

BOOK REVIEWS

LUDGER KÖRNTGEN and DOMINIK WASSENHOVEN (eds.), *Religion and Politics in the Middle Ages: Germany and England by Comparison / Religion und Politik im Mittelalter: Deutschland und England im Vergleich*, Prince Albert Studies, 29 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013), 234 pp. ISBN 978 3 11 026204 9. € 99.95. US\$140.00

This volume brings together the papers given at the annual conference of the Prince Albert Society, held at Coburg in 2010. In keeping with the Society's stated aim to promote research on Anglo-German relations, the theme chosen was religion and politics in medieval England and Germany. The papers cover a wide span of time, from Carolingian Francia to England and Germany in the late Middle Ages, but are held together by a common interest in the complex interrelationship of religion and politics in these years. They vary greatly in length, with some constituting little more than fully referenced versions of the orally delivered paper (Nelson, Ormrod, and Fössel), and others representing very substantial studies in their own right (Görich and Weiler).

After a brief preface detailing the background to the collection, the book begins with an introduction (presumably by the editors, though this is not clearly stated). An overview of the volume's aims is given, as well as summaries of the individual papers. There is little attempt to saying anything new here and the exercise seems to be designed to help the casual reader pick out which article(s) might be of interest. In any case, the summaries given are fair and judicious, although there are a few egregious slips. Thus King Æthelred's defeat against the vikings at the Battle of Maldon came in 991 not 993 (p. 13: Pentecost 993 is when Æthelred reacted to this defeat by undertaking a public act of repentance); meanwhile the canonization of Charlemagne was not accomplished by Barbarossa in 1065 (p. 15), some half a century before his own birth.

The volume picks up speed with the first main contribution, a short piece by Janet L. Nelson on 'Religion and Politics in the Reign of Charlemagne'. Nelson does not attempt to be comprehensive here,

but rather chooses to approach her subject from three different angles: the degree of control the emperor exerted over the institutional church; the means by which he managed to exert this control; and the manner(s) in which he channelled the religious towards political ends. She covers much ground and the result is a nuanced view of Charlemagne's relationship with the church, one which gives *Realpolitik* its place, but does not deny the emperor's own very real religious convictions. Amongst the important points made is that Charlemagne's harsh actions during the conquest of Saxony should not be seen as a proto-crusade or *jihad*, but rather as a conscious response to Saxon infidelity (*infidelitas*: a term which, as Nelson notes, carries both religious and secular connotations).¹

In the second contribution Dominik Waßenhoven takes discussion into the Ottonian and Salian periods. His focus is on the role of bishops during royal successions, particularly their part in the election of kings. Here he sensibly distances himself from traditional constitutional readings of such events, taking a more flexible approach to royal election.² At the heart of his paper lies a basic but important observation: between the early Ottonian and early Salian periods the role of bishops at these events changed substantially. Thus while bishops did not take part in the election of Otto I, as described by Widukind of Corvey, Wipo presents them as playing a key role in the election of Conrad II in 1025. Waßenhoven is well aware of the source-critical issues raised by these accounts and makes a strong case for taking this difference to be meaningful. Indeed, he highlights the importance of the disputed succession of Henry II (1002) as a tipping point, at which bishops were able to start taking on a more prominent role in the election process. On the whole, these arguments are convincing and raise important further questions. In particular, it would be interesting to examine the Carolingian back-

¹ Here she takes issue with Yitzak Hen, 'Charlemagne's *jihad*', *Viator*, 37 (2006), 33–51. See, similarly, Jonathan Jarrett, 'Charlemagne's "Jihad"' <<http://tenthmedieval.wordpress.com/2007/01/14/charlemagnes-jihad/>>, posted 14 Jan. 2007, accessed 23 July 2013.

² See further Steffen Patzold, 'Königserhebungen zwischen Erbrecht und Wahlrecht? Thronfolge und Rechtsmentalität um das Jahr 1000', *Deutsches Archiv*, 58 (2002), 467–501 (a study cited by Waßenhoven).

Book Reviews

ground to growing episcopal self-consciousness in this era.³ In the next contribution, Catherine Cubitt takes us to England in the same period, examining the role of penance and lay piety. She deftly combines evidence for pastoral care and religious practice on the ground with indications that these had an impact at a national level. Particular importance is attached to Æthelred's penitential politics in the 990s, which Cubitt sees as an indication of the extent to which sin and pollution had become political as well as religious concerns. She goes little beyond synthesizing previous work on the subject (much of it her own), but her article is a welcome *entrée* for Germanophone readers into what is proving to be a profitable sub-field of studies on penance and piety in Æthelredian England.⁴

The fourth and fifth contributions, by Stuart Airlie and Ludger Körntgen, shift the focus on to the later eleventh century by examining the Investiture Contest, perhaps the most famous case of the intersection of religion and politics in the Middle Ages. Airlie provides a witty and insightful discussion of recent Anglophone work on the subject, noting many important differences between this and research undertaken in the Germanophone world. His intention is not so much to call for a 'cosy consensus' (p. 87), as he puts it, as to encourage historians to grapple with historiographical traditions beyond their own. In this respect he neatly sets the scene for Körntgen's article, which returns to the relationship between religion and politics in the earlier Middle Ages, as exemplified by the Investiture Contest. Körntgen builds on important recent work (much of it his own), arguing that the Investiture Contest did not create a distinction between religion and politics *ex nihilo*; rather, the line

³ On this see Michael E. Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300–850* (Washington, 2011); and Steffen Patzold, *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008).

⁴ Catherine Cubitt, 'Bishops, Priests and Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe*, 14 (2006), 41–63; 'Ælfric's Lay Patrons', in Mary Swan and Hugh Magennis (eds.), *A Companion to Ælfric* (Leiden, 2009), 165–92; and 'The Politics of Remorse: Penance and Royal Piety in the Reign of Æthelred the Unready', *Historical Research*, 85 (2012), 179–92. Cf. Levi Roach, 'Penitential Discourse in the Diplomas of King Æthelred "the Unready"', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 64 (2013), 258–76.

continued to be blurred long thereafter.⁵ Körntgen's arguments are persuasive and his picture of the Investiture Contest shares much with that drawn by Anglophone historians, who have tended to be less interested in the events which took place at Canossa in January 1077 than in the European-wide impact of the reform papacy.

In the next section Knut Görich and Björn Weiler take the story into the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The former provides a discussion of the canonization of Charlemagne by Frederick Barbarossa in 1165. Whereas previous scholarship treated this event as part of an (abortive) effort to re-sacralize German kingship in the aftermath of the Investiture Contest, Görich sees local and religious motivations as being primary; the canonization was driven not so much by the emperor's need for sacral legitimation, as by the interests of the local canons of the *Marienkappelle* at Aachen. Barbarossa, insofar as he was involved, seems to have been motivated more by personal piety than *Realpolitik*. There is much to be praised here and Görich's article will doubtless be one of the most cited in this collection; nevertheless, one cannot help but feel that his arguments run the risk of throwing the proverbial baby out with the bathwater. Whilst Görich is doubtless right that this act should not be seen in political terms alone, it seems equally reductionist to insist that the emperor's actions were without political undertones. Indeed, a comparison between Barbarossa and his Angevin counterparts, whose piety carried clear political implications, might have added nuance to Görich's conclusions here.⁶

More consciously comparative in this regard is Björn Weiler's discussion of relations between bishops and kings in high medieval England. Here Weiler argues that English bishops stand out from their continental (and in particular German) counterparts for their

⁵ See Ludger Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade: Zu Kontext und Funktion sakraler Vorstellungen in Historiographie und Bildzeugnissen der ottonisch-frühsalischen Zeit* (Berlin, 2001), esp. 435–45, and "'Sakrales Königtum" und "Entsakralisierung" in der Polemik um Heinrich IV.', in Gerd Althoff (ed.), *Heinrich IV.* (Sigmaringen, 2009), 127–60; and cf. Hartmut Hoffmann, 'Canossa – eine Wende?', *Deutsches Archiv*, 66 (2010), 535–69.

⁶ See e.g. Nicholas Vincent, 'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings of England 1154–1272', in C. Morris and P. Roberts (eds.), *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan* (Cambridge, 2002), 12–45; and cf. Jürgen Petersohn, 'Saint-Denis – Westminster – Aachen: Die Karls-Translatio von 1165 und ihre Vorbilder', *Deutsches Archiv*, 31 (1975), 420–54.

Book Reviews

ability to criticize rulers. He suggests that this tradition had deep roots, stretching back at least as far as the tenth-century monastic reform movement. There is much to be said for these arguments and it would be all too easy for the eager Anglo-Saxonist to add to Weiler's observations. To provide but one thought: the very process of reform during the tenth century was framed as a response to an act of royal admonition: the *Regularis Concordia* states that during his youth King Edgar had been warned by a certain churchman (who is known to have been the reformer Æthelwold) to pay heed to the ecclesiastical well-being of the realm.⁷ Where more might be said here is about the earlier continental background – as Weiler is aware, there are important Carolingian precedents for such behaviour.⁸ Equally, something might be said about why this tradition did not take off (or continue?) in Germany during the high Middle Ages. Certainly Ottonian bishops and their representatives were able to criticize rulers, sometimes even in public.⁹

The final two contributions, by Mark Ormrod and Amelia Fössel, take us into the later Middle Ages. Ormrod focuses on the rulers of late medieval England, examining the part played by religion in ritual, ecclesiastical patronage, and the burgeoning sense of nationhood in these years. His arguments are convincing and he makes a number of interesting points; nevertheless, one cannot help but feel that he misses a trick by not engaging with German literature on the subject of medieval and early modern ritual.¹⁰ Fössel, on the other hand, briefly sketches the situation in late medieval Germany. Here the power of the localized princes prevented kings from utilizing reli-

⁷ *Regularis Concordia*, proem 1, ed. Thomas Symons and Sigrid Spath, *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum*, 7 (Siegburg, 1984), 61–147, at 69.

⁸ See Moore, *Bishops*; and Patzold, *Episcopus*. Weiler cites the latter, but does not engage with its arguments in detail.

⁹ See e.g. Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon* VI.32, ed. R. Holzmann, *MGH: SS rer. Germ. n.s.* 9 (Berlin, 1935), 312–13; with E.-D. Hehl, 'Der widerspenstige Bischof: Bischöfliche Zustimmung und bischöflicher Protest in der ottonischen Reichskirche', in Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert (eds.), *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen* (Sigmaringen, 1998), 295–344.

¹⁰ For an *entrée* into this rich literature, see Gerd Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale: Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2003), esp. 170–86; as well as Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Des Kaisers alte Kleider: Verfassungsgeschichte und Symbolsprache des Alten Reiches* (Munich, 2008).

gious ritual to their benefit in the fashion witnessed in England. As with Ormrod's contribution, there is much of interest here, but more might have been made of the comparative angle, examining the similarities and differences between the ways in which English and German monarchs dealt with the demands of their leading magnates in these years.¹¹

Overall, Körntgen and Waßenhoven are to be congratulated for bringing together a set of interesting articles which will do much to encourage further engagement with religion and politics in the Middle Ages, particularly from a comparative angle. Although some of the articles are more avowedly comparative than others (Weiler's and Airlie's stand out in this regard) they all provide much useful food for thought. The only real regret must be the volume's price (€99.95), which means that it will only be bought by major research libraries and its circulation will be correspondingly limited.

¹¹ For an exemplary study of this nature from a somewhat earlier period, see Björn Weiler, *Kingship, Rebellion and Political Culture: England and Germany, c.1215–c.1250* (Basingstoke, 2007).

LEVI ROACH was appointed Lecturer in Medieval History at the University of Exeter in 2012. Before that he held a Research Fellowship at St John's College, Cambridge. He is the author of *Kingship and Consent in Anglo-Saxon England, 871–978: Assemblies and the State in the Early Middle Ages* (forthcoming 2013), and future projects include a biography of Æthelred 'the Unready' and an edition of two of the law-codes of King Æthelstan's reign.

JOHANNES FRIED, *Canossa: Entlarvung einer Legende. Eine Streitschrift* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012), 181 pp. ISBN 978 3 05 005683 8. €29.80

Contemporary accounts of the meeting of Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV of Germany at Canossa in January 1077 have always had a 'mythical' quality: a penitent king humiliatingly forced to stand in the snow for three days to grovel before the pope in order to be restored both to Christian communion and the kingship of the German Reich. Such accounts have challenged historians ever since to interpret the nature of the meeting, its significance, and whether it marked a fundamental transformation in papal-imperial relations and, indeed, in European history more broadly. Yet, as Johannes Fried argues in this new book, whose title could be translated as 'exposing' or even 'de-bunking a legend', it is time to dismantle not merely the mythical image but also the historical interpretations of what led to and, in fact, happened at Canossa once and for all. Building upon a distinguished body of previous work on cultural memory, Fried looks to apply his methodological approach 'der Memorie' so as better to understand what occurred between Gregory VII and Henry IV between 1076 and 1077, the nature of the meeting at Canossa, and also why the 'Canossagang' and 'Canossa als Wende' myths have been, and continue to be (as he contends), perpetuated in modern historiography as well as popular culture.

Building upon his far from universally accepted 2008 article, 'Der Pakt von Canossa',¹ in which he argued that Canossa marked a peace alliance between the pope and king, Fried here extends his discussion over six chapters. In the introduction, Fried assesses what he terms 'the dubious success story of the legend of Canossa', and sets out his ambition to strip away the erroneous layers of historical myth which have led historians consistently to misunderstand what took place. In chapter 1, he briefly outlines the methodological considerations developed in earlier work and addresses how historical research needs to circumvent false memory with a brief analysis of the key sources we possess for Canossa and their problems. In chapter 2, Fried ques-

¹ Johannes Fried, 'Der Pakt von Canossa: Schritte zur Wirklichkeit durch Erinnerungsanalyse', in Wilfried Hartmann and Klaus Herbers (eds.), *Die Faszination der Papstgeschichte: Neue Zugänge zum frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Cologne, 2008), 133–97.

tions past readings of the sources, especially historians' neglect of the significance of the terms 'pactum' and 'pacticum' in the texts and what he sees as too great a reliance on post-1080 sources. These have highlighted the issue of the non-restoration of Henry IV to the German kingship and have led historians wrongly to focus on the status of Henry's kingship in the period 1077 to 1080. Here Fried also addresses issues of dating, the transmission of reports and, indeed, the travel itineraries of the pope and the king, which he argues present a very different sort of relationship. A very brief chapter 3 turns to the issue of whether and how far we can trust the contemporary historians: Lampert of Hersfeld, Bruno of Merseburg, and Berthold of Reichenau.

In chapter 4, Fried assesses what he terms 'deformations in cultural memory' by examining how the perspectives and agendas of humanist and early modern authors reading the contemporary accounts contributed to a 'Canossa complex'. In chapter 5, Fried outlines his reconstruction of the events by examining the preparations for the meeting between the pope and the king at Canossa, the alliance concluded there, the nature of its content, and the way in which this guaranteed mutual honour for both parties. In light of this, a brief chapter 6 then reassesses the relationship of Gregory and Henry following the reconciliation until the second excommunication of the king at the Lenten synod of 1080. In the conclusion, Fried reaffirms his argument and underlines the paramount need of historical research to recognize and circumvent the 'deformative power of memory' that has led to an erroneous interpretation of Canossa both in the historiography and in popular culture. The volume includes, as an appendix, a chronology from 1076 of Henry's 'progress' to Canossa in support of Fried's position.

This is a difficult work to characterize, given that it combines the methodology of 'Memorik' with extended analysis of the proof for Fried's contention that Canossa was a peace alliance between the pope and the king. At the same time, although Fried indicated that it was for others to judge whether or not the book was a 'Streitschrift' (p. 7), the tone is highly polemical and Fried, in fact, dismisses almost all previous historiographical interpretations of Canossa as misguided or incorrect. There is considerable refutation of the critics of his 'Der Pakt' article, one of whom – a highly respected German historian – is rather regrettably referred to as the DAMALS-Autor (after the

Book Reviews

journal in which this historian's review was published). The uneasy marriage of the two seemingly principal ambitions of the book, the reinterpretation of the events and the refutation of past historians and critics, the latter of which one senses might have been curtailed, make the monograph a far from easy read.

That said, Fried's overall argument is relatively simple to summarize and is perhaps not quite as revolutionary as he seems to believe. There are essentially five key elements to his thesis. In the first place, the accounts of Lampert, Bruno, Berthold, and Bonizo cannot be trusted at face value and must be subjected to critical remembrance theory and also be more rigorously counterpoised by Gregory's letter to the princes (*Registrum Gregorii VII.*, 4.12), the Königsberg Anonymous, and Arnulf of Milan's account. Second, when an appropriate critical assessment of the sources is undertaken, Fried contends that we have an entirely new understanding, namely, that Canossa was far from being about the absolution of the king or the exaltation of the pope as judge of the German kingship, but rather about cementing a peace treaty and alliance between the two men. Third, as a consequence, Canossa was neither a fundamental turning point nor a key moment in the Investiture contest writ large. Fourth, the peace alliance failed not because of Henry or Gregory, but rather because of the precipitous act of the princes to elect Rudolf of Rheinfelden at Forchheim in March 1077, something which Gregory did not explicitly condemn. Fried concludes that only critical remembrance analysis can work out the full extent of the modulations and deformations of the events in the memories of the witnesses (p. 146).

There are probably few historians who would dispute the need for careful, critical reading of the highly partisan sources of this period. Yet one can hardly avoid concluding that the issue of the kingship was in Gregory's mind, even if this only crystallized after Forchheim. The characterizations of the factual errors and omissions of Lampert and Bruno as 'errors of memory' (pp. 73, 76) seem a bit of a stretch; after all, both writers had clearly defined agendas for their characterizations of Canossa, which is in many ways the more interesting question, at least for this reviewer. At the same time, dates and rates of travel, which are key elements of Fried's chain of evidence, are often unreliable.

The key contention in the end is the question of what precipitated the meeting: the falling away of German support for Henry after the

Lenten synod of 1076 and the force exerted by the princes at Tribur, as many historians would favour, albeit with variations, or whether there was a long-planned meeting to make a formal peace alliance in 1077, as Fried contends? It seems unlikely that such an event would go so wholly unnoticed in the sources. Fried is, of course, correct to underline that this was scarcely a spontaneous penitential act on Henry's part, but his reading of 'pax' is perhaps too narrow. Whilst the list of signatories to the 'iurisiurandum' to which Henry committed himself before he and his German companions received the kiss of peace clearly underlines the collective (and hence clearly also well-planned) nature of the meeting, the 'pax' signified a peace and concord between the Church and the kingdom that Gregory had long sought even before the events of 1076 (*Registrum Gregorii VII.*, 4.12), and wished to better secure by travelling to Germany from Canossa. Moreover, there has been considerable debate and revisionist work on the nature of the meeting, all of which has more nuance than Fried perhaps allows. For example, in an article 'Contextualizing Canossa: Excommunication, Penance, Surrender, Reconciliation' published posthumously in 2006 (seemingly unknown to Fried), Timothy Reuter argued that one would do well to think of Canossa in terms of 'deditio', a ritual public surrender of a rebel to a lord, in which the very public surrender was just an integral part of a less public compromise; something originally explored in different contexts by Gerd Althoff and also touched upon by H. E. J. Cowdrey. Canossa, in this view, was a 'deal', a way out of present difficulties for both parties. But as ritual, Canossa was inherently ambiguous because the king 'submitted' both as a penitent and as a rebel, and we find it hard to tell the difference because contemporaries also did.²

In the end, *Canossa: Entlarvung einer Legende* is unlikely to be the last word on Canossa or to find universal acceptance. Yet Fried's arguments will challenge medieval historians to think further about what led to the events that transpired in Tuscany in January 1077.

² Timothy Reuter, 'Contextualizing Canossa: Excommunication, Penance, Surrender, Reconciliation', in id., *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, ed. Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), 147–66.

Book Reviews

KATHLEEN G. CUSHING is Reader in Medieval History at Keele University. She is interested in the religious and social history of early medieval Europe. Her work to date has focused on the 'Gregorian' reform of the eleventh century, and on the use of medieval canon law as a tool of polemic. This has resulted in several books, including *Papacy and Law in the Gregorian Revolution: The Canonistic Work of Anselm of Lucca* (1998); *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change* (2005); and (ed. with Martin Brett), *Readers, Texts and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages: Studies in Medieval Canon Law in Honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl* (2009). She is currently investigating the significance of monastic compilers of canon law and is also writing a book on penance, reform, and pastoral care in eleventh-century Italy.

MICHAEL VAN DUSSEN, *From England to Bohemia: Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 86 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), x + 217 pp. ISBN 978 1 107 01679 8. £55.00. \$US85.00

In this book Michael van Dussen's aim is to work out the patterns and networks of textual communication between England and Bohemia at the time of Richard II and the early Lancastrian kings, something that has not yet been done for this combination. The purely quantitative method (as used, for example, by Neddermeyer in his graphics), is not adequate in van Dussen's view as it cannot explain the movement of books. Although England's book production was modest at that time by comparison with Europe, it was of some significance for the new *studium* in Prague because of the interaction between the universities of Paris and Oxford. The author wants to place heretical 'Lollard-Hussite communication' (see below), whose importance he does not deny, into a wider chronological and factual context. As the Bohemian king at this time also wore the Roman-German crown, van Dussen regards his contact with the Holy Roman Empire as a whole as relevant. The author also wants to explore whether the longstanding Council of Constance, a large, centralized book market with numerous tracts, put an abrupt stop to Lollard-Hussite communication. It might have been more interesting for the reader, however, not to find out the outcome of the study in the Foreword.

Chapter 1 deals with Anne, daughter of Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV and sister of Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia and Roman-German king, who married the English king, Richard II, in 1382. It has long been maintained that, with her Bohemian household, she could make access to England, and Oxford in particular, possible or easier for Bohemian students. But van Dussen does not set out to discover anything new about the historical Anne. He is more interested in how the textual tradition, and English culture as a whole, dealt with her symbolically. The view that Anne promoted Wycliffism dates from the sixteenth century, when it was put forward by English Protestant historiographers. John Foxe (d. 1587), in particular, considered it possible that Anne had connections with the Lollards and

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

Book Reviews

Hussites; later English authors of the seventeenth century (Thomas James, William Sanderson) saw her as a Protestant sympathizer in order to justify Lutheran influence by pointing to its home-grown English national roots.

The author returns to the Middle Ages, to Anne's funeral (the service was held on 3 August 1394, two months after the burial), which reveals other Bohemian-English contacts. The eulogists praised her piety, her support of the poor by alms-giving, her reading of the gospels in English, and her good influence on the king. One textual transfer between England and Bohemia is the travel account (1402-13) of a Bohemian knight, Wenceslaus, from a manuscript held in the library of the metropolitan chapter in Prague. This preserves the texts of three panegyrics on the epitaphs of Queen Anne, which van Dussen studies in detail. In them, her figure is associated, among other things, with that of St Anne, who was already popular in England (for example, the queen was buried on the day after St Anne's feast day). One of the panegyrics to Anne is also preserved in a later Hussite compilation of 1414. We must agree with van Dussen's (hardly surprising) conclusion that while Anne was not involved in a heterodox exchange of texts, her marriage and her piety, which appealed to the reformers, encouraged exchange between England and Bohemia in an ideological context that was still fluid.

In chapter 2, the author investigates a sizeable group of Bohemian manuscripts containing material by the English religious writer Richard Rolle of Hampole (d. 1349). Rolle's popularity among the Lollards is well known, and some material is dated 1412-13 in the manuscripts. Van Dussen, however, also wants to take account of pre-Wycliffite relations. A large group of clergy in Rome read Rolle's *Incendium amoris*, which was taken to the Curia by English monks; from there, van Dussen surmises, on the basis of other indications, the early reformers Johann of Jenstein or Johannes Cardinalis might have taken it to Bohemia. Other material by Rolle was probably transferred directly from England to Bohemia, for example, by the Bohemian students Mikuláš Faulfiš or Jiří of Kněhnice.

Chapter 3 deals with 'Lollard-Hussite communication', in particular, the transmission of Wycliffe's most powerful and effective works to Bohemia. The earliest evidence that Wycliffe was known in Bohemia is found before 1380 in Mikuláš Biceps, and in 1385 in Jenštejn, who calls Wycliffe the 'heresiarch'. Perhaps these early con-

tacts were mediated by reform-oriented Bohemian students who were members of the English nation at the university of Paris. It is well known that in the 1390s, Wycliffe's philosophical works were the first to reach Prague, while the most important theological tracts, *Dialogus* and *Trialogus*, were taken there by Hieronymus of Prague between 1399 and 1401. In 1406–7 the Faulfiš mentioned above brought further tracts by Wycliffe to Prague; van Dussen believes he has evidence that Faulfiš undertook a second journey to England in 1410, and suggests that he might have brought Richard Wyche's letter to Hus and other works by Wycliffe with him from there. Van Dussen speculates that Faulfiš might have died on a third journey to England in 1411. John Foxe later regarded Faulfiš as playing a large part in establishing these contacts. Other reformers, such as Šimon of Tišnov, Nicholas of Hus, and Matthias Engliš, might also have been involved. The burning of Wycliffe's books ordered by the Archbishop of Prague in 1410 strengthened contacts between the network in that year: protest letters from Wyche and John Oldcastle (to Woks of Waldstein) in Bohemia were the result. Four letters written in 1410 by the Scottish preacher Quentin Folkhyrde also reached Bohemia. Jean Gerson was likewise aware of these connections. Master Peter Payne's visit to Prague from England in 1414 was the last known contact between the Lollards and Bohemia. With the Council of Constance and the death of Jan Hus, this connection came to an end.

Chapter 4 looks at official diplomatic communications with the Holy Roman Empire in the period 1411 to 1416, which turned against 'heretical' contacts between England and Bohemia. According to van Dussen, before the Council the English king tried to forestall any possible suspicion of England's religious orthodoxy by sending a delegation to King Sigismund in Hungary. Their journey took the envoys, Hartung von Clux (in the service both of Henry and Sigismund) and John Stokes (Licentiate of Law in Cambridge), via Prague, where they came into contact with the circle around Jan Hus. A letter from the university of Oxford, which expressed itself positively about Wycliffe and described the opposition to him as a minority, played a special part in this context. According to Hus, it was taken to Prague by Faulfiš and his companions in 1407. Hieronymus referred to it in his arguments in 1409, Hus not until 1411. Van Dussen leaves open the question of whether it was a forgery. Archbishop Arundel, who had appointed a commission to judge Wycliffe as early as 1407, only

Book Reviews

found out about this letter in 1411. Thereupon he applied to Pope John XXIII for permission to exhume Wycliffe and burn him. The events surrounding this letter were one reason for the English delegation's especially energetic persecution of Hus in Constance, while the Lollards' attempts to win over King Sigismund with a letter on a visit to London that resulted in the Treaty of Canterbury (August 1416) were, of course, in vain. Van Dussen surmises that the two Christian princes had agreed to make a concerted effort to condemn Wycliffe and Hus in Constance, but this seems questionable to me, especially for Sigismund. The English king's entourage, however, contained other people dedicated to finding out about conditions in Bohemia. For the English, it was certainly important that Wycliffism now no longer appeared as a purely English problem.

Chapter 5 looks forward to the Reformation. The revolutionary events in Bohemia after 1419 had an unpleasant significance for England precisely because of Wycliffe. The theologian Thomas Netter, who was also present at Constance, saw Lollards and Hussites going back to a common root, although he did acknowledge their differences on the Eucharist, for example. In a letter of 1428 Pope Martin V, drumming up support for the anti-Hussite crusade, reminded the English that the Bohemian heresy had begun in England. Other English theologians, such as Reginald Pecock and Thomas Gascoigne, tended to pass over the alliance between the Lollards and Hussites in silence and seek other reasons for events in Bohemia. By the early sixteenth century, English writers such as Henry VIII, Thomas More, and John Clerk lumped Hus (the old heresy) and Luther (the new heresy) together, as was often done in the Roman Catholic Holy Roman Empire. The opportunist Luther was regarded as merely having copied Hus. At this time information about Bohemia flowed fairly freely to England, for example, via the voluminous (and non-partisan) correspondence of Erasmus of Rotterdam.

Van Dussen's book provides a careful and thorough account of communication between England and Bohemia from the later Middle Ages to the sixteenth century, naturally seen more strongly from the English perspective. His (sometimes scarce) sources and other indications occasionally lead him to speculate, but he always identifies speculations as such. The author is right to look beyond the narrow confines of contacts between Wycliffites and Bohemians, and

rejects any fixation on the antithesis between heretical and orthodox communication. His notion that ideological relations in the communication networks of the two countries were often fluid is undoubtedly appropriate. In Prague, criticism of the Church can be found as early as the fourteenth century among the preachers Konrad Waldhauser, Jan Milíč of Kroměříž, and Matěj of Janov. Even some of the German masters in Prague, such as Heinrich Totting, Konrad of Soltau, and Matthäus of Krakau were reform-oriented scholars who, at times, fell under suspicion of heresy. Hus himself, however, as far as I can see, never referred to these 'predecessors'. The impetus to radical reform among the young masters of the *Natio Bohemica* seems to have started from scratch with the adoption of Wycliffe. Van Dussen's terminology in referring to 'Lollard-Hussite communication' (which came to an end with Constance and Hus's death), however, must be seen in a more critical light because in today's terms, Hus was not a 'Hussite'. His reforming movement can be seen as Wycliffite, but cannot (yet) be called 'Hussite'.

Appendix A contains the three poems written to Queen Anne (*Anglica regina*, *Femina famosa*, and *Nobis natura florem*) with a commentary and English translation; Appendix B presents *Nouitates de Anglia de Wikleph* on the basis of a (corrected) old edition by Jodok Stülz (1850) and a manuscript from the district archives of Wittengau/Třeboň, similarly with scholarly apparatus and translation. Extensive endnotes, a bibliography of sources and secondary literature, a list of manuscripts, and an index complete the volume.

PETER HILSCH is Professor Emeritus of Medieval History at the University of Tübingen. His main field of research is the history of the Bohemian lands in the Middle Ages. His publications include *Johannes Hus: Prediger Gottes und Ketzer* (1999); and *Das Mittelalter: Die Epoche* (3rd rev. edn. 2012).

MARTHA WHITE PAAS, *The Kipper und Wipper Inflation, 1619–23: An Economic History with Contemporary German Broadsheets*, with Broadsheet descriptions by John Roger Paas and translations by George C. Schoolfield (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), xii + 172 pp. ISBN 978 0 300 14676 9. £65.00

Since the publication of Gustav Freytag's *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, the major currency devaluation that took place in Germany at the beginning of the Thirty Years War has been known to the historically aware public as the Kipper und Wipper inflation. This name goes back to a term coined in the pamphlets and broadsheets of the years around 1620. In addition to the monetary and economic aspects of the Kipper und Wipper period, the way in which it was presented in the media has already attracted a certain amount of scholarly interest. In first place we should mention works by Gabriele Hooffacker and the present reviewer.¹ Added to this there are the large editions of seventeenth-century German pamphlets associated with the names of Wolfgang Harms, Michael Schilling, and John Roger Paas.

This book by Martha White Paas, Professor of Economics at Carleton College in Northfield (Minnesota), also picks up the theme of the presentation in the media of the Kipper und Wipper inflation in twenty-seven selected broadsheets on the Kipper und Wipper period. It reproduces the whole sheets as images, and in each case provides an English translation of the text. This is supplemented by a seventeen-page introductory essay on the German inflation between 1619 and 1623 by Martha White Paas, and two brief explanatory texts by John Roger Paas on early modern pamphlets and Georges C. Schoolfield about his English translations of the texts of the Baroque German pamphlets.

The undertaking of presenting the illustrated pamphlet, a medium so characteristic of the early modern media landscape in the German-language area, to an English-speaking public is certainly to be welcomed. It would, however, have profited its readers even more

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

¹ Gabriele Hooffacker, *Avaritia radix omnium malorum: Barocke Bildlichkeit um Geld und Eigennutz in Flugschriften, Flugblättern und benachbarter Literatur der*

if the contents of the broadsheets had been explained and placed in the context of research on economic and media history. Unfortunately Paas has not done this, perhaps because she has taken little or no note of essential studies on the topic. While Gabriele Hooffacker's work is mentioned in a footnote, Paas does not use the contents of her work, and the present reviewer's works are not mentioned at all. The result is that Paas does not recognize the illustrated pamphlets of the Kipper und Wipper period for what they were: rapidly produced, commercial printed matter which, in a functionally differentiated and networked media landscape, offered its readers explanations for current events. In the broadsheets, therefore, we do not hear contemporaries who sought a public voice because of personal involvement, but media professionals with a keen sense for commercially marketable topics and contents. To this extent, seeing the illustrated broadsheets of the Kipper und Wipper period as an 'eyewitness account' (p. 17) of events of the time is problematic.

In addition, the basis on which Paas selected the broadsheets to include in her book remains unclear. This is regrettable because in three cases the connection between the broadsheets and the Kipper und Wipper period is highly doubtful. *Trawrige Klag/Vber meinen Seckhel* (no. I) dates from 1616, and was clearly published before the Kipper und Wipper inflation began. *Des Seckels Jämmerlich Heulen* (no. II) is a general lament about wasting money without any recognizable connection with the Kipper und Wipper period in particular. The same applies to *Hie wirdt Fraw Armuth angedeut* (no. XI), produced in 1621 by Daniel Manasser in Augsburg, which concerns the economic consequences of alcohol abuse.

The introductory text on the German inflation between 1619 and 1623 adds nothing new to the current state of research, but some factual errors in it are surprising. According to Paas, for instance, the Fugger trading house, which existed until 1657, collapsed as the result of a Spanish bankruptcy in 1607 (p. 5), and the doubling or trebling of the European population between 1500 and 1618 which she postulates (p. 6) cannot be verified by reference to the relevant liter-

Kipper- und Wipperzeit (1620–1625) (Frankfurt am Main, 1988); Ulrich Rosseaux, *Die Kipper und Wipper als publizistisches Ereignis (1620–1626): Eine Studie zu den Strukturen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (Berlin, 2001).

Book Reviews

ature. If we compare the figures given by Jan de Vries,² we find a moderate population growth in the sixteenth century of around 28 per cent (1500: 61 million; 1600: 78 million).

All in all, although it is beautifully produced, this book is disappointing as a contribution to the academic debate on the Kipper und Wipper inflation. At most, it may be of some use as an introduction for readers who do not know German and are not familiar with the subject.

² See Jan de Vries, 'Population', in Thomas A. Brady Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy (eds.), *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1994), i. 13.

ULRICH ROSSEAUX is Deputy Director of the Money Museum of the German Bundesbank in Frankfurt am Main. He also teaches early modern history at the Technical University of Dresden. His research interests include the history of early modern media and communication, the history of towns and cities, and the history of leisure. Among his publications are *Die Kipper und Wipper als publizistisches Ereignis (1620–1626): Eine Studie zu den Strukturen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (2001), *Städte in der Frühen Neuzeit* (2006), and *Freiräume: Unterhaltung, Vergnügen und Erholung in Dresden 1694–1830* (2007).

EVA GILOI, *Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany 1750–1950*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 422 pp. ISBN 978 0 521 76198 7. £60.00. US\$99.00

Monarchy is back. Almost 100 years after the end of the Kaiserreich, the historical exploration of the dozens of kings and grand dukes, dukes and princes, whose *Bund* formed the constitutional backbone of Imperial Germany until 1918, is reaching new heights. From the 1960s to the 1980s, social history, and not only of the Bielefeld brand, relegated ancient institutions alongside ‘great men’ to the margins of history. Over the last twenty years, however, historiography has refocused on the versatility and adaptability of monarchy, which survived several revolutions and foreign interventions to remain politically, socially, culturally, and economically important in Germany well into the twentieth century. Yet most studies focus on the Kaiserreich, nineteenth-century history, or the early modern period, and there are still too few attempts to trace the fate of monarchy across the threshold of the years around 1800. And the impact of the sudden disappearance of German monarchies in 1918 on the political culture and social fabric of republican Germany in the following decades is rarely considered.

This is where Eva Giloi comes in. She follows the public image of the House of Hohenzollern over 200 years, starting in the middle of the eighteenth century, when new modes of communication and consumption (‘public sphere’) affected the relationship between kings and subjects, and ending after the Second World War, when the democratically elected father figures of the Adenauer era replaced the hereditary patriarchalism that had underpinned German monarchies for centuries. The theme of Giloi’s book, which has grown out of a Princeton Ph.D. dissertation, is the popular attitudes of Prussians to their monarchy, which she analyses through the form they took in ‘material culture’. Although the ‘Germany’ of the book title really refers only to Prussia, Giloi makes an effort to compare her findings with research on the British and French monarchies, which has inspired so much of the recent revival of monarchy studies.

At the centre of the work is the exchange of gifts and objects between Prussian subjects and their kings (and, after 1871, German emperors). Here, Giloi distinguishes between two kinds of objects.

Book Reviews

First, she considers 'relics', that is, objects that were used by a member of a ruling house (such as Frederick the Great's frock coat), that formed part of the royal body (Queen Louise's locks of hair, for instance), or that bore traces of it (for example, royal autographs). Second, Giloi examines the production, sale, and use of souvenirs, such as cups bearing royal portraits, which were produced for a market that included royalty in celebrity culture from the start. She demonstrates that members of the middle classes in particular displayed an avid interest in both relics and souvenirs, and collected them from early on. Moreover, subjects sent some of these objects, as well as other items related to specific episodes in dynastic history, to the ruling monarch himself, and the analysis of these donations and the accompanying letters forms the centre of Giloi's study. She asks which monarchs received most gifts (and at what period of their reign), and whose relics were most popular; she examines the social profiles as well as the gender of donors; and considers the landscape of gift-giving.

Most 'relics' originally started life as royal gifts to servants or courtiers (sometimes because of their monetary value), and then made their way through various family generations and stages of selling-on. Giloi follows the trajectory of these objects, examines how they were sold, who bought them, and how particular meanings came to be attached to them. From the 1850s on, a veritable market emerged, but some objects returned to the orbit of the court as donations. The combination of royal display and public appropriation of monarchy was not a specifically German practice. Royal objects were popular throughout nineteenth-century Europe. Prussia, Giloi points out, was actually a latecomer in this field as royal celebrity culture depended on a sophisticated consumer and leisure culture. Celebrity tourism emerged during the nineteenth century, as thousands visited museums, monuments, galleries, and palaces as well as their inhabitants, and it spelled out when members of the royal dynasty could best be viewed ('Kaiser-spotting').

With this shift towards objects, Giloi appropriates the recent focus on objects (*Dinge*) and material culture in the humanities for her examination of monarchy. In this historiographical field, the culture of gift-giving has so far only been considered in the context of inter-dynastic exchange between various courts, and thus in relation to diplomatic activity. By embedding the mass use of royal 'relics' and

'souvenirs' in a wider culture of gift-giving that took root in middle-class families in the later eighteenth century, Giloi sheds new light on the political culture of Germany in the long nineteenth century. In line with recent research on political culture, Giloi understands *Herrschaft* not as top-down governance, but as an act of communication in which the roles of subject and ruler were subject to constant negotiation and change. Consequently, the book deals both with royal projections and middle-class appropriations, and thus moves away from older notions of royal propaganda. By asking where the Germans' enthusiasm for their monarchs came from, and how it can be measured, Giloi circumvents any problems which an exploration of public opinion in pre-1918 Germany might encounter, as the press was officially regulated and informally guided.

The book's structure is partly chronological and partly systematic. It begins with an overview over the 100 years from 1750 to 1850, when a new material culture of monarchy took root in German society. Here, the cult surrounding Frederick II 'the Great' and the *Luisenkult*, which turned Frederick William III's consort, who died early, into the epitome of German motherhood and Prussian resistance to Napoleon, were pivotal. Memorabilia of Frederick and Louise also formed the centrepieces of later collections. Frederick William III, by contrast, pales by comparison, which Giloi attributes to his conservative politics and restrained personality. Giloi thus demonstrates that the *Luisenkult*, which took off almost immediately after the queen's death in 1810, did not translate into admiration for the widowed king. Here it already becomes apparent that the popular cult of monarchy was a question of projection. This becomes especially clear in Giloi's chapters on William I and the Hohenzollern Museum. They form the analytical core of the book, making up five of the book's eleven chapters (excluding introduction and conclusion), and also figuring prominently in the long term analyses in chapters 2 and 4.

What made William I so central was two things. First, the culture of gift-giving was institutionalized and made public under William I, when the Prussian monarchy established its own museum in 1877. While Frederick William III and Frederick William IV had stored donations in the royal collections scattered across various palaces, and thus kept them removed from the public gaze, the Hohenzollern Museum now displayed gifts from subjects along with other 'relics' in a series of specially designed rooms in Berlin's Monbijou Palace,

Book Reviews

which were constantly being redecorated to adapt to changing public taste (chapter 9). Here the history of the House of Hohenzollern was narrated as both national and family history, thus linking the ruling dynasty with two dominant discourses of the nineteenth century. In the museum, William I's cradle could be seen alongside the chair in which Frederick the Great had died in 1786.

Secondly, the link between William I and his mother, Queen Louise, did not just connect Imperial Germany with the mythologized and distant Napoleonic era but, more importantly, it partially 'feminized' the Prussian monarchy that had just achieved German unification through military victory. Making the monarch look both heroic and vulnerable, Giloi argues, was important for the monarchy's ability to put down sentimental roots in German society as well as to command the public's respect for its power and authority. Although William I made his dislike of publicity well known, he proved to be much more adept at managing his public persona than Frederick William III or William II. In combining ostentatious modesty with a shrewd use of the media, he bears some resemblance to Frederick the Great, who also managed to do justice to the demands of audiences as different as European courts and the Parisian *philosophes*. The story of the Prussian monarchy that emerges is thus different from the usual narrative of the rise of an all-conquering Prussian military state by the 1870s. Rather, Queen Louise's maternal love and William I's vulnerability as an orphaned prince reflected the vulnerability of what had, for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, been the weakest of Europe's great powers as a whole.

This combination of the *Luisenmythos* with a specific narrative about William I also helped to compensate for the relative poverty of the House of Hohenzollern's folkloric resources by comparison with other, older German dynasties, who could boast historical figures, such as Henry the Lion or Emperor Ludwig the Bavarian, to emphasize their ancient traditions in the age of historicism. It was not access to the monarch as head of state and church and commander-in-chief of the army with political, religious, and military functions that was sought, but to his personality and character. Gift-giving established a personal link between subject and monarch that could be interpreted in various ways. The emotional bonds that this kind of vision fostered were, however, difficult to maintain, and needed careful managing. Counterbalancing Bismarck's image as Iron Chancellor, the

public image of William I successfully reconciled military courage and sentimental vulnerability. William II, by contrast, wanted to project imperial power and glory, while the public was much more interested in glimpsing the Kaiser's otherwise 'hidden' side.

Paying particular attention to the subjects' *Eigensinn*, Giloi points out that gift-giving should by no means be misread as an act of unquestioned loyalty. Rather, subjects created their own image of monarchy, one that often contravened official purposes. Giloi thus emphasizes the multiplicity of meanings: not all 'relics' were admired, and the very triviality of many everyday objects offered unedifying views of the ruling dynasty (p. 10). Political reform, however, was rarely advocated through gifts; royal relics and souvenirs were certainly not objects of revolution. This becomes clear when the social and regional background of donors is considered. Here the nobility, coming in at around 25 per cent, was over-represented, while under William II in particular, industrialists and the wealthy bourgeoisie stepped up their gift-giving, reflecting the Kaiser's particular fondness for technical and industrial innovation.

Moreover, throughout the period, most gifts to the court were sent from Prussia's core provinces, such as the Mark Brandenburg. Prussia's western provinces, acquired after 1815, were under-represented, accounting for only 10 per cent of donations (p. 318). Even after 1871, few objects came from the other constituent states of the new Kaiserreich; under William II, only 16 per cent of gifts were sent in from the non-Prussian parts of Germany. Whether this points to the Imperial monarchy's limited powers of integration, or to the regional limits of a particular culture of gift-giving within Germany is a question that remains unanswered. But what does become clear is how closely gift-giving was tied both to social structure and long-standing regional connections, as well as to specific political developments. Donations to William I increased greatly in the late 1870s, when the vulnerability of the ageing emperor was highlighted by a series of unsuccessful assassination attempts that pushed memories of William's earlier controversial career into the background.

By putting William I at centre stage, Giloi provides a welcome reassessment of this important monarch, who has always remained in the shadow of the more glittering figure of Bismarck. William II, by contrast, is cast in the usual role of blundering egomaniac who spoils it all. Kings Frederick William II and Frederick William IV,

Book Reviews

however, make surprisingly few appearances. Although this certainly mirrors Giloi's analysis of gift-giving, as well as the rulers' attempts to banish the potentially dangerous popular cult of Frederick the Great, it begs the question of what exactly their role was in shaping the public image of the Hohenzollern monarchy. Frederick William II, after all, was the first Prussian king who made a deliberate effort to popularize monarchy in the decade of the French Revolution, while Frederick William IV pursued a novel public relations strategy integrating both ceremonial and the new tool of public speeches.

Giloi approaches the role of monarchy in emergent modern society from a highly original perspective that goes beyond the now conventional analysis of courts and ceremonial, newspapers and artistic patronage. She has an impressive command of the literature in a wide field, and brings to life the culture of gift-giving in readable yet precise prose interspersed with observations of dry wit. Once or twice, Giloi seems confused by royal and imperial titles: in 1848, the later William I was not 'His Majesty the Prince of Prussia' (p. 100), while a 1861 coronation photograph could show only his royal, but not yet imperial, crown (figure 22). It is also unlikely that the 'poor invalid' mentioned in a 1830s board game refers to widowed Frederick William III (p. 96). In general, however, the book is edited and illustrated to a high standard. Giloi's analysis of written sources and examination of museum layouts are skilfully linked to larger developments in European politics, German society, consumer culture, and mass media. Especially laudable is that she not only highlights the multiple meanings attached to 'royal objects', but herself openly asks questions. Often she discusses several possible interpretations, as on the political effects of the 'disparity between popular depiction and royal intention' (p. 8). Two decades after Peter Burke's seminal *Fabrication of Louis XIV*, Giloi's examination of royal images through the interaction of monarchy and subjects thus places the study of monarchy on a new level.

THOMAS BISKUP is a Lecturer in Early Modern History at the University of Hull. His main publications include *Friedrichs Größe: Inszenierungen des Preußenkönig in Fest und Zeremoniell 1740–1815*

Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany

(2012) and, as co-editor with Martin Kohlrausch, *Das Erbe der Monarchie: Nachwirkungen einer deutschen Institution seit 1918* (2008). He is currently working on natural history and politics in eighteenth-century Britain and Germany.

ROLAND WENZLHUEMER, *Connecting the Nineteenth-Century World: The Telegraph and Globalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), xvi + 339 pp. ISBN 978 1 107 02528 8. £65.00. US\$110.00

The historian-zealots of the 1970s who believed that quantification would revolutionize the writing of history (most notably the advocates of QUASSH, Quantitative and Social Science History) would be demoralized by the state of the field today. Despite great initial enthusiasm in the 1960s and 1970s, efforts to transform the discipline through the application of statistics eventually fell on hard times.¹ By 2010, according to a survey by the American Historical Association, older historians, from the generation that pioneered quantitative history, were more likely than younger historians to use heavy-duty number crunching statistical programmes.² In fact, contrary to the predictions of cliometricians, the most trendy historical research of the last three decades moved in the opposite direction, towards a fascination with language and culture that owed more to the humanities (especially literary studies) than to the social sciences. Instead of seeking numbers in the quest for universal truths, historians moved towards greater tolerance of subjectivity, particularism, and anecdote.

In this context, *Connecting the Nineteenth-Century World* may be an exciting harbinger of emerging scholarly trends. The book, which seeks to understand how the telegraph affected globalization, is eclectic, innovative, and pragmatic in its approach, employing (as will be described below) a mixture of humanistic and social scientific methodologies. A brief summary indicates the diversity and complexity of the subjects it covers. Chapter one introduces the topic and also contrasts the telegraph with the internet. Chapter two offers a conceptual analysis of the concepts of globalization, space, and net-

¹ For telling statistics on this trend, see Steven Ruggles's PowerPoint slides on 'The Decline of Quantitative History', available on the internet at <www.hist.umn.edu/~ruggles/hist5011/Decline.pptx>, accessed 1 July 2013; Robert Whaples, 'Is Economic History a Neglected Field of Study?', *Historically Speaking*, 11/ 2 (Apr. 2010), 17-20.

² Robert B. Townsend, 'How is New Media Reshaping the Work of Historians?', American Historical Association, *Perspectives on History* (Nov. 2010).

works, and then explores the vexed question of whether technology is an autonomous force driving historical change. Chapter three describes the development of long-distance electric communication during the nineteenth century. Chapter four considers the effect of telegraphy on imperialism, commerce, journalism, and culture. Chapter five examines the structure of the worldwide telegraph network, and how it influenced economic integration and contemporary notions of 'global communication space'. Chapter six makes generous use of social scientific methods of inquiry to identify centres and peripheries in the global communication network of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Chapter seven, also employing social scientific methods, reconstructs the structure and use of the domestic British telegraph system during the nineteenth century. Chapter eight provides a similar analysis of the telegraph network of British India during the same period. Finally, chapter nine attempts to weave these strands together, and offers perspective on telegraphy's impact upon cultural practices and global spaces.

As he investigates these topics, Wenzlhuemer makes good use of the vogue for particularism and anecdote popularized by cultural historians and characteristic of much recent historical scholarship. The book is filled with marvellous tales that illustrate his arguments. For example, he narrates an instance in which the viceroy of India and his wife diverged in their use of language during a public exchange of telegrams, suggesting that context, habit, gender, and cultural expectations influenced the messages of telegraph users as much as intrinsic aspects of the technology. Even more dramatically, he describes an early telegram ordering that a convicted criminal be executed, which generated confusion due to the lack of context in telegrams (which tended to be extremely brief because of the expense) and the difficulty of determining whether they were really from the person purporting to send them.

Wenzlhuemer sympathizes with the view that time and space, as historically experienced, were subjective and unstable, but he challenges assertions that these concepts were 'annihilated' by technology. He subjects such generalizations to empirical critique, as with a story he tells demonstrating that, far from becoming irrelevant, space and time retained their importance in the age of telegraphy: during the 1908 Telegraph General Strike in India, strikers transmitted telegrams without their date and time, destroying their value in

Book Reviews

many cases (p. 255). More generally, he describes other instances when the telegraph failed to operate as intended. While engaging stimulating ideas from postmodern authors, Wenzlhuemer brings an empirical rigour that is useful when examining their sometimes breathless claims. For example, a close examination of the historical record suggests that the 'communications revolution' often associated with the rise of a global telegraph network actually occurred decades earlier, during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when the time required for land and sea travel fell rapidly in absolute terms (p. 30). He likewise offers an intriguing challenge to the conventional narrative of communications progress when he suggests that 'absolute message delivery times had in many instances grown between 1890 and 1900' due to increased traffic on a telegraph system that had not increased in capacity (p. 128).

Wenzlhuemer's judicious approach is helpful when, from the standpoint of the electric telegraph, the book examines the technological millennialism surrounding the internet. Wenzlhuemer concludes that much of what is genuinely new about the internet is the relatively broad public access to it, the disintermediation it provides between customer and technology (we no longer need to communicate through telegraphers, for example), and its relatively low cost (which is why email spam is a problem and telegram spam was not). Perhaps most importantly, the digitization of information and enormous growth of bandwidth 'allow internet users to exchange much more than just brief text-based messages', while the 'World Wide Web stores information and makes it accessible on-demand and from any (connected) place' (p. 8).

While Victorians would have been astonished by these last two capabilities, they were already familiar with other aspects of the 'information age', such as the 'dematerialization' of information (by converting a written message into electrical impulses) and the drastic change in the relationship between distance and the speed of sending news. These two characteristics of telegraphy are central to Wenzlhuemer's analysis of its impact on 'globalization', which he describes as comprising 'all processes that lead to a gradual detachment of patterns of sociocultural interaction from geographical proximity' (pp. 14-15). As the book shows, messages could frequently be sent more quickly from London to distant but well-connected parts of the British Empire than between addresses within London. This

helped reconfigure contemporary notions of space and time. Wenzlhuemer particularly emphasizes that telegraphy, by dematerializing information, allowed for communication that was much faster than a human could travel. As he notes, 'dematerialized information outpaced material transport and could, therefore, be used to efficiently co-ordinate, control and command such material movement' (p. 31). Unlike technological enthusiasts, who tend to be ahistorical, Wenzlhuemer argues that information technologies are historically shaped and limited by path dependence.

But telegraphy did not affect everyone equally. At one point, Wenzlhuemer notes: 'Only a very small privileged group of mostly Western administrators, businessmen and travellers really witnessed a transformation of global communication space in the nineteenth century' (p. 49). His focus on elites, although likely an accident of subject matter rather than a methodological or moral preference, is worth noting. Indeed, one of the few areas of continuity between the proponents of quantitative history and the advocates of the 'cultural turn' is a concern with recovering the stories of ordinary people and socially marginalized groups. Both approaches rebelled against more traditional histories focused on political, economic, and social elites. In this area, Wenzlhuemer's work has a more traditional focus on the wealthy and powerful because telegrams were expensive, and generally only elites sent or received them. Even the labourers most closely identified with the telegraph industry, despite their legitimate workplace grievances, were not prototypical members of a Marxian proletariat. The humble telegrapher, subject as he or she was to repetitive stress injuries and other unsatisfactory labour conditions that sometimes led to strikes, possessed a highly marketable skill that allowed for geographic freedom and led many towards a middle-class life.³ Likewise, poorly paid telegram delivery boys worked outside the confines of an office, and sometimes showed surprising upward mobility as a result of their contact with powerful businessmen and familiarity with what was a leading technology of its day, as is shown most starkly by the extraordinary career of Andrew Carnegie.

In the course of addressing many stimulating topics, such as the effect of telegraphy on language and manners, the book sensibly and

³ Edwin Gabler, *The American Telegrapher: A Social History, 1860–1900* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1988).

Book Reviews

assiduously employs classic archival research as well as more recently fashionable methodologies such as cultural analysis. But where it makes its most significant methodological contribution is in sections that deploy techniques more common in other disciplines, such as the use of geographic information systems (GIS) and statistical analysis, using these two techniques to complement one another. For example, through the application of social network analysis tools, Wenzlhuemer tries to locate centres and peripheries in the global telegraph system. He employs four tools: degree (which counts the number of connections that a node has with other nodes), closeness (how few connections a node requires to reach each and every other node), betweenness (how often the shortest connection between two nodes passes through a certain node), and eigenvector (to what extent a node is connected to other central nodes) (pp. 138–46). The application of these four ‘centrality measures’ produces a plethora of maps and statistics. The book prints twenty-five maps and an appendix with forty-three pages of statistical tables in addition to other tables scattered throughout the text.

While all of this is extremely laudable, it is not clear to me that these innovative techniques provide startling new insights; for the most part they offer additional confirmation for what we already suspected, such as the importance of London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna to the international telegraph network. Similarly, it seems unsurprising that small countries sent more international telegrams per capita (other things being equal) than big countries. This is almost inevitable, just as small countries tend to import and export a higher percentage of their goods than big countries if both follow similar policies. In one frustrating case, statistical analysis fails to support or even provide clear evidence about the hypothesis that better global telecommunications increased transnational economic integration (for example, an improvement in telegraphic communication between two places distant from one another might thereby increase trade between them). It appears that Wenzlhuemer had anticipated a more favourable result (p. 133). Yet, although this last finding is preliminary and cannot be considered definitive, it is nonetheless extremely valuable to publish negative or inconclusive results, which help future generations of scholars to avoid endlessly re-testing enticing theories that never pan out. Likewise, it is worthwhile to examine the validity of hypotheses that at first glance seem obvious

or common sense but are sometimes wrong and, in any case, extremely difficult to prove. I have no doubt that the findings in this book will be of great assistance to future researchers.

One problem in using statistics to answer important historical questions is the frequent inadequacy of the data. For example, as Wenzlhuemer acknowledges, his work is hindered by the difficulty of finding usage data to complement more abundant evidence on the structure of the international telegraph network, although he does achieve some success in overcoming this formidable obstacle (pp. 122, 176). Despite such challenges, this book offers thoughtful and sensible judgements on a variety of topics, as well as generally good writing, and indefatigable research. Yet it may be the use of innovative (at least among historians) research techniques that captures the attention of many readers. This book may be part of a movement that will integrate history back into the social sciences.⁴ There are drawbacks to this focus on social scientific methodology, which results in a book that is rather dense in places and lacking in narrative drive. Despite valuable efforts to provide coherence in the introduction and conclusion, it feels more like a collection of essays than a monograph. But is that so bad? It would be unfair to criticize this book for literary shortcomings that do not relate to its aims and accomplishments, which, indeed, are ambitious, and impressive, enough.

⁴ The next frontier may be the natural sciences. See Michael McCormick, 'History's Changing Climate: Climate Science, Genomics, and the Emerging Consilient Approach to Interdisciplinary History', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 42/2 (Autumn 2011), 251-73.

DAVID PAULL NICKLES is the author of *Under the Wire: How the Telegraph Changed Diplomacy* (2003) and a historian at the US Department of State. The views expressed here are the author's and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of State or the US Government.

TATJANA TÖNSMEYER, *Adelige Moderne: Großgrundbesitz und ländliche Gesellschaft in England und Böhmen 1848–1918*, Industrielle Welt, 83 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2012), 372 pp. ISBN 978 3 412 20937 7. €59.90

The wave of interest in the late modern history of European nobilities unleashed some three decades ago, in part by Arno Mayer's provocative thesis on 'the persistence of the old regime', continues its slow rise, tossing up fine works of historical learning as it does. This book comparing and contrasting what would seem to be quite disparate groups of English and Bohemian nobles at the high tide of landed aristocracy is one of them. The apparent dissimilarity is accentuated by the state of the literature. Where the English or British landed establishment has been illuminated from many angles and is the subject of major narrative interpretations such as David Cannadine's *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (1992), the Bohemian or Habsburg high nobility has remained in the shadows. The notable revival of interest in recent years in central European nobilities, specifically in various German lands, has also largely passed the Habsburg Monarchy and its territories by. The collapse of the old regime at the end of the First World War and the rise of nation-states within whose physical and mental boundaries the old elites would seem to have little place continues to exert a profound influence on the approach to, and writing of, history nearly a century later. Thanks to the long parliamentary tradition, the English peerage has not been understood, in contrast, as having been foreign or extraneous to the 'nation'.

That old corporate diets enduring down to 1848 shaped noble traditions in the Habsburg lands points to another meaningful divergence in the historical experiences of English and Bohemian nobles. Those diets were the political expression of a social order that had ultimately rested on the manorial system, which in the English countryside had withered away centuries earlier. Only in consequence of the events of 1848 did that system, together with the customary Estates, disappear in the Habsburg lands. Yet this change confronted Bohemian landowners with a challenge very like that facing their English counterparts following the abolition of the Corn Laws only two years earlier (1846): it exposed them to the full blast of agrarian capitalism. These mid-century caesuras form the starting point for the study under consideration here. Both groups of landowners were furthermore uniquely well equipped to take the heat. It is well known

that the British elite was Europe's most broadacred, with vast swathes of the urban and rural worlds in the hands of a few hundred families. Less familiar is that the Habsburg aristocracy, especially its Bohemian and Hungarian manifestations, was its closest continental equivalent in terms of resources. In 1896, almost a quarter of the Bohemian kingdom's total land area was held by 163 proprietors; fourteen of these, led by Prince Schwarzenberg with 150,000 hectares, owned 11.4 per cent of that area (p. 23). Both the English and Bohemian nobilities were strongly supra-regional in orientation, which reflected the importance of 'imperial' politics as essential points on their compass. And they were also part of a closely interconnected, European-wide social elite.

That we get little sense of cross-influences or of the nobility's British, Habsburg, or European context is a function of this study's resolutely local focus, which is at the same time its great merit. Starting from the historian Otto Brunner's famous premise that the essence of nobility over time has been *Herrschaft über Land und Leute* at the level of the estate, the author asks how her focus groups attempted to stabilize and uphold 'dominion over land and people' under circumstances very different from those of the medieval and early modern periods with which Brunner was concerned. In view of the high proportion of people who continued to live in the European countryside after 1900, this is an important question. Because of strong 'national assumptions' (p. 31), however, it has been rarely asked. In the English case, the combination of land, opulence, and authority has been taken as a given, with paradoxically little need seen to explore just how the noble base was sustained. For the Czech lands, national teleology has postulated a landed nobility deprived of its legal hold over the subject populace by the mid-century revolution and then inexorably pushed aside by modern, middle-class society. Perhaps even more than their English counterparts, Bohemian great landowners remained firmly rooted on their ancestral acres – and a power to be reckoned with – down to 1914 and beyond. The author's findings for Bohemia show how carefully they avoided identifying with any one group in a multi-lingual world. This helps to explain their success.

In keeping with recent advances in the understanding of how power is exercised, the author firmly and effectively integrates the 'ruled' into her picture of the 'rulers'. The same has been done, for

Book Reviews

example, by primarily English-language scholars to overturn older notions of 'absolutism' in early modern France and thus deepen our knowledge of how the expansion of royal power occurred. In German-language scholarship, the emphasis has been on power as a process of communication and negotiation. Impulses coming from sociology and other disciplines have been important in this re-thinking. Drawing on such insights, Tönsmeier interprets dominion as a form of 'social practice' in which historical players interact in what is thought of as a 'force field' (*Kräftefeld*) (p. 19); the focus is on their interaction with each other and the cultural 'tools' they use in doing so. These 'tools' are often rooted in daily usage that itself draws on long-established custom, rather than reified ideas of 'efficiency'. In other words, the actors bring their 'own logic' (*Eigensinn*) into play. In conceiving of the exercise of power as a matter of negotiation, some scholars have gone too far in assuming a level playing field between 'rulers' and 'ruled', a mistake that the author carefully avoids. Those who were dependent or lacking resources had 'fewer possibilities for being successful in processes of negotiation' (p. 256), as a conflict between the beneficiaries of a foundation for the poor and the administration of Count Czernin, whose family funded it, suggested. But to be most effective, noble dominion had in some way to take into account the interests and needs of those they ruled.

The book is divided into four major sections that reflect how the theoretical and methodological reflections apply to the actual historical record as surveyed by the author in family and estate papers surviving in eight regional archives in England and the Czech Republic (and concerning roughly a dozen families in all). The first section thus introduces the reader to the 'actors in agrarian society' – those who in effect occupied the postulated 'force field'. These included not only the noble landowners themselves, but also their bailiffs, stewards, and other administrators, as well as the many other rural social elements that fell within the penumbra of estates. Another player not introduced at this point but nevertheless factored into the equation later in the book is the 'state', which was extending its reach into the countryside by creating new structures of government.

Proprietors in both England and Bohemia shared a central concern, reflected in their frequent presence on their lands and close involvement in management, to turn the profit needed for them to maintain a lifestyle in accordance with their rank. Otherwise the

structures in the two places varied, as both this and the following section, 'The Working World of the Estates: Practices and Conflicts', show. A key difference was that the English nobility generally leased out its holdings—thus the prominence of tenant farmers in agrarian society there—whereas the Bohemian nobility tended to farm its properties itself. Flashpoints of conflict also differed significantly as a consequence of historical circumstance. In England, they concerned cottages, the consumption of alcohol, and unionism; in Bohemia, pay-in-kind (such as dairy products), access to forests, and the use of ponds and streams. In both the Bohemian and English cases, the author interestingly teases out the clashing conceptions of 'property' that, in some cases, despite being rooted in older ways of thinking, were now criminalized. That the nobility did not always manage to enforce its will was evident in the struggle over the unionization of workers on its industrial holdings in England. Here patriarchal and paternalistic appeals to 'common interests' had lost their effectiveness.

The last two sections explore 'traditional' and 'modern' ways in which the nobility sought to stabilize its hold in the countryside. These again differed somewhat according to circumstance. Among the former, the provision of charity, the maintenance of churches and schools, and celebrations and solemn occasions all provided opportunities for reinforcing hierarchy. As late as the 1870s, petitioners for help in Bohemia are on record as recommending themselves to noble patrons by recalling the former subject-status of themselves or their immediate ancestors. In England, the dissenting chapels in the so-called 'open villages' offered alternative forms of allegiance bitterly opposed by noble landowners, not least because of the connection to unionism. New structures of local government and associations were the most important of the 'modern' forums used by the landed nobility with some success in defending its interests.

The interpretative model of the 'force field' that brings interaction and conflict into focus has perhaps not allowed for consideration of one aspect of the nobility's continuing assertion of its presence and status in the agrarian world: the later nineteenth century was the last great age of the construction and remaking of castles and country homes in both England and Bohemia. Such buildings had traditionally been a supreme expression of the nobility's claim to dominate. Did they provoke no opposition in the later nineteenth century, or is

Book Reviews

the silence a function of the sources examined? The study's focus on the problem of conflict, in combination with the comparative English-Bohemian perspective, nevertheless casts more light than it obscures. Where conflict has been seen as a pervasive daily phenomenon in Bohemia with its traditions of customary rights anchored in the manorial system, historians have tended to assume a 'culture of deference' in the English countryside. The author convincingly calls this assumption into question. The original findings and fresh perspective are thus not limited to the less well-known Bohemian case and make abundantly clear how profitable, even essential, comparisons remain to historical scholarship.

WILLIAM D. GODSEY is a Research Fellow at the Institute for Modern and Contemporary Historical Research of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and a University Lecturer in Vienna. His major publications include *Aristocratic Redoubt: The Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office on the Eve of the First World War* (1999); *Nobles and Nation in Central Europe: Free Imperial Knights in the Age of Revolution 1750-1850* (2004); and, as co-editor, *Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten der Landesfürsten? Die Stände in der Habsburgermonarchie* (2007).

MATTHEW S. SELIGMANN, *The Royal Navy and the German Threat 1901–1914: Admiralty Plans to Protect British Trade in a War Against Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), x + 186 pp. ISBN 978 0 19 957403 2. £60.00

Everything seems to have been said about Anglo-German rivalry and the arms race before 1914. Studies of British sea power before and after the launching of the battleship *HMS Dreadnought* in 1906, which took naval armament to a new level, have filled whole libraries over the last twenty or so years. It is all the more surprising, therefore, that Matthew Seligmann seems to have discovered a new topic, one that has received little attention so far: the protection of British sea trade against 'Germany's extensive fleet of large Atlantic liners' (p. 6).

Those who know Seligmann's work will recognize that he does not belong to those revisionists, who, in recent years, have questioned the paradigm of Anglo-German measure and counter-measure. On the contrary, he has recently attempted to underpin the orthodox view that the sole threat to Britain before 1914 was posed by German naval policy. In this new book he believes he has got to the heart of the Anglo-German rivalry at sea. It was not the German battle fleet that had given the British Admiralty a permanent headache since the turn of the century, he suggests, and certainly not any other modern world fleets, or even financial or technical problems, but Germany's fast passenger ships.

This arresting claim commands the reader's attention. With a great deal of verve, Seligmann first directs our gaze towards Germany's supposed intention of disrupting British trade in future by using armed commercial ships (pp. 7–24). His claim that this adds a completely new factor to existing patterns of interpretation (pp. 5, 171), however, quickly falters. In particular, the exclusive focus on Germany suggests that this is just another addition to the orthodox line of a sole German challenge. It completely ignores the French *Jeune École*, which directed its attention exclusively to the task of wearing Britain down in an extensive trade war. The Cunard Agreement (pp. 46–64) on the military use of the *Lusitania*, therefore, needs to be considered in the context of France. Nonetheless, this perspective on the use of commercial shipping in the war is refreshing and

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

Book Reviews

promising. It is also noteworthy that Seligmann does not, like so many others, merely describe German intentions and extrapolate a British reaction from this. Rather, he draws on intelligence investigations of Britain (pp. 25–45).

Yet despite this promising approach, Seligmann's evidence is surprisingly thin in quality and quantity. For example, his claim that the German government was considering war when it subsidized commercial ships requires further analysis. The interconnectedness of commercial and political interests and the fact that the ships were not commercially viable is not enough to demonstrate Berlin's sinister motives. At the beginning of the twentieth century there was a real competition between passenger steamships, often driven by prestige rather than solely commercial considerations. HAPAG's ships, for example, competed with those not only of Britain's White Star Line, but also of Germany's Norddeutsche Lloyd, and vice versa. Instead of concentrating purely on the potential wartime use of merchant and passenger ships, the argument would have benefited here from at least bearing the economic background of commercial shipping in mind.

In addition, there is little evidence that Germany's approach was peculiar. After all, it has always been completely normal for seafaring powers at times of war to count on any suitable merchant and commercial shipping. The Boer War had already demonstrated to all seafaring powers that at times of war even the ships of neutral powers were not immune to seizure by the Royal Navy. Moreover, by June 1914 – still in peacetime – the Royal Navy was counting on the *Lusitania* as well as over forty civilian ships, armed with 4.7-inch guns.¹ German efforts, by comparison, were extremely modest. Seligmann himself repeatedly admits that contemporaries regarded the collected intelligence information as a whole as 'inaccurate' (p. 38) and German preparations as 'overemphasized' (pp. 44–5). Even a well-informed and capable naval attaché such as Philip Dumas was unable to deliver any information about possible converted cruisers (p. 36).

It may seem surprising that, against this background, the author manages to construct a significant threat potential based on scarcely a dozen passenger ships that might be armed. An example of Selig-

¹ Churchill, House of Lords, 17 Mar. 1914, Naval Notes, June 1914, *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, 58 (1914), 668–77, at 670.

mann's procedure is how he treats the Beresford Inquiry of 1909. The Commission of Inquiry dealt with Lord Charles Beresford's allegations against his arch-enemy, the First Sea Lord, Sir John Fisher's preparation of the Royal Navy for defence and war. According to Seligmann, the Commission of Inquiry was mainly interested in the threat to British trade. It is true that at the twelfth sitting Beresford referred to the protection of trade as a 'big thing' (p. 33). It is also true, but is unfortunately not mentioned in this book, that at the same sitting, Beresford left no doubt that 'the state of the Home Fleet', that is, the strength of the battle fleet, was incomparably more important: 'This is, from my point of view, the crux of the whole thing—the whole thing hangs on it.' Prime Minister Henry Asquith explicitly agreed: 'It all hinges on that.'² Characteristically, the Commission's final report does not even mention trade protection.³

Here Seligmann accepts uncritically Beresford's view. The reader gains the impression that the Admiralty had simply neglected to address the question of armed merchantmen. In fact, however, comments by the First Lord of the Admiralty, Reginald McKenna, indicate the exact opposite. What was crucial, he said, was whether or not the German merchant navy was armed in peacetime. If not, McKenna said, he saw 'no danger'. But if 'the German mercantile ships do carry guns and ammunition, then we shall make different preparations . . . but we do not want to have our present preparations examined upon the presumed basis that German ships do carry guns and ammunition in peace, when we have the very best of reasons for thinking they do not.'⁴ A sober assessment of the situation had obviously prevailed over insufficient information. Not so in Seligmann's view. Instead of looking more closely at the feud between Beresford and Fisher, he follows Beresford too closely in assuming, without any obvious evidence, that McKenna was obscuring the situation, or even lying (p. 34). What reasons McKenna might have had for not telling

² Report and Proceedings of a Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence Appointed to Inquire into Certain Questions of Naval Policy Raised by Lord Charles Beresford, 15 June 1909, TNA, CAB 16/9A-B (Q.2417).

³ Beresford to Asquith, 2 Apr. 1909, Report of the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence Appointed to Inquire into Certain Questions of Naval Policy Raised by Lord Charles Beresford, 12 Aug. 1909, Accounts and Papers, Cd. 256, fos. 295–7.

⁴ Beresford Inquiry, TNA, CAB 16/9A-B (Q.2403).

Book Reviews

the truth, given that he had just replaced Lord Tweedmouth, who was seen as too pro-German, remains an open question. The same applies to the obvious question of why Germany, if it wanted to attack British trade, had opted for a battle fleet rather than for a cruiser fleet, which would have been much better suited to this purpose, and did not start building submarines systematically until 1909. The explanation supplied later, after the event, by Admiral Slade in May 1909 that this was another example of Germany's obfuscation tactics (p. 172) is typical of the general stereotyping of Germany as the putative enemy in the wake of contemporary invasion scares and spy hysteria, but is hardly convincing from today's point of view.

Long before 1914 the facts spoke clearly in favour of Britain, and the threat scenarios were largely imaginary. This plays no part in Seligmann's line of argument, however. He explicitly stresses that 'no solid evidence ever support[ed]' the view 'that German ships carried their armament . . . in peacetime'. Apart from a few 'unsubstantiated agents' reports', he goes on, 'plenty of material' exists 'that contradicted the idea'. 'Yet the rightness or wrongness of British thinking is . . . irrelevant', because the British 'believed that the Germans would behave in a particular way', and this 'moulded British planning' (p. 45). Contemporaries knew that there was not much behind the idea that German merchantmen were armed, but according to Seligmann 'almost everyone' except Fisher and Churchill believed it (p. 45). Who in particular he means by this, however, remains open. A look at military journals of the time would have made a more differentiated account possible.⁵

This brings us to one of the main problems of the book: the narrow range of sources used and the overabundance of conjecture. Seligmann's explanation for recent increased interest in the building of British battle cruisers is particularly dubious (pp. 65–87). He argues that these served primarily to pursue and fight the fast German passenger steamers and potential auxiliary cruisers run by

⁵ Rear-Admiral R. G. O. Tupper, 24 Jan. 1912, in G. Renwick, 'Our Supplies of Food Stuffs and Raw Materials in Time of War', *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, 56/1 (1912), 483–514, at 513; W. C. Crutchley, in Stewart Murray, 'The Internal Condition of Great Britain During a Great War', *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, 57/2 (1913), 1561–616, at 1609; K. Dewar, 'Influence of Overseas Commerce on the Operations of War', *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, 57/1 (1913), 449–500, at 466.

Norddeutsche Lloyd and HAPAG. But again, there is little evidence to back this up. It is completely forgotten, for example, that the battle cruisers had been ordered before the Battle of Tsushima, that is, at a time when Lord Selborne, for example, still sounded rather dismayed about the Russian threat, as 'these cursed Russians are laying down one ship after the other'.⁶ Apart from this, the claim that battle cruisers could be employed to combat armed merchantmen and passenger ships (p. 86) is tenuous. It hardly seems credible that, given the budgetary constraints of the time, the Admiralty would have opted for the costly construction of the Invincible class with 12-inch artillery simply to counteract a handful of unarmoured passenger ships (p. 82).

On the whole, the book often lacks wider contextualization. It is true, of course, that up to 1907, several German passenger steamers repeatedly won the Blue Riband awarded for the fastest Atlantic crossing. A number of these ships were drafted into military service, as was usual among all seafaring powers, and one is inclined to agree with Seligmann's judgement on the Cunard Agreements on arming merchant vessels (pp. 47–53), especially as a signal to an excited public at home (p. 51). As far as German motives go, however, the chronologies are problematic. For one thing, eight of Germany's twelve giant ocean liners were built at a time when the political leadership in Berlin still believed that it could impress, if not outdo, Britain in the arming of its battle fleet. And for another, by 1907, German steamers had permanently lost their superiority in speed to the Cunard Line.

Moreover, Seligmann rather nonchalantly ignores the technical contexts and the financial aspects and background of British naval policy. What precisely did a specific threat posed by German merchant and passenger shipping mean? How should we imagine this in concrete terms? These ships could carry only a limited stock of coal, which meant that they could operate freely only for a limited period of time. Contemporaries were well aware that even in wartime, these ships could only replenish their stocks of coal in large harbours. And if they ventured in while at war, they would be detained in a neutral harbour and impounded, as in fact happened later. Only the *Prinz Eitel Friedrich*, whose top speed was a mere 15 knots and which thus

⁶ Selborne to Balfour, 28 Oct. 1903, Sandars Papers, Bodleian Library, MSS Eng. hist. c. 715.

Book Reviews

does not really fit into the author's scheme of fast steamers, and the *Kronprinz Wilhelm* operated successfully, responsible for eleven and fourteen sinkings respectively. The greatest successes, characteristically, were achieved by a ship built as an auxiliary cruiser from the start, the *SMS Möwe*, which was responsible for forty-two sinkings, and, of all things, a former cargo ship, the *SMS Wolf*, which, at a top speed of 10 knots, was especially slow (p. 163).

Seligmann's argument, contesting both the classic interpretation's focus on the battle fleet and the revisionist view of British naval policy developing independently of a German threat, is not fully convincing. The source material he provides on a few members of the navy is too cursory. His focus on the trade war, however, is promising. In this context, a recent study by Nicholas Lambert, *Planning Armageddon*,⁷ shows that Britain early on envisaged an extended trade war against Germany. Seligmann's work again makes use of the standard action-reaction theorem which postulates a German challenge and an inevitable British response. But it has become clear how much some members of the Royal Navy overestimated Germany's striking power on the water. That this can be attributed to an error or misperception (p. 164), which was the result of Berlin's merely asserted deviousness, seems questionable. Similarly, Seligmann's conclusion that the misperceptions were ultimately irrelevant and the German threat, whether real or not, was the cause of Britain's pre-war policy (p. 173) falls short. In the case of Germany, thanks to the Fischer controversy of the 1960s we have for a long time not been satisfied by references to the mere existence of Berlin's encirclement phobia as the basis for decision-making. In the case of Britain, too, it is high time to look beyond mere (mis)perceptions and ask about inner motives and their causes.

⁷ Nicholas A. Lambert, *Planning Armageddon: British Economic Warfare and the First World War* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012).

The Royal Navy and the German Threat 1901–14

ANDREAS ROSE teaches history at the University of Bonn. His work focuses on international history, naval as well as military history, and the history of ideas in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He is the author of *Zwischen Empire und Kontinent: Zur Transformation britischer Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik im Vorfeld des Ersten Weltkrieges* (2011); *Deutsche Außenpolitik in der Ära Bismarck, 1862–1890* (2013); and *Die Außenpolitik des wilhelminischen Kaiserreichs, 1890–1918* (forthcoming 2013). He is currently working on transnational liberal and conservative networks in the 1970s and 1980s in Germany, France, and Great Britain.

THOMAS ROHKRÄMER, *Die fatale Attraktion des Nationalsozialismus: Über die Popularität eines Unrechtsregimes* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag, 2013), 402 pp. ISBN 978 3 506 77676 1. €34.90 (hardback)

‘National Socialism’s aspiration’, writes Thomas Rohkrämer in this new and engaging book on popular opinion in the Third Reich, ‘was not simply to fill a vacuum, but rather to awaken enthusiasm for a take-off into a new, and supposedly better future’ (p. 37). In this it was largely successful, at least until 1942–3 and, to some extent, beyond. Nazism, he argues, was not just a ‘protest movement’ against Weimar, and its rise to power and continuing appeal over twelve years cannot be explained solely by reference to the Republic’s failures. Rather it was a political phenomenon which exerted a ‘fatal attraction’ on millions of ordinary Germans, both lower middle class and working class. Its true significance can be seen in the way it began (with the support of a ‘good third’ of German voters in free and open elections in the early 1930s), and the way it ended (with most Germans choosing to fight on until 1945 regardless of the hopeless odds). In spite of this, historians have been reluctant to recognize the sheer popularity of the Nazi dictatorship and/or have pushed to one side the issue of why so many aligned themselves with this barbaric and criminal regime. Instead, emphasis has been placed on identifying, explaining, and differentiating between various forms of complicity, conformity, ‘immunity’, resistance, opposition, and dissent. For Rohkrämer this means that, as far as the attitudes of ordinary Germans are concerned, the wood has been missed for the trees.

How, then, does he account for the regime’s overwhelming popularity? Some of the causes, he argues, are quite bland: full employment, cheap holidays through the Strength through Joy organization, perceived opportunities for social mobility, and the supposed removal of class privileges. On these grounds he rejects as ‘too narrow’ the notion of Nazism as a political religion that sought to mobilize the irrational longing of the masses for spiritual leadership in the wake of rapid secularization and the ‘disenchantment’ of the world by science and reason. Yet, equally, he criticizes Götz Aly’s ‘materialist’ explanation of the Third Reich as a ‘convenience dictatorship’ (*Gefälligkeitsdiktatur*) which stayed in power by bribing the people with a generous range of economic gifts and social benefits made possible by

plundering occupied territories and dispossessing the victims of racial persecution.¹ Rather, borrowing a phrase from the philosopher Ernst Bloch, Rohkrämer argues that National Socialism's popular success was based on its ability to offer a consciously elastic 'realm of beliefs' (*Glaubensraum*) which could accommodate both other-worldly and this-worldly visions and combine idealistic with rational, goal-oriented aspirations. The common dominator was not a utopian desire for a new religion in an age of secularization, but the romantic yearning for community, for connection with *Volk* and homeland, or what Rohkrämer describes as a 'single communal faith' (*ein gemeinschaftlicher Glauben*) uniting all Germans.

In terms of the history of ideas, Rohkrämer traces the concept of a 'single communal faith' back to the early nineteenth century, but he also recognizes that it gained political traction only with the rise of radical nationalism in the 1890s and the rapid fluctuations between expectations of national greatness and fears of national decline brought about by the First World War.² Even then, the advocates of 'Conservative Revolution' who carried the notion forward in more brutal form in the 1920s were 'too elitist' and insufficiently pragmatic to have any serious hope of success. Rohkrämer's explanations therefore rely on elements of contingency as well as continuity. Without the economic crisis of the late 1920s and early 1930s, and without the 'aestheticization of politics' (Walter Benjamin) promoted by the ruthlessly popularizing and 'ideologically polycratic' Nazi movement (p. 53), the ideal of a 'single communal faith' as a 'positive' alternative to democratic pluralism may never have been attractive to the majority of Germans.

A second element in the pernicious appeal of National Socialism was Hitler himself. Here Rohkrämer largely follows Ian Kershaw's approach, arguing that in the Third Reich power functioned less through authoritarian, top-down structures or strict, bureaucratic enforcement of ideological conformity than through the Nazi leader's

¹ Götz Aly, *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War and the Nazi Welfare State*, trans. Jefferson Chase (New York, 2006), originally published in German as *Hitlers Volksstaat: Raub, Rassenkrieg und nationaler Sozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005).

² See also Thomas Rohkrämer, *A Single Communal Faith? The German Right from Conservatism to National Socialism* (New York, 2007).

Book Reviews

charismatic authority.³ When things went wrong, corrupt party officials at local level or Germany's enemies abroad were blamed. When successes came, all the credit went to Hitler, who stood 'above party' and sectional interest. The emphasis on charisma also helps us to understand the regime's need for constant success, its desire to project itself as based on the popular will, and its predilection for public spectacle and ritual, all of which served to reinforce the 'Hitler myth' as a key pillar of Nazi rule. All this is entirely convincing, but it is hardly a new, or controversial, line of argument.

More original and distinctive is Rohkrämer's emphasis on ordinary Germans' support for militarism, which he links in with a more nuanced interpretation of the public reception of rearmament and war. Not only did Germans applaud Hitler for his foreign policy successes before and after 1939, he argues, but they were also attracted by his risk-taking and his *Politik der Stärke* (p. 119) towards neighbouring countries and towards the West. The reintroduction of conscription in 1935, for instance, was hugely popular, not only, but especially, among young men. So, too, of course, were the victories over Poland in 1939 and France in 1940. The 500,000 women auxiliaries who volunteered for service with the *Wehrmacht* are a further indication that belief in soldierly virtues like 'order' and 'discipline', and pride in the apparent strength and invincibility of Germany, was not confined just to men (pp. 246, 249–50). Seen against this broader trend, the depressed and fatalistic mood of September 1939 appears as a short-term aberration. Even after 1945, when many West Germans rejected militarism, for instance, by joining the anti-rearmament 'Ohne Mich' movement, there was still a tendency to remember the excitement and feelings of wonder and awe occasioned by early *Wehrmacht* victories. In popular memory, the bad times had come only after the Russian campaign began to falter in the winter of 1941–2, and especially after the defeat at Stalingrad in 1942–3.

Overall, Rohkrämer underpins his argument with careful use of a variety of rich sources, from Sopade and SD mood reports to diaries, letters, memoirs, post-war opinion surveys, and published oral history interviews. In his introduction and throughout the book Rohkrämer subjects these raw materials to a thorough and largely convincing *Quellenkritik*. On the question of how different genera-

³ Ian Kershaw, *The 'Hitler Myth': Image and Reality in the Third Reich* (1st edn. Oxford, 1987; 2nd edn. Oxford, 1989).

tional identities are constructed, however, one might have expected a more critical attitude, especially in view of the growing body of literature challenging the idea that there was a common German war experience for any or all age groups during and after the First World War.⁴ The highly stylized autobiographical pieces in the Abel collection, for instance, should be seen for what they are: a group of essays written in 1934 by dedicated Nazis that say more about the authors themselves and about the regime's wish to peddle certain myths concerning its own origins than about the wider enthusiasms of the German population.⁵

In any case, regardless of when they were born, how they experienced the First World War, and whether or not they identified themselves as belonging to a particular class, region, confession, or generation, in Rohkrämer's account most ordinary Germans, including those who were initially quite sceptical, were able to find some reason for joining the National Socialist *Glaubensraum* after 1933. Beyond this, generalizations are difficult to make. Indeed, while supporters of the regime bought into the same broad, generic vision of a bright new tomorrow under Hitler and, as such, were bound together in 'a common structure and alignment' (*einer gemeinsamen Struktur und Ausrichtung*), there were also 'numerous individual variations' in motivation (p. 14). Even the founders of the Confessing Church were not directly opposed to Nazism as a political cause, but merely to its interference in spiritual questions and matters of faith (pp. 138, 291). Most ordinary citizens were coldly indifferent towards, or, at best, mildly supportive of anti-Semitic persecution, but hardly enthusiastic, especially when it came to boycotts of Jewish shops. They were also mistrustful of the official justifications for 'euthanasia'; uncertain or fatalistic about war in 1939; and resentful of the brutal campaigns targeting individual Christian

⁴ Prominent examples include Richard Bessel, *Germany after the First World War* (Oxford, 1993); Bernd Ulrich, *Die Augenzeugen: Deutsche Feldpostbriefe in Kriegs- und Nachkriegszeit, 1914–1933* (Essen, 1997); and Benjamin Ziemann, *War Experiences in Rural Germany, 1914–1923*, trans. Alex Skinner (Oxford, 2007), first published in German as *Front und Heimat: Ländliche Kriegserfahrungen im südlichen Bayern 1914–1923* (Essen, 1997).

⁵ See also the comments on the Abel collection in Benjamin Ziemann, *Contested Commemorations: Republican War Veterans and Weimar Political Culture* (Cambridge, 2013), 124.

Book Reviews

priests and religious symbols in schools that were periodically launched by fanatical Nazis at local level. Nonetheless, violence against 'outsiders' was approved of where it was seen as necessary to the imagined future happiness of the German people. This imagined future happiness also involved the retention of the Hitler regime at almost any cost, even after war without end and then impending defeat had become a daily reality.

From 1942 at the latest, knowledge of the mass crimes committed by the SS and the *Wehrmacht* in occupied countries was commonplace. In line with Nazi racial teaching, certain categories of 'enemy' were regarded as 'sub-human' and their murder was thus legitimized, especially in the East. For soldiers in the combat zones this was combined with an acceptance of atrocities against foreign civilians as a 'natural' part of war ('Krieg ist eben Krieg') and an emphasis on the 'manly' duty to defend the homeland (pp. 246, 264–6). Even in July 1944 most Germans disapproved of the assassination attempt carried out by Stauffenberg and his fellow conspirators, and were prepared to fight on in spite of the radically dwindling prospects of victory. Ultimately, however, Hitler's failure to come up with a 'miracle weapon' which would turn the tide in Germany's favour, his eventual suicide in the bunker in Berlin, and the overwhelming material superiority of the Allies all destroyed the will to resist further.

What we are left with, then, is the 'banality' of Germans' enthusiasm for National Socialism, including the regime's use of violence. Nazism was popular when it was successful. Its successes, and the propaganda around them, offered some excitement in what was otherwise a humdrum existence, a sense of living in 'great times', and an emotionally satisfying level of distraction from the hardships of everyday life. After 1942–3 fascination gradually gave way to fear and introspection, the *Volksgemeinschaft* to a focus on individual survival and private family interest. Defeat in 1945 was total. Yet even if Hitler was now condemned as a criminal or madman who had led Germany into an unwinnable war, something remained of the old attraction to National Socialism in the accounts that ordinary Germans told themselves (and others) about their experiences in the 1930s and early 1940s. In this sense, Rohkrämer's findings also have a bearing on our understanding of Germans' somewhat detached or semi-hostile attitudes towards Allied de-Nazification trials after 1945, their reluctance to accept collective or personal responsibility

for wartime atrocities, and their support for the amnesties offered by the Adenauer government in the early 1950s.

In conclusion, this is a fine piece of scholarship which will be of great interest to all those concerned with the question of popular feeling in Nazi Germany and how to measure it, particularly in relation to the mindset towards rearmament, racial persecution, wartime violence, and military comradeship. An English translation must surely follow.

MATTHEW STIBBE is Professor of Modern European History at Sheffield Hallam University. He has published widely on Germany in the era of the two world wars, including *Women in the Third Reich* (2003); *British Civilian Internees in Germany: The Ruhleben Camp, 1914–18* (2008); and *Germany, 1914–1933: Politics, Society and Culture* (2010). He is also co-editor, with Kevin McDermott, of *The 1989 Revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe: From Communism to Pluralism* (2013).

VERA K. FAST, *Children's Exodus: A History of the Kindertransport* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2011), xvii + 270 pp. ISBN 978 1 84885 537 3. £25.00 (hardback)

Until the 1980s, few were aware of the fate of the children rescued from Nazi Germany by the *Kindertransport*. Even those affected had not, before then, generally perceived their own stories as part of a collective Holocaust destiny, and *Kindertransport* did not appear as heading in major accounts of the Holocaust, such as Saul Friedländer's *Nazi Germany and the Jews*,¹ or the *Enzyklopädie des Nationalsozialismus* edited by Wolfgang Benz and others.² Not until the fiftieth anniversary in 1989, when around a thousand of these *Kinder* met in London on the initiative of Bertha Leverton, herself one of the rescued *Kinder*, did this unique mission, which had made it possible for 10,000 Jewish children from Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland to flee from Nazi Germany, become known to a wider public. Self-help groups were set up (the Association Kindertransport in the USA and the Reunion of Kindertransport in Britain), and many *Kinder* wrote their life stories, inspired by an important monograph in which Bertha Leverton and Smuel Lowensohn collected around 1,000 reports by the rescued children.³ Historians also began to address this significant topic, and studies were undertaken, most recently a Ph.D. thesis by Claudia Curio, written at the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung in Berlin in 2005.⁴ In addition to academic treatment, the theme has also received literary attention,⁵ and has been the subject of numerous films, including the Oscar-winning

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).

¹ Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, vol. i (New York, 1997), published in German as *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden*, trans. Martin Pfeiffer (Munich, 1998).

² Wolfgang Benz, Hermann Graml, and Hermann Weiß (eds.), *Enzyklopädie des Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart, 1997).

³ Bertha Leverton and Smuel Lowensohn (eds.), *I Came Alone: The Stories of the Kindertransport* (Lewes, Sussex, 1990), published in German as *Der jüdische Kindertransport von Deutschland nach England 1938/39: Geschichte und Erinnerung*, trans. Rebekka Göpfert (Frankfurt am Main, 1999).

⁴ Published as Claudia Curio, *Verfolgung, Flucht, Rettung: Die Kindertransporte 1938/39 nach Großbritannien* (Berlin, 2006).

⁵ E.g. in W. G. Sebald, *Austerlitz* (Munich, 2001).

documentary *Into the Arms of Strangers*. Along with exhibitions and monuments (London set the ball rolling with the dedication of a memorial in Liverpool Street Station in 2003), all this has resulted in the *Kindertransport* being deeply rooted in the collective awareness of the general public in both Britain and Germany.

Now, in *Children's Exodus*, Vera K. Fast has produced a further history of the *Kindertransport*. Like other accounts, Fast's begins by describing the Nazi seizure of power and the step-by-step process by which the Jews were eliminated in order to contextualize the relief campaign. In a total of ten chapters she presents a detailed picture of the whole rescue operation, from the arrival of the first transport in December 1938 to that of the last in 1948, linking the activities of the relief organizations with reports of their experiences by those involved. She describes the various local, regional, and national relief committees, their structures, problems, and organizational efforts, and their not always successful attempts to work together.

Triggered by the alarming news of the November pogrom in 1938, which left tens of thousands of Jewish children in Germany and Austria orphans, leading representatives of the Jewish community in Britain worked to have the children admitted to the country. The British government was the only one to declare that it was prepared to permit entry to unlimited numbers of vulnerable children on condition that they were unaccompanied, less than 17 years old, and that a surety of fifty pounds sterling was paid for each one. A wave of helpfulness ran through the country. Within a short time, around 180 local and regional initiatives had been set up. They organized the reception of close to 10,000 Jewish children and teenagers; found foster parents; looked for accommodation; collected the money required for their keep, the organization, and sureties; and provided training places. The assumption that the children's stay would be brief and temporary as a rule excluded the need for any higher or academic education. The assistance committees consisted largely of untrained volunteers acting under the auspices of the Refugee Children's Movement (RCM), a central organization set up in November 1938. Not all assistance groups by far were Jewish, and the RCM was explicitly set up to cross religious boundaries. Thus numerous Christian organizations, especially the Quakers, took part in rescuing the vulnerable children, as the roughly 350,000 British Jews did not have the resources to take in all the threatened or orphaned children.

Book Reviews

Fast firmly refutes the widespread accusation that the Jewish community in Britain provided money, but not hospitality (p. 189). She does, however, describe the catastrophic organizational and conceptual shortcomings of the relief campaign, already known from many memoirs and the research literature. Only recently a former *Kind* has described how, one year after the *Kindertransport*, her 16-year-old brother died from heart failure in a hostel in Westgate-on-Sea, where he had no help.⁶

Power struggles between Liberal and Orthodox British Jews and Zionist groups overshadowed the cooperation between the various aid organizations. In this context, Fast explores in detail the role of the charismatic and idiosyncratic Orthodox Rabbi Dr Salomon Schonfeld, the young founder and assertive executive director of the Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council. As Fast had access to the organization's archive in the University of Southampton's Hartley Library, she can provide new insights into this Orthodox branch of aid for refugee children ('The Orthodox Experience', pp. 97-114), while she hardly considers the work of the Reich Association/National Association of Jews in Germany. Schonfeld's commitment must have been unflagging. Right at the beginning of the campaign, he single handedly brought 300 children from Vienna to Britain. In his Orthodox attitude, however, the Rabbi did not shy away from imputing hostile intentions to other assistance organizations because they 'only' wanted to rescue the children, but not their Jewish identities as well. Schonfeld placed the commandments of his religion above everything else, and refused to receive a transport on the Sabbath. The Orthodox Rabbi preferred to accommodate children in camps, where they were largely left to themselves, rather than let them go to Christian families. Fast correctly points out that conflicts between the various religious camps were exacerbated by the fact that the majority of the rescued German and Austrian children came from assimilated families, while the religious background of most British Jews was that of Orthodox immigrants from the East. She also reports, however, about conflicts with children who insisted on ob-

⁶ Monika Müller, 'Es ist ein hartes Los, das uns getroffen hat.' *Der Weg der Familie Einstein aus Augsburg-Kriegshaber. 'It's a Cruel Hand We've Been Dealt.' The Einstein-Family of Augsburg-Kriegshaber*, *Lebenslinien: Deutsch-jüdische Familienschicksale*, 5. *Lifelines: German-Jewish Family Stories*, 5. (Augsburg, 2012).

servicing their Orthodox customs even in secular or Christian surroundings. It cannot be overlooked that her sympathies lie on the side of the Orthodox experience. She sketches touching scenes such as the Sabbath meal served to children who had just arrived, but does not conceal the arrogance of some Orthodox children towards their non-religious or Christian foster parents. The author devotes less attention to the situation of children brought up in non-Orthodox, Liberal, or secular homes. One wonders what evidence she can provide for the rather surprising statement that Orthodox children coped better than these with the traumas of flight and separation (p. 112).

Fast contrasts the problems and challenges of the assistance organizations with the situation of the children, their abandonment, anxieties, and huge achievements in adapting. For most, exile meant not only rescue but also trauma. With great sympathy, Fast describes the situation at their reception, the disturbing experience of being chosen by their foster parents, which made the children feel as if they were on the 'market'. Often, foster parents lacked not only knowledge of but also understanding for the needs of the traumatized children and teenagers. That these were often exploited as cheap labour, sometimes also sexually abused, is mentioned only in passing by the author. But she sensitively describes the desperation and hopelessness that drove parents to entrust their children to total strangers. Hardly had they acclimatized, when the rescued children older than 16 suffered another trauma of separation as they were interned as enemy aliens in June 1940.

It is one of the merits of this work that it also looks at baptized children, in Nazi terminology, 'people of mixed race of the first and second degree'. The author devotes a separate chapter to them ('Jewish Christian Children', pp. 115–32), in which she also discusses the situation of the Christian assistance organizations and describes the *Kindertransport* as a catalyst for Christian-Jewish cooperation (p. 131). Unlike most previous accounts, Fast's counts the Jewish children and teenagers who survived the camps or lived through the war with false identities (pp. 133–62) as belonging to the *Kindertransport*. In fact, hundreds of these children were brought to Britain in a second wave, up to 1948, and, despite all difficulties, integrated into British society. Here, too, Rabbi Schonfeld was a driving force. The concluding chapter on the after-effects of the *Kindertransport* makes

Book Reviews

clear the long-term mental health problems faced by the children rescued and taken to a foreign country, but does not go beyond previous research on this question.⁷

For this book Fast has drawn on a broad range of published and unpublished memoirs and interviews, which she uses to illustrate the most diverse facets of experience. On the whole, this makes for a highly fragmented account, which indirectly demonstrates the advantages of whole biographical interviews. Longer quotations from the sources would have made it possible to understand the children's behaviour and reactions in their biographical context, and thus to comprehend their individual spaces of experience, something which this synthetic distillation of 'all' experiences cannot achieve. We look in vain for discussions of questions that would lead further, for example, about the reasons for the children's frequently problematic integration, how they processed their experiences, or the concepts of assistance used by the organizations involved, such as those which Claudia Curio, for example, has addressed in analysing the RCM's welfare policy.⁸ But this was not the author's intention. In the Foreword she announces that her aim is largely to sum up what is already known (p. xiii). To this extent *Children's Exodus* is directed mainly to readers who want a first, detailed overview of this unique rescue of Jewish children from Nazi Germany.

⁷ E.g. Wolfgang Benz, Claudia Curio, and Andrea Hammel (eds.), *Die Kindertransporte 1938/39: Rettung und Integration* (Munich, 2003).

⁸ Claudia Curio, 'Die Fürsorgepolitik des Refugee Children's Movement: Ein Instrument der Integration deutsch-jüdischer Flüchtlingskinder in die britische Gesellschaft', *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung*, 10 (2001), 287–308.

BENIGNA SCHÖNHAGEN is Director of the Jüdisches Kulturmuseum Augsburg-Schwaben. Her publications include *Die Synagoge: Orte jüdischer Geschichte und Kultur* (2006); *'Getrennt von allem, was uns geblieben...': Der Weg der Familie Kraus aus Augsburg* (2008); and 'Die zweite jüdische Gemeinde von Augsburg 1861–1943', in Michael Brenner and Sabine Ullmann (eds.), *Die Juden in Schwaben* (2013), 225–49.

TOBIAS SEIDL, *Führerpersönlichkeiten: Deutungen und Interpretationen deutscher Wehrmachtgeneräle in britischer Kriegsgefangenschaft* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2012), 214 pp. ISBN 978 3 506 77382 1. €34.90

Among the millions of words spoken by German prisoners of war and surreptitiously recorded and transcribed in 1939–45 by British intelligence was the lament that ‘Twenty Germans have twenty-one different opinions’. Tobias Seidel’s monograph on the evolving attitudes and views of seventeen German general officers between May 1943 and May 1944 seeks to confirm that quasi-proverbial insight. Britain’s Combined Services Detailed Interrogation Centre (CSDIC) provided hospitable surroundings at Trent Park mansion in north-east London; ample food, drink, and newspapers; and access to BBC and German broadcasts. In return, the apparently unwitting officers talked – for hidden microphones. The resulting transcripts from this and similar British camps amounted to roughly 25,000 pages over the course of the war, and have been collected, retyped as machine-readable text, coded in a complex database, and analysed by a research team led by Sönke Neitzel and Harald Welzer. Numerous publications have resulted, most notably Neitzel’s *Tapping Hitler’s Generals: Transcripts of Secret Conversations, 1942–1945* (2007; German edn. 2005) and Neitzel and Welzer, *Soldaten: On Fighting, Killing, and Dying. The Secret World War II Tapes of German POWs* (2012; German edn. 2011).

Seidl’s part in this enterprise, as set forth in his introduction, is to analyse the recorded remarks of the 1942–3 North African cohort of senior prisoners of war, in order to discern the extent to which *Wehrmacht* general officers shared a common mentality. He sees his work as a challenge to ‘older generalizing descriptions of the attitudes and views of German generals in the Second World War’, which ostensibly suggest that they shared similar degrees of ideological commitment (p. 148). And the CSDIC transcripts indeed suggest that Seidl’s subjects entertained a variety of views on numerous topics – including reverence for, or abhorrence of, Adolf Hitler. But as Seidl concedes, his sample of ‘Führer-personalities’ is too narrow to permit valid statistical conclusions about the mentality of German general officers as a class. Nor do we know what criteria governed the CSDIC’s choice of dialogue snippets to record and transcribe; Seidl’s

Book Reviews

evidence base and that of the wider transcript project is thus skewed in unknown ways, limiting the interpretive weight that it can bear. Yet he nevertheless insists repeatedly that his seventeen officers show the full 'bandwidth' and, by implication, the distribution of views held by German generals (pp. 26, 82, 142).

Seidl's presentation falls into two principal sections. He first surveys remarks from the entire group on six topics: Germany's allies and enemies; the military effectiveness of the *Wehrmacht* and of its personnel; the Second World War; what it meant to be a German officer; the character of National Socialism and of its leadership; and the outlook for the future. He spices the text with quotations from the transcripts that are often striking, despite the familiarity of most of his cast of characters from Neitzel's *Tapping Hitler's Generals*. Seidl's analysis would nevertheless on occasion have gained in vividness and evidentiary efficacy had he been more specific about the identity of those holding particular opinions.

His second part, by contrast, provides close scrutiny of the views on his chosen topics of five significant individuals, around whom he has constructed a typology: true believers; duty-bound obsessives; the undecided; the converted (to opposition in captivity); and convinced opponents of National Socialism. Seidl's five characters, in typological order, are General Ludwig Crüwell (commander, *Afrika-korps*, September 1941–May 1942); *Generaloberst* Hans-Jürgen von Arnim (commander, 5th Panzer Army, then Army Group Africa, December 1942–May 1943); General Hans Cramer (commander, *Afrika-korps*, March–May 1943); *Generalmajor* of the *Luftwaffe* Gerhard Bassenge (*Luftwaffe* ground commander, Tunisia); and General Wilhelm Ritter von Thoma (commander, *Afrikakorps*, September–October 1942, and one of the army's foremost tank warfare experts).

Agreement between the generals included a 'surprisingly positive' view of the British and to a lesser extent the Americans, despite scorn for the Western powers' tactical and operational timidity and awkwardness in ground combat (pp. 37–8, 40, 86, 97). The Russian army's superior fighting power, staying power, organizational skill, and operational brilliance ('Manstein could not have done it better', p. 41) attracted praise; some officers also noted the resilience and achievements of the Soviet regime (p. 42). But the group viewed allies and racial enemies with less indulgence. The Italians were 'charming people . . . but absolutely the worst soldiers to be found in Europe' (p.

35). The 'Japse' were targets of racist comment (p. 37). And Seidl soberly reports the wholly unsurprising finding that 'a fundamentally positive assessment of the Jews is not to be found in the Trent Park dialogues' (p. 45). Some group members accepted the *Endlösung* 'subliminally' (pp. 73-4); others viewed National Socialist methods as damaging to Germany's reputation and/or shocking in 'extent, brutality, and mechanization' (p. 60). Virtually all nevertheless favoured segregation or 'elimination (*Ausschaltung*)' from Europe as appropriate responses to the purported cosmic malevolence and global hegemonic designs of 'the international Jew' (pp. 45-6, and Arnim, p. 98). Seidl notes that this anti-Semitic mindset did not necessarily comport a positive view of National Socialism, and had evidently been absorbed long before 1933 (p. 46) – no novelty to those familiar with the history of the Prusso-German officer corps.

The generals prized the German soldier's ostensible 'loyalty, sense of duty, toughness verging on cruelty (*Härte*), eagerness for combat (*Einsatzbereitschaft*)', and thus man-for-man superiority over all opponents (p. 47). By contrast they blamed Germany's supreme leadership for the cardinal strategic error that had purportedly cost Germany an otherwise assured general victory: 'England [*sic*] should have been defeated before the attack on the Soviet Union' (p. 102; pp. 51-2, 112, 122). But in reality Germany had lacked the forces and operational concepts required to defeat Britain, even in an attritional air-sea duel lasting for years. And Seidl likewise passes over in silence a consideration far beyond the generals' blinkered strategic horizon: Franklin Delano Roosevelt's unprecedented third term reelection in November 1940, which guaranteed that Germany would soon face the full military-economic might of the United States.

The generals' views of the officer corps, and of their own roles, gravitated around two issues: the generational and ideological split between senior and junior officers; and their own historically unprecedented sworn duty of 'unconditional obedience' to 'the Führer of the German Reich and people, Adolf Hitler'. The conviction that 'the young officers are all slaves of the system' (p. 61; pp. 49-50, 74) was widespread, an unsurprising notion amply demonstrated by the miserable failure of the July 1944 *coup d'état*. But Seidl mentions only fleetingly (pp. 58-9) a further sharp, if most secret, divide that bore heavily on the obsequious acceptance of servitude throughout the commanding heights. Field marshals and *Generaloberste* – including

Book Reviews

Hans-Jürgen von Arnim, both before and during his captivity—received from Hitler in person lavish tax-free salary supplements, and in many cases sumptuous ‘birthday presents’ of cash and country estates.

The oath was indeed much on the generals’ minds; they had patently violated Hitler’s order to defend Tunisia to the last cartridge. Yet Seidl inexplicably suggests that the August 1934 oath to Hitler’s person was similar to that in ‘all modern regular armies’ (p. 56). He seems unaware that of Germany’s three major opponents, only the British vowed loyalty—not ‘unconditional obedience’—to an individual, and that the Americans pledged, as they still do, ‘to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic’. Nor does Seidl mention the sad fates of the generals’ preceding oaths to the Kaiser and to the Weimar constitution, and lets pass without comment Bassenge’s Freudian slip or judicious amnesia: ‘The oath came in ’33, when Hindenburg was still there’ (p. 116). Perhaps that made it seem all right in retrospect, but in reality the armed forces high command itself drafted the oath to Hitler as Hindenburg lay dying, and immediately following the murders, using army weapons and support, of the SA leaders, of the evidently dispensable Generals Kurt von Schleicher and Ferdinand von Bredow, and of the Chancellor of Austria, Engelbert Dollfuss, victim of the Vienna Putsch of 25 July 1934. Perhaps ambition, criminal complicity, and bribery of the higher echelons explain faithfulness to Hitler more parsimoniously and credibly than the purported moral binding force of the oath. Its most conspicuous function, both before and after 1945, was to veil the officer corps’ shared responsibility for national catastrophe in an aura of honourable conduct.

Many of the generals indeed perceived a dark future: ‘Everything [will] fall to pieces unless there’s a miracle’ (p. 69). Some took a decidedly negative view of the National Socialist Party, except for its role in the hated and despised Weimar Republic (p. 65). Hitler himself polarized opinion; Thoma and several others judged him a lunatic whose megalomaniacal ambition, imperviousness to advice, and overestimation of his own military talent was leading Germany to catastrophe (pp. 52, 78, 135). But the generals comforted themselves with notions almost as delusional as those of their Führer: regime change in Germany might lead swiftly to an Anglo-German coalition against Soviet Russia, and ‘England’ and the United States might fall

out, opening the road to an Anglo-German alliance against the USA (pp. 39–40).

Seidl sometimes suffers from lack of contextual awareness. He expresses puzzlement (pp. 75–6) that the generals recognized areas of military judgement in which ‘unconditional obedience’ played only a relative role. Yet such notions were anything but singular; they were a fundamental feature of Prusso-German military culture, derived from the army’s mission tactics (*Auftragstaktik*) tradition, and well expressed by Hans Cramer: the oath merely required ‘common-sense interpretation and execution of orders’ (p. 107). Even flagrant but successful disobedience—in seeming direct violation of the oath—had an honoured place, as the May 1940 dash from the Meuse to the Channel demonstrated.

Seidl’s efforts to confirm what appears to be his principal thesis, the alleged lack of homogeneity of views among *Wehrmacht* general officers, are sometimes strained. He claims to have ‘refuted’ on at least two occasions (pp. 80, 73; p. 172 nn. 544, 523) ‘current research (*die Forschung*)’, to which he ascribes the views that *Afrikakorps* prisoners were ‘deeply committed to NS ideology’ and that German troops invariably accepted the National Socialist characterization of the Soviets as sub-human. In the first case, Seidl cites a passage from Renate Held’s *Kriegsgefangenschaft in Großbritannien*,¹ a detailed monograph not on German attitudes but on British policy that merely describes in passing a report by Britain’s Political Warfare Executive referring to *Afrikakorps* prisoners in their entirety, not to officers or commanding generals. In the second case, Seidl cites work equally tangential to the issue posed: an essay, largely unconcerned with attitudes toward the Russians, by Thomas Kühne on the decisive importance of the ‘myth of *Kameradschaft*’ as the key to German combat-unit cohesion.

Seidl concedes in his conclusion that the generals’ generational position and shared experiences help explain some similarities of attitude: all had been born between 1888 and 1899, had joined the Imperial German Army as regular officers or officer candidates, and had served in the First World War. The routines, hierarchy, and selective recruitment and promotion systems of the army itself presumably further reinforced a ‘consensus in particular attitudes, interpre-

¹ Renate Held, *Kriegsgefangenschaft in Großbritannien: Deutsche Soldaten des Zweiten Weltkriegs in britischem Gewahrsam* (Munich, 2008).

Book Reviews

tive patterns, and opinions' (p. 150). But Seidl's evidence hardly substantiates his claim (p. 144) that individual background did not matter: 'neither ancestry, membership in a particular milieu, religion, training, nor career path are reliable predictors of the officers' views (*Deutungen*)'. All except two of the sample of seventeen began their careers in the Prussian army, but the two exceptions – the Bavarians Georg Neuffer and Wilhelm Ritter von Thoma – were conspicuous for their independence of mind. And of the three mentioned as having attended university – Crüwell, Bassenge, and Thoma – the last two proved hostile to the regime. Thoma in particular had fought in the West, East, and Balkans in the First World War, until finally taken prisoner by an American unit in the July 1918 Soissons fighting. He had subsequently studied history, geography, and economics, had travelled widely, had taken part in the suppression of the Beer Hall Putsch in 1923, had commanded the German ground forces in Spain in 1937–9, and had fought in Poland and Soviet Russia. His superiority of insight over his fellows clearly derived in part from a range of knowledge and experience far broader than theirs. In this and other respects, *Führerpersönlichkeiten* would have benefited from greater understanding of context, additional biographical investigation, and a touch more interpretive imagination.

MACGREGOR KNOX held the Stevenson Chair of International History at the LSE from 1994 to 2010. His main fields of research are European international and strategic history, 1890–1945, especially the foreign and military policies of Italy and Germany; comparative history; strategic theory; and dictatorships. His works include *To the Threshold of Power, 1922/33: Origins and Dynamics of the Fascist and National Socialist Dictatorships* (2007–8); *Hitler's Italian Allies: Royal Armed Forces, Fascist Regime, and the War of 1940–43* (2000); *Common Destiny: Dictatorship, Foreign Policy and War in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany* (2000); and, co-edited with Williamson Murray, *The Dynamics of Military Revolution, 1300–2050* (2001).

CLAYTON J. WHISNANT, *Male Homosexuality in West Germany: Between Persecution and Freedom, 1945–69*, *Genders and Sexuality in History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), xii + 262 pp. ISBN 978 0 230 35500 2. £55.00

The history of homosexualities in post-war West Germany has only recently started to attract sustained historiographical attention.¹ For a long time it had been almost forgotten, squeezed, as it is, between the horrible past of Nazi persecution and the glamorous present of gay liberation since the 1970s. Clayton Whisnant, currently Associate Professor of European History at Wofford College in Spartanburg, South Carolina, ably demonstrates in his book how fascinating and fruitful it can be to research the situation and the life of homosexual men in the 1950s and 1960s. The author convincingly argues that ‘this era made a positive contribution to the history of German homosexuality, without which it is impossible to imagine gay life in the country today’ (p. 204).

Whisnant’s study accommodates the current search for homosexual self-understandings that can supplement the identity formations shaped by gay liberation in the 1970s. In this vein, the author convincingly emphasizes the diversity of homosexual life styles in terms of different masculinities, distinct social milieus, and diverging generational groups. Yet his exploration of the post-war history of homosexualities not only enriches our understanding of the multifaceted past of same-sex love, but also contributes to the broader political and social history of post-war West Germany. Whisnant challenges some hitherto cherished views by stressing the longevity of pre-1945 persecution strategies and demonstrating that the Nazi vocabulary legitimizing such discriminatory politics continued to inform government statements well into the 1960s. On the other hand, he also shows how debates about society’s relationship to, and treatment of, sexual minorities decisively contributed to West Germany’s democratization processes.

Thus there is a great deal to learn from Whisnant’s study, which looks at the policing of homosexuals (chapter 1), the political initiatives and self-images prevalent within the homophile movement

¹ Andreas Pretzel and Volker Weiß (eds.), *Ohnmacht und Aufbegehren: Homosexuelle Männer in der frühen Bundesrepublik* (Hamburg, 2010).

Book Reviews

(chapter 2), the everyday experiences and practices of homosexual men (chapter 3), and their changing legal position (chapter 4).

Chapter 1 offers a wealth of sometimes surprising detail. People who happened to be included in police lists of alleged homosexuals, for example, ran the risk of having their driving licences withdrawn. Whisnant also offers some interesting observations on therapeutic interventions that disastrously tried to cure homosexuality, but his discussion of psychoanalytical approaches as simultaneously detrimental to, and empowering for, homosexual clients remains problematic. At a more general level, Whisnant identifies different times when and places where persecution was more or less intense. In the 1950s the administration and courts of Hamburg, for example, followed a more lenient policy than their counterparts in Cologne and Munich. The author also identifies a significant shift in homophobic stereotypes underlying, for example, the *Volkswartbund's* repeated calls for more restrictive policies. While the image of the effeminate weakling dominated the public's perception of homosexual men until the 1940s, the figure of the corrupting predator endangering German youth gained currency in the 1950s.

Chapter 2 meticulously follows the twists and turns of the homophile movement. Whisnant describes various mostly rather short-lived organizations and publications. He also outlines the activities of some prominent figures, such as Hans Giese, Kurt Hiller, and Erwin Haarmann and his assistant, Johannes Werres. Two findings are particularly interesting. First, Whisnant shows how claims for minority protection and minority rights increasingly shaped the arguments of homophile representatives. Second, he discovers that their efforts to improve the societal position of homosexuals came to a sudden end around 1960, when homophile publications and organizations disappeared almost completely. This was due, among other things, to an increase in administrative and judicial restrictions that at least nominally aimed to protect youth. Yet while the official side of the homophile movement withered away, the number of bars and clubs continued to grow. At this point it makes sense to stress, as Whisnant compellingly does, the inseparability of the formal and informal activities of homosexuals. Instead of according political significance only to the official associations, Whisnant's narrative suggests that it was the very interplay between these different dimensions of the homosexual counterpublic that proved decisive for the long-term success of

the homophile movement, that is, for achieving the decriminalization of consensual sex between male adults in the late 1960s.

The third chapter looks at this informal side of homosexual activities. Again concentrating primarily on Hamburg, with occasional detours into cities such as West Berlin and Hanover, Whisnant paints a vivid picture of homosexual meeting spaces, bars, and saunas in the 1950s and 1960s. In light of the chapter's detailed richness it is especially regrettable that the book contains neither photographs nor maps nor any other kind of illustrations. Readers learn a great deal about how housing shortages, emergency accommodation, bombed-out buildings, public toilets that were scarcely lit because of electricity shortages, and post-war conditions in general offered many opportunities for clandestine sex. When these opportunities vanished as a result of West Germany's gradual economic recovery, more and more bars and clubs started to cater for the needs of homosexual customers. The chapter's particular strength lies in showing how this homosexual scene developed internal lines of differentiation. 'Respectable' homophiles, feminine *Tunten*, working-class hustlers, and rough leather men all had their preferred spaces and quarters. Although these scenes were not totally separate, Whisnant shows how they came to be ever more distinct from each other.

The fourth chapter, finally, scrutinizes the reform of the West German criminal code and the decriminalization of male-to-male intercourse in 1969/73. In line with previous research, Whisnant states that these reforms did not primarily grow out of grassroots protests and endeavours, but resulted from the continued efforts of some prominent artists, journalists, politicians, and academics.² Among these were Theodor Bovet, Peter von Zahn, Herbert Jäger, and Hans-Joachim Schoeps. In this context Whisnant accords specific significance to discussions among theologians and lawyers. He also highlights the increasing emphasis on a more 'modern' and 'liberal' notion of the state that was no longer to enforce a specific understanding of morality, but to grant its citizens the freedom to decide for themselves what kinds of sexual activity they wanted to engage in.

Two points in Whisnant's account are particularly noteworthy: his emphasis on transnational connections and on the diversity within the homosexual scene. As far as the transnational dimension is

² Michael Kandora, 'Homosexualität und Sittengesetz', in Ulrich Herbert (ed.), *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland* (Göttingen, 2002), 379–401.

Book Reviews

concerned, the author primarily highlights the Cold War and transatlantic interactions as important frames within which his narrative unfolds. While it is debatable how deeply the 'lavender scare', that is, the fear of homosexual spies working for the Communist enemy, impacted on West Germany (pp. 17, 61), it is undoubtedly true that the minority protection arguments that gained ever more currency during the 1960s were heavily influenced by the debates on ethnic diversity taking place at the same time in the United States (pp. 103, 193). There is another 'transnational' link, however, that might have deserved more attention. Unlike its 'democratic' counterpart in the West, the 'totalitarian' government of East Germany had a more lenient policy towards its homosexual citizens, at least in terms of criminal prosecution. Although this did not go unnoticed in the Federal Republic's homophile magazines of the 1950s and 1960s, it is unfortunately scarcely touched upon by Whisnant.

As far as distinct homosexual identity formations are concerned, Whisnant convincingly highlights the 'internal' differentiations between homophiles, *Tunten*, hustlers, leather men, and others. Because of this heterogeneity the author refuses to use the homogenizing phrase 'homosexual subculture', preferring to speak of gay scenes (p. 5) instead. Especially against this background it is particularly regrettable that Whisnant makes no reference at all to how 'lesbian scenes' might have interacted with their gay counterparts. Recent research has shown how rewarding it can be to take on the admittedly laborious task of casting light on the history of women who loved other women in the 1950s and 1960s.³ In this and some other respects, the book might have profited if Whisnant had placed even more stress on the multiplicity of different and often contested identifications according to gender and sexuality that co-existed within the gay scenes. When, for example, he writes about gay men attempting to partake in the James Dean version of masculinity (p. 50), he forgets to mention that in those days Dean was considered an effeminate figure by the general adult public. Even more problematic is Whisnant's distinction between an older understanding of homosexuality tied to gender inversion and a more 'modern' definition based on men having sex with men. Of course it is possible to argue that before the 1960s men who had sex with other men were not necessarily consid-

³ Kirsten Plötz, *Als fehle die bessere Hälfte: 'Alleinstehende' Frauen in der frühen BRD 1949–1969* (Königstein/Ts., 2005).

ered homosexuals if they appeared perfectly masculine. But the reader is left with the impression that there were probably many more understandings of homosexuality and that to reduce them to the somewhat strange opposition between effeminacy and male-to-male intercourse is cutting a complicated story too short. Many leather men, for example, formulated a specifically homosexual and hyper-masculine self-image that, in turn, impacted on heterosexual masculinities which then increased the popularity of fitness studios that in turn attracted more and more gay customers.

Finally, a few minor points should be mentioned. Apart from a number of misspellings and small mistakes in writing German words and names, some relevant recent German-language publications are missing from the references.⁴ While looking for these references it also became clear how tremendously the absence of a full bibliography diminishes a book's usefulness for research and other academic purposes. To check a particular reference, a short title does not suffice. In order to find the full bibliographical details of a certain book, the reader might have to undertake the time consuming task of skimming through all the endnotes. I am aware that this criticism should be addressed to Palgrave Macmillan, but it should nevertheless be noted here. As a compensation for the 'select' bibliography, however, the book offers a useful index at the end.

Overall, and in spite of these shortcomings, the book makes a valuable contribution to current debates within the field. It is, as far as I can see, the first English-language monograph offering a comprehensive and source-based treatment of the post-war history of male same-sex desire in West Germany. It offers its readers numerous fruitful thoughts and inspiring insights into the history of homosexualities as well as German history.

⁴ This applies to the works quoted in nn. 1 and 2 as well as to Burkhardt Riechers, 'Freundschaft und Anständigkeit: Leitbilder im Selbstverständnis männlicher Homosexueller in der frühen Bundesrepublik', *Invertito: Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Homosexualitäten*, 1 (1999), 12-46.

Book Reviews

BENNO GAMMERL is a Research Fellow in History of Emotions at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin and is working on the project 'Homosexuality and Emotional Life in Rural West Germany (1960-1990)'. His other research interests include the history of empires, citizenship and nationality, and oral history. He is the author of *Untertanen, Staatsbürger und Andere: Der Umgang mit ethnischer Heterogenität im Britischen Weltreich und im Habsburgerreich, 1867-1918* (2010) and numerous articles.