

LAUDATIO FOR KONRAD JARAUSCH by *Elizabeth Heineman* (University of Iowa)

Crossing the Atlantic Divide with the Carrboro School: An Appreciation of Konrad Jarausch

It's an honor to be asked to speak at this celebration of Konrad Jarausch's 65th birthday. I first met Professor Jarausch in the spring of 1986, when I visited several campuses in an effort to choose a PhD program. Professor Jarausch, needless to say, was a big part of my decision to attend the University of North Carolina. In my second year at Chapel Hill, I joined a group house that included three Germanists and a historian of Britain. It was there that we dubbed the team of students working with Professors Jarausch and Gerhard Weinberg the "Carrboro School," after the former mill village right next door to Chapel Hill whose lower rents were popular with grad students. I imagine we must just have slogged through a stack of articles on the Bielefeld School. We were in any case convinced that UNC was a very exciting place to do German history.

Deciding what to talk about today was no easy talk. What, exactly, could I NOT discuss? Professor Jarausch's breadth is one of his trademarks: he has been an important voice in nearly every discussion regarding modern German history in the last several decades. He has published on an enormous range of topics, each time making a major intervention. In taking on high politics – the career of Chancellor Bethmann-Holweg – he joined the Fischer controversy concerning German guilt in the First World War. Turning to nineteenth century German liberalism, Professor Jarausch looked towards large political movements to put his stamp on discussions about Germany's Sonderweg. Shifting his focus to the history of social groups, he examined students and professionals to confront the failures of German liberalism in the early twentieth century. Critically eyeing the either-or frameworks of totalitarian versus apologetic analyses of the GDR, Professor Jarausch offered an interpretation that integrated political and social history: the notion of a "welfare dictatorship." His latest book, covering sixty years since the end of World War II,

LAUDATIO FOR KONRAD JARAUSCH by *Christoph Kleßmann*translated by *Patricia Casey Sutcliffe*

Building Contemporary History at Potsdam – Personal Remarks on a Partnership

Dear friends of the GHI, dear colleagues, and dear honoree, Konrad, whom I am addressing here in English for the first time!

To begin with, I would like to thank German Historical Institute very warmly for its generous invitation. It came as a surprise to me, and I view it as something special. I was glad to accept it. I would also like to thank Patricia Sutcliffe for the English translation of my German text.

What do you do when you are supposed to say farewell to a colleague you have worked with for many years? You praise him extensively, of course. You stress his immortal service to scholarship; you utter not a word about conflicts, and, perhaps, you offer a few wise words of advice or best wishes for the future. Other people are doing that today. My role is a special one: of course, I will try to sing his praises, but as I do so, I will pursue one question above all: How is it that an American came to Potsdam? What drove him to deal with the GDR—a small state that founded? It was not much bigger than Northrhine-Westphalia, the largest German state, where I come from. After the end of this little GDR in 1990, there was an amazing, adventurous and frightening boom in research into its history. This boom had many facets, including spectacular, political, methodological, as well as very personal ones. I'd like to discuss some of these.

One answer to this question suggests itself right away: Konrad was born in Magdeburg, a once significant industrial city and a center of the social democratic workers' movement. So his birthplace may have influenced his interests. But this answer is only superficial because Konrad grew up in Bavaria and the Rhineland before he turned his back on Adenauer's authoritarian Germany and repaired to the great freedom of the USA. As far as I can tell, early on he became interested in German history and studied it intensely. His first subject was Bethmann-Hollweg, the chancellor with war aims in the First World War. Konrad's research in this area did indeed take him to the state archives in Potsdam in the 1960s, but this stay was no doubt unmotivating, expensive, tiring, and often even boring. For in the GDR at that time, you were not allowed to leave the town named in your visa. Moreover, you were kept under surveillance, and the food was not particularly good. Still, these research trips, which would have been nearly impossible for West Germans at that time, may well have given Konrad his first insight into the daily life of "real-existing socialism".

I do not need to go into Konrad's numerous scholarship and research trips to West Germany, nor the many topics that occupied him there. His soft spot for Germany came perhaps from having temporarily turned his back on it. An incident described at the beginning of his latest book might help to give us more insight into his motivations. It is called *Die Umkehr: Deutsche Wandlungen, 1945-1995*, literally *The Reversal: German Transformations* and translated into English as *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans*. Konrad describes one of his trips at the beginning of the Seventies. He remarks on his experience at the passport control at the Frankfurt Airport. There was a bearded civil servant with an open collar and a crooked tie who, after a short glance at his passport, wished him a pleasant stay. This scene stunned Konrad. Did this casual behavior of a uniformed representative of the state indicate a fundamental change in German society and culture?

The answer is clear, and Konrad pursued this theme of the fundamental transformation of Germany and its political culture intensively.

I cannot remember when I met Konrad for the first time—probably in Bielefeld, the bastion of German social history since the Seventies. There is an old, smug rhyme about this provincial town with an excellent university. It sarcastically addresses the discrepancy between its provincialism and its excellence: „Seh’n wir uns nicht in dieser Welt, dann seh’n wir uns in Bielefeld“. [Roughly, If we don't meet anywhere else, then we'll meet in Bielefeld.] When the end of the GDR was hardly conceivable, Konrad took part in an initiative to establish contacts between historians from the GDR and the USA. Of course, it turned out to be a dead end in the long run because the GDR ceased to exist. But no one could have predicted that. All reasonably enlightened people at that time assumed that the second German state would last indefinitely. The “normalization” of détente policy had even left its mark on historical scholarship. Mentioning these sorts of contacts is important, I think, because they would later considerably ease the necessary dialogue between scholars from East and West that we successfully undertook in Potsdam.

Things got serious in 1989 with the great upheaval of the second half of the twentieth century: the GDR raced toward its end, and reunification completely shook up politics in Germany. The German academic world faced wholly new challenges. At the American Historical Association conference in Chicago in 1990, Konrad invited me to participate on a panel that he organized. After that, we were in ever closer contact during his stay as a visiting professor in Potsdam. He had a position at the institute founded by the Max-Planck Society with the cumbersome name “Research Focus: Studies in Contemporary History”. The founding father was Jürgen Kocka. Af-

ter some detours, in 1995 the Center for Contemporary Historical Research (Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung [ZZF]) emerged from this. Together we organized this new center. I had moved from Bielefeld at that time to the land of Theodor Fontane and the University of Potsdam, and I was included in the plans for the institution. After Kocka withdrew from the center, I insisted with good reason that I would not undertake this adventure alone but only together with Konrad.

Potsdam—the symbol of Prussia and all it stood for—and for that reason it was still being bombed in April 1945—but it was also a site of the European enlightenment, and, today, is a prominent center of scholarly research, especially in the natural sciences and technology. Military history and—of course—contemporary history—are prominent there, too. These are some common associations with this small, lovely city neighboring Berlin.

I imagine that both of us think back fondly on these early years of the institute because there is always something exhilarating about new organizations. After all, one doesn't know what will become of the child one has brought into the world. Our exciting task was to offer new positions to a group of colleagues from the former Academy of Sciences of the GDR—to Osis, in other words. We mixed them with West German scholars, Wessis, in a new institute. That was challenging both politically and intellectually. There were unavoidable issues, and political and bureaucratic troubles. We suddenly had to put together a budget for the scarce funds the state of Brandenburg had allotted for the institute, and we had only vague notions of what one should look like or whether we were doing it correctly. But the biggest challenge was developing research projects for our employees. The German Research Foundation, our future sponsor, would have to

LAUDATIO FOR KONRAD JARAUSCH by *Christoph Kleßmann*translated by *Patricia Casey Sutcliffe*

Building Contemporary History at Potsdam – Personal Remarks on a Partnership

Dear friends of the GHI, dear colleagues, and dear honoree, Konrad, whom I am addressing here in English for the first time!

To begin with, I would like to thank German Historical Institute very warmly for its generous invitation. It came as a surprise to me, and I view it as something special. I was glad to accept it. I would also like to thank Patricia Sutcliffe for the English translation of my German text.

What do you do when you are supposed to say farewell to a colleague you have worked with for many years? You praise him extensively, of course. You stress his immortal service to scholarship; you utter not a word about conflicts, and, perhaps, you offer a few wise words of advice or best wishes for the future. Other people are doing that today. My role is a special one: of course, I will try to sing his praises, but as I do so, I will pursue one question above all: How is it that an American came to Potsdam? What drove him to deal with the GDR—a small state that founded? It was not much bigger than Northrhine-Westphalia, the largest German state, where I come from. After the end of this little GDR in 1990, there was an amazing, adventurous and frightening boom in research into its history. This boom had many facets, including spectacular, political, methodological, as well as very personal ones. I'd like to discuss some of these.

One answer to this question suggests itself right away: Konrad was born in Magdeburg, a once significant industrial city and a center of the social democratic workers' movement. So his birthplace may have influenced his interests. But this answer is only superficial because Konrad grew up in Bavaria and the Rhineland before he turned his back on Adenauer's authoritarian Germany and repaired to the great freedom of the USA. As far as I can tell, early on he became interested in German history and studied it intensely. His first subject was Bethmann-Hollweg, the chancellor with war aims in the First World War. Konrad's research in this area did indeed take him to the state archives in Potsdam in the 1960s, but this stay was no doubt unmotivating, expensive, tiring, and often even boring. For in the GDR at that time, you were not allowed to leave the town named in your visa. Moreover, you were kept under surveillance, and the food was not particularly good. Still, these research trips, which would have been nearly impossible for West Germans at that time, may well have given Konrad his first insight into the daily life of "real-existing socialism".

I do not need to go into Konrad's numerous scholarship and research trips to West Germany, nor the many topics that occupied him there. His soft spot for Germany came perhaps from having temporarily turned his back on it. An incident described at the beginning of his latest book might help to give us more insight into his motivations. It is called *Die Umkehr: Deutsche Wandlungen, 1945-1995*, literally *The Reversal: German Transformations* and translated into English as *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans*. Konrad describes one of his trips at the beginning of the Seventies. He remarks on his experience at the passport control at the Frankfurt Airport. There was a bearded civil servant with an open collar and a crooked tie who, after a short glance at his passport, wished him a pleasant stay. This scene stunned Konrad. Did this casual behavior of a uniformed representative of the state indicate a fundamental change in German society and culture?

The answer is clear, and Konrad pursued this theme of the fundamental transformation of Germany and its political culture intensively.

I cannot remember when I met Konrad for the first time—probably in Bielefeld, the bastion of German social history since the Seventies. There is an old, smug rhyme about this provincial town with an excellent university. It sarcastically addresses the discrepancy between its provincialism and its excellence: „Seh’n wir uns nicht in dieser Welt, dann seh’n wir uns in Bielefeld“. [Roughly, If we don't meet anywhere else, then we'll meet in Bielefeld.] When the end of the GDR was hardly conceivable, Konrad took part in an initiative to establish contacts between historians from the GDR and the USA. Of course, it turned out to be a dead end in the long run because the GDR ceased to exist. But no one could have predicted that. All reasonably enlightened people at that time assumed that the second German state would last indefinitely. The “normalization” of détente policy had even left its mark on historical scholarship. Mentioning these sorts of contacts is important, I think, because they would later considerably ease the necessary dialogue between scholars from East and West that we successfully undertook in Potsdam.

Things got serious in 1989 with the great upheaval of the second half of the twentieth century: the GDR raced toward its end, and reunification completely shook up politics in Germany. The German academic world faced wholly new challenges. At the American Historical Association conference in Chicago in 1990, Konrad invited me to participate on a panel that he organized. After that, we were in ever closer contact during his stay as a visiting professor in Potsdam. He had a position at the institute founded by the Max-Planck Society with the cumbersome name “Research Focus: Studies in Contemporary History”. The founding father was Jürgen Kocka. Af-

ter some detours, in 1995 the Center for Contemporary Historical Research (Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung [ZZF]) emerged from this. Together we organized this new center. I had moved from Bielefeld at that time to the land of Theodor Fontane and the University of Potsdam, and I was included in the plans for the institution. After Kocka withdrew from the center, I insisted with good reason that I would not undertake this adventure alone but only together with Konrad.

Potsdam—the symbol of Prussia and all it stood for—and for that reason it was still being bombed in April 1945—but it was also a site of the European enlightenment, and, today, is a prominent center of scholarly research, especially in the natural sciences and technology. Military history and—of course—contemporary history—are prominent there, too. These are some common associations with this small, lovely city neighboring Berlin.

I imagine that both of us think back fondly on these early years of the institute because there is always something exhilarating about new organizations. After all, one doesn't know what will become of the child one has brought into the world. Our exciting task was to offer new positions to a group of colleagues from the former Academy of Sciences of the GDR—to Osis, in other words. We mixed them with West German scholars, Wessis, in a new institute. That was challenging both politically and intellectually. There were unavoidable issues, and political and bureaucratic troubles. We suddenly had to put together a budget for the scarce funds the state of Brandenburg had allotted for the institute, and we had only vague notions of what one should look like or whether we were doing it correctly. But the biggest challenge was developing research projects for our employees. The German Research Foundation, our future sponsor, would have to

approve of them before any money was available. That was hard, and it still is, because the evaluations occurred every two years. There were different reasons for this, but it was tough and sometimes even absurd. The German Science Council last year ironically and admiringly observed that the ZZF was probably the most frequently evaluated institute in Europe! This pressure of constant evaluation certainly strengthened the employees' will to survive and the directors' resistance. But we also had to learn to accept defeat. The rejection of projects is normal in the scholarly enterprise. Yet for the East German employees, it was a completely new and depressing experience. In the GDR, they had enjoyed positions that were quite secure, though not luxurious. When their projects were rejected, we needed to be imaginative to develop new topics, and we needed to be sensitive to their feelings.

East German history was a political minefield at that time. Fierce public controversies erupted. Who should be allowed to write GDR history? What approaches should be taken? The debates about totalitarian theories from the Fifties experienced a remarkable renaissance. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* became the mouthpiece for the polemics against our institute by young East German scholars who had opposed the socialist system. They attacked above all the founding father, Jürgen Kocka, and suspected that there were dark insider relationships between West German and former SED historians. They called it “The Bielefeld Way.” This title was designed to call forth associations with the “Bitterfeld Way” that Ulbricht had proclaimed in 1959. This has all long since become a matter for historiography. But it illustrates the political backdrop to the founding of the Potsdam institute. This new institute was a political issue and had to assert itself against all sorts of competition. The time-honored Institute for Contemporary History in Munich was one such competitor. So we had to fight on many fronts, and our opponents did not fight with

kid gloves. But that is not surprising, for contemporary history has been and is in large measure the history of conflict.

I would first like to praise Konrad for contributing to the Potsdam institute's successful management of these conflicts. What was needed to legitimize the institute was international connections and methodological innovation. The positivist investigation of GDR history and the political examination of the SED dictatorship occurred at a rapid pace—considerably sooner and more intensively than the parallel process in the old Federal Republic in regard to the much larger theme of the National Socialist dictatorship. Comparison of the dictatorships became downright fashionable—and scholars eager to pursue the necessary political and moral delegitimation of the GDR sometimes lost their sense of proportion. To prevent this, an outside view was important. Konrad was our man. He had a wide network of international connections that helped the institute tremendously. Many Americans came as guest scholars for short periods to Potsdam; as board members or evaluators they provided useful advice; ZZF employees were invited to sessions at the annual GSA meeting. All of this substantially fortified the institute's ability to repel polemical, political attacks, as well as to establish an international reputation. To be sure, GDR history remained the focus of its research and public events in the first years, but the research program was designed for expansion. We planned to bring social and cultural history to a field dominated by political history. Thematically, this expansion would include the comparison of the GDR with East European communist countries, as well as the treatment of West German and West European topics. We often paraphrased the program of the ZZF with the political catchphrases “Eastern Expansion” and “Western Integration”.

To give you an idea of this program, I'd like to describe the three major projects that we developed and worked on in succession in the first twelve years with a rapidly growing number of employees from East and West:

1. Structures of rule and dimensions of experience in GDR history
2. The GDR in the German and European East/West conflict
3. Germany and Europe in the East/West conflict: structures--representations

The first main project aimed at connecting structural analysis of a socialist dictatorship with collective and individual records of experience. The several topics dealt with different phases and various social spheres of the GDR. With this project, we also created an organizational and methodological model for the ZZF: there were four project leaders, four project directors, and four different approaches, that is, methods from political, social, everyday, and cultural history. By taking structure and experience together, we aimed to dissolve the stark dichotomy between political authority and the reality of social life and provide complementary crossover between them. Force from above was necessary to compel the East German population to participate, but the limits of the dictatorship in everyday social life were likewise in evidence. This approach caused us at the ZZF from time to time to be accused of softening the SED dictatorship. That did not prevent us from continuing to pursue our goal of developing a differentiated concept of the GDR that lies between political condemnation and "ostalgic" glorification.

Later projects systematically continued this approach and expanded it to encompass Europe. Contemporary German history needs to be set in its European context. Doing so, and incorporating

comparative and relational history, is a tremendous task. Willy Brandt's famous dictum applies to postwar German history as well as to contemporary European history: "What belongs together is now growing together." Konrad became very intellectually engaged in both fields. As a result, the Potsdam institute stimulated German and international research in important ways. This accomplishment was expressly acknowledged in numerous evaluations. This laid the cornerstone of an edifice that one could no longer tear down, even if many critics might have liked to.

I cannot refrain from mentioning one last point in this context. It pertains to a field in which Konrad was very active and successful early on, and which was a complete mystery to me for a long time. I'm referring to the use of electronic data processing in historical research. This need not be further explicated for this audience. Two key words in this area are the historical information network "H-Soz-u-Kult" and the portal "Clio-Online," which is managed in Berlin. The creation of an electronic edition of the institute's journal, „Zeithistorische Forschungen“/Studies in Contemporary History in 2004 is closely connected to Clio-Online. I would just like to mention that I, an old-fashioned historian, have finally advanced into the electronic age and figure as a co-editor of this journal with Konrad. Without him I would never have been able to earn such laurels!

Secondly, I would like to praise Konrad for his physical stamina. It enabled him to cope with the burdens of work in Potsdam and Chapel Hill. The two positions made a frequent flier of him. He led a spartan existence as a single in Berlin for weeks at a time because Hannelore could not come to Germany to stay for long periods of time as originally planned. The Potsdam institute choir that I was finally able to establish after several futile attempts demonstrated its respect for

this situation on the occasion of Konrad's sixtieth birthday with a sad song in F minor, "Lonesome Cowboy"! We also sang a song from the Fifties by an agricultural producers' cooperative of the GDR (an LPG) to create the right balance of pathos ("Aufbau-pathos")! Of course, Hannelore always supported her "lonesome cowboy". She came to Berlin regularly for shorter or longer periods and helped organize the apartment or the house in Berlin and buy the furnishings. Thus, she should be praised for her stamina as well.

Third, I would like to praise Konrad for making our shared directorship of the institute successful. Many skeptics doubted that having two heads at a research institute could function well. After all, we are not twins and have rather different temperaments, although we both live on a Tristan Street, Konrad in Berlin-Wannsee and I in the Brandenburg village of Groß Glienicke not far away. This symbolic coincidence opens itself up to wry remarks, but I do not want to exaggerate this symbolism. Of course, we have had varied positions and interests. I have had many problems with some postmodern currents from America and Germany. And especially, I could never keep up with Konrad's pace. But perhaps Westphalian deliberateness was occasionally good for the institute. I cannot deny that my role was not always the better one: I was always present while Konrad commuted between two continents. As a result, I had to deal more intensively with the bureaucratic hassles with the ministry, and I had to remind the employees more often of their duties when presentations were poorly attended. I have been told that I did both these things with a certain stubbornness and a louder voice than Konrad, who was known for his friendliness. In any case-- all in all, our partnership as co-directors did function very well. We agreed on all the important points, set some foundations, and established very flat hierarchies in the institute. It has paid off: the ZZF has become famous for its lively, intellectual atmosphere and the high degree of involvement among its employees. Moreover, in the spring of 2000, our shared directorship

enabled me to spend some time researching at St. Anthony's College in time-honored Oxford. At that time I still had no e-mail--unheard of for Americans--so I was able to devote myself entirely to my research on the workers of the GDR in peace and almost forget Potsdam for a short while.

At this point I must add a fourth point about Konrad and sports, because this explains how he held out under the burdens of his work without visible damage to his body or his soul. His enthusiasm for sports is most likely well-known on both sides of the Atlantic. Konrad enjoys jogging, swimming, tennis, and skiing. But his sports enthusiasm impacted the institute. I distinctly remember Konrad becoming visibly restless in the late afternoons after long project discussions or institute exams. Whereas others, including myself, would be more likely withdraw to a pub, he first had to go swimming or jogging to reduce the academic stress. This left him ready to take up work on one of his many books the next morning at home with renewed energy. He has done this writing these many years in addition to work at the institute and teaching at Chapel Hill or Potsdam with a consistency I find astounding.

In conclusion, I'd like to make two very personal observations that are not meant to be taken completely seriously.

Of course, we celebrated Konrad's sixtieth birthday at the institute in Potsdam, too, and the next celebration is still to come. As the business manager of the institute in 2002, I had to give a talk. So I thought about what an appropriate gift might be. I came to no clear conclusion. I had to toss out my first idea almost immediately: J. S. Bach's lovely aria, „Erbauliche Gedanken eines Tabakrauchers“ which roughly translates as "Uplifting Thoughts of a Tobacco Smoker"--referring, of course, to a pipe smoker. This aria offers all kinds of reflections on the meaning of life, on

work and leisure, wrapped up in flowery pietistic verbiage. But that would not do because Konrad is an adamant non-smoker, even though he tolerated my occasional pipe fumes. Another idea was to present him with the novel by Sten Nadolny as a sort of a challenge. The novel had become very popular in Germany and bore the provocative title "The Discovery of Slowness". Why wouldn't that work? He had already read the book, of course! Today, I face a similar problem!

To finish on a serious note: Konrad has managed the balancing act between Chapel Hill and Potsdam very well up to this point, and I am sure that he will continue to do so in the future--though perhaps a bit more slowly? He has done a great deal for German-American relations, but above all, he has helped to procure an international reputation for contemporary history in Potsdam. Both of us have expressly campaigned since the beginning of the institute to make it a permanent fixture rather than a temporary experiment on the complicated scholarly landscape. Now we have succeeded. The commission of the federation and states in charge of our institute (the "Wissenschaftsrat") passed a resolution to that effect in October. Thus, an important part of contemporary historical research is now anchored in Potsdam, right on the former German-German border. At the institute, the history of the little GDR is no longer the only focus. Rather, it now aims for a much broader European perspective. Without the transatlantic relations that are especially nurtured here at the GHI, this achievement would be inconceivable. Many have contributed to the institute's success. But Konrad was an essential part of it. And for that, I congratulate him on this occasion very warmly. As retirees, we both will probably often have an opportunity to talk about all this over a glass of wine, on the Tristan Street in Berlin or on the Tristan Street in the village of Groß Glienicke that lies on a lovely Brandenburg lake that the brutal border ran through until 1989.

approve of them before any money was available. That was hard, and it still is, because the evaluations occurred every two years. There were different reasons for this, but it was tough and sometimes even absurd. The German Science Council last year ironically and admiringly observed that the ZZF was probably the most frequently evaluated institute in Europe! This pressure of constant evaluation certainly strengthened the employees' will to survive and the directors' resistance. But we also had to learn to accept defeat. The rejection of projects is normal in the scholarly enterprise. Yet for the East German employees, it was a completely new and depressing experience. In the GDR, they had enjoyed positions that were quite secure, though not luxurious. When their projects were rejected, we needed to be imaginative to develop new topics, and we needed to be sensitive to their feelings.

East German history was a political minefield at that time. Fierce public controversies erupted. Who should be allowed to write GDR history? What approaches should be taken? The debates about totalitarian theories from the Fifties experienced a remarkable renaissance. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* became the mouthpiece for the polemics against our institute by young East German scholars who had opposed the socialist system. They attacked above all the founding father, Jürgen Kocka, and suspected that there were dark insider relationships between West German and former SED historians. They called it “The Bielefeld Way.” This title was designed to call forth associations with the “Bitterfeld Way” that Ulbricht had proclaimed in 1959. This has all long since become a matter for historiography. But it illustrates the political backdrop to the founding of the Potsdam institute. This new institute was a political issue and had to assert itself against all sorts of competition. The time-honored Institute for Contemporary History in Munich was one such competitor. So we had to fight on many fronts, and our opponents did not fight with

kid gloves. But that is not surprising, for contemporary history has been and is in large measure the history of conflict.

I would first like to praise Konrad for contributing to the Potsdam institute's successful management of these conflicts. What was needed to legitimize the institute was international connections and methodological innovation. The positivist investigation of GDR history and the political examination of the SED dictatorship occurred at a rapid pace—considerably sooner and more intensively than the parallel process in the old Federal Republic in regard to the much larger theme of the National Socialist dictatorship. Comparison of the dictatorships became downright fashionable—and scholars eager to pursue the necessary political and moral delegitimation of the GDR sometimes lost their sense of proportion. To prevent this, an outside view was important. Konrad was our man. He had a wide network of international connections that helped the institute tremendously. Many Americans came as guest scholars for short periods to Potsdam; as board members or evaluators they provided useful advice; ZZF employees were invited to sessions at the annual GSA meeting. All of this substantially fortified the institute's ability to repel polemical, political attacks, as well as to establish an international reputation. To be sure, GDR history remained the focus of its research and public events in the first years, but the research program was designed for expansion. We planned to bring social and cultural history to a field dominated by political history. Thematically, this expansion would include the comparison of the GDR with East European communist countries, as well as the treatment of West German and West European topics. We often paraphrased the program of the ZZF with the political catchphrases “Eastern Expansion” and “Western Integration”.

To give you an idea of this program, I'd like to describe the three major projects that we developed and worked on in succession in the first twelve years with a rapidly growing number of employees from East and West:

1. Structures of rule and dimensions of experience in GDR history
2. The GDR in the German and European East/West conflict
3. Germany and Europe in the East/West conflict: structures--representations

The first main project aimed at connecting structural analysis of a socialist dictatorship with collective and individual records of experience. The several topics dealt with different phases and various social spheres of the GDR. With this project, we also created an organizational and methodological model for the ZZF: there were four project leaders, four project directors, and four different approaches, that is, methods from political, social, everyday, and cultural history. By taking structure and experience together, we aimed to dissolve the stark dichotomy between political authority and the reality of social life and provide complementary crossover between them. Force from above was necessary to compel the East German population to participate, but the limits of the dictatorship in everyday social life were likewise in evidence. This approach caused us at the ZZF from time to time to be accused of softening the SED dictatorship. That did not prevent us from continuing to pursue our goal of developing a differentiated concept of the GDR that lies between political condemnation and "ostalgic" glorification.

Later projects systematically continued this approach and expanded it to encompass Europe. Contemporary German history needs to be set in its European context. Doing so, and incorporating

comparative and relational history, is a tremendous task. Willy Brandt's famous dictum applies to postwar German history as well as to contemporary European history: "What belongs together is now growing together." Konrad became very intellectually engaged in both fields. As a result, the Potsdam institute stimulated German and international research in important ways. This accomplishment was expressly acknowledged in numerous evaluations. This laid the cornerstone of an edifice that one could no longer tear down, even if many critics might have liked to.

I cannot refrain from mentioning one last point in this context. It pertains to a field in which Konrad was very active and successful early on, and which was a complete mystery to me for a long time. I'm referring to the use of electronic data processing in historical research. This need not be further explicated for this audience. Two key words in this area are the historical information network "H-Soz-u-Kult" and the portal "Clio-Online," which is managed in Berlin. The creation of an electronic edition of the institute's journal, „Zeithistorische Forschungen“/Studies in Contemporary History in 2004 is closely connected to Clio-Online. I would just like to mention that I, an old-fashioned historian, have finally advanced into the electronic age and figure as a co-editor of this journal with Konrad. Without him I would never have been able to earn such laurels!

Secondly, I would like to praise Konrad for his physical stamina. It enabled him to cope with the burdens of work in Potsdam and Chapel Hill. The two positions made a frequent flier of him. He led a spartan existence as a single in Berlin for weeks at a time because Hannelore could not come to Germany to stay for long periods of time as originally planned. The Potsdam institute choir that I was finally able to establish after several futile attempts demonstrated its respect for

this situation on the occasion of Konrad's sixtieth birthday with a sad song in F minor, "Lonesome Cowboy"! We also sang a song from the Fifties by an agricultural producers' cooperative of the GDR (an LPG) to create the right balance of pathos ("Aufbau-pathos")! Of course, Hannelore always supported her "lonesome cowboy". She came to Berlin regularly for shorter or longer periods and helped organize the apartment or the house in Berlin and buy the furnishings. Thus, she should be praised for her stamina as well.

Third, I would like to praise Konrad for making our shared directorship of the institute successful. Many skeptics doubted that having two heads at a research institute could function well. After all, we are not twins and have rather different temperaments, although we both live on a Tristan Street, Konrad in Berlin-Wannsee and I in the Brandenburg village of Groß Glienicke not far away. This symbolic coincidence opens itself up to wry remarks, but I do not want to exaggerate this symbolism. Of course, we have had varied positions and interests. I have had many problems with some postmodern currents from America and Germany. And especially, I could never keep up with Konrad's pace. But perhaps Westphalian deliberateness was occasionally good for the institute. I cannot deny that my role was not always the better one: I was always present while Konrad commuted between two continents. As a result, I had to deal more intensively with the bureaucratic hassles with the ministry, and I had to remind the employees more often of their duties when presentations were poorly attended. I have been told that I did both these things with a certain stubbornness and a louder voice than Konrad, who was known for his friendliness. In any case-- all in all, our partnership as co-directors did function very well. We agreed on all the important points, set some foundations, and established very flat hierarchies in the institute. It has paid off: the ZZF has become famous for its lively, intellectual atmosphere and the high degree of involvement among its employees. Moreover, in the spring of 2000, our shared directorship

enabled me to spend some time researching at St. Anthony's College in time-honored Oxford. At that time I still had no e-mail--unheard of for Americans--so I was able to devote myself entirely to my research on the workers of the GDR in peace and almost forget Potsdam for a short while.

At this point I must add a fourth point about Konrad and sports, because this explains how he held out under the burdens of his work without visible damage to his body or his soul. His enthusiasm for sports is most likely well-known on both sides of the Atlantic. Konrad enjoys jogging, swimming, tennis, and skiing. But his sports enthusiasm impacted the institute. I distinctly remember Konrad becoming visibly restless in the late afternoons after long project discussions or institute exams. Whereas others, including myself, would be more likely withdraw to a pub, he first had to go swimming or jogging to reduce the academic stress. This left him ready to take up work on one of his many books the next morning at home with renewed energy. He has done this writing these many years in addition to work at the institute and teaching at Chapel Hill or Potsdam with a consistency I find astounding.

In conclusion, I'd like to make two very personal observations that are not meant to be taken completely seriously.

Of course, we celebrated Konrad's sixtieth birthday at the institute in Potsdam, too, and the next celebration is still to come. As the business manager of the institute in 2002, I had to give a talk. So I thought about what an appropriate gift might be. I came to no clear conclusion. I had to toss out my first idea almost immediately: J. S. Bach's lovely aria, „Erbauliche Gedanken eines Tabakrauchers“ which roughly translates as "Uplifting Thoughts of a Tobacco Smoker"--referring, of course, to a pipe smoker. This aria offers all kinds of reflections on the meaning of life, on

work and leisure, wrapped up in flowery pietistic verbiage. But that would not do because Konrad is an adamant non-smoker, even though he tolerated my occasional pipe fumes. Another idea was to present him with the novel by Sten Nadolny as a sort of a challenge. The novel had become very popular in Germany and bore the provocative title "The Discovery of Slowness". Why wouldn't that work? He had already read the book, of course! Today, I face a similar problem!

To finish on a serious note: Konrad has managed the balancing act between Chapel Hill and Potsdam very well up to this point, and I am sure that he will continue to do so in the future--though perhaps a bit more slowly? He has done a great deal for German-American relations, but above all, he has helped to procure an international reputation for contemporary history in Potsdam. Both of us have expressly campaigned since the beginning of the institute to make it a permanent fixture rather than a temporary experiment on the complicated scholarly landscape. Now we have succeeded. The commission of the federation and states in charge of our institute (the "Wissenschaftsrat") passed a resolution to that effect in October. Thus, an important part of contemporary historical research is now anchored in Potsdam, right on the former German-German border. At the institute, the history of the little GDR is no longer the only focus. Rather, it now aims for a much broader European perspective. Without the transatlantic relations that are especially nurtured here at the GHI, this achievement would be inconceivable. Many have contributed to the institute's success. But Konrad was an essential part of it. And for that, I congratulate him on this occasion very warmly. As retirees, we both will probably often have an opportunity to talk about all this over a glass of wine, on the Tristan Street in Berlin or on the Tristan Street in the village of Groß Glienicke that lies on a lovely Brandenburg lake that the brutal border ran through until 1989.

takes seriously the matter of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, but is equally concerned to understand the ways postwar Germans built with the future, and not just the past, in mind. And we surely haven't heard the last. Professor Jarausch was last spotted at the GSA speaking on transnationalism in German history.

As important as Professor Jarausch's topical breadth is his methodological flexibility. He has written a biography of a "great man," and he has written social histories of groups whose members remain mainly anonymous. He pioneered the use of quantitative methods in history, and he offered a plea to cool inflated passions against deconstruction in historical writing. In all cases, he has remained committed to the empirical record. Indeed, his methodological catholicism has shown us just how much this record has to offer us, if only we remain open to new ways to investigate it. Professor Jarausch has often been at the forefront of discussions of new topics, methodologies, or theoretical frameworks – and then, a few years later, has been the one to write up a summary evaluation of the development. In this regard, his enormous corpus of articles has been as important as his books, certainly for those of us involved in graduate training. One can find an article by Professor Jarausch on just about any important development in German historiography of the last three decades.

How did this affect us as students? Of course, we learned by example. We learned the limitations of identifying ourselves as "fill-in-the-blank" historians – as social historians, as cultural historians, as military historians. Instead, we absorbed a sort of fearlessness about drawing from all strands of historical writing, including schools that positioned themselves as mutually exclusive. Mainly, we understood we were simply to read everything. And we absorbed a sort of fearlessness about being the first to try something – we were to know what was current, but not be limited to what was stylish.

But in preparing this talk, I didn't want to assume my experience was typical. Thanks to Hannelore Jarausch, who painstakingly created a list of Professor Jarausch's PhD students from departmental records not organized according to advisor, I polled them for their thoughts on Professor Jarausch's influence on them. And here's what I found out.

Many recalled what one delicately called "Professor Jarausch's version of the Socratic method." Some of you in the audience will know what I'm talking about. But for the rest, it usually started with Professor Jarausch posing what might be called an open-ended question. Perhaps one like this:

"Why is Konrad Jarausch important?"

Such a question usually provoked a wild scurry to figure out which of the many correct answers was the one he had in mind:

"Because he pioneered the application of quantitative methods to history?" No, that wasn't it.

"Because he challenged the use of the totalitarianism framework for understanding the GDR?" Sure, but that wasn't the answer to bring this discussion forward.

"Because he exposed exaggerated fears based on caricatures of deconstruction & brought common sense to the discussion of its use in history?" Well, yes, but what else?

"Because he insisted on placing debates on liberalism in their social context?"

With the class clearly not getting it, Professor Jarausch would finally be forced to fill in the answer himself: "Because he was the first director of the Friends of the German Historical Institute!"

A number of former students reported, with a hint of apology towards their students, having absorbed the technique so well that they now use it in their own classrooms.

On a more serious note, many described their awe upon witnessing what they described quite simply as intellectual brilliance. One student recalled Professor Jarausch's "extraordinary capacity for putting other people's thoughts in order. I would go to his office, find him jetlagged and buried under a stack of mail, lay out what I thought was a brilliant strategy for approaching my next chapter, and he would, off the top of his head, suggest a far more sensible approach."

And former students admiringly recalled his conscientiousness, commenting on his quick turnaround of draft dissertation chapters – including when he was in Potsdam. "Another lesson I took from my time working with Konrad," wrote one, "was that it was important to always make time for students. . . true, he might come to your defense and eat lunch (as he did for my prospectus gathering), but he was there -- with probing questions and a wry wit."

Former students commented on his practicality, his knack for "combining lofty intellectual pursuits with a hard-nosed, practical understanding of the academe. While he always encouraged us to find our own scholarly voices, he also wanted his graduate students to get jobs." And this, perhaps, went hand in hand with Professor Jarausch's pedagogical sensibility. One graduate described his "deft 'Leinenpolitik,' i.e. knowing, sensing, divining not just when grad students need some direction, but also when to get out of the way and let them get on with it."

Undergirding this scholarly and pedagogical profile was, we recognized, a complex personal relationship to Germany and to German history. To read Professor Jarausch's work is to engage a tremendous seriousness about just how big the issues at stake are. For him, however, seriousness does not automatically mean pessimism: it is as important to understand the good as it is the bad.

Most centrally, we see in his work a persistent concern with the public sphere, with liberalism, and with what he most recently has called "civilization": the development of a commitment to civil society. And we see a sober confrontation with the consequences of the failure of

the public sphere, of liberalism, of civilization. This is not a removed scholarly concern, for in Professor Jarausch's work we face the abandonment of liberal principles by people like us – by professionals and students. Nor is his work simply a sober reflection on the past. Rather, Professor Jarausch reminds us of continuing perfidious consequences of racial nationalism in sometimes violent xenophobia today. Yet he is unabashedly admiring of East Germans' grass-roots movement to end dictatorship in 1989.

Furthermore, even in tales of tragedy Professor Jarausch is concerned with the potential for a different outcome, indeed the fact that the end of the story has yet to be written. This is why we must recognize the attractions, and not just the failures, of nineteenth-century liberalism. This is why we must recognize the intelligence, the sense of responsibility, and the open-mindedness of Bethmann Holweg, and not just the imperial hubris and institutional rigidity that led to catastrophe of World War I. And this is why we must not permit the task of looking backward after the Nazi era to obscure the long distance traveled since 1945 – in East, West, and reunified Germany. Even as he spurns facile parallels, such as the notion that we can democratize Iraq “just like” we democratized Germany, Professor Jarausch still holds out hope for learning from the positive, not just the negative, lessons of history. Indeed, he makes it just as urgent to do so, a sentiment nicely summed up in *Civilizing Germans*: “It is important not only to analyze what went wrong in the past but also to point out how things were put right after the Nazi catastrophe, since recovering from dictatorship and atoning for massive crimes is an issue facing other nations beyond Germany.” This is a big charge – and one that I hope his students are worthy to carry out.