
The title of Stefanie Schild’s Der Investiturstreit in England (The Investiture Controversy in England) undersells the intention and scope of her work. While the period of Investiture Controversy in England (1100–1107) forms the core of her work, she considers interactions between the kings of England, their Church, and the papacy from the time of the Conquest until the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164). Furthermore, while England remains at the heart of the piece, the work is strongly comparative and draws frequent connections between events and changes in the Empire (and, more occasionally, in France) and those in England. This chronological and geographical breadth provides a thorough overview of the events surrounding the conflict over Investiture and raises some important issues with common narratives.

This book makes a significant contribution to current research trends. It is important for three reasons: firstly, it provides a continental perspective on the insular conflict between Church and State. While this is far from unique, as demonstrated by Schild’s extensive German bibliography, this application of the traditions of a national school in the study of a different region is still relatively unusual and forms part of a broader trend towards interaction between different schools. Secondly, Schild does not look at the events and issues of the Investiture Contest in England in isolation, but rather compares them with the corresponding controversies on the continent, looking at the Empire (in some depth) and France (to a lesser extent). This comparative approach is of vital importance to the study of this period in general, and, in this particular case, allows Schild to cast new light on the conflict in both England and the Empire. Again, Schild’s work is not unique in this approach, but this is nonetheless an important component within a growing and profitable trend towards a more holistic and transnational view of medieval church history in general and, more specifically, of the Investiture Controversy. And third-
ly, on the basis, in part, of these approaches Schild challenges several elements within the dominant narrative. Most notably, she questions the chronology of events and argues against the imposition of modern terms and concepts.

*Der Investiturstreit* is methodical in its approach. In a brief introduction, Schild sets out her core research question: why was the Investiture Contest resolved swiftly and easily in England when compared to the drawn out and embittered conflict in the Empire? Around this core, she highlights a range of further issues within and around the crisis: the causes and chronology of the conflict; the role and relative importance of key figures beyond the king, the pope, and the archbishop of Canterbury, both in England and on the continent; the use of terms such as ‘Investiture’ and ‘Concordat’. Schild then raises issues regarding the implementation of the Concordat of London from 1107 and the impact on the kingdom of England. Finally, and most significantly, she underlines the connection between the Concordat of London and that of Worms in 1122.

The remainder of the work sets out to address these issues over six chapters through a primarily chronological approach. The first two chapters establish the background to the conflict, addressing the rule of William I and William II respectively. Through these chapters, themes of continuity and change from the pre-Norman Church emerge, including the use of episcopal offices for royal power politics through the installation of figures loyal, or at least connected, to the king, alongside the emergence of a tradition of papal lenience towards these practices in England. The significance of the quarrel between William II and Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, with regard to both the subsequent conflict between king and pope, and to William’s traditionally poor reputation is also considered.

The next two chapters move into the conflict itself. Chapter three revolves primarily around the identification of the starting point of the conflict between Pope Paschal II and King Henry I. In opposition to the traditional September 1100 origin, Schild argues for an outbreak of hostilities in 1101, represented by the explicit reference to investiture and homage in a letter of Paschal to Henry produced in these months. On this basis, she presents the 1100 dispute between Henry and Anselm as a local affair rather than a formal split between king and pope. This distinction between two related but separate conflicts, the first between the king and the archbishop, the second
between the king and the pope, is a significant and recurring theme throughout Schild’s work. The argument here is convincing, although it perhaps places too much emphasis on the identification of a sudden breakdown in the royal–papal relationship.

Chapter four builds on this work to consider the resolution of the conflict. Schild emphasizes a swift end, especially when compared to the corresponding contest in the Empire, identifying a resolution between king and archbishop in 1105 or 1106 prior to its ratification through the Concordat of London in 1107. To explain this, she revisits themes from her opening chapters, namely that the Norman kings traditionally held a great deal of power over episcopal appointments and that the Church traditionally looked upon this power with tolerance if not approval. Furthermore, by considering the individual circumstances of king and pope, Schild underlines that neither figure sought conflict here and both were generally conciliatory in their correspondence. Schild raises two further important points within this chapter. First, she underlines the role of mediators and advisers, such as Adela of Blois and Robert of Meulan, between king and pope, emphasizing that this was not a binary conflict and seeing greater nuance within negotiations. Secondly, Schild questions whether the Concordat of London resolved the issue of investiture, arguing that in 1107 there was no separation of sacerdotium and regnum. Instead, the Concordat focused on the issue of episcopal homage.

The fifth chapter provides a wide-ranging and impressive view of the consequences of the conflict and the Concordat of London through the rest of the reign of Henry I, the contested claims of Stephen and Matilda, and, ultimately, the rule of Henry II and his promulgation of the Constitutions of Clarendon. Schild addresses the use of the Church in the politics of these monarchs in turn before returning to consider their relationships with the popes. Through this, she highlights the incomplete solution provided in 1107 and the continued issues surrounding the nature of the bishop’s temporal and spiritual authority. This chapter is particularly interesting as it reflects on the changes in England in relation to those on the continent, looking in particular at the fluid and frequently hostile relationships between pope and emperor.

Chapter six develops these ideas further and focuses on the relationship between the Investiture Contest in England and that on the continent, with a particular consideration of the differences and sim-
ilarities between the Concordat of London and that of Worms. In doing so, Schild demonstrates a coherent and evolving strategy among the popes, arguing that the discourse around earlier attempts to resolve the conflict, such as the Concordat of London or the varied interactions between Paschal II and the Emperor Henry V, informed later attempts, such as the Concordat of Worms, and enabled later popes and emperors to achieve a satisfactory compromise.

Schild’s conclusion provides a solid overview of her arguments and presents her narrative for the events of the Investiture Controversy in England clearly and concisely. This culminates in a brief reiteration of the connection between the Insular Controversy and that within the Empire.

Taken as a whole, the work is cohesive and well argued. More could be done to set out the structure and direction of each chapter, but the language and written style is accessible and generally clear and concise. The bibliography is extensive and a substantial range of English and, especially, German works have been consulted. The absence of French- or Italian-language material is unfortunate given the scope of the project and somewhat undermines its strength as a transnational comparative study. In a similar vein, a slightly greater consideration of the contest in France and Italy would have been an interesting and worthwhile addition and more could have been done to emphasize the connections, similarities, and differences between England and the continent. Nevertheless, a focus on interaction and comparison is an important and visible theme within this study, and Schild systematically develops complex and well-reasoned arguments, supported by a balanced reading of the primary and secondary sources.

The book serves as a useful introduction to the Investiture Contest and the concepts of sacerdotium and regnum in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, with a particular emphasis on England but with relevance throughout France and the Empire. Furthermore, it is important reading for scholars of this period in general. The Investiture Contest and the interaction between temporal and sacral power exerted influence across political, social, economic, and military spheres. As such, the ideas Schild counters or promotes have significant potential consequences for many fields of history.

Der Investiturstreit in England is an important addition to the study of the Investiture Contest both in England and the Empire.
Schild reconsiders the traditional narrative and develops innovative arguments for the causes and consequences of the changing relationship between king and Church in England. More significantly, she underlines the interconnected nature of the conflict, highlighting both immediate and longer term consequences for events on the continent stemming from insular developments and vice versa. This is a very rich vein for further study and increases the relevance of Schild’s book well beyond her immediate theme.
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Jennifer Bain introduces her volume on the nineteenth-century reception of Hildegard of Bingen and her songs through a personal encounter with Hildegard’s music: when in 1991 Bain read the name ‘Hildegard of Bingen’ on a cassette tape, she presumed that this referred to a modern composer writing music in a medieval style. Subsequently she learned that a figure from the Middle Ages was involved only through feminist and New Age literature, which at that time in the English-speaking world were almost the only approaches taken to Hildegard. This eventually led the author to ask after the historical person behind these layers of reception, above all with regard to Hildegard’s musical oeuvre. In the book under review Bain examines the rediscovery (or reinvention) of Hildegard of Bingen and her music in the nineteenth century within various religious, cultural, and political movements of that time. Her work meets a clear need in current research on Hildegard, which following the major conferences devoted to her in 1998 at Bingen and on the occasion of her canonization in 2013 at Mainz has concentrated on revealing the historical person of Hildegard of Bingen in her twelfth-century context. This also applies to her musical compositions, which have been re-evaluated through the deconstruction both of twentieth and twenty-first century myths and of the songs identified in the Middle Ages by her personal milieu and currently ascribed to Hildegard in terms of their genesis, the influence upon them of contemporary musical developments, and editing procedures in the creation of written versions.

Bain’s book is dedicated to the thus far relatively unexplored period between the Middle Ages and the twentieth century (which is not immediately apparent from the term ‘modern’ in the title) and shows that Hildegard as a historical figure was the subject of continuous interest, although her musical works have received more attention since the mid nineteenth century.

Bain arranges her study into an introduction on the reception of Hildegard’s sequence O virga ac diadema, and five chapters on the
reception of Hildegard from her death in 1179 up to 1850, on the increasing veneration of Hildegard and her recognition as a composer after 1850, on the revival of chant in Germany, and on the place of these developments in the movements of the Kulturkampf era and the reciprocal relationships between the growing attention given to Hildegard and her music and the nationalist and religious-political currents of the second half of the nineteenth century. The conclusion briefly highlights the re-founding of the abbey of St Hildegard in Rüdesheim and the stimulus which this has given to the academic study of Hildegard’s works.

In the introductory chapter on O virga ac diadema Bain shows that this sequence has repeatedly found prominence since it was mentioned in documents for the canonization process of 1233. It was amongst the first of Hildegard’s pieces which the parish priest Ludwig Schneider transcribed from the Wiesbaden Codex (Riesen-codex) and had performed by a small female choir on 17 September 1857 (p. 22). The modern musical rediscovery of Hildegard of Bingen began with Schneider and was continued by Franz Meyer, who in 1866 posthumously published Schneider’s transcription, and by Johannes Schmelzeis, who included a transcription of the sequence by the historian and practitioner of church music Raymund Schlecht in his 1879 biography of Hildegard, Das Leben und Wirken der heiligen Hildegardis (p. 24). O virga ac diadema also received attention from Dom Joseph Pothier of Solesmes Abbey and from Hildegard’s biographer Johannes May (1911), as well as appearing on records from the first recordings by the choir of Aachen cathedral in around 1960 down to Richard Southers New Age version on the CD Vision (1994), alongside many taking a period performance approach.

Schneider, Schmelzeis, Schlecht, and Pothier comprise the most important protagonists in the musical reception of Hildegard from the mid nineteenth century. Even beforehand, as Bain shows in her following chapter, Hildegard of Bingen had never been entirely forgotten ever since her death, although she was remembered with varying intensity across the centuries. Beginning with Goethe’s famous note on his examination of the Riesen-codex in the Wiesbaden library in 1814–15, Bain traces a peculiarly German process which imbued the figure of Hildegard with the character of a ‘national saint’—for instance, through her inclusion in the Walhalla hall of fame (p. 45)—although her musical output played no part at this stage.
The earliest known modern transcription of Hildegard’s songs is that of Ludwig Schneider, who received an episcopal commission to authenticate the relics of Hildegard at Eibingen. Bain is able to re-evaluate and underline Schneider’s decisive role in the musical reception of Hildegard with the aid of many contemporary documents (p. 98).

The history of the editions of Hildegard’s songs is illuminated by Bain’s reflections on their connections with the respective focal points of the French and German revivals of chant. Detailed expositions of the genesis of the Editio medicea and its reprinting and of the role of Haberl feel somewhat digressive, not least because specialist studies on these matters are already available. This section would have benefited from a tighter focus on the significant differences, namely on the continuous tradition of the chant in France in contrast to the introduction in Germany through the Reformation of an alternative hymnal tradition. The same applies to the overview of the history of both confessions since the Reformation, which comes across as both too brief and not strictly necessary (p. 121).

In contrast, Bain provides extremely interesting detail on Wilhelm Preger, a Protestant author who in 1874 cast doubt on the authenticity of Hildegard’s entire oeuvre, a recurring accusation, most recently pursued with a polemical edge in Richard Witt’s article ‘How to Make a Saint’,¹ and who received in the same year an honorary doctorate from the Evangelical Theological Faculty of the University of Erlangen. Bain clearly demonstrates that regardless of the factual position this was interpreted from the Catholic perspective as an attack in the context of wider tensions between the two confessions. In a moment of historical irony, we learn that Preger omitted from his critique the correspondence between Hildegard and Bernhard of Clairvaux (p. 137), precisely the material which is regarded by modern editors as particularly questionable. The many illustrations of the earliest editions of Hildegard’s songs contained in Bain’s study shed light on the various editorial approaches of the time: from Schneider’s transcription with organ accompaniment, through Schlecht and Pothier’s attempted facsimiles from the neumes of the Riesencodex, to Schlecht and Pothier’s translations into rhythmic and square notation

respectively. The latter visited Wiesbaden several times to study the
Riesencodex and his series of articles in the Revue de chant grégorien contrib-
uted significantly to the dissemination and better theoretical understanding of Hildegard’s songs. As valuable as this information is, here too the precise descriptions of Pothier’s journeys or of the town of Wiesbaden seem largely unnecessary.

Overall, the English-speaking Bain must be accorded respect for having processed a large number of German sources which are difficult to access and not always linguistically straightforward, whilst also being able repeatedly to correct misunderstandings in the Anglo-Saxon literature (for example, the excursus on merkwürdig in the context of Goethe’s travelogue, p. 41 n. 29). Useful information continually crops up even outside of the main themes (for instance, the fact that the first ever recording of Hildegard’s music was made in 1948 by the monks’ choir of Saint-Benoit-du-Lac in Québec, and hence with male voices!). The only faults that can be found in Bain’s own transcriptions are a few minor imprecisions (such as the unremarked resolution of the quilismae as two equal notes or the possibly transposed syllables ‘ley-son’ in the Kyrie, p. 186).

The volume is rounded out and made easier to use with a discography, a bibliography of editions, primary sources (including archival) and secondary literature, an index, and a list of figures. The enduring merit of Bain’s study consists in revealing and tracing from their modern origins onwards the different modes of reception of Hildegard of Bingen in nineteenth-century Germany, especially in connection with her musical works, and in being probably the first to do so for an English-speaking readership.
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This work originated in a dissertation by the author, who now teaches in Boston, and sets out to investigate the reception of Jan Hus in the contexts of the Bohemian reform movement of the fifteenth century and the German Reformation of the sixteenth. The programmatic brevity of the chapter headings leaves an impression of contrivance, but by collecting together these titles we gain a rough sense of the varied processes of retrospection and appropriation during the century and a half under consideration: ‘The Saint’, ‘The Founder’, ‘The Patron’, ‘The Apocalyptic Witness’, ‘The Prophet’, ‘The Catholic’, and ‘The Exemplar’ are the keywords used to mark the changing roles ascribed to Hus.

A comprehensive introduction presents the book’s central questions and the current state of the field, establishes the subject matter’s potential to produce new insights, and offers a brief overview of the life of Jan Hus. The first of the main chapters is then devoted to the battle over Hus’s memory and the interpretation of his personality and career which commenced immediately after he was burned at the stake in 1415. Following some interesting preliminary reflections on theories of memoria and kulturelles Gedächtnis, Haberkern analyses the early texts which debate Hus and his martyrdom from the perspective of his supporters. Of these, the Relatio of Hus’s confidant, Petr of Mladoňovice, achieved particular longevity. But from a very early stage the image of a pious Hus, who had achieved a clear affinity to Christ and the saints and who was praised by his followers in songs and sermons, was opposed by an orthodox perspective which vehemently condemned veneration of Hus in any form. This commenced the struggle for control of the interpretation of the person and teachings of the Bohemian theologian. The invocation of ‘Saint Jan Hus’ (p. 66) played a central role in the Hussite movement, which began to spread immediately after his death, and in the armed conflict which began around 1420. For his followers, the memory of Hus’s martyrdom became the foundation on which a new ‘Czech church’ (p. 67) was to be built.

Trans. Ben Pope.
The second chapter deals with the period 1419 to 1436, which was dominated by the military clashes of the Hussite Revolution. Hus was transformed from *casus belli* to the founder of a stable, Bohemian nationalist Utraquism. Haberkern demonstrates that throughout the long conflict Hus was deployed by both sides as either a martyr and witness to the true faith or as a heretic and false prophet who had led the Bohemians away from their old faith. During the negotiations conducted by the Council of Basel, which produced at least an interim agreement in the *Compactata* of 1436, Hus remained, as previously during the Hussite Wars, a central precursor, patron, and protector of the Hussites’ Bohemian–Utraquist church. The following chapter examines the way in which Hus was venerated in this church and the role played by 6 July, the anniversary of his death. New sermons, songs, and prayers recalled Hus as ‘patron’ of the Utraquist movement. This veneration expanded in the 1470s. Hus was now stylized as a holy warrior for God and the Czech people. Alongside the memory of Hus and his martyrdom, the chalice constituted a central symbol of Hussite–Utraquist identity. Besides the textual witnesses, Haberkern investigates certain Utraquist works of arts which evidence the widespread remembrance of Hus and his enduring veneration as a saint of the Hussite movement. In the late fifteenth century the author sees an increasing use of ‘new media’ (p. 146) such as illustrations. Thus the fifteenth-century Hussite and Utraquist commemoration of Hus relied very much on the standard forms of medieval saints’ cults. July 6 was celebrated as a particularly important anniversary with a special rite.

The first part of the book, with its focus on the Bohemian situation in the fifteenth century, ends on the question of how the commemoration of Hus would change under the completely altered conditions which arose in the Reformation era of the sixteenth century. The initial answer is that commemoration in the form of a saint’s cult gave way to a more historically focused memorial culture. The Wittenberg Reformation was associated with a rediscovery of the figure of Jan Hus, beginning with the Leipzig disputation of 1519. Johannes Eck attacked Luther’s ‘heresy’ by accusing him of being a Hussite. This gave Luther cause to engage more closely with Hus’s life and teaching. Luther and the evangelical movement subsequently took a positive approach to the Bohemian theologian. In 1520 Luther had *On the Church*, Hus’s chief work, printed, and further writings by Hus fol-
lowed. Whilst evangelical authors increasingly represented Hus as a precursor of Luther and an early fighter against the papal Antichrist, the orthodox side saw Luther’s proximity to Hus as proof of his heresy.

The increasing interest in Hus during the 1520s is shown by the printing of his works and of eyewitness accounts of his execution and of other events at Constance. Hus’s supposed prophecy that he, the goose, would be followed in one hundred years by a swan, or Luther, was especially popular. This legend was taken up and disseminated in the 1530s by Luther and his followers. By this means Hus became a prophetic forerunner of Luther who had proclaimed the German Reformation in advance. When a council was called to Mantua in 1536, evangelical authors repeatedly pointed to Hus and his tragic end at Constance as an example of the conniving of papal councils, the pronouncements of which could not be trusted. As proof, Hus’s prison letters from Constance were printed, amongst other texts, in multiple editions. Johannes Agricola penned a play based on Petr of Mladoňovice’s version of events which brought the sentencing and mistreatment of Hus to a wider audience.

In the sixth chapter Haberkern turns to the Catholic theologian and polemicist Johannes Cochlaeus, one of the most significant of the publicists and theologians in opposition to Luther and the Reformation. Cochlaeus’s strategic aim originally consisted in foregrounding what Hus and Luther had in common in order to prove the heresy of Luther and his followers. This line of argument was employed by many other orthodox authors. But in the mid 1530s Cochlaeus began to redraw his image of Hus. He now emphasized the differences between Luther and Hus. In comparison to Luther, Hus appears as a relatively faithful Catholic, albeit one who eventually had to be executed on account of his heresy. But Hus, Cochlaeus now argued, had adopted much more moderate positions than the Wittenberg heretic. Cochlaeus’s answer to the previously mentioned play by Johannes Agricola is a further example of the expertise and originality involved in the polemical sparring around the figure of Hus. In his own theatrical work Cochlaeus stressed the differences between Hus and Luther. The plurality and vitality of the disputes over Hus are well expressed in these battles over his memory and meaning. Haberkern’s recognition of a ‘shifting strategic imperative’ (p. 231) in Cochlaeus’s interpretation of Hus is one of the most com-
pelling sections of the book. However, no matter how far Cochlaeus went in his re-interpretation of Hus, his strategy never represented Hus’s ‘rehabilitation’ (p. 239), as a subheading suggests.

The final chapter, titled ‘The Exemplar’, focuses on the crisis of Protestantism from the mid sixteenth century. On the orthodox side, Conrad Braun and Johannes Cochlaeus warned against placing any trust in and making peace with the Empire’s Protestants. The history of Hussitism was ever present as a cautionary example. Simultaneously, an effort was made to present the ‘heresy’ of Luther and his adherents as singular in its intensity. Luther’s death, the Schmalkaldic War, and the Augsburg Interim tipped the Reformation within the Empire into a crisis. On the evangelical side this gave rise to a need for historical self-reassurance. Haberkern describes an ‘explosion of historical texts . . . across Europe’ (p. 276). Hus was at the centre of many historical works. Matthias Flacius included him in his Catalogus testium Veritatis. Haberkern correctly stresses the central place accorded to Hus in the creation of a Protestant historical tradition. The voluminous edition of Hus and Jerome of Prague’s complete works compiled by Flacius in 1558 underlines the role envisaged for Hus as a witness to evangelical truth.

The extensive list of sources and bibliography, including Czech titles, makes clear the study’s large evidential base and follows the main text together with a substantial index, which constitutes a meaningful and helpful addition to the work. In his choice of sources the author has necessarily concentrated on certain areas. Personalities such as Cochlaeus, Agricola, and Flacius dominate the second half of the study. The opportunity could certainly have been taken to include others who engaged with Hus and thus to complete the picture. But given the broad chronological scope of the study this is perhaps an unrealistic aspiration.

Overall, Patron Saint and Prophet evinces a winning formula of clear prose and cogent argumentation. The author indulges repeatedly in playful language, such as when he speaks of an ‘early modern “axis of evil”’ (p. 164). He is always able to relate the reception of Hus to the major political events of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and to reconstruct its structures in detail. The tremendous significance of Jan Hus in the memorial culture and historical self-positioning of the Bohemian reform movement and the German Reformation is established through a thorough source analysis. The par-
ticular motives underlying each reference to Hus are elucidated with precision and represent a valuable advance in understanding. Brief summaries at the end of each chapter help the reader to follow the thought processes, lines of argumentation, and conclusions. The author also seeks to carry the reader with them through the more complicated issues. Connections with other disciplines, for example, with literary studies, are made with apparent ease and enrich the final product.

The term ‘Bohemian reformation’ (p. 6) is used by Haberkern as a solid and presupposed concept, although one which is never further defined. Whether or not it might be better with respect to the Hussite movement in Bohemia to speak of a ‘reform movement’ distinct from the Reformation of the following century remains a matter for discussion. The author nonetheless makes reference to an ‘era of the European reformation’ (p. 2), a point of view which should be recognized as controversial, at least within German research on the Reformation. The two halves of the study could also have been more closely linked together—as it is, they sit rather monolithically alongside one another. Thus it remains to be seen whether the sixteenth-century Reformation did not, in fact, inaugurate a new phase in the reception of Hus which had few connections with the late medieval Bohemian phase. The multimedial qualities of the commemoration of Hus form a clear focus of the study in the first half, but receive only very cursory treatment in the second. A more incisive investigation, going beyond the well-known examples, would have been desirable here.

Regardless of these queries and points of disagreement, the author has succeeded in producing a thoroughly researched and well thought through monograph which, drawing on a rich source base, provides a lucid overview of the commemoration of Hus in the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth centuries. This represents a first step in closing the still plentiful gaps in research on the reception of Hus. This monograph both establishes a reliable foundation and sets the standard for all subsequent work in this field.
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Early modern Germany was difficult for the outsider to fathom. The Holy Roman Empire was a complex political entity that did not easily fit the familiar concepts of a monarchical or aristocratic state. The question of where rights and authority actually lay was always a complicated one, and answering it often required a deep familiarity with local customs and traditions as well as religious developments. This lack of straightforward political structures not only troubled political reformers and jurists throughout the entire period but also constituted a major obstacle to diplomatic relations with the Empire. This applies especially to the later sixteenth century, when the right of the Estates to conduct a more or less independent foreign policy was less articulated than during the period after 1648, and when the Reformation had unsettled and complicated the political landscape. To find the proper and most promising addressee for a particular diplomatic request from outside thus constituted a diplomatic effort in its own right. Testimony to this are the enduring yet often agonizingly slow and frequently fruitless attempts to achieve a concerted policy towards the Protestant Estates by the rulers of France, Denmark, the Netherlands, and England.¹

In addition to his recent valuable contribution on Anglo-German relations during the reign of Elizabeth I, David Scott Gehring has now published an edition of three treatises on early modern Germany and Denmark during Elizabeth’s reign. Written during or as a direct result of diplomatic activity within the Empire and Denmark, these treatises dating from 1569, 1588, and 1590 offer pro-

found insights into how these realms were perceived through English diplomatic eyes, and into the problems of diplomatic activity with the Empire. *The State of Germany* (1569), convincingly attributed by Gehring to the English diplomat Robert Beale, *A Discourse . . . of Denmark* (1588) by Daniel Rodgers, and *Ane Account of ane Embassie* (1590) by the Scottish diplomat John Skene are, each in its own way, valuable sources for a number of strands of diplomatic history. The astonishing amount of detail the reports contain and their implicit or explicit political agenda, however, often also represent a major challenge for the modern reader. It is convenient therefore, that the book opens with a brief discussion of the wider political background in which these documents were conceived, their authors, and their immediate connection with specific diplomatic settings. In addition, Gehring offers some methodological reflections on their potential value to diplomatic historians using both old and new approaches, and discusses these diplomatic accounts in the context of the wider genre of diplomatic travel writing.

Most valuable of all, however, is the meticulous and untiring effort Gehring has put into the critical apparatus. This is apparent less in the thorough but fairly conventional index than in the work and detail that has gone into the footnotes. They offer bibliographical and biographical information on both the more famous and the lesser known protagonists of the texts, and usually even reference further reading. Additionally, archaic or corrupted place names and other specific terms of the time are usually explained, and Latin passages and expressions are conveniently translated into English. It is mainly this, and the occasional comment on the political background or dynastic intricacies, that makes the texts understandable and useful for the modern scholar. The only thing one could have wished for in addition to the existing apparatus is a short synopsis of each of these texts, which would, for example, have been helpful for understanding some of the more subtle and implicit aims of Skene’s political mission in the Netherlands. Nor is there any discussion of how these reports actually shaped foreign policy in England and Scotland at the time, but this might, admittedly, be a theme more suited to research than an edition of sources.

The three texts are very different from each other, and their potential use for historiography varies accordingly. *The State of Germany* was written during a period when English hopes for a treaty with the
Protestant Estates in the Empire were strongly encouraged by the Electors of the Palatinate and traditionally thwarted by the Electors of Saxony. It is no surprise, therefore, that the account focuses on these two courts in particular. The text starts, however, by outlining the structures and political mechanisms at work in the Empire (describing, as it were, its mostly unwritten constitution). It touches on the position of the Emperor, goes on to describe the three Estates of Electors, Princes, and Cities, and then details their chief trading commodities and matters of religion. Most of this account can still be read as a helpful introduction, even today. Much more partial and thus more valuable to the historian, therefore, is the description of the courts of Heidelberg and Dresden. In a very clear attempt to show where English sympathies were supposed to lie in the Empire, the Dresden court and August of Saxony fare much worse than Frederick III in Heidelberg throughout the report.

The *Discourse . . . of Denmark* provides a dense and detailed description of the state of Denmark, chiefly focusing on its dynastic problems and history, and describing the complicated power relations in the country after the death of King Frederick II. Apart from his observations on dynasty and power relations, the author’s interest in political geography, trade routes, and trade policies is noteworthy. The text also touches on interesting details from a cultural and religious perspective, mentioning, for example, the famous astronomer Tycho Brahe and the disagreement between the King of Denmark and the Protestant Estates in the Empire after the *Book of Concorde* (1580). The diplomatic intelligence contained in the text, however, as Gehring mentions, was probably of much less use to English diplomats than *The State of Germany* had been twenty years earlier, since hitherto fruitful Anglo-Danish relations declined considerably after 1588.

Richer in detail and remarkable particulars is the third text in the collection. Unlike the other two, it is less a thought-out report than a travel account, with a more flexible and less abstract form. The writing of John Skene, therefore, provides a glimpse of the actual challenges and tribulations of diplomacy in the Holy Roman Empire. It is, for example, interesting to see that diplomacy was often impeded by the absence of the princes from their court, or by the fact that gaining access to the princes was apparently not as certain for a Scottish diplomat at the time as might be assumed. Apart from these specific
problems, diplomats were aware that the German princes ‘uses to
doe all yer turns with ane partes of tyme, & not suddenlie’ (p. 166),
which was rendered all the more problematic by ‘ye difficultie of
convening ye Electors & princes of almaigre duelling so far distant
from other’ (p. 166). This is a clear indication that the habits of
German princes as much as the constitution of the Empire were a
great hindrance to effective diplomacy. To this was added, at times,
a rather peculiar problem: on more than one occasion, the diplomats
were molested by ‘ye filthier & common waye of drynking’ (p. 178),
so much so, in fact, that they once had to refuse a dinner invitation
‘for fear of drinking’ (p. 170).

Each of these reports, and each in its own way, will be of great
benefit to the understanding of English diplomacy in the Holy
Roman Empire during Elizabeth’s reign. Apart from this specific per-
spective, however, the reports not only convey a colourful, contem-
porary picture of early modern Germany and Denmark, but also con-
tribute to answering the larger question of how the Holy Roman
Empire was perceived by neighbouring rulers at the time. It would
be worth attempting to bring these perceptions together in a com-
parative perspective, combining, for example, French and English
notions of the Empire with Danish and Dutch views, and comparing
these with ideas entertained in Rome and Madrid. The ongoing and
lively inside discussion of what the Empire actually was, and how it
was supposed to work, could in this way be complemented by an
outside perspective on how the politics of the Empire could be
understood, and thus on how the Empire had to be dealt with at a
practical level for anything tangible to be achieved.
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This is a significant volume about printers and bookdealers as agents of cultural exchange between Britain and the continent during the long eighteenth century written by someone who has played a comparable role in this day and age. A literary scholar and librarian by training, Graham Jefcoate has crossed the Channel more than once to work in Britain, Germany, and the Netherlands. In the 1980s he was part of a team of bibliographers in Münster that compiled a catalogue of early printed English books in the collections of the university library in Göttingen, a centre of Anglo-German cultural transfer during the Enlightenment period. He then joined the British Library where he enjoyed a remarkable career only to return to the continent in 2002 to take up the directorship of the State Library in Berlin and subsequently of the university library in Nijmegen. Already during his time in Münster Jefcoate developed what became a life-long fascination with German printers and booksellers (but not bookbinders or engravers) who had moved in the opposite direction and set up bookshops and presses in the British capital from the early 1700s to the early 1800s. In the three decades since his first publication on the topic, he has tirelessly followed up every surviving trace and hint of these shadowy figures, and his findings have been published in a succession of articles. During his retirement and helped by the vast digitization projects undertaken by libraries in recent years, he has extended his research even further and published the present volume, which will remain a reference work for a long time to come.

The period under investigation ranges from 1680, the year that saw the publication of the first book containing extensive German text in Britain, to 1811, when interest in all things German had risen to such an extent that a continuous presence of German bookshops in London during the nineteenth century was guaranteed. Few contemporary observers, however, would have foreseen such a promising state of affairs only a few decades earlier. For much of the eighteenth century the German element of the London book trade had rested on very precarious foundations indeed. The first German printer to set
up shop in the British capital was one Johann Christian Jacobi, a supporter of Halle Pietism, in 1709. Yet his business faltered after just eight or nine years, a fate that would also haunt many of his successors. Few German printers and booksellers in eighteenth-century London survived for more than half a dozen years. There were also two prolonged periods (1718/25–49 and 1779–92) when no one with a German background was active in the London book trade. Altogether, only a dozen or so German-speaking printers and booksellers can be traced in the surviving records and they thus form the core of Jefcoate’s book. A mere third of this dozen stayed in the business for ten or more years and even they struggled to balance their books, although risky business strategies were often to blame for economic failure. To take just one example: Johann Christoph Haberkorn, in many respects one of the most successful Germans in the London book trade, overreached himself with prestigious publishing projects, ran up huge debts, spent time in a debtors’ prison, and eventually had to give up his business. He ended his days in Altona, again working in publishing. Pursuing a career as a German printer in London was obviously a hazardous undertaking in the age of the Enlightenment.

This reflects to some extent the state of the German community in London, which consisted mostly of workers, artisans, and merchants and, according to Jefcoate’s perhaps overly optimistic estimate, counted around 30,000 people at the end of the century. Its appetite for German books, however, seems to have been limited. In most cases these migrants from the German-speaking lands of central Europe had left their homes as young men on the search for work. Once arrived in Britain they assimilated quickly into their new environment, marrying local women and bringing up children who, despite the best efforts of a few German schools run by a handful of Protestant German churches in London, gravitated towards the English-speaking majority society in terms of both their language skills and religious inclinations. A pronounced lack of interest in German language and literature in Britain throughout most of the century did not help German booksellers either. Foreign visitors frequently complained about the isolationist mood among many inhabitants of the British Isles, although the presence of German language teachers in London and the repeated publication of German grammars and dictionaries testify to a certain degree of curiosity in German culture, as Jefcoate
demonstrates. Edifying religious literature by mainly Pietist authors enjoyed some success in the first half of the century, while works by authors who are little known or forgotten today, such as Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock and the Swiss-born Solomon Gessner, were noteworthy exceptions in the latter part of the century. If there was a reading public for foreign literature, it was primarily interested in French texts with German books coming a distant second, on a par with Italian titles. This began to change only towards the end of Jefcoate's period, when German literature, and in particular drama, became more fashionable. Again it was a writer who is rather obscure today, the dramatist August von Kotzebue, who led the way.

Most German printers in London therefore did not restrict themselves to printing and selling German books (either in the original or in translation). They also, and in some cases even predominantly, produced publications in English or other languages. Christlieb Gottreich Seyffert, for example, who flourished briefly between 1757 and 1762 imported German books but only published English and French titles, which pandered to the wishes of an urbane audience interested in political topics, or the most recent literary fashions such as novels in the vein of *Tristram Shandy*. Still, none of the German printers and booksellers played in the same league as the twenty or so big firms that dominated the book trade in London (and therefore in the whole of England) during the eighteenth century. Rather they were among the plethora of smaller businesses that were operative during the period. In the earlier part of the century their premises were located mainly on the Strand or in Soho, where part of the London book trade then resided, while at the beginning of the nineteenth century, along with most of their competitors, they had moved further west and settled in St James's or near Oxford Street. In most other respects, too, the German booksellers and printers did not differ much from English firms of the same size. They made extensive use, for example, of English newspapers and periodicals to advertise their wares. Already in the eighteenth century marketing was one of the biggest cost factors in publishing a book. According to Jefcoate up to 30 per cent of the total investment in a title could be spent on publicity.

Given their small number and the uncertainty of their existence, it is surprising how versatile and significant the legacy of these German printers and bookdealers turned out to be. Until the middle of the century, religion was probably the dominant feature of their enter-
prises. It is no exaggeration to say that the trade in German books started in earnest with the arrival of Pietist preachers from Halle in London around 1700. With the help of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and its English printer, Joseph Downing, they started an extensive publishing programme which comprised religious tracts in the German original as well as in English translation. Early on they also enlisted the services of German printers such as Johann Christian Jacobi. The collaboration with German businesses continued well into the middle decades of the century when, for instance, Haberkorn repeatedly printed books for the German Protestant communities in London. Prominent among them were collections of sermons by the court chaplain Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen, a stalwart of Pietism in London until his death in 1776. Between 1740 and 1760 the Pietists were joined by Count Zinzendorf, the leader of the Moravian Brethren, and his followers, who established a strong presence of their own in Britain and similarly tried to disseminate their ideas through the printing press. They joined forces with local printers such as Haberkorn to publish among others a famous hymn book, the Londoner Gesangbuch. From 1749 to 1755 the Moravians went one step further and relocated their main publishing house from Germany to London, as Jefcoate explains in one of his most intriguing chapters. Temporarily set up in Zinzendorf’s private home in Chelsea it printed casual and liturgical texts for the Moravian community. Interestingly, when the Moravians plunged into a deep crisis and were fiercely attacked by other Protestant groups after 1753, it was another German printer, Andreas Linde, who led the assault on Zinzendorf. Motivated by his strong attachment to the Pietist cause he printed several of the main invectives against the Moravians.

During the middle of the century religion slowly gave way to more mundane projects as the staple diet of German publishing houses. Haberkorn made his name in English-speaking circles as a publisher of books on architecture and arts and crafts. He worked with, and printed books for, the cabinet maker Thomas Chippendale and the architects William Chambers and James ‘Athenian’ Stuart. Haberkorn’s edition of Stuart’s Antiquities of Athens (1762) is rightly praised as one of the finest illustrated books emerging from the London print trade during the eighteenth century. Other German printers, in contrast, excelled as cultural mediators. Carl Heydinger,
Haberkorn’s successor, published works by Albrecht von Haller and Christoph Martin Wieland which he himself had rendered into English, while Andreas Linde made the translation of works by German and Scandinavian authors his business, again in some cases taking on the role of translator himself. Linde also printed a German translation of William Hogarth’s *Analysis of Beauty* (1752) under the title *Zergliederung der Schönheit* (1754). It was, however, Constantin Geisweiler who, despite a very brief spell of only three years (1799–1802) in the London book trade, became the best known printer-cum-translator in Jefcoate’s cast. He corresponded briefly with Wieland, Schiller, and Goethe in Weimar, translated several novels and plays from and into German with his wife, and published a journal, *The German Museum*, dedicated to the dissemination of German literature in the Anglophone world.

If processes of cultural transfer between London and the German-speaking lands form one recurring theme in Jefcoate’s book, the everyday practice of the international book trade is another. Again and again we learn about the increasing links between German printers in London and the publishing trade in their native country. Although none of the expats explicitly targeted the book market back home, after the middle of the century the knot tightened between London and the Holy Roman Empire. In the early 1770s Carl Heydinger began to visit the book fair in Leipzig which had supplanted Frankfurt as the main emporium of the publishing business in central Europe, setting an example for other German booksellers later in the century. Heydinger’s initial visit in 1770 was also the first appearance of a London printer at this trade show since the early seventeenth century, leading to an increase in the number of German books imported into the British Isles. Linde, in turn, produced his translation of Hogarth’s work along with a printer in Hanover, with whom he also collaborated on other projects. And from the late 1780s two (English) brothers, James and William Remnant, established an English bookshop in Hamburg and a German bookshop in London. In some instances cross-Channel co-operation came about as a result of necessity. Because of a lack of Gothic type characters in London in 1804, for example, a German book meant for the British market had to be printed in Bremen. Involvement in the international book trade, however, reached beyond ties with the German-speaking parts of Europe. Seyffert, for example, printed a number of scandalous texts
in French, which counted as clandestine literature on the continent and earned him the reputation of an underground printer. His fictitious imprint was used by French and Dutch publishers to conceal their identity while advertising their books to a clientele keen on titles sold under the counter.

These are just some of the discoveries to be made in a book full of insights into London’s print culture and Anglo-German exchanges during the eighteenth century. They can be found in all sections of Jefcoate’s text, which proceeds in a chronological fashion and is mainly organized by the biographies of the individual printers and booksellers. After initial chapters about the German community in London, Anglo-German cultural relations, and the book trade in Britain and the Holy Roman Empire, Jefcoate devotes a chapter to each of his protagonists, narrating their careers in London (nothing is usually known about their lives before they arrived in the British capital) and describing the various books which flowed from their presses. In places this makes for less than riveting reading since the wealth of detail can be overwhelming. But it is hard to imagine that such a level of documentation will be surpassed any time soon. With little to go on in the secondary literature Jefcoate had to reconstruct the lives and achievements of his heroes from a vast variety of dispersed sources, from (very few) booksellers’ catalogues and (numerous) advertisements in newspapers to parish registers, records of prerogative courts, insurance policies, and tax lists. He drew on the odd letter in archives and libraries, chief among them the archives of the Franckesche Stiftungen in Halle, and undertook extensive searches in German and British national bibliographies and library catalogues. Richly illustrated and adorned with an extensive bibliography that comprises all German books printed in London during the period under review as well as the publications by German printers in other languages (pp. 435–581), this is a worthy monument to painstaking historical research.
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Although the historiography of the past two hundred years has tried to make us believe that there is an intrinsic contradiction between religion and modernism, there are movements that prove the opposite. Among these is the Catholic Enlightenment, a social and intellectual movement of the eighteenth century (and beyond) that has championed modern Western values such as criticism of slavery, women’s rights, and ecumenism. In his present book, Ulrich L. Lehner, who has published extensively on the topic over the past decade, takes the narrative to the global level and examines the impact of the Catholic Enlightenment beyond its core regions, meaning first and foremost in the world of overseas Catholic missions.

Lehner does not conceal his intent to convey a message related explicitly and iteratively to present-day papal policies, namely, those of Pope Francis. He provides a narrative of Catholicism from the heyday of the Catholic Enlightenment to the ‘dark period’ (p. 3) of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when an aggressively conservative and ultramontane Catholicism prevailed, and picks up various lost threads with the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s.

How does Lehner tell this story? Chapter one provides an introduction to the major topics at stake, along with some of their important champions: the reaction to Spinozism as a new way of relating science to faith; Jansenism in ecclesiology and devotional practice; the reforms of Pombal and Joseph II as acts redefining relations between church and state; Benito Feijoo as a Spanish example, and Lodovico Antonio Muratori and Pope Benedict XIV as Italian examples of reforming Catholic thought. The following chapters see some of these settings discussed in more detail: chapter two deals with toleration and tolerance, making a clear distinction between the acceptance of private non-Catholic faith and the granting of equal rights to

---

non-Catholic communities in Catholic states, while chapter three focuses on topics related to women, from female scientists and seemingly liberal views on interrupted sex, love marriages, and abortion to ‘proto-feminism in new religious orders’ (p. 98).

What follows in chapter four is an attempt to portray Catholic missions in the Americas, China, and India as mindful of the personal and cultural integrity of the indigenous people, with a particularly interesting sub-chapter on bishop John Carroll and North American Catholicism around 1790 (pp. 110–13). Chapter five presents the many ways in which Catholic theology sought to (re-)frame the irrational in the eighteenth century, including Benedict XIV’s (1740–58) attempts to create reasonable grounds for the definition of miracles, the redefinition of the liturgical processes, and how the church dealt with the remnants of popular magic. Chapter six assesses the notion of holiness in the Catholic eighteenth century, and although Lehner does not find much engagement with Enlightenment, he detects ‘modern’ virtues and emphasizes the role of Catholic martyrs and victims (for example, during the French Revolution). Chapter seven tackles the difficult relations between Catholic abolitionism and the widespread practice of slavery in Catholic countries, including the Papal States. In his conclusion, Lehner describes the French Revolution as the beginning of the end of Catholic Enlightenment, portraying members of the Constitutional Church and explaining the rejection of reform Catholicism in the decades and centuries to follow. Not until the Second Vatican Council would some of the main ideas of Catholic Enlightenment resurface, often without reference to their origins.

As mentioned above, the book makes no attempt to conceal its agenda. While Lehner does articulate some caveats and strives for a balanced judgement (for example, on questions of slavery: ‘ambiguous record’, p. 205), the overall message is nevertheless clear: the Catholic contribution to modernity has been unduly understudied, underestimated, and for the most part has yielded better results, in terms of modern values, than its Protestant (that is, capitalist, nationalist, and imperialist) counterpart. It is obvious that by following this line of argument (positively or negatively), one accepts the overall narrative and is forced to take a clear theological and even political stance. And it is equally evident that this is precisely what Lehner wishes to provoke. More conservative Catholic readers who share the concerns of the 1790s and those of the 1960s alike will probably
disagree, as will proponents of gender or postcolonial studies, who will not see the broader picture of ancien régime colonialism and gender determination (of whatever denomination) seriously challenged by individual thinkers and case studies. Moreover, some doubts remain as to whether the outlined narrative can entice such readers seriously to engage (in a positive way) with the wealth of material presented by the author.

This material and its exposition are the strengths of the book. Although for obvious reasons some Catholic Enlighteners have by now starred in more than one of Lehner’s books, he has an undisputed grasp of material that has visibly expanded from Europe to embrace several scenarios around the globe and that, as in previous works, combines intellectual with social and political history. The arrangement of the material into topics is original, though not thoroughly coherent and somewhat eclectic, and more conceptual and methodological framing would have been desirable.

This leads to the conclusion that the book can certainly be useful reading for students if accompanied by some complementary accounts (for example, Steffen Martus’s Aufklärung, which, although published in 2015,2 totally lacks any Catholic perspective). It might prove helpful to subordinate the somewhat forced focus on ‘Enlightenment’, which often boils down to an equation with Tridentine reforms, to a less ‘Whig’ (or rather, ‘Conciliarist’) narrative of modernity and progress. It is true that no comprehensive history of the early modern Catholic world exists, and Lehner is one of the few historians capable of writing one. It remains doubtful, however, whether there was a coherent ‘movement’ behind that world, as the book’s title suggests, and if so, whether ‘Enlightenment’ is the best term to describe it.
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What is left of Heligoland? A North Sea spa, unadulterated nature, a shopping paradise without duty or VAT—this is how ‘Germany’s only offshore island’ is advertised on the internet. These highlights describe some of the constants that run through Heligoland’s changing history. They were made possible by the island’s location and the will of its people to defend their chartered privileges against every state into which, without being asked, they were integrated, first as a colony and then as part of a nation-state. In his masterly work, Jan Rüger graphically presents this history, shaped by nature and humans. It shows how this rock in the North Sea could become a ‘microcosm of the Anglo-German relationship’ (p. 6). Rüger’s stated aim is to ‘rethink the Anglo-German past’ (p. 3) from the point of view of Heligoland, and he achieves it convincingly.

The story told by Rüger begins when a British warship anchored off Heligoland on 4 September 1807. At the same time, the British military was bombarding Copenhagen. The Danish commander on Heligoland took stock of his situation, and surrendered the island to Britain without a fight. The Danish empire shrank a little; the British empire grew. As a strategic bastion, the new northern outpost in the British ‘insular empire’, as G. F. Leckie put it in 1808, first proved its worth in the struggle against Napoleon’s economic blockade and his attempt to gain a continental European empire by force. Later the history of Heligoland acquired a German national colouring, but the historical significance of the island is only revealed in the context of the European empires. This became apparent again when Britain ceded Heligoland to Imperial Germany in 1890, receiving German colonial possessions in East Africa in return, and the two European states demarcated their imperial spheres of influence there. This deal was nationally charged on both the German and the British side, but as Rüger emphasizes, it was above all ‘a colonial agreement—a function of the scramble for Africa rather than the Concert of Europe’ (p. 86).

What is fascinating about the way in which Rüger links imperial, national, and local history is that these types of historiography are
not presented as opposites. Rather, they are interwoven and the people of Heligoland also find their place as actors. They were given no say in the change of their rulers. The regime change in 1807 was normal for Europe at the time—all territorial reforms, implemented first by Napoleon and then at the Congress of Vienna, were undertaken over the heads of the people—and the change of ruler in 1890 was considered normal for the colonies. The people of Heligoland simply had to submit. But they could influence what this actually meant for them in everyday life. The treaty of surrender of 1807 guaranteed the continuation of the existing law, as did the treaty of 1890. Freedom from duties and taxes was among their most important rights. The people of Heligoland successfully stood up for these rights and did not hesitate to defend the ‘legal “mish-mash”’ that favoured them with ‘their own diplomacy from below’ (p. 67). The British empire and Imperial Germany here found the limits of their policy of standardization. Nonetheless, incorporation into Imperial Germany represented a profound change for the people of Heligoland. Their island was no longer a colony, but for the first time belonged directly to a nation-state, and its inhabitants were therefore exposed to all the processes of internal nation-building. In addition, British–German relations began to change fundamentally at that time. If Heligoland had ‘symbolized Anglo-German friendship’ (p. 54) until then, it now became ‘a metaphor of Anglo-German rivalry and enmity’ (p. 109).

In 1890 the successful deal had been acknowledged by both governments as a sign of friendship, and the majority of the press in both states agreed. In East Africa this closeness revealed itself in a special way. While the handing over of Heligoland was ‘well orchestrated’ (p. 89), in East Africa things got out of hand. A conflict arose between some soldiers of the Sultan of the Protectorate of Witu and a number of Germans there. It was not clear which side fired the first shot, but the German and the British press spoke of the ‘Witu massacre’. Admiral E. R. Fremantle intervened with his troops, imposed martial law on the whole Sultanate, and burned down several villages. ‘I am not so satisfied with such wanton destruction’, he noted, ‘but . . . it is in accordance with African custom’ (p. 107). He wanted to restore ‘the honour of Europeans, defined in terms of race and gender’ (p. 108). The colonial transfer thus began with a punitive action in Witu and a naval review in the presence of the German Kaiser in Heligoland. The twenty-two visits he paid to the island between 1890 and
1914 were intended to help turn the people of Heligoland into Germans. Rüger impressively analyses how difficult this was, and what a Heligoland identity meant in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

As a British colony, the island had developed into a bridgehead between the British empire and the European continent. During the Napoleonic era it served the King’s German Legion as a base. Their loyalty was ‘both to the king and to various Germanies that they identified with’ (p. 17). In order to pinpoint what was different about Heligoland, it would have been useful if the author had distinguished between the ‘various Germanies’ and the ‘German Föderation nation’. Recent research uses this term to underline that before the foundation of the German Reich, a commitment to the German nation could not be equated with the desire for a unified nation-state. Historically, the German nation comprised many states. In its British period, Heligoland was not part of this multi-state German nation but, as Rüger shows, a transnational space. During the Napoleonic era Heligoland became a centre of trade between the British empire and the continent: the president of its Chamber of Commerce came from Hamburg, its secretary was a London merchant, and the Royal Navy was its protective shield. Since the 1830s, the British colony had been on the way to ‘becoming more German’ (p. 32), as its Governor observed. ‘More German’ did not mean that it wanted to leave the British empire. Heligoland now became a refuge for writers who wanted to escape the censorship of German states, such as Heinrich Heine, for example, or for those who hoped to revolutionize the German world of states by working from the island.

The people of Heligoland earned much more from tourism than from the exiles. Wealthy people and aristocrats were the first to come from the German states; mass tourism began in the late nineteenth century. Heligoland enjoyed popularity as a pollen-free monument of nature. In its schools, children learned English from German teachers, the administration dealt with the inhabitants in German, the language of the church was also German, and the advice of German lawyers was needed to interpret the laws dating from before 1807. Heligoland was a culturally German part of the British empire. This only became a political problem when the North Sea was no longer regarded as an area of conflict between Denmark and Prussia, but between Britain and Germany. Rüger detects the first signs of this
perspectival change in the Prussian administration in 1855, but it was not until the 1890s that rivalry began to outweigh cooperation.

When the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a diplomat to Heligoland in 1890 to prepare for Germany’s takeover of the island, he reported to Berlin that if there were to be a vote, a large majority of the islanders would support the status quo. Only a minority eventually opted for British nationality, and most of them left the island. Those who wanted to remain there as British citizens faced financial penalties. They could not benefit from the tax privileges which the German citizens on Heligoland were allowed to keep in order to make the change of regime palatable to them. And any British citizens who remained on Heligoland had to pay the overseas tax that was obligatory in Imperial Germany.

When Imperial Germany set about ‘turning Heligoland into a German Gibraltar’ (p. 114), the political mood in Britain changed. Heligoland became a symbol of the ‘German problem’ and a misguided policy of appeasement, and Heligoland was discovered to be ‘a freedom-loving miniature nation, overpowered by militarist Germans’ (p. 119). Heligoland had become a ‘metaphor for German Machtpolitik’ (p. 119). In the First World War, people from Heligoland served as soldiers on both sides of the front, and both sides distrusted their national loyalties. The British government weighed up various options for Heligoland after the war: a return to Britain or Denmark, neutralization under the League of Nations—in fact, this would have been a British recolonization—or the complete destruction of the island. The peace treaty left a—demilitarized—Heligoland with Germany. The island became a symbol of Germany’s defeat and the failure of its world policy. Nazi Germany was able to build on this. It developed Heligoland into a fortress and turned it into a symbol of British–German enmity. When the Second World War ended, Heligoland was left behind as ‘a deserted battle-field, a moon-like landscape of craters and ruins’ (p. 203). The peak of destruction, however, was not reached until April 1947, when large amounts of explosives were blown up on the deserted island. The British press admiringly wrote about the ‘Biggest Bang since Bikini’ (p. 206), while for the German public, Heligoland became a ‘metaphor of victimhood’ (p. 207). When the island, which served the British Air Force as a site on which to practice bombing until 1951, returned to German administration in 1952, the German government celebrated this as a
homecoming. Heligoland was no longer regarded as standing for German greatness in the past, but was evoked as a symbol of Heimat and, at the same time, of a common European future. When the first Heligolanders returned to their island in April 1954, all that remained of the old Heligoland was nature. ‘The Heligolanders had finally arrived in Germany’ (p. 229). Or perhaps not quite. Today’s shopping paradise reminds us of the tax privileges of the past. They have survived all political regimes.

Rüger’s work ends with a look at Anselm Kiefer’s painting Hoffmann von Fallersleben on Heligoland, which marks the island as a ‘site of German memory’ (p. 223), in which nature also lost its innocence. The many works that have been published on German and European sites of memory so far seem to have overlooked Heligoland. Rüger’s book, by contrast, shows us why the changeable history of Britain and Germany is captured on this island as if under a magnifying glass. In order to break open the narrowness of national historiography, Rüger pursued his research in British, German, Danish, Australian, Canadian, US, and Austrian archives, museums, and libraries. Only on this broad basis was it was possible to fit the local history of Heligoland into imperial, transnational, and national contexts. Jan Rüger’s work on this small island is historiography at its best.
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Britain was not unaffected by the crisis of liberal democracy between the two world wars. Here, too, there was a radical right which opposed political modernity and developed an ideology that, while it took much from the European continent, also had home-grown, British roots in the history of ideas. Although the radical right was far from gaining power in Britain and organized fascism in the form of the British Union of Fascists (BUF) was the opposite of a political success story, historical research on this topic is still extremely productive. Three main research approaches can be distinguished. One strand is work on the BUF and its leader Oswald Mosley.1 A second, building on Richard Griffiths’s fundamental study *Fellow Travellers of the Right*,2 looks at British sympathizers with Italian fascism and especially National Socialism, seeking ‘Hitler’s Englishmen’ in British society. Here the focus is on imported ideology, collaboration, and betrayal by the ‘British pro-Nazi Right’.3 A third approach emphasizes the genuinely British character of the British radical right and concentrates more on its intellectual and social history context as an independent phenomenon.4

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).


The book under review here, a biography of George Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers (1890–1966), British landed aristocrat, captain in the Royal Dragoons, and anthropologist, moves between these poles. The title makes clear that the book examines Pitt-Rivers’s connection with the Nazis. But in his brief study, the American historian Bradley W. Hart spends a great deal of space looking at the academic and ideological development of his ‘hero’. This leads him to the peculiar mixture of social Darwinism, racism, fear of degeneracy, doubts about democracy, and neo-aristocratism that was widespread among some British anthropologists, in the eugenics movement, among many intellectuals, and on the right-wing fringes of the Conservative Party. This ideological cocktail had its roots at the turn of the century, when the optimistic liberal belief in progress was declining, but did not develop its full anti-liberal potential until the inter-war period.

Hart, however, does not attempt to position his topic within the research landscape. In a very brief introduction he tells the reader that his interest is mainly focused on his protagonist. His aim is not to ‘rehabilitate’ Pitt-Rivers, who was imprisoned in 1940 because of his political views, but to show ‘how and why a wealthy aristocrat with scientific pretensions and respectable academic qualifications ended up detained for the first half of the Second World War and his career in tatters thereafter’ (p. 6). Pitt-Rivers was never a member of the BUF and certainly never a leading figure of the radical right. But that he was ‘largely forgotten in existing historical accounts’ is true only in the sense of a general understanding of cultural memory. Hart’s source for this is Wikipedia (which now has an entry for Pitt-Rivers). But Pitt-Rivers does play a part in the historiography of the radical right, and especially of the British eugenics movement. No historian before Hart, however, has systematically analysed Pitt-Rivers’s extensive papers, which have been in the Churchill Archives Centre in Cambridge since 2009, and based a biography on them.

Hart’s study is chronologically structured and divided into seven chapters, framed by a brief introduction and an equally brief conclusion. The first chapter goes back to the nineteenth century and starts by looking at Pitt-Rivers’s grandfather, Augustus Henry Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers (1827–1900), a well-known military officer, ethnologist, and archaeologist whose fame George Pitt-Rivers aspired all his life to emulate, ultimately unsuccessfully. This was not the result of an underprivileged start in life, as Hart points out. The celebrations
George Pitt-Rivers and the Nazis

for George’s twenty-first birthday on the family estate lasted for almost a week, and several thousand people took part. Schooling at Eton was followed by a career as an officer in the 1st Royal Dragoons cavalry regiment, in which he served in the First World War, sustaining a war injury that troubled him for the rest of his life. The second chapter investigates Pitt-Rivers’s first intellectual efforts, consisting of a social Darwinist interpretation of Friedrich Nietzsche’s philosophy (not untypical for the times), an idiosyncratic reading of Sigmund Freud’s and Carl Jung’s psychoanalytical theories, and a deeply antisemitic publication on the Russian revolution of 1917. In chapter three we follow Pitt-Rivers to Australia where, initially without any academic training in the subject, he undertook his own field research and produced anthropological works. These earned him respect and recognition among some members of the discipline, especially from the influential natural scientist Arthur Keith, a prominent representative of a racist (and antisemitic) branch of anthropology in Britain.

The fourth (and most important) chapter deals with Pitt-Rivers’s involvement in the eugenics movement. Hart describes how Pitt-Rivers rose to become an important figure in international eugenics organizations, and even held a large eugenics conference on his country estate in Dorset. In his own country, however, he increasingly marginalized himself by calling for the British Eugenic Society to take a more radical stand. This progressive self-isolation, mainly because of his radical antisemitism, is also revealed in chapters five and six, which are largely an account of Pitt-Rivers’s activities in British pro-Nazi organizations. It is significant that the Germanophile Anglo-German Fellowship refused him membership. Chapter seven deals with the surveillance and imprisonment of Pitt-Rivers by the British security services during the war, causing him great mental and physical anguish. (From prison he wrote a cynical and insulting letter to his cousin, Clementine Churchill, the Prime Minister’s wife.) Although the security services did not see him as posing a serious threat, he was not released until 1942. Embittered by the experience of imprisonment, Pitt-Rivers lived unobtrusively on his country estate until his death in 1966.

What conclusions can be drawn from this man’s life story? Hart foregrounds Pitt-Rivers’s professional career: the author concentrates on his successes (or unrealized potential) as a scholar in particular,
using the academic achievements of his famous grandfather as a benchmark, but also drawing on those of his wives and partners and his sons. (On the whole, the comparison is unfavourable to Pitt-Rivers.) Although certainly interesting for the biography in the narrow sense, this approach leaves any reader with historical interests unsatisfied, for Pitt-Rivers’s activities in the inter-war period throw up important questions, in particular, about where ideological lines were drawn within Britain’s political culture. Fear of degeneracy, criticism of democracy, eugenics, anti-urbanism, anti-communism, and a fascination with the ‘efficiency’ of Italian fascism and German National Socialism were not limited to a small group of political extremists. Taking Pitt-Rivers as an example, we could analyse what political and cultural scope the radical right had in the inter-war period. This applies especially to antisemitism, whose importance in inter-war Britain has been tellingly described by Richard Griffiths: ‘In the Thirties and Forties a casual social anti-Semitism permeated society. Though seen as innocuous in itself, it formed a social cushion on which far more dangerous anti-Semitic attitudes could flourish.’

Pitt-Rivers’s extreme antisemitism and sympathy for National Socialism crossed a line, and he had to pay the social and later also the political and legal price. But what did Pitt-Rivers stand for? How can he be classified in the political culture of the inter-war period? What influence did his publications have on the radical right? The reader is given little assistance in addressing these questions about the political and cultural context, and the historical situation of this man. Nonetheless, this book is well worth reading. It is full of entertaining and lively anecdotes, and is fluently written. Drawing on a rich basis of archival sources, it tells the story of a man who was a member of the Establishment by birth, but ended up on the margins of society because of his political views. It is the story of an eccentric anthropologist, eugenicist, and would-be politician, whose obvious failure implicitly reveals a great deal about the science, society, and political culture of inter-war Britain. The author has written a fundamental book which will stimulate further research. It is to be hoped that it finds many readers.

5 Griffiths, What Did You Do During the War?, 309.
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In this book Greg Eghigian analyses correctional rehabilitation in the penal systems of three different regimes in twentieth-century Germany. Eghigian’s study ‘is not a history of the prison. Nor it is a history of penology, criminology, or forensic psychiatry’ (p. 10). The author points out that the history of twentieth-century correctional rehabilitation was informed by multiple actors, institutions, and ways of knowing and cannot be accurately represented in a conventional institutional or disciplinary history. As a result, his study offers a history of the correctional imagination in Germany since 1933.

‘Correctional imagination’ is what Eghigian terms ‘the ensemble of ideas, values, policies, practices, subjects, and objects associated with public attempts to reform and rehabilitate criminals’ (p. 10). The book’s primary aim is to understand how science, medicine, and criminal justice interacted to shape new ways of analysing and managing criminal behaviour and determine the fate of offenders. Eghigian is interested in how states, experts, and the general public projected ideals of good and bad, normal and pathological, corrigible and incorrigible on to correctional rehabilitation. In his study Eghigian follows on from such scholars as Erving Goffman, Joseph Gusfield, Edwin Sutherland, and Michel Foucault, who all studied the process of problematization. But the author neither engages with Foucauldian theories nor draws comparisons with Goffman’s ‘total institution’.

His approach is to examine both the correctional regime and the treatment of a specific group of offenders in three different twentieth-century German states: Nazi Germany, the German Democratic Republic (GDR), and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). (Male) sex offenders are the subject of examination because they ‘were widely considered by both the lay public and experts to be incorrigible’ (p. 14). This focus determines the structure of the book, which is divided into five chapters. The first deals with the National Socialist

---

regime and is followed by two each on the GDR and the FRG. Of the pairs, one chapter provides an overview of the correctional system of the regime in question while the second analyses the treatment of individual sex offenders. The study draws on a wide range of sources: Interior and Justice Ministry archives, prison records, forensic patient files from the Charité in Berlin, and contemporary publications including journals.

After a concise introduction, the second chapter begins in 1933. This starting point highlights a fundamental thesis of the book: that a rehabilitative system was part of the Third Reich’s penal policy. Passed in November 1933, the Law against Dangerous Habitual Criminals and on Rehabilitative and Preventive Measures is considered by the author as ‘marking the start of the contemporary rehabilitative era in German penology’ (p. 9). This legislation established a ‘two track system of criminal sanctions’, differentiating between criminal punishment (‘Strafrecht’) and executive measures (‘Maßregel’). Those deemed incorrigibles were excluded from the national community through preventive detention, while those categorized as corrigibles were reintegrated via therapeutic rehabilitation. Correctional incarceration was understood as a ‘schooling in character building’ (p. 38). The incorrigibles faced what an official from the Ministry of the Interior described as ‘the sharpest weapon in the fight against the sex offender’ (p. 42): castration. Experts across a wide range of disciplines (scientists, clinicians, and government officials) were united in their view that this was not an extension of punishment but a preventive safety measure.

The German Democratic Republic’s determination to distance itself from Nazi policies and rigorously apply correctional rehabilitation forms the subject of the third chapter. The result, as Eghigian emphasizes, was a huge disparity between ideal and practice. For example, despite the claims of the SED (Socialist Unity Party of Germany) that their nation had one of the world’s most advanced rehabilitative penal systems, in reality, conditions in East German prisons were grim. The GDR’s penal system also underwent a policy U-turn. After an initial apparent return to Weimar reformist ideas of correctional rehabilitation, in the 1950s legal scholars and party leaders came to view crime as a political expression of class struggle. As a result, ‘bourgeois’ sciences such as criminology and forensics were abandoned.
Instead, productive work increasingly became the focal point of correctional efforts. By the mid 1950s almost every East German inmate was given work. As Eghigian points out, the aim was not to rehabilitate, but to meet economic targets. While his focus is on Germany, it might have been interesting for the author to explore possible parallels here with contemporary communist penal labour systems in the GDR’s political master, the Soviet Union, or the People’s Republic of China. The mid 1950s also saw a conceptual swing in the GDR back to the importance of nurture in the formation of the criminal offender. Correctional rehabilitation was now understood as ‘Correcting the Disoriented Socialist Personality’. All convicts therefore had to be evaluated, which, in turn, restored the importance of forensic science. Hans Szewczyk, director of the Department of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology at the Charité in Berlin, was the most influential figure throughout the 1960s and 1970s. He institutionalized forensic psychiatry and psychology as empirical sciences and clinical tools in the GDR. Through case studies Eghigian convincingly demonstrates that in the GDR ‘[c]orrectional rehabilitation within prison walls existed in name only’ (p. 86).

Sex offenders in the GDR, the subject of the fourth chapter, were seen by authorities and researchers as primitive relics both of a biological evolutionary past and a more recent historical one. It was believed that male offenders required civilization in the form of modern, scientifically based treatment and therapy. Legal scholar Gerhard Feix predicted that child molestation would ‘increasingly disappear from the life of our society in the process of an ever-growing socialist consciousness and the realization of the social lifestyle’ (p. 101). This chapter is ground-breaking because of the fascinating insights it provides into medical discourse and practice concerning sex offenders in the GDR. The latter is based on the author’s analysis of previously unused forensic files from one of the GDR’s prime psychiatric centres, Berlin’s Charité, where the ‘new psychopathology of sex offenders’ was developed. Szewczyk and other scholars expressed frustration with the institutional limits of East German confinement and saw the need to build special indefinite detention centres to hold and treat sex offenders. But such facilities, like the social therapeutic facilities discussed in the FRG (see below), were never constructed. This led to what the author terms ‘workarounds’ and shortcuts: chronic offenders were preventively detained in mental hospitals.
The FRG had an equally ambitious correctional rehabilitation programme, which forms the subject of the fifth chapter. Following Cold War logic, West German reformers drew their models from the United States rather than the Soviet Union. Despite some continuities from the Third Reich in relation to personnel and experts, correctional rehabilitation in the Federal Republic was reformed. Academics, federal administrators, and politicians combined to create the therapeutic prison despite public opposition. An important part of this more ‘social’ concept of criminality was the emergence of a new therapeutic invention: social training. This was billed as an economic, non-stigmatizing form of group learning with the aim of allowing offenders better to perform the functions expected of them in the outside world. As the subject of correctional rehabilitation, the West German convict was given the idealized goal of becoming ‘a responsible member of a liberal, pluralistic, consumer society’ (p. 158). Punishment operated as a form of participatory counselling in democratic and capitalist citizenship, and rehabilitation was renamed resocialization.

The sixth chapter focuses on West Germany’s attempt to medicalize sex offenders through the creation of a new institution. They were to be patients in so-called ‘social therapeutic facilities’, of which eleven were established in the 1970s. These facilities were the fourth possible form of indefinite confinement, alongside psychiatric hospitals, centres for substance abuse treatment, and preventive detention units. According to Eghigian, many inmates considered the facility an improvement on conventional incarceration. Some even spent up to five years trying to gain admission. Unlike castration, which was legalized in 1969, the transfer to a social therapeutic facility was never institutionalized. Like other approaches, social therapy divided offenders into the corrigible and the incorrigible. Thus West Germany’s social therapeutic facilities ‘helped provide a steady supply of “incorrigible” sex offenders for the preventive detention system’ (p. 198).

The author’s conclusion is that while the ideals and rhetoric on correctional rehabilitation in each of the three German regimes were very different, in practice there were striking continuities. This also applies to the treatment of sex offenders. Although East Germany banned preventive detention and forcible castration in its constitution, incorrigibles were held by a back-door method in psychiatric
facilities and voluntary castration was allowed. Both outcomes also existed in the FRG. Neither state managed to live up to its rehabilitational ideals. Nevertheless, correctional rehabilitation found a place in all three German regimes and still does so today.

Eghigian is to be lauded for his pioneering use of East German forensic patient files. It is a pity that the relevant section is so brief (only ten pages) and that there is no comparative use of patient files from the FRG. It would also have been interesting for the author to place his pioneering study into the context of the history of East German medicine. Attempts to correct the disoriented socialist personality of sex offenders in the 1950s, for example, coincided with the application of Lysenko’s theories of modifying heredity dispositions through environmental factors in East German genetics.

This well-written and vivid book covers the history of German penal systems in a longue durée perspective, something that has never been done before. Eghigian draws the conclusion that there was no German Sonderweg in the history of correctional rehabilitation. This could be a stimulus for research on the history of penal correction in other countries. His study not only enriches the history of medicine and science but, it is hoped, will also be discussed beyond the disciplinary bounds of history.

ANNE GNAUSCH is a Research Fellow at the Institute for the History of Medicine and Ethics in Medicine (Charité) in Berlin. She is also a Ph.D. student at the Friedrich Meinecke Institute, Free University of Berlin, and her dissertation deals with suicide in Weimar Germany. Her publications include Weltstadtvergnügen: Berlin 1880–1930 (2016).

This excellent comparison of the pension systems in post-war Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany provides a milestone in the historiography of social policy. It succeeds in explaining the contrasting concepts of social justice underpinning British and German pension arrangements, details the role of welfare institutions in shaping them, and assesses their impact on social inequality—a topic that has generated a considerable amount of interest in Britain and is beginning to rise on the political agenda in Germany. Several prominent studies of worsening inequality, including Thomas Picketty’s international bestseller *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* and Danny Dorling’s *Inequality and the 1%*, have focused on the renewed concentration of wealth among a small socio-economic elite in recent decades. By directing his attention to provisions for old age, Torp analyses material trends among far larger groups, including numerous people living at the lower end of the social spectrum. Beyond contributing to the history of social policy, this study significantly enhances our understanding of how inequality has developed since the middle of the twentieth century.

The British state pension system gained its defining features during the Second World War in the wake of the famous report by the Committee on Social Insurance and Allied Services under William Beveridge’s leadership in 1942. Aiming to alleviate widespread poverty among old people, many of whom had to rely on meagre means-tested benefits for survival, the Labour government introduced a new state pension in 1946, which more than doubled weekly payments to 26 shillings for single retirees and 42 shillings for couples. By offering pensioners a flat, standardized benefit irrespective of their previous income, the new law expressed an ideal of social justice emphasizing equality of treatment, which met with widespread support among British contemporaries. Despite enhanced benefit levels, the new state pensions only partially succeeded in reducing poverty among the old for several reasons. National Insurance contributions were kept at low levels to render them affordable for people on low incomes. While this strategic decision
ensured a wide social reach for the scheme, it gave the state pension system weak financial foundations and ruled out more generous benefits. Moreover, policymakers intentionally designed the pension to provide basic subsistence level rather than material comfort in old age, not least to encourage employees to make private arrangements for retirement, for instance, by joining company pension schemes. Old-age poverty also persisted because the British state pension rose in line with inflation rather than wages and salaries during the 1950s and 1960s. This form of indexation resulted in a widening financial gap between state pensioners and the working population, which experienced significant rises in wages and salaries into the 1970s. To be sure, skilled workers and white-collar employees benefited from an expansion of company pension schemes that complemented the state pension. Unskilled workers on low incomes, however, frequently did not have access to these private pension plans or could not afford them. And finally, women, many of whom spent substantial parts of their lives performing unpaid domestic roles, faced a particularly high risk of poverty in old age because of intermittent employment histories that granted them only severely truncated pension payments. When social scientists forcefully drew attention to persistent and pervasive poverty in Britain in the mid 1960s, they emphasized the deprivation of millions of pensioners on means-tested benefits.

Only in 1975 did the Labour administration under Harold Wilson overcome resistance from the Conservative Party, the private insurance sector, and trade unions to introduce a second state pension, which offered a payment linked to an employee’s previous income (State Earnings-Related Income Scheme, or SERPS). SERPS was intentionally calculated on the basis of a comparatively low number of years in employment to ensure women with uneven trajectories in paid employment would profit from Labour’s pension reform. And finally, the new pension framework linked state pensions to rises in income rather than inflation to prevent a widening material gap between pensioners and the working population. SERPS and the new indexation, however, did little to alleviate social inequalities because the Thatcher government reversed Labour’s changes in pension policy. The renewed decision to raise pensions in line with inflation (rather than incomes) from 1980 meant that a single pensioner received £61.15 rather than £80 per week in the mid 1990s. In 1986 the
Conservative administration also significantly reduced the value of SERPS and encouraged the working population to rely on private pensions for their retirement planning. The consequences of Conservative pension policies were dramatic. By 1994, more than 3 million (or about 30 per cent of) Britons over the age of 60 were entitled to means-tested benefits to prevent them from sinking into serious poverty. Women, low-skilled men, and members of ethnic minorities were particularly likely to live extremely materially constricted lives in old age. Torp shows impressively how pension arrangements fuelled a wider trend towards income inequality in the 1980s and 1990s that has turned Britain into the most socially polarized country in Western Europe by a wide margin. The redistributive policies of New Labour governments under Blair and Brown managed to halt this development, not least by enhancing the incomes of the aged, but income inequality remains at markedly high levels in the UK. Despite a consensus between Labour and the Conservatives to boost state pensions in recent years, the outlook for the growing number of future retirees in the UK is not rosy, not least since private pensions have significantly eroded since the mid 1990s.

Since the pension reform overseen by Adenauer in 1957, the Federal Republic has followed a markedly different path. To fund a costly retirement scheme in a country that possessed no state pension funds after two disastrous wars, politicians drew on the contributions of the working population to pay for an insurance scheme for the aged. The West German pension system, thus, rested on a much-vaunted ‘contract between the generations’, an arrangement that stipulates an intergenerational redistribution of material resources. In contrast to the uniform rate paid to retirees by the British state, West Germany offered state pensions linked to a person’s previous salary level. Beyond eradicating widespread poverty among the old, this approach aimed to reflect the social status individuals had reached during their working lives. Rather than an ideal of justice based on equality, the West German pension system embraced an ideal of justice based on achievement (Leistungsgerechtigkeit). Irrespective of their in-built dimension of income inequality, West German pension arrangements proved effective in reducing poverty in old age. Unlike in Britain, in West Germany pensions rose in line with the incomes of the working population, which ensured that during the substantial wage and salary gains of the late 1950s and mid
1970s, retirees profited from the ‘economic miracle’. Moreover, the German state pension system commanded far larger resources than its British counterpart, because employees in West Germany paid higher shares of their income into the state retirement scheme than in the UK. As result, German state pensions proved more generous not just for the comfortable middle class (who could boost retirement incomes through private schemes) but also for retirees at the lower end of the social spectrum.

West Germans regarded their pension arrangement as a major political success, extending its coverage to wider groups and preserving it throughout the less auspicious economic circumstances after the mid 1970s. Indeed, the state pension system reached its apex with German re-unification, when the Federal Republic extended its scheme to the former East. This manoeuvre ensured that East German pensioners enjoyed substantial rises in income, but also brought the system close to collapse. Beyond rising longevity, early retirement schemes that compensated for mass redundancies in the West and East resulted in spiralling costs that generated calls for a fundamental reform. Amid high unemployment, a falling share of exports markets, and concern about an aging society around the millennium, the Red-Green government of Schröder and Fischer faced enormous national and international pressure to restore German competitiveness through cuts in the welfare sector. As part of a wider drive for competitiveness, the administration reduced the future value of the general state pension, launched an additional state-subsidized savings scheme (Riester-Rente), and encouraged the working population to invest in private pensions. In a nation that has witnessed a general rise in income inequality since the 1990s, this ‘multipillared’ approach to pension provision does not bode well for the majority, since the Riester-Rente and private pension schemes rely on returns on capital markets that have proved to be extremely unstable since the dot.com bubble burst in the early millennium.

Torp concludes on a rather gloomy note for future retirees in Britain and Germany. Irrespective of their differing post-war trajectories, both countries’ pension systems place much responsibility for retirement provision on the individual rather than the state. Future retirees also find themselves exposed to the vagaries of financial markets in which their savings for old age are invested. As a result, it is no longer possible to speak of substantial parts of the pension system
as a form of social security. The book’s sobering end, however, should stop no one from picking it up. Torp situates his primary research in a broad body of quantitative and qualitative work by historians and social scientists to fashion an authoritative account full of insights and food for thought far beyond the issue of pensions. Each chapter includes treatments of general income inequality, many of which are worth reading on their own because they detail indicators including financial factors, residential conditions, health, life expectancy, and indicators of social exclusion. This reviewer, for one, has not encountered a better outline of social inequality in Britain under the Thatcher and Major governments than that offered here. One can only hope that this book will soon be translated into English because it deserves to inform discussions of contemporary history in both the countries studied.
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The German Democratic Republic (GDR) had traditional universities in East Berlin, Leipzig, Rostock, Greifswald, Jena, and Halle, with technical universities in Dresden, Karl-Marx-Stadt (Chemnitz), and Magdeburg. The official statistical yearbook for 1989 records that there were around 131,000 students at 54 higher education institutions, where they were taught by about 20,000 teachers. Not included in these statistics were institutions that must be called ideological universities, that is, higher education institutions run by the Ministry of the Interior, state security, the army, the trade unions, and the Socialist Unity Party (SED). These institutions could also confer doctorates.

The old garrison town of Potsdam had no university until 1990 but, in addition to a film institute, it housed three educational institutions central to propping up the SED system: the Law School of the Ministry of State Security (JHS), the Academy for Law and Political Science (ASR), which trained specialists for state employment, and the largest teacher-training college (PH) in the country. These three institutions de facto merged in 1990 to form the Brandenburg State University, out of which the University of Potsdam grew in 1991, taking over mainly the buildings and infrastructure of the JHS.

Barbara Marshall, who taught German and European politics at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, experienced this reform process at first hand during a stint as guest lecturer at the University of Potsdam in 1992, and went back after twenty years to study this process of university formation. To this end, she conducted numerous interviews with experts and evaluated press reports. She was also able to draw on archival material, but there was far less of it than she had expected. Many documents had never been sent to the archives, others had never arrived, and much of what was there, she was not allowed to see. She was able to fill some of the gaps because many of the actors involved at the time gave her access to their private documents.

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).
In many respects, the University of Potsdam was a special case in the process of German unification. Although it was a truly new foundation, it still had to struggle with the legacy of the SED dictatorship for more than twenty years. While theoretically the initial conditions were far more favourable there than in the other eastern Länder, nowhere did the process of reform prove to be as contradictory and complicated as in Potsdam. Ultimately, there was one reason for this: in the federal state of Brandenburg, state governments under the Social Democratic Minister President, Manfred Stolpe, a former influential consistorial president of the Berlin-Brandenburg Church, tried to keep as many of the old staff as possible on into the new times, in the police, the administration, the judiciary, and education and research institutions. It has often been suggested that this was connected with the fact that for twenty years Stolpe had closer contact with the Stasi than was usual for a man of the church. But it seems to me that this is an overly simplistic and naive interpretation that underestimates the complexities of the situation. Stolpe was acting as the father of the people, not as a prince or king. His advisers, especially those from the West, were happy with the course he had adopted, which was to leave the past behind and not pay it much heed. This resulted, for example, in a far higher degree of personal continuity in Brandenburg than in the other federal states, affecting even institutions that were de facto new foundations, like the University of Potsdam (p. 136, quotation from Schütte).

This had three tangible consequences: first, there was a disproportionately high number of the old guard filling the university’s planned positions; secondly, the middle-range posts were blocked with permanent appointments virtually for years; and thirdly, staffing levels were incredibly bloated by comparison with other institutions. In the winter semester of 1992/3 the University of Potsdam had 865 teachers at all levels for a student body of 7,000. At the University of Siegen there were 570 teachers for 12,500 students; and the University of Düsseldorf had barely 540 teachers for 12,700 students. At the Humboldt University in Berlin, which was undergoing a profound process of reform, 700 lecturers taught 20,500 students (p. 112).

These figures alone demonstrate what had gone fundamentally wrong in Potsdam. This situation burdened the university for almost twenty years because the bulk of positions had been filled with per-
manent appointees. The fact that it was able to become a modern university at all is connected with something to which Barbara Marshall pays too little attention. Despite these difficult circumstances, investors and recognized scholars with international networks were drawn to Potsdam because it was located not in the Mecklenburg lakes or in the Vogtland, but right next to Berlin. The people of Potsdam might be upset by this analysis, especially coming from the pen of a native of Berlin (although one who gained his doctorate in Potsdam), but its location appears to have been a huge advantage for the university, and in the 1990s it exerted a force of attraction so powerful that it cannot be ignored.

Barbara Marshall provides a detailed and engaged analysis of the process by which the university was founded. Although she repeatedly indicates that at the university her project was not universally met with open arms and willing support, she was able to unearth sufficient material and conduct enough interviews to allow her to present a dense and vivid analysis. Again and again she shows how West Germans and East Germans worked with each other, but sometimes also against each other. As a result of the availability of material she concentrates mainly on political science, social science, and history, but this can also be justified in substantive terms because these were the subjects that had a strong ideological taint in the GDR and had to make a new start.

This was, however, anything but easy. The continuity in both teaching and administrative staff mentioned above was one obstacle. Marshall illustrates this by drawing on numerous impressive examples and statistics. Her study is especially important because it shows for the first time in the case of an East German university after 1989–90 how individual West Germans tried to impose their own personnel policy. Particularly grotesque is the case of a named scholar of Romance language and literature who somehow, via two committees, managed to appoint herself to a professorship in Potsdam (p. 145). In another case no appointment was made, but it nonetheless casts light on the atmosphere in the ‘wild East’, and shows how individual West Germans behaved there in certain cases. A well-known historian intervened in ‘the process of appointing a professor and declared his interest in the candidate on the basis of their friendship of more than twenty years’ standing’ (p. 147). A little later, the chair of the appointments committee wrote about this
incident: ‘I have never come across anything like this as a university teacher at three universities and with twenty-five years of experience; rather, it was always assumed that in such a case [of personal friendship] . . . extreme caution was necessary, because academic valuations must be delivered free from personal bias (ibid.).’

The book contains a wealth of such interesting individual cases. The author also analyses overall processes, but no clear picture of the university emerges. The contradictions in its development phase are reflected in this study. It becomes obvious how many burdens from the past the university had to contend with, and that most of its problems stemmed from the fact that its foundation lacked a clear concept. A genuine will for innovation and forces opposing change stood in each other’s way and blocked each other for a long time.

Marshall’s monograph is a fundamental work for the university history of Potsdam, but it also lays the basis for a history of the transformation of the East German higher education system as a whole. Above all, it should be stressed that the author has tapped many new resources. The numerous interviews with experts that she conducted were a necessary supplement, as many sources were not available to her. Her free use of personal names from the sources is somewhat surprising. While researchers will welcome this, data protectionists may rub their eyes in astonishment on occasion.

It remains to be noted that there are a number of annoying errors in the book. The claim that internal telephone calls within the university were still being monitored in 1994 (‘and perhaps even later’) is a myth based on the general Stasi hysteria after 1990, and should not exercise a historian (p. 173) because for purely technical reasons alone there was nothing to it. The author writes elsewhere that the historian Joachim Petzold was dismissed by the Humboldt University in Berlin because he had participated in the repression of the 1960s and 1970s (p. 184, n. 722). In fact, Petzold worked at the Academy of Sciences (AdW). Marshall confuses him with Kurt Pätzold, a researcher of fascism. Nor is her assertion that the Centre for Contemporary History (ZZF) in Potsdam was transformed into a branch of the Institute of Contemporary History in Munich correct (p. 191). The ZZF is, in fact, an independent Leibniz Institute, which also has links with the university as directors hold a professorship there. Despite such errors, this book by Barbara Marshall is a successful contribution to the history of the transformation of the
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East German higher education system, something that has hardly been investigated so far.