and informational foreign policy. Records pertaining to Germany are located throughout the USIA's files. For example, it contains some records of the International Information Agency (IIA), a USIA predecessor, including the IIA's German program files, 1945–53. Researchers also may wish to examine the records of

the USIA's Exhibits Division, where there are files documenting USIA exhibits in Germany spanning the years 1955–67. In addition, there is a small collection of USIA publications pertaining to the America Houses, dated December 1949–December 1950.

The records of the USIA's Office of Research are especially rich. Researchers may wish to begin with the Office's research reports on German public opinion, 1949–62, and the country project correspondence files, 1955–61. Researchers should be certain, however, to examine the Office's other records. Covering the years 1953–93, these records consist of several series of special, research, foreign opinion barometer, and other reports and studies gauging foreign opinion and editorial comment on a wide range of issues, such as the state of the world economy, disarmament, the Vietnam conflict, and the Cold War in general.

#### Records of U.S. Foreign Assistance Agencies (RG 469)

This record group documents a number of agencies that existed between the end of World War II and the creation for the U.S. Agency for International Development in 1961, including the European Cooperation Administration, the Mutual Security Agency, and the Technical Cooperation Administration. It is divided into three major sections: headquarters records, the records of the United States Special Representative for Europe, and the records of United States Overseas Missions.

The most fruitful place to begin the search for records pertaining to Germany is among the records of the U.S. Special Representative for Europe (SRE). The SRE was responsible for overseeing virtually all American assistance agencies in Europe, and its records are rich and varied. Most of the information pertaining to Germany is in various country-subject files, commonly consisting of 1,000–2,000 pages of material. The records are only declassified through 1953 at this time.

Although the other two sections contain information pertaining to Germany, they are much less voluminous. The

material in the headquarters records is widely dispersed throughout numerous series of files and usually consists of single folders. Whereas they may be worthwhile to examine, the process is labor-intensive and requires examining a large number of file title lists. The records of the U.S. Overseas Mission (USOM) in Germany are much easier to use than those of the headquarters, though they are quite thin, consisting exclusively of the program and subject files of the USOM Office of Economic Affairs, 1951–3 and three series of the USOM Productivity and Technical Assistance Division, 1953–6.

#### Records of International Conferences, Commissions and Expositions (RG 43)

Researchers may wish to examine this record group to document the activities of American representatives to the Council of Foreign Ministers relating to Germany. Whereas most of the files pertain to meeting among the foreign ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, there are also records of meetings among those three powers and the USSR. Topics of interest to scholars of German history include the 1950–1 London and Paris Inter-Governmental Study Groups for Germany; the 1951–3 Tripartite Commission on German Debt; the 1952 meetings between the foreign ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany; and the 1954 Four-Power Conference in Berlin.

#### General Records of the Department of the Treasury (RG 56)

The records of the Department of the Treasury provide important documentation of American foreign economic policy. These records became especially valuable two years ago, when the National Archives opened the records of the Treasury Department's Office of the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs (OASIA). Although there is information pertaining to Germany throughout the files, historians should pay particular attention to OASIA's Subject Files relating to Germany, 1931–

52; Records relating to External Debt Settlement by West Germany, 1950–7; General Records of the Undersecretary for Monetary Affairs, 1965–8; and the several series of OASIA country files, 1945–59.

### Descriptive Aids

The staff of the National Archives has prepared a wide variety of descriptive aids to assist researchers understanding agency histories and the arrangement of the records. These inventories, reference reports, and file title lists are essential to a successful research experience, and visitors to the National Archives should plan to consult them at the beginning of their research trips. Prospective researchers would do well to begin with reference reports. These provide short, solid introductions to record groups and important series, and they are a handy way to gain familiarity with the records. If researchers write in advance of their trip, the staff of the National Archives will be glad to mail them pertinent reference reports. Other descriptive materials, such as inventories and file title lists, are available in rooms 2600 and 2000 of the National Archives at College Park.

*Kenneth W. Heger*

## Institute News

---

### Collaborative Research Program for Postdoctoral Scholars

The GHI now offers a new research program for postdoctoral scholars on the topic of continuity, change, and globalization in postwar Germany and America. This program is co-organized by the AICGS, and it is supported by the GAAC and the NEH. The program is designed to further communication and collaboration between American and German scholars working on postwar topics. The fruits of this partnership will be discussed at workshops and symposia to be held at the GHI and the AICGS.

American participants will be selected through the established NEH review process. The German counterparts will be selected by a joint committee of representatives from the GHI and the AICGS. The GHI is currently sponsoring a competition to select German scholars to join the research program for a period of six to twelve months. Specific research topics will be based on the research topics being pursued by the NEH grantees. Details on the competition can be found on the GHI's Web site ([www.ghi-dc.org](http://www.ghi-dc.org)).

Successful candidates will receive an overall award of DM 48,000, which serves both as salary replacement and travel allowance. They will be given the title of Visiting Research Scholar at the GHI or the AICGS. Office space and research facilities will be provided as needed.

The following scholars have been selected for 1999: Dr. Christine von Oertzen (Free University of Berlin), "Gender Politics in Postwar Germany and America"; and Dr. Hanna Schissler (Georg Eckert Institute, Braunschweig), "World History, Multi-Ethnicity, and National Identity in Schoolbooks and Curricula of the Federal Republic and the United States."

They will be working with Prof. Donna Harsch (Carnegie Mellon University), “The Revenge of the Domestic: Women and State Policy in the German Democratic Republic, 1945–1970”; and Prof. Yasemin Soysal (Harvard University), “Education, National Identity, and Citizenship in Postwar Europe: A Cross-National Study of Curricula and Texts.”

*Christof Mauch*

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

Max Planck Institute for History, Göttingen, April 22–25, 1998.

The Fourth Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History was again co-sponsored by the GHI, the GAAC, the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown University, and the Conference Group for Central European History.

Selected from a large pool of applicants, sixteen doctoral candidates—eight from the United States and eight from Germany— were invited to present their dissertation projects. Four historians from the United States and Europe served as mentors during the seminar: Prof. Thomas A. Brady Jr. (University of California at Berkeley), Prof. Mary Lindemann (Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh), Prof. Luise Schorn-Schütte (University of Potsdam), and Prof. Peter Becker (European University Institute, Florence). These historians moderated the sessions together with Prof. Hartmut Lehmann (Max Planck Institute for History, Göttingen), Prof. Roger Chickering (Georgetown University), and Dr. Andreas Daum (GHI).

As in the past, the doctoral students were the protagonists of the seminar. They represented diverse personal backgrounds, institutional affiliations, and research fields, all of which brought about vigorous discussion. The students’ topics ranged from social, political, religious, and medical history to the history of

law, academic disciplines, and everyday life. Simultaneously, dialogs between Americans and Germans crossed scholarly boundaries. In contrast to the previous seminars, the Göttingen meeting showed no clear dividing lines between Americans and Germans with respect to methodological approaches or topics chosen. The differences lay more in different modes of academic presentation.

The program was enhanced by an excursion to the nearby city of Duderstadt. The city's archivists introduced the participants to the pioneering project of digitizing archival holdings, which allows access to these holdings via the Internet. The group also visited the old city hall of Duderstadt, where the city's chief financial officer hosted a reception. Responding to the questionnaires that were distributed at the end of the seminar, all students praised the friendly atmosphere of the seminar, and they emphasized the benefits both for their own research and for establishing further academic contacts.

The Institute is pleased to announce that the Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar program will be continued. The Fifth Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar will take place in Washington, D.C., in April 1999 and will deal with "Germany in the Age of Revolution, 1789–1850." Please see the announcement on page 69.

The participants of the Göttingen conference and their projects were as follows:

Andreas Bähr (University of Halle-Wittenberg), „Selbsttötung und Selbstverständnis: Protestantismus und Aufklärung in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert.“

Michael Carhart (Rutgers University), "Autochthonous Cultures and the Question of Influence: The Scholarship of Pre-History in the 1770s and 1780s."

Eileen Crosby (Cornell University), "Claiming Honor: Litigants, Honor, and the Legal Process in Seventeenth-Century Saxony."

Magdalena Drexler (Ruhr University, Bochum), „Die 'Querelle des femmes' im Kontext des Brandenburgischen Hofes um 1600.“



David Freeman (Emory University), "Refugees and Civic Identity in Sixteenth-Century Wesel."

Dennis Frey (Syracuse University), "Wealth Management and the Handwerker Household in Göppingen, 1735–1806."

John Holloran (University of Virginia), "Competing Visions of Pedagogical Reform and the Founding of the University of Halle."

Vera Jung (University of Saarland, Saarbrücken), „Kirchweihfest und Tanz: Annäherungen an ein frühneuzeitliches Fest."

Andreas Klinger (University of Jena), "'Gute Policey, heilsame Justiz und die Wiederherstellung der Ehre Gottes': Die Durchsetzung von Ordnungsvorstellungen im Staatsbildungsprogramm Ernsts des Frommen von Sachsen-Gotha."

Amy Leonard (University of California at Berkeley), "The Ties that Bind: Nuns, Family, and Regime in Reformation Strasbourg."

Franz Mauelshagen (University of Bonn), „Christlich-moderner Prodigien Glaube in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten.“

Eva Ortlieb (University of Münster), "Die kaiserlichen Kommissionen des Reichshofrats und die Regelung von Konflikten im Alten Reich (1637–1657)."

Harriet Rudolph (University of Trier), "Disziplinierung durch Sanktionsverzicht? Peinliche Strafgerichtsbarkeit im Fürstbistum Osnabrück (1716–1802)."

Claudia Stein (University of Stuttgart), "Reframing a Sixteenth Century Disease: The French Pox in Germany."

Andre Wakefield, (University of Chicago), "From Law to Botany: The Reformation of the Cameral Sciences in Göttingen."

Michele Zelinsky (University of Pennsylvania), "Confessional Conflicts in Early Reformation Augsburg."

*Andreas W. Daum*

## Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture, 1998

On May 26, 1998, Prof. Sander L. Gilman of the University of Chicago presented the GHI's eighth annual Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture, titled "How I Became a German-Jurek Becker's Life in Five Worlds."

Gilman's main scholarly interest was the call for a serious consideration of the reconstitution of Jewish culture in the new Central Europe, in particular the rebirth of Jewish culture in Germany. As part of this enterprise he is now engaged in writing a new biography of Jurek Becker, the novelist, film and television screenwriter, and public intellectual who died on March 14, 1997. Gilman's approach as a critic is self-consciously empathetic, primarily because he was a friend of Becker's. It is also as a Jew himself that Gilman finds Becker's life and work of singular importance as a representation of the diasporic Jew.

Gilman intends to present Becker's life within the context of the multiple histories in which he lived—the history of all the Germanies since 1937, the history of the Jews in Europe, Poland, the German Democratic Republic (GDR), in Berlin, and finally in the (re-)united Germany. It is a cultural history, literary history, and media history of a Jewish concentration camp survivor and author, an Eastern European Jew who held a major position in the culture of both Germanies but who was also a completely secular Polish Jew at home in the new Germany. Becker's life is the complex tale of how he became a German writer while living in five different worlds. By crossing the border from Poland to Germany in 1945 and from the GDR to West Berlin in 1977, and then from Berlin to the Federal Republic of Germany with the reunification; by exchanging the Polish language for German; and by elegantly moving from film to television to fiction to essay, Becker tells us the story of Germany, of Central European Jews, of the role of culture in defining identity by examining his works and his life— never completely but certainly with a richly detailed narrative.

Becker's first world was the Poland of his birth and early childhood, from 1937 to 1939, a country of increasing political anti-Semitism that threatened the Jewish bourgeois. Multilingual, speaking Polish and Yiddish and even some German and Russian, these were Jews in the process of becoming Poles, as Jews in Germany had become German Jews.

For Jurek the child and for the other Jews in Lodz, occupied Poland quickly became the Poland of the ghettos and camps, the second world of his life. The middle-class, Polish-speaking child of Lodz becomes the Jew in the ghetto at Litzmannstadt. What made the Beckers into "Jews," at least according to Jurek's father, was the anti-Semitism of both the Poles and Germans.

Becker's life in the concentration camp, a world of consummate boredom and ultimate fear, is marked by the death (or murder) of his mother. This loss is central to his experience of the post-Shoah world. The missing mother resonates in all his writings. However, he claimed that this existence and experience left no impression. After the death of his mother and the liberation he lost his Polish and Yiddish "mother tongues," the *lingua franca* of the camps. As an adult Becker retained no memory of the Shoah or of his life prior to 1945.

The forgotten experiences of the past, the silence of his father, and the obsessive discussion of the Shoah in the GDR and the FRG all provided material for his work. Although Becker may not have remembered his experiences or the language in which they were cast, his literary work captured them.

Ironically, in 1945 Becker's father sought safety in Berlin, in a defeated and divided Germany whose shame was inscribed on its national body by its division— like the tattoo on his arm. After all, his father reasoned, "it wasn't the Polish anti-Semites who lost the war." Although Jurek Becker admitted to understanding himself as a Jew, he never felt himself to be a Pole. This was the result of what his father saw as the Polish betrayal of the Enlightenment's promise. Becker's new German identity was created as the antithesis to a Polish identity: For him, as for

his father, a secular Jewish, Polish identity represented the God that failed them.

It is with the move to Berlin and Becker's acquisition of the German language that his memories begin. His new language becomes the world that defines him. It is German that became the new mother tongue and the new mother, but it also heightened his awareness of the loss of his past. With no past, a tabula rasa, Becker became the model new German citizen, a good citizen of the GDR.

However, being Jewish in the GDR of the 1950s, particularly during the Stalinist anti-Semitic show trials, was not necessarily something that was seen as positive. It became a public and political sign of "split loyalties" in a world where the demand for a "universal" Marxist identity beyond national and religious definitions permitted only one level of identification, namely, that with the new state. The establishment of a new socialist German identity in the GDR was incompatible with a "Zionist" or "Jewish" identity.

A sense of belonging but also of being separate, of being a German but also of being a Jew, marks Becker as a German writer. It is his Jewish identity in Germany that is the underpinning of his sense of what being German and being Jewish was— his attempt to recoup loss through the command of language. This ambiguity of how to be both German and Jewish is a theme in all of his works.

Based on his experience of alienation, Becker began to write. From the beginning he had the sense that there was a close link between the tragic and the comic and that "tragedy must not always wear a dark suit and comedy a T-shirt." Although Becker took his writing seriously, whether as a novelist of first rank or as a TV screenwriter of broad acceptance, his was not a world of "high culture."

Becker learned to write in the GDR, as he later said, in a world in which writing had a "substitute quality," replacing newspapers and radio and film. It was writing from the margin, writing in code, a task well suited to someone who never felt

quite at home in his language, who always sensed his alienation from official literature.

Becker learned to write in the context of the half-spoken and partially overheard. Writing in a dictatorship (even of the proletariat) is difficult but in complex ways rewarding. Writers such as Becker, in his own estimation, had a greater freedom. The struggle with the state censor became a game. But it is greater freedom only within the self-conscious ability to exploit one's status as "Jewish" or "oppositional," as a spokesperson for a marginal position both within and beyond societal self-definitions.

These were heady years, years in which one could truly believe in what one was doing as one helped to build socialism and to guide it in new and positive directions through the act of writing. He initially wrote for the mass media, e.g., a sitcom for East German television and several DEFA-films. In 1965 Becker wrote his first serious script for DEFA, titled "Jakob der Lügner." Film seemed the preferable medium to Becker because it was a means of reaching the widest possible audience in a way that was not seen by the government as suspect or perverse. But to make a film in which a self-identified Jew and the murder of Jews stood at the center of the story was deemed politically unacceptable in 1965, and DEFA and the Ministry of Culture refused to permit the film to be made. In 1969 Becker turned the script into one of his best novels.

During 1977 Becker joined other writers of high visibility, such as Stefan Heym and Stephan Hermlin, to protest the official banishment of Wolf Biermann from the GDR. The Stasi spied on Becker, the party member and recipient of national honors, giving him the code name *Lügner*. The Jew as liar, misfit, and perpetual outsider was the theme that was given voice in the novel. In the secret coven of the Stasi, Becker had become a character in his own work.

In December 1977 Becker finally left the GDR, following Reiner Kunze's expulsion from the Writer's Union. He was given a two-year visa and encouraged to leave for West Berlin;

two years later the visa was extended. He continued to renew the visa until the GDR fell.

He did not go into exile, and he never truly left the GDR. He wrote in 1993 that “none of my books deal with the West, still today all of my texts, which I have published, take place in a country that no longer exists, in the GDR.... All my attempts to make my new, unfamiliar home a ‘*Heimat*,’ the subject of my books, have been in vain.”

It is in the remarkable city of “Westberlin” (according to East German nomenclature), an artificial construct of the Cold War fixed in time, that Becker felt himself most at home. Coming to the “West” in 1977 meant coming to a city in which he could always feel himself only one step away from returning to the GDR. In the middle of the GDR and yet not of it, Berlin was neither fish nor fowl. He called it a “middle thing,... a Western, capitalist economy designed by a GDR firm.” It was a place for misfits, for deviants. It signified the ability for individual change and growth in spite of the prevailing models of social identity in both the FRG and GDR. It was a virtual city “where one’s contradictions are taken most seriously,” and Jurek Becker became one of its real inhabitants.

He quickly became one of the major German cinematic writers. He was invited to write the screenplay for the first film about the Shoah in West Germany, *David* (1979), undertaken by a Jewish writer and a Jewish director (Peter Lilienthal). He completed his trilogy of novels as well as his great novella *Die Mauer*, all of which are a major literary record of the survival—not the death—of Jews in Germany, of the reclamation of Jewish culture, no matter how fragmentary and misunderstood. As a screenwriter Becker’s impact on the “average” German’s understanding of Berlin (or at least of Kreuzberg) was substantial. In 1986–7 he began work on what was to become the most popular German television series ever, *Liebling - Kreuzberg*, in which his close friend and fellow East German Manfred Krug portrayed a new type of liberal popular hero.

With the fall of the Wall he became one of the most articulate spokespeople for a new, kinder, more self-critical Germany. And the man who wrote that he did not know how he had become a Jew came to realize that he stood at the epicenter of new Jewish writing in the new Germany.

The division of Germany seemed a natural one for Becker, as for other German Jews. The question of a new, reunited Germany, of a vanished GDR, was problematic for him. Although he became one of its first chroniclers, he was not convinced of the desirability of, or the need for, reunification.

In a piece first published in the United States, Becker bemoaned the radical shift in the function of literature in the GDR and the FRG. He saw in the imminent reunification of the Germanies a “reunification” of the literature of the new Germany under the banner of the FRG. His critique of the newly reunified Germany found its expression in the film *Neuner* (1990) and in the nine-part miniseries *Wir sind auch nur ein Volk* in 1994.

He saw the role of literature of the GDR as not “merely” oppositional but as a space in which ideas could be debated seriously. This function seemed to have disappeared with the end of the GDR. However, the revelation of betrayals among East German authors, many of them his close personal friends who had collaborated with the Stasi, called this benign interpretation into question.

Difference is at the core of Becker’s structuring of the world. And here the diasporic imagination becomes a tool in learning to represent productive disparities of awareness. Becker thus is one of the great examples of the resolution of “multiculturalism” in Germany—a Pole and a German, a Jew and an *Ostler*, a producer of high as well as mass culture—all of which made sense of his unique position.

*Raimund Lammersdorf*

## Recipients of the GHI's Dissertation Scholarships, 1999

Suzanne Brown-Fleming, "The Holocaust and Catholic Conscience: Discourse on Guilt, Responsibility, and Victimization Amongst German Catholics, 1945–1950".  
Doctoral advisor: Prof. James F. Harris, University of Maryland at College Park.

Jennifer Fay, "The Business of Cultural Diplomacy: Hollywood in Occupied Germany, 1945–1949." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Vance Kepley Jr., University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Alexandra M. Friedrich, "Awakenings: Vietnam's Impact on West German-American Relations in the 1960s." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Richard Immerman, Temple University.

Ulrike Goeken, „Die Repatriierung sowjetischer Zwangsarbeiter und Kriegsgefangener aus Westeuropa seit 1914.“ Doctoral adviser: Prof. Ulrich Herbert, University of Freiburg.

Lauren Heberle, "Gender and Social Status in Extremist Social Movements: The Nazi Party, 1919–1929." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Helmut Anheir, Rutgers University.

Felicitas Hentschke, „Die Besatzungspolitik der USA in Japan und Deutschland 1945–1955 am Beispiel der Demokratisierungspolitik.“ Doctoral adviser: Prof. Wolfgang Jacobmeyer, Free University of Berlin.

Ralf Hühner, "Die Dekolonisierung Mikronesiens: Interessen und Konzeptionen der USA von 1947 bis 1994." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Wolfgang Leidhold, University of Cologne.

Claus K. Meyer, "King Cotton and Krautjunker: Social Relations on Slave Plantations in Antebellum South Carolina and Noble Estates in Eighteenth-Century Brandenburg." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Winfried Schulze, European University Institute, Florence.

Kathrin Meyer, "Frauen in US-amerikanischen Internierungslagern in Deutschland 1945–1952." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Karl-Heinz Füssl, Technical University of Berlin.



Volker Nies, „*Apaisement* in Asien? Frankreich und die Fernost-Krise 1937–1939." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Klaus Hildebrand, University of Bonn.

Kiran Klaus Patel, "Strategien gegen die Grosse Depression: Arbeitsdienste, im 'Dritten Reich' und im New Deal in vergleichender Perspektive." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Heinrich August Winkler, Humboldt University, Berlin.

Brigitte Ramscheid, "Das aussenpolitische Denken Herbert Blankenhorns: Blankenhorn und die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Hans-Peter Schwarz, University of Bonn.

Michael Schmidtke, "Vergleichende Analyse der 1968er Bewegung in den USA und der Bundesrepublik." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, University of Bielefeld.

Peer Volkmann, "Heinrich Brüning im amerikanischen Exil." Doctoral adviser: Prof. Josef Becker, University of Augsburg.

## Library Report

Among the recent acquisitions of the GHI library is the 60 volume series, *Germans to America: Lists of Passengers Arriving at U.S. Ports*, edited by Ira A. Glazier and P. William Filby and published by Scholarly Resources (Wilmington, De.) This reference work provides both the historian and the genealogist with an extensive database of German immigrants who came to the United States between 1850 and the 1900. The lists are indexed first by ship at the port of debarkation and then by family name. With the information available in these volumes, researchers will be able to go beyond gross statistical profiles to study immigration movements at the level of microhistory— to follow individuals and families from their place of origin to their destination and to focus on their personal circumstances.

Furthermore, the library has extended its holdings in the field of Berlin history. The Library's more recent acquisitions

include Peter Fritzsche, *Reading Berlin 1900*, Cambridge, Mass., 1998; Thomas Parrish, *Berlin in the Balance*, Reading, Mass, 1998; Alexandra Ritchie, *Faust's Metropolis: A History of Berlin*, New York, 1998; Ronald Taylor, *Berlin and Its Culture*, New Haven, Conn., 1997; and Michael Z. Wise, *Germany's Search for a New Architecture of Democracy*, New York, 1998.

We also are proud to announce that the software that runs the Library catalog, "Inmagic," has been updated. Our readers will now find it even easier to browse the library's catalog via the accustomed Windows graphic interface. Finally, we have improved our services on our Web site ([www.ghi-dc.org](http://www.ghi-dc.org)): The online catalog will now include all the library's periodicals.

*Monika Hein*

## Staff Changes

BARBARA AMARASINGHAM, Receptionist, born in Storman, Schleswig-Holstein. In her previous position she was in charge of the Subsidiary Disbursement Office at the German Armed Forces Representation in Washington, D.C. Mrs. Amarasingham has lived in Africa and the Middle East, where she worked in primary schools and as a volunteer at the American Center for Oriental Research.

UTA ANDREA BALBIER, Intern, October-December 1998. Currently studying history, political science, and journalism at the University of Münster. Ms. Balbier is working on various projects, including research at libraries and archives, and proofreading and fact-checking of scholarly texts.

MONIKA HEIN, GHI Librarian, born in Bonn. Ms. Hein studied at the University of Madrid and completed a degree in library science in Cologne in 1988. Her previous work experience includes the Hochschulbibliothekszenrum des Landes

Nordrhein-Westfalen in Cologne, the library of the GHI London, and the library of the German Bundestag in Bonn.

THOMAS L. HUGHES, Senior Visiting Research Fellow, born in Minnesota. B.A. Carleton College; B. Phil., M.A. Oxford University; LLB, J.D. Yale Law School. Mr. Hughes was assistant secretary of state during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations; for many years thereafter he served as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He also is a trustee of several German-American institutions. Dr. Hughes will work on an extended essay on the life and times of Sigismund, Archbishop of Magdeburg (1555–66) and Margrave of Brandenburg (1538–66)—a snapshot of realpolitik involving several interacting relationships, including Brandenburg-Poland, Prussia-Poland, Reformation-Counterreformation, as well as Charles V, the Hohenzollerns, and the Papacy.

KATHRIN KLEIN, Intern, July-September 1998; M.A., University of Munich; currently pursuing an M.A. in Political Science at the School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) at The Johns Hopkins University. Ms. Klein worked on various projects, including research in libraries and archives, preparation of conferences, and proofreading of scholarly texts.

LUSI KITANIA MCKINLEY, Editorial Assistant for the Cold War project, born in Bandung, Indonesia. B.A. in German, Padjadjaran University, Bandung, Indonesia; M.A., German Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore, Otto Friedrich University, Bamberg. Before arriving at the GHI, Mrs. McKinley worked as a German-language instructor for the Goethe Institute's "Sprachbrücke" program at the Big Bend Community College extension in Baumholder, and later as an Indonesian language instructor for the U.S. attache officers at the Inlingua language school in Rosslyn.

## Visits to the Institute

---

### German History and Art History Students at the GHI

On October 1, 1998, a group of German students from the history department at the University of Braunschweig and the department of art history at the University of Oldenburg visited the German Historical Institute. They were accompanied by Prof. Herbert Mehrrens (Braunschweig) and Prof. Silke Wenk (Oldenburg). The purpose of their visit was to discuss the mission, objectives, and ongoing research of the GHI. They also met for a seminar on representations of American history in public spaces. The group's visit was part of an excursion titled "Sites of Memory in the United States."

## Calendar of Events

---

### Fall 1998 Lecture Series

#### *"History and Biography"*

- September 24      Deborah Hertz (Sarah Lawrence College)  
*Was Rahel Varnhagen a Self Hating Jew?*
- October 22        David B. Dennis (Loyola University of Chicago)  
*"O Freunde, nicht diese Töne": Beethoven Biography as Propaganda*
- November 5        Ian Kershaw (University of Sheffield)  
*Problems of a New Hitler Biography*
- November 24      Sabine Freitag (GHI London)  
*Friedrich Hecker Revolution, Emigration, Commemoration*
- December 3        Ruth Lewin Sime (Sacramento City College)  
*Politics, "Race," and Gender: Lise Meitner and the Discovery of Nuclear Fission*
- December 10      David E. Barclay (Kalamazoo College)  
*Ernst Reuter: The Problem of Cold War Hagiography*

### Upcoming Conferences and Workshops

"A Search for Genius in Weimar Germany: The *Abraham-Lincoln-Stiftung* and American Philanthropy." Workshop at the GHI, January 21, 1999. Speakers: Malcolm Richardson (President's

Committee on the Arts and the Humanities), Eckhardt Fuchs (GHI, and Frank Trommler (University of Pennsylvania).

“The American Impact on Western Europe: Americanization and Westernization in Transatlantic Perspective.” Conference at the GHI, March 25–28, 1999. Conveners: Volker R. Berghahn (Columbia University), Anselm Doering-Manteuffel (University of Tübingen), and Christof Mauch (GHI).

“18<sup>th</sup> Brumaire Conference.” Conference at Hunter College, CUNY, New York, August 25–28, 1999. Co-sponsored by the GHI and the Conference for the Study of Political Thought. Convener: Melvin Richter (CUNY).

“The Shadows of Total War: Europe, East Asia, and the United States, 1919–1939.” Conference at Münchenwiler, Switzerland, August 25–28, 1999. Conveners: Roger Chickering (Georgetown University) and Stig Förster (University of Bern).

“Before Television: Mass Media, Political Cultures, and the Public Sphere in Western Europe and the United States, 1900–1950.” Conference at the GHI, September 23–26, 1999. Convener: Thomas Goebel.

“Berlin-Washington, 1800–2000: Capital Cities, Cultural Representations, and National Identities.” Conference at the GHI, November 1999. Conveners: Andreas W. Daum (GHI) and Christof Mauch (GHI).

## Second International Media Conference

Atlantik-Brücke and Deutsche Welle, in cooperation with the GHI, have organized a second international media conference with German and American journalists. The lively discussions of the first conference, held in November 1997, and the broad interest it

generated convinced the organizers that they have opened up an important topic for a continuing transatlantic dialog. The second conference, titled “The Fourth Power: Media and Democracy in a World of Concentration and Fragmentation” will take place at the Institute on January 28–30, 1999.

The vital contribution of the media— widely seen as the “Fourth Power”— to the functioning of democracies is under challenge. The concentration of media ownership in ever fewer hands threatens to change this power in ways potentially harmful to the necessary pluralism of democratic societies. Media moguls may come to dominate more than just the media. At the same time, the fragmentation of media content, encouraged by the information revolution, tends to render the media ever more sensational and irresponsible. How to deal with the dual challenges of concentration and fragmentation will be the topic of the second conference.

## Friends of the GHI

---

### Seventh Annual Symposium of the Friends of the GHI

In its continuing effort to better acquaint the Friends with the work of the research fellows at the Institute, their seventh annual symposium will feature presentations by two of the fellows, Philipp Gassert and Raimund Lammersdorf, in addition to presentations by the winners of this year's Friends Dissertation Prize, Michelle Mouton and Timothy R. Vogt. The symposium will take place on November 13, 1998, in the GHI lecture hall. Following the welcoming remarks by Geoffrey Giles, president of the Friends, and Detlef Junker, director of the GHI, Dr. Gassert will give a talk on "A Man with a Past: Kurt Georg Kiesinger and West German *Vergangenheitspolitik*, 1949–1969." Following this, Dr. Lammersdorf will speak on "Continuity and Change in German Westernization, 1945–1949: Encounters Between the Political Cultures of Germany and the United States." After lunch, Dr. Mouton will present "From Nurturing the Nation to Purifying the Volk: Conflicts in the Implementation of German Family Policy, 1918–1945," and Dr. Vogt will speak on "Denazification in the Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany: Brandenburg, 1945–1948."



## Notices and Announcements

---

### Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History, 1999 "Germany in the Age of Revolution, 1789–1850."

The GHI, the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown University, and the Conference Group for Central European History are pleased to announce the Fifth Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar in German History. The conference is once again supported by the German-American Academic Council and will convene in Washington, D.C., April 21–24, 1999.

The seminar is meant to bring together young scholars from Germany and North America nearing the completion of their doctoral degrees. Eight scholars from each side of the Atlantic will be invited to discuss their doctoral projects. The discussions will be based on papers submitted in advance and will be conducted in German and English. Travel costs and lodging expenses will be covered by the seminar's sponsors.

The theme of this year's seminar will be "Germany in the Age of Revolution, 1789–1850." Applications are now being accepted from doctoral students whose work deals principally with this era and who will not have finished their degrees before June 1999. Applications should include a short (2–3 pp.) project description, a curriculum vitae, and a letter of reference from the applicant's doctoral adviser.

Please send applications by **December 1, 1998, to:**

Transatlantic Doctoral Seminar  
German Historical Institute  
1607 New Hampshire Ave, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20009

## Summer Program 1999

The Summer Program, co-organized by the GHI Washington and the German Department of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, is designed to introduce graduate students to the German handwriting styles of previous centuries, expose them to a variety of German archives, familiarize them with major research topics in German culture and history, and encourage the exchange of ideas among the next generation of American scholars. Our main purpose is to assist participants in planning the course of their future dissertation research in Germany.

Participants will attend courses on German handwriting and in archival science at the federal and state archives in Koblenz. They also will visit a wide variety of archives, including business, media, church, city, and university archives.

During the program, participants will be exposed to German archival organization and practices, and, at each stop, archivists will discuss the history and use of their respective collections. Students will have an opportunity to explore finding aids and to meet individually with archivists. The planned itinerary is as follows: Koblenz for the first week, day trips to Bonn and Heidelberg, and then the final two days in Cologne.

Ten North American graduate students will be selected to participate. The program will provide round-trip air fare (economy class, tourist rate) to Germany, transportation via rail to the various destinations, and accommodations (double occupancy). Students already in Europe will be reimbursed for rail travel to and from Koblenz, our starting point.

Please forward applications by **December 31, 1998**, to:

Summer Program 1999  
German Historical Institute  
1607 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20009

Candidates must be enrolled in a Ph.D. program. Preference will be given to those who have already chosen a dissertation topic that makes the consultation of German archives necessary. Candidates also must be fluent in German. All applicants will be notified by February 15, 1999. For specific information about the program, please contact Dr. Christof Mauch, Deputy Director, [e-mail: mauch@idt.net](mailto:mauch@idt.net).

## GHI Dissertation Scholarships

Each year the GHI awards scholarships of up to six months' duration to doctoral students researching topics related to the Institute's general interests. Applications should include a curriculum vitae, a research proposal (dates, itinerary, project summary), and a letter from the applicant's doctoral adviser.

Please forward applications by **May 13, 1999**, to:

GHI Dissertation Scholarships  
German Historical Institute  
1607 New Hampshire Ave., N. W.  
Washington, DC 20009

American students applying for these scholarships should be working on topics in German history for which they need to evaluate sources in the United States. For more information, please contact Dr. Christof Mauch, Deputy Director, [e-mail: mauch@idt.net](mailto:mauch@idt.net).

## The GHI's New Habilitation Scholarships

Each year the GHI awards Dissertation Scholarships of up to six months' duration to German and American doctoral students in the field of German and American history and transatlantic relations.

Starting in 2000 the GHI also will award one or two short-term scholarships of one- to three months' duration to habilitation scholars who are researching topics related to the Institute's general areas of interest. Applications should include a curriculum vitae, a research

proposal no more than ten pages in length (including itinerary), and a letter of recommendation from the applicant's adviser.

Please forward applications by **May 31, 1999**, to:

GHI Scholarships  
German Historical Institute  
1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20009

For more information, please contact, Dr. Christof Mauch, Deputy Director, [e-mail: mauch@idt.net](mailto:mauch@idt.net).

### Recipients of the German-American Center for Visiting Scholars (GACVS) Research Grants 1998/1999

Bosch, Anna, M.A. "Case Studies of Latino Communities in Washington, D.C.: Relevance to European Countries in the Era of Ever-Expanding European Unification, of Open Borders and Mass Wave Immigration." University of Bonn.

Breska, Eric von, Ph.D. candidate "The Lending Policy of the IMF and the World Bank Toward Russia." Center for Applied Political Science, University of Munich.

Bultmann, Julia, M.A. "Basic Contents and Methods in the Work of Church Career Development Centers and Career Development Centers in the USA" University of Göttingen.

Fleming, Susanne, Ph.D. candidate "The Holocaust and Catholic Conscience: Discourse on Guilt, Responsibility, and Victimization Amongst German Catholics, 1945–1950." University of Maryland at College Park.

Geist, Helmut, Dr. "Social and Environmental Implications of Tobacco Farming (and Processing)." University of Düsseldorf.

Greven, Thomas, Ph.D. candidate "Coping with Globalization: International Labor Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy." Free University of Berlin.

- Hahn, Barbara, Dr. "Changing Retail Concepts and Retail Locations in the USA." University of Lüneburg.
- Hensel, Silke, Dr. "Ethnic Differentiation and Conflicts in a 'Multicultural' Society: Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans in the United States, Twentieth Century." University of Bielefeld.
- Hertkorn, Michaela, M.A. "Political Actors Within the Fields of Preventive Diplomacy, Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation: A Comparative Analysis Between the USA, Germany and Some Selected European Countries Regarding the Actors." Free University of Berlin.
- Kirchhoff, Jochen, M.A. "The German Rockefeller Committee on Social Sciences of the Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft, 1923–1936: A History of Transatlantic Philanthropy and International Science Policy." University of Munich.
- Pickenhan, Katrin, Dr. "When Ideas Travel: The Impact of Scottish Enlightenment Thought on the American Founding Fathers: A Case Study on John Witherspoon, Francis Alison, and James Wilson." Free University of Berlin.
- Römmele, Andrea, Dr. "Direct Communication Between Political Parties and Voters in the United States and Germany." University of Mannheim.
- Sabrow, Martin, Dr. "Historische Forschung und Herrschaftsdiskurs: Ausbildung und Wandel der 'sozialistischen Geschichtswissenschaft' in der DDR am Beispiel historiographischer Grossforschungsprojekte (1949–1989)." Center for Contemporary Studies, Potsdam.
- Thunert, Martin, Dr. "A 'Third Way' Beyond 'Big Government' and 'Anti-Government'? Governing Philosophies and Public Policies During the Clinton Administration." University of Hamburg.
- Beestermöller, Gerhard, Dr. habil. "The Call for Reconciliation as a Challenge to Theology." Institute for Peace, Barsbüttel.