BOOK REVIEWS


The aim of this study is to investigate the role of humour and irony as constitutive elements of the political culture of medieval England from the Norman Conquest through to the later thirteenth century. The set of case studies chosen for close reading are, in the main, historiographical and epistolary texts, and Katrin Beyer situates her approach to them somewhere between a strictly literary line, which would understand humour and irony in these works as particular rhetorical devices operating within the formal constraints of their genres, and a naive reading that would assume them to be direct reflections of a historical reality. The stated aim is instead to understand the position of humour and irony within the broader structure of medieval political communication: ‘[die] Freilegung der Erwartungshaltungen und Verhaltensweisen im Gespräch auf der Grundlage von normativen Darstellungen, Redeszenen und Briefen, um auf diesem Wege Aussagen über Konventionen und Verhaltensnormen jener Zeit treffen zu können’ (to uncover the inherent expectations and forms of conduct in spoken discourse on the basis of normative representations, literary dialogues, and letters, in order to draw conclusions in this way about conventions and norms of conduct in this period) (p. 21). In the main, Beyer achieves this balancing act quite well, even if one notes that at some points, what she (and her readers) would really have liked to investigate is whether an acerbic display of wit presented in a particularly charged situation actually occurred in the manner the sources would have us believe.

The first three central chapters deal with facetiae and the facete dicturn—witty tales and clever wordplay—as a constituent element of urbanitas, an ideal of the new courtly culture emanating from northern France, of which English (or rather: Angevin) curial writers of the period understood themselves to be part. The political deployment of
the *facete dictum* in order to de-escalate conflict and defuse fraught situations went beyond a rhetorical trope, as we are shown through case studies of the well-documented relationships between Henry II and the Carthusian Hugh, bishop of Lincoln (d. 1200), and the king’s cousin Roger, bishop of Worcester (d. 1179), respectively. Yet it is also clear that the success of a *facete dictum* in such circumstances depended on the prior personal acquaintance and, indeed, friendship with the king on the part of figures who were already heavyweight politicians, voices heard seriously at court. The *facete dictum* in this political context was the exception, not the norm, and if deployed inappropriately, or by an individual without the necessary personal standing, reflected badly upon the speaker. The ability to tell witty stories (*facetiae*) effectively, by contrast, was a quality prized more broadly as a mark of distinction for a courtier. As a social rather than an ethical quality, it was not necessarily a mark of character, and so can be found ascribed to individuals otherwise held in poor repute. Skill in the delivery of *facetiae* was taken by some twelfth-century authors as a distinctive feature of national identity—of Britishness, Englishness, or, in the case of Gerald of Wales, Welshness—and they could also be deployed to political effect. Gerald and Walter Map both presented *facetiae* in which a positive connotation lent to the frugality of the Capetian kings was intended to contrast only semi-implicitly with the power-hungry ambition of Henry II, to the latter’s discredit; inverting thereby the original direction of these *facetiae*, which Beyer argues had begun life as orally circulated tales that poked fun at the relative poverty and somewhat feeble territorial jurisdiction of the twelfth-century kings of France.

In the second set of three chapters, Beyer turns to three different spheres of life and thought: law, letters, and satirical literature. The first of these (law) is long and difficult, and starts with the proposition that Anglo-Norman justice saw the death penalty as inappropriate for nobles, even in cases of treason (though not, one might note, for everyone else). Instances in which a treacherous nobleman was put to death at the order of a ruler had, therefore, to be especially legitimized in some way by subsequent narrators of the events. Beyer appeals to the idea of punishments that ‘mirrored’ the crime they addressed, the ‘spiegelnde Strafe’, as part of those strategies of legitimation, and which contemporary historians signalled by the introduction of (invented) ironic statements. Thus, to explain the execu-
tion of the Mercian nobleman Eadric Streona (d. 1017) by Cnut, later historians like William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon made him responsible for the murder of Edmund Ironside, and then attributed to Cnut an ironic statement towards Eadric of the ‘and now you will get your just rewards’ type. This turns out to be the latter’s execution, with Cnut presented as a man who hated treachery, even when it had worked to his advantage. Eadric was thus ‘deceived’ by Cnut’s irony, just as he himself had ‘deceived’ Edmund Ironside. William of Malmesbury (again) and Orderic Vitalis attribute a similar ironic statement to the future Henry I in the year 1090, having him declare ‘All this will be yours’ to his captive, the rebel leader Conan Pilatus, whilst gazing out from a tower upon the city of Rouen, before hurling Conan violently from said tower to his death, the ‘reward’ for his treachery. What was in reality a usurpation of the juridical authority of Henry’s older brother Robert Curthose, then Duke of Normandy, an act of dubious legality, and a display of distasteful cruelty on the part of a man who had since become king, was then turned into a ‘spiegelnde Strafe’ by Henry’s apologists through their inclusion of this ironic phrase (both were careful to state that it was uttered per hironiam, lest their readers fail to grasp the point). In the context of Beyer’s work, this legal perspective is then placed alongside studies of irony in the works of Matthew Paris, where irony serves to characterize others negatively (especially the French), and of the mockery and scorn that could occur on the battlefield—or require prevention, in the prosecution of successful peace negotiations. All three are taken together as types of ‘agonale Redezzenen’, dialogues in situations of sharp conflict (the adjective agonal is a neologism derived from the Greek ἄγων, without a direct English equivalent), but as an analytical category, it lacks much in the way of useful coherence here.

The final two chapters, on letters and satirical writing, take us more firmly into the literary territory of crafted rhetoric. We learn how jocularity could maintain friendships by letter despite physical separation, but that irony could also be used in letters to stage verbal assaults and shape cutting arguments with which to belabour one’s correspondent. The effect in the latter case was heightened by the ingenuity required successfully to communicate ironic statements on a purely textual level, without the assistance of gestures, expressions, or changes in the tone of voice (or the lame recourse to the declara-
tion that a given statement was meant *ironice*). Walter Map’s *De nugis curialium* and the *De inventionibus* of Gerald of Wales are then examined as examples of satirical prose, in which irony was used as one rhetorical device amongst many to defame opponents. Both are really examples of formal invective, but whilst Walter seems to have been a clever satirist of the new Cistercian movement, Gerald comes across as an embittered and vituperative individual who sought to cast blame on others for his failure to secure the bishopric of St David’s. Beyer detects in Gerald’s purple prose traces of the rhetorical strategies by which the case will have been presented and debated at the papal curia, and so establishes a contemporary political dimension to a work that is otherwise very much a product of literary, indeed textual, craft and of the evident inheritance of classical learning.

The Latin texts are quoted at length in the footnotes, which helpfully allows the reader to examine the exact wording of the statements under discussion. It is clear that Beyer has an eye for detecting the ironic, but one would like to know how the episodes singled out for particular examination were chosen, on what grounds the material basis was selected, and why the study was conceived as it is. It is not easy, after the chapters dealing with *facetia*, to grasp the integral coherence of the study, or always to understand whether the features identified are exceptional to particular works, or are representative of broader trends in contemporary political culture. The sharp expression of conclusions and the treatment of the tension between literary technique and historical reality suffer somewhat at the hands of the considerable body of detail marshalled in this study. How Beyer’s conclusions change our existing understanding of the nature of political, and thus courtly, culture in twelfth- and thirteenth-century England is a matter that readers are required to work out for themselves. This reviewer is unconvinced by the contention, outlined in the introduction, that the high status accorded to wit and humour in English society is a historical constant, and so England (or the Angevin Empire) was different in this respect from the rest of Europe, because a comparative angle is never opened.

What, then, of the quality of the humour and wit presented in this study? Beyer notes that scholars of medieval literature have focused more on laughter than on humour, and that few historians have touched on either. The political dimension of much of the humour
that comes to light in this study, however, often only worked through the mechanism of laughter. The examples of humorous *facetiae* uttered in order to reinforce a collective identity or create a group loyalty work by singling out another for scorn, generating laughter at the expense of a third party. One begins to see what the long-standing ecclesiastical distaste for laughter was getting at. *Facetiae* are more genuinely witty, and one can further admire the oratorical skill and literal quick-wittedness of a Hugh of Lincoln. But with the exception of certain outstanding individuals—those like Walter Map, who gave real thought to constructing humorous episodes—the wit and irony on display is, in itself, often not very sophisticated. The statement accorded to the future Henry I whilst casting Conan to his death, regardless of whether he actually said it, may well be part of an ingenious legalistic strategy to legitimize the act, but it is pretty grim all the same. The courtly milieu of urbane jocularity competes here with a sense of humour inherited from the early Middle Ages, of which Chris Wickham noted recently that ‘what was funny to them (largely mockery and dreadful puns) by no means makes them seem closer to us; they used irony, but it was usually pretty savage and sarcastic’. ¹
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How British was the British Empire? How German was it? Or, to put it in less politically volatile terms, to what extent and in what sense was the colonial structure built up and controlled by England/Britain a shared European undertaking? Setting the indigenous populations aside, it is obvious that with individuals and groups from all over Europe as well as other parts of the world in a more or less constant flow of migration and transmigration, colonialism was more than just the relationship between one ‘metropolis’ and the periphery on which it acted. How did migrants from different countries and backgrounds act and connect? How and why did they introduce or influence what was at work in various geographical settings over two centuries? This is the issue at the heart of this collection of essays, which singles out the German minority and their relevance for British imperialism. The more recent concepts of networking and transnational entanglements offer an inroad into the as yet largely uncharted territory of the role played by non-British subjects within the British Empire.

To explore empire as a multifaceted, multicultural, multidimensional undertaking, a process of interaction and exchange of individuals rooted in diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, is not new. Nevertheless, interactions between individuals, groups, and institutions beyond national or cultural boundaries, the effects of stage migration and seeing an empire work, and the repercussions of these on more than one metropolis have not yet been studied systematically. This is surprising in the light of the fundamental nature of colonialism and the function of empire, especially the British Empire, as a facilitator of migration, which is, after all, the basis of all—direct—interaction and exchange. It is this shortcoming that this collection of essays on networks and entanglements, a follow-up to an earlier volume by the same group of authors on migration, seeks to redress.

In fact, the eight case studies aim high. Their intention is to show ‘the contribution of immigrants to making the Empire work’ and, in so doing, to ‘shed new light on the dynamics which made Britain a world power’ (p. 5). It is always difficult to create a narrative out of a
few case studies, even more so in the case of a group of actors whose numbers might have been ‘substantial’ (p. 17), a rather vague description, but whose relevance can only be properly assessed in light of a similar evaluation of contributions by other groups. A more modest goal is to offer a ‘repository of information and argument calling into question preconceived notions’ (p. 17). It is more easily achieved since by looking at the activities of non-British individuals within the British Empire each essay in itself succeeds in exposing the diversity of backgrounds, motives, and actions of those involved. It is in showing how these factors were interlinked and affected the already heterogeneous expansion process that the essays come into their own. However, the articles vary in respect to the depth of entanglement they present.

Germans moved to the British Empire and within it for various reasons. The main one was the economic motive or pull factor of an Empire providing the infrastructure for trade or jobs inaccessible to inhabitants of city-states, princedoms, duchies, or kingdoms on the European Continent without possessions overseas. Four essays in this collection focus on the Germans who migrated to the British Empire and transmigrated within it primarily for economic reasons. One of them describes four types of merchants emerging from the business activities of German-speaking migrants in the eighteenth century: investors in land developments and settlement projects and entrepreneurs enticing German craftsmen from the iron- and glass-making trades to transplant their trade and knowledge to workshops across the Atlantic. They assumed the role of transatlantic travellers or ‘newlanders’, whose more or less regular journeys established a specific kind of link. Or, like the Herrnhuter (Moravians), they acted as Protestant businessmen, using their denominational ties for commercial networking. Individuals of these four types played an interesting part in bringing the Atlantic world closer together, creating ties not only between German-speaking countries and Britain and its overseas colonies, but also between these and other colonial powers, such as Spain, France, the Netherlands, and their possessions. The essay identifies these groups and indicates the great variety of their activities and the existence of a lively transfer. What is absent, however, is the actual transfer, the entanglement beyond the fact of individuals or goods moving to, and perhaps from, the British Empire. The same applies to the overview of the commercial activities of
German merchants in the transatlantic textile, tobacco, and fur trades. The immediate influence of networks becomes more tangible in the biographies of chain migrants who moved to London as sugarbakers and ended up as farmers in New Zealand, and in the collective biography of five immigration agents in Canada, who wanted to promote German immigration to the country. Even here, however, one senses that there is much more to the story.

Two case studies are based on just one individual, a potentially easier approach to the workings of transnational networks in practice. Both individuals left their mark on Britain and the Empire as knowledge-producers, that is, as a scientist and explorer respectively. One deals with Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig Leichhardt, the Prussian explorer who went to Australia, and his most cherished project, through transnational networks of scientists. His greatest ambition was to cross the Australian continent from east to west. His expeditions to achieve this goal and their media resonance have made him a prominent figure in the Australian collective memory to the present day. The essay unexpectedly devotes a great deal of space to Leichhardt’s reception in the twentieth century, for example, in Patrick White’s novel *Voss*. The other case study is of Friedrich Max Müller, German philologist and Professor of Modern Languages at Oxford, who went a long way in raising the appreciation of ancient Indian culture in Britain, Europe, and America. The embodiment of the stereotypical absent-minded, metaphysical German professor, he advanced to the position of a full professor at Oxford through the mediation of the Prussian Ambassador to London, Baron von Bunsen, another key promoter of Anglo-German intellectual entanglement. As well as Müller’s contribution and postcolonial criticism of his idealized description of Indian culture, it would have been interesting to learn about how contemporaries received his ideas, to what extent they actually integrated his teachings into their own views, or how and why they modified them.

Two more essays address potential links between British and German imperialism. In the context of the impact of transatlantic networks, it is highly relevant to investigate how the experiences of Germans in Britain and the British Empire in the nineteenth century might have impinged upon the development of a specifically German type of expansionism. The cursory glance at the Central League for German Navy Clubs Abroad that carried tensions
between Britain and Germany overseas, and the overview of interests of Germans in Britain in the mid nineteenth century both only offer the basic facts of this story. A total of 30,000 Germans in London and Liverpool were strongly influenced by transmigration. How exactly? Germans in Anglo-German business partnerships adapted to British patterns to facilitate business. How did they achieve and assess the steps they took to blend in? Explorers such as Heinrich Barth and August Petermann provided expertise useful for British expansionism. Did the British undertaking acquire new facets in the process or was knowledge free of bias—which, as the sociology of science tells us, it is not? Both essays and the overviews they offer demonstrate once again that to ‘refer only to the vaguely defined category of the network’ does not suffice. Nor does a mere glance at ‘the large variety of forms of interactions and adaptation’ (p. 78). These forms deserve systematic and in-depth analysis.

The activities of migrants in the British Empire and beyond were indeed multifarious. So were the links, transfers, and levels of entanglement created in the process. The essays take an important first step in pointing this out. Very often, though, they do not go further than stating ways in which Germans appeared within the context of expansionism. Since this has not yet been done systematically, this first step is to be welcomed and appreciated. But more is to follow, very likely in a larger and considerably more comprehensive study that will focus less on migration itself than on its effects, transnational interactions, and exchanges at the level of values, assessments, ideas, and mentalities. Then we may be closer to finding an answer to the question of the Britishness or Europeanness of the British Empire.
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Intellectual historians generally trace the linguistic turn, the insight into the inextricable interrelationship between language, thought, and the world, back to Wilhelm von Humboldt. It has been extensively studied by scholars from Bruno Liebrucks to Jürgen Habermas, Jürgen Trabant, and many more.1 Isaiah Berlin described this turn towards language as an explicitly anti-Enlightenment movement. Johann Gottfried Herder’s and Johann Georg Hamann’s thinking about language, he argued, drew attention away from the universalism and rationalism of the Enlightenment and focused instead on the limits of reason, the irrational, and the culturally relative and plural.2 Here Berlin was reformulating older assessments and canonizations of German national historiography of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—such as contrasting an ‘unGerman Enlightenment’ with a supposedly romantic and irrational German national culture—in a way that had momentous consequences for the Anglophone world, and is still controversial today.3

Arguing against Berlin’s thesis, Avi Lifschitz rehabilitates the Enlightenment’s thinking on language and demonstrates impressively that not only was language one of the main themes of the discourse of the European Enlightenment, but that it was already seen as having a knowledge- and world-constituting significance. Herder stands wholly in the tradition and the debates of this Enlightenment thinking about language, and something similar could also be said of Humboldt. According to Lifschitz, two main features are common to
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all the language theories of the Enlightenment from Condillac to Rousseau, Mendelssohn, Michaelis, and Herder, and distinguish them both from the older view of language as a tool or an image of thought which dominated from Aristotle to Descartes, and from theological explanatory models. First, building on Leibniz’s insight into the nature of human thought as inevitably sign-bound, language is ascribed a constitutive role in cognition and the construction of social realities. In contrast to physical phenomena, institutions such as private property or forms of government are constituted by language. Herder contributed this insight to the image that language had created cities and transformed deserts into gardens. Secondly, the language theorists of the Enlightenment, building on the models of Epicurus and Lucretius from Antiquity, developed a naturalistic theory of the evolution of human language. Lifschitz demonstrates that historical naturalism was central for the Aufklärer, even if they had different ideas about God, because a scientific explanation could only appeal to internal and natural phenomena, while the method of conjectural history that they developed was understood exclusively by analogy with the natural sciences (p. 5).

Lifschitz’s argument draws its persuasiveness from the fact that, unlike Berlin, he does not operate purely within Geistesgeschichte or the history of ideas. Rather, he contextualizes these debates in the history of institutions, thus placing forms of discourse in relation to social forms of knowledge. The Berlin Academy of Sciences in particular was a centre of the European discourse on language around the middle of the eighteenth century. All the authors discussed were associated with it, and the debates focus on it. Crucial to the question of language here was the Berlin Enlightenment’s nature as a multilingual and multi-confessional ‘melting-pot’ (p. 65), an exciting constellation that was reflected in the Academy. Apart from the French Aufklärer patronized by Frederick II, including such notorious materialists as La Mettrie and Maupertuis, president of the Academy, the Class in Speculative Philosophy formed a centre for Wolffianism in the tradition of Leibniz and the early Enlightenment. Between these two poles there were a number of Swiss scholars such as Merian and Sulzer, while the French-speaking Huguenots around the Academy’s permanent secretary, Jean Henri Samuel Formey, defended the positions of Protestant orthodoxy and Wolffianism conveying a moderate Enlightenment.
Through the medium of essay prize contests, the Academy also played a crucial part in the Enlightenment discourse in the German language. These contests, which had been held since Frederick’s reform of the Academy in 1746, attracted not only many of the great Parisian philosophes, but also the best known German Aufklärer, such as Moses Mendelssohn, Immanuel Kant, Christian Garve, and Herder, who had been crowned three times. Throughout the second half of the eighteenth century, no other subject provided the topic for these competitions as frequently as the question of language: in 1759 the topic was the reciprocal influence of language on opinions; in 1771 the origin of language; in 1784 a European universal language; in 1794 a comparison between Europe’s main languages; and in the same year again, the chances of perfecting the German language. In addition, there were further questions relating to logical connections between language and thought, such as that of 1763, won by Mendelssohn ahead of Kant, on the difference between mathematical and metaphysical certainty.

The main focus of Lifschitz’s study is the prize contest of 1759 on the connection between opinion and language, which he identifies as the intersection between early Enlightenment theories of the dependence of thought on signs as in Leibniz, Pufendorf, Wolff, and Baumgarten, and later theories of the evolution of language and human civilization. This prize question crystallized the various positions and it also allowed a surprising alliance to emerge between the two real heroes of Lifschitz’s book, the prize-winner Johann David Michaelis, and André Pierre Le Guay de Prémontval, a French Aufklärer who had fled to Berlin and had conceived the question. He later conducted an intensive correspondence with Michaelis, and his translation of Michaelis’s prize-winning essay turned it into a European success. This contest, therefore, brought together two partners who, at first glance, could hardly seem more different: on the one side a German Orientalist with a Pietist background, who had been sponsored in Göttingen by Albrecht von Haller, and whose invectives against what he saw as the atheistic and materialistic machinations at the Berlin Academy were preserved in many forms; on the other a radical French Aufklärer who embodied pretty much everything that Haller rejected.

Lifschitz meticulously documents how Michaelis gradually approached a naturalistic view of language, culminating in his prize-
winning essay of 1759 in which he argued that there was no (divine) universal language, but that languages had evolved. Beyond this, he suggested, they represent a paradigm of democracy in which ‘the will of the majority’ is expressed in each language community. Thus in language, the whole population is the sovereign lawmaker, and women as the main reading public and men of letters play a special role. According to Lifschitz, the main factor in this remarkable change in Michaelis’s view of language was his study of the debates about Hebrew vowels and his reading of Robert Lowth’s interpretation of the Mosaic texts and Hebrew poetry which, like Homer’s poems, were regarded as manifestations of natural languages.

In the case of Prémontval, the prize question he formulated for the 1759 competition was part of a comprehensive campaign waged against an affirmative Wolffianism, against which Prémontval, like Voltaire later in Candide, brought sceptical and anti-providential arguments to bear. Prémontval’s insistence on contingency and openness to the future in human history forms part of his evolutionary and naturalistic view of language. The extent to which Prémontval’s question is situated in the Berlin context is shown by his Préservatif contre la corruption de la langue française, which was written at the same time as, and in close connection with, the prize question. In this polemical book, which was immediately banned by the Prussian censors, Prémontval does not, as the title might suggest, defend French language purism. On the contrary, it makes a passionate plea for linguistic diversity. Prémontval accuses the French Huguenots in Berlin of using old-fashioned and bad French, associated with a courtly elitism, instead of perfecting their grasp of the national language, German. The book is peppered with attacks on Formey, secretary of the Academy, whom Prémontval sees as the chief representative of a conservative and orthodox Wolffianism. Thus starting from two quite distinct debates on specific empirical problems—Hebrew vowels and the question of privileged immigrant languages—Michaelis and Prémontval, long before Herder and Humboldt, arrived at the idea of language as a culturally relative phenomenon that constitutes thought and the world.

It is a special strength of Lifschitz’s account that he lucidly shows the connections between the institutional field, specific problems and debates, and philosophical questions. Successfully combining the larger picture with thick description of local contexts, Language and
Enlightenment is a rich book that will be read with profit by those interested in the philosophy of language, the history of ideas, and cultural history alike. As in the case of Christopher Clark’s book on Prussia, it seems that it sometimes requires a view from outside to overcome outdated stereotypes and rigid canonizations in cultural history, and allow historical objects to appear in a new light.
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The aim of Oliver Zimmer’s new book is ambitious. He is looking for a way to escape the master narratives of modernization and nation-alization without paying the price of his account falling apart into unconnected stories. He enlists the concepts of journeys, place-makers, and rhythms to help him in this, but it is unclear whether their content is more analytical or metaphorical. A comment about research on nationalism from the book’s conclusion may demonstrate this tension: ‘As well as questioning the still common top-down perspective of nationalist inculcation, the conceptual metaphor of the dance shifts our focus towards nationalism as a collective practice, one in which people from different walks of life took part with varying degrees of intention and awareness’ (p. 303).

However one may judge the overall success of the book in achieving its stated aim, it is true that the author has interesting stories to tell about changes in three medium-sized German towns in the second half of the nineteenth century. The selection of Ulm, Augsburg, and Ludwigshafen, three towns with very different socio-economic and confessional structures, for this purpose does not need to be discussed. It proves its worth in that the comparison facilitates the breaking up of all too homogeneous narrative patterns, which is the author’s intention. And towns of this size, that is, those with more than 20,000 inhabitants but fewer than 100,000, shaped the everyday life of the majority of German city-dwellers until well into the twentieth century. It remains to be considered whether this limited size made them more manageable as well as giving them a special ‘institutional density’ which distinguished them from large cities such as Hamburg and Berlin.

In the first part of the book (‘Journeys’), Zimmer analyses the economic development of his selected towns in the context of the wider southern German setting or, to be more precise, he examines the comments on this made by the classes that set the tone in each case. Here, as in the book as a whole, his method is to investigate revealing key controversies, such as the debate in Ulm about the establish-
ment of warehouses and storage facilities, which took place in the mid 1870s. This debate allowed large sections of local commerce and industry to voice the doubts which they had about the ambitions of transit and long-distance trade (especially in grain), an attitude that was reflected in attempts to hold on to traditional economic forms and status hierarchies symbolized by the museum for local crafts (Gewerbemuseum) which opened a few years later. Its only successful exhibition was a presentation of Japanese art, clear evidence that the visitors, who also came from outside the town, did not all share the highly developed localism of Ulm’s petty bourgeoisie. This sort of mentality was not to be expected in a recently founded industrial town such as Ludwigshafen, and, indeed, was not observed there. Wholesale trade and large industry long dominated Ludwigshafen unchallenged. The textile town of Augsburg, finally, had a considerable industrial tradition, but its expansion took place on the city’s periphery. This permitted the spatial co-existence of a commercial centre of small businesses and a periphery with a neglected infrastructure.

Where the journey was to end was a question not only of economic development. Progress required education, and this meant that the question of schools was of central importance. The issue of non-denominational primary schools was controversial. Their advocates could argue that the ability of teachers (and students) was crucial, not their religious affiliation. They were introduced only in Ludwigshafen, and while there were conflicts there about the church’s influence on the inspectorate of schools, ultimately teachers were more concerned about the possible loss of reputation of colleagues who taught at schools near the chemical factories. Non-denominational schools were the ideal of the liberals who dominated local politics in Augsburg, but they remained a minority phenomenon in the face of confessional resistance. For the liberals, it was all the more important to retain control over the school inspectorate and to reduce the influence of the religious orders, who provided a number of teachers in the predominantly Catholic town. But in Ulm, with its Protestant majority, the inspection of schools was also at the heart of a number of debates, and it is a strength of this microhistory that it reveals the subtle strategies which the town used to gain influence over the appointment of an increasing number of Catholic primary school teachers.
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The second part of the book (‘Place-Makers’) concentrates on the law of citizenship and residence based on community of origin (Bürger- und Heimatrecht) that clung on tenaciously for so long in southern Germany. While it is well known that this law was challenged after 1870 by Imperial laws, especially the Relief Residence Law, Zimmer’s analysis of how it was implemented locally, and the mentalities behind this, breaks new ground. Ulm’s city council complained, quite rightly, that the new regulations redistributed expenses to the disadvantage of the large towns. Until then, these had been able to pass on the social costs of an increasingly mobile population by sending the poor back to their communities of origin, which were obliged to support them. The city authorities now checked all the more carefully whether they could not deport those in need of assistance and their families after all, before they had been resident in the city for two years without claiming poor relief, which secured them the right to support in Ulm. And as late as the 1880s Ludwigshafen tried to collect fees for which the legal basis had been abolished in 1868 by threatening to withdraw the Heimatrecht in cases of non-payment. And Augsburg, finally, as late as the first half of the 1870s, used fees levied for granting the right of citizenship and the Heimatrecht to fund around 10 per cent of its annual outgoings on poor relief. Locally, therefore, progress towards freedom of movement was much bumpier than national legislation, or that of individual states, may make it seem.

Imperial legislation, however, not only placed a question mark over the traditional link between the right to poor relief and citizenship status in the community of origin, but also contrasted the right to vote in local elections, tied to local citizenship status, with the socially much more open male suffrage at national level. The discrepancy varied from place to place, and this is far less surprising than that the author occasionally hints that the socially most open community of municipal citizens (Bürnergemeinde) was in Ulm, which had the gravest doubts about economic innovations. Rapidly growing but primarily proletarian Ludwigshafen, however, was primarily interested in creating a Bürnergemeinde of this sort in the first place, while in Augsburg the local political privileges of an exclusive Bürnergemeinde were carefully defended. As late as the mid 1890s, applications from war veterans for citizenship rights to be granted without a fee were treated with reserve. This exclusivity was not broken down until the
turn of the century, with the rise of political Catholicism and Social Democratic associations, the *Heimat- und Bürgerrechtsvereine*. Taking the example of consumer cooperatives, Zimmer illustrates tellingly that these basic structures, which differed from locality to locality, also shaped other areas of life. He thus distinguishes between the type of consumer cooperative common in Augsburg and Ludwigshafen, and that found in Ulm: ‘Rather than socio-economic integration for the sake of communal holism, its declared aim was the support of affordable consumer goods for those who could least afford them.’ While this is clear, it is a moot point whether the next sentence provides additional insights: ‘Rather than place-reinforcing, its socio-economic practices were place-transcending’ (p. 167).

The third and longest part of the book (‘Rhythms’), finally, in discussing urban hygiene and city theatres, treats areas central to communal activity. Looking at Sedan Day celebrations and Corpus Christi processions, it introduces areas in which local loyalties might come into conflict with larger ones. An outline of the different political cultures is indispensable background to this. Augsburg’s unusually combative denominational nature had already become apparent during the *Kulturkampf*. In Ulm, by contrast, beyond all differences of opinion, political debates were much more about social cohesion, and in Ludwigshafen it was customary, until well into the twentieth century, to select candidates for local office so that all the most important areas of the local economy and society were represented. Consequently, only in Augsburg could the liberal call for a new town theatre be attacked as reflecting bourgeois class-interest, while Ulm’s town council, in the controversy about high culture versus mass culture (circus versus theatre), argued for both, and Ludwigshafen, given the proximity of Mannheim’s competition, declined to provide anything itself. Given the balance of power in communal politics it is no surprise that in 1863 Augsburg broke ranks with the Bavarian towns that had declined an invitation to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of the Nations in Leipzig. The Bavarian–Swabian town also distinguished itself in its celebration of Sedan Day, erecting a war memorial on the Fronhof, a town square. And finally, Augsburg celebrated on 2 September for the entire existence of the Kaiserreich, while in Ludwigshafen, which was similarly dominated by liberals and equally fun-loving, soon shifted the celebrations to the preceding or following Sunday.
The antagonistic political constellation in Augsburg during the *Kulturkampf* meant that 2 September never became a truly national holiday. Nor was it one in Ulm or Ludwigshafen, where, as elsewhere from the 1890s, it increasingly became an affair of the veterans’ associations. But it was far less divisive there than in Augsburg. Although anti-Prussian democrats were strong in Ulm, the confessional component of the conflicts was not comparable with that in Augsburg, even when the Centre Party and the Social Democratic Party increasingly questioned the liberal hegemony from the late 1880s. Rather, struggles took place behind closed doors, with the result that the Catholic community also held a commemoration, but at a place of its own choosing, and with special emphasis on the fallen soldiers. And in Ludwigshafen in 1895, the mayor’s repeated request, made via the bishop, for the Catholic churches please to join in the ringing of the Protestant church bells, was at last successful. In the 1870s and early 1880s, the same diocese had had to exert enormous pressure on its clergyman in Ludwigshafen before he was prepared to take part in a Corpus Christi procession outside his own church. The right to hold such a procession, guaranteed by the Bavarian constitution, had been challenged by the liberal town council, which feared traffic disruption, but it took place for the first time in 1881 and was well attended. In the years that followed it evoked no further disputes. In Augsburg, the liberals would have liked to ban the processions, but in essence accepted the constitutional situation. Events in Ulm once again demonstrated the local actors’ capacity for compromise. The right to process was not enshrined in the constitution there, but in the early twentieth century, when the regularly authorized procession expanded its route and threatened to obstruct access to the railway station, a solution was speedily found. Instead of rows of two people marching close together, the procession would now consist of rows of six, with large gaps between rows, making it possible for people to cross the procession. While the rhythms of religion and traffic could not be synchronized, they at least did not obstruct each other.

Zimmer does not treat Ulm as an exception. Rather, it seems important to him to reverse the standard question about tensions between national liberalism and Catholicism and to ask why, given the competition for the same public space and competing rhythms, deeper conflicts did not come about more frequently. His answer
relates on the one hand to urban societies, where mixed religious marriages were increasingly seen as normal, promoting tolerance, and on the other, to a non-denominational Christianity which made it possible for the Catholic population to participate in the nation below the threshold of a national religious transfiguration. Not all the evidence adduced in support of this hypothesis is necessarily convincing, for example, the common Christian anti-socialism of the 1890 Catholic Conference in Ulm, cited for its obvious rhetorical function. The anti-Jewish implications of this sort of non-denominational Christian nationalism could have been explored in greater depth, but the Jewish communities of the towns under investigation are not often mentioned. This may be because the period on which Zimmer concentrates and the themes which he analyses have, so far, been seen primarily from the perspective of a basic conflict between Catholicism and the liberal ideology of progress. His comparative case studies are able to make these dichotomies fluid. To what extent this is due to his concepts of journeys, place-markers, and rhythms remains to be seen. In any case, his comparative urban histories are stimulating, especially in their approach to local, regional, and national problems, and their relations with each other.
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PERRY MYERS, *German Visions of India, 1871–1918: Commandeering the Holy Ganges during the Kaisersreich* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), xiii + 259 pp. ISBN 978 1 137 29971 0. US $85.00. £55.00

This perceptive and penetrating new study examines the complex and multi-faceted German interest in India, held at the time by Germany’s imperial rival, Great Britain. During this era of German militarism and colonial expansion, Germans nevertheless used India for a wide array of religious, political, cultural, and social purposes. A professor of German Studies at Albion College, author Perry Myers brings seasoned experience with German literature and Indo-German cross-cultural connections, having written a book on *fin-de-siècle* Germany’s Rudolf Steiner and Max Weber, as well as articles on the Indian travels of Waldemar Bonsels, Ernst Haeckel, Joseph Dahlmann, and others. In this newest addition to his collection of Indo-German studies, he takes an interdisciplinary literary and historical approach, critically examining religious, travel, and other literary texts within their historical context.

Especially innovative ideas in this book include linking the German interest in India to domestic German concerns such as the Catholic response to the *Kulturkampf*, the role of German discourse about India in contemporary debates about science and religion, and the meshing of India with German imperial interests. The *Kulturkampf* was a failed attempt under Chancellor Bismarck to forge unity within the German Empire by forcing southern German Catholics into conformity with northern German Protestant society. During this north German cultural assault in Europe, beleaguered Catholic southern Germans displaced their religious struggle half a world away onto India, where they thought they had a promising foreign field on which they could better their confessional rivals (p. 78). In 1891 the German Jesuit and missionary Adolph Müller, fantasizing about the prospect of converting ‘millions’ in India, criticized the Portuguese, lamenting their inability to find many converts and to hold on to their Indian empire (p. 67). Myers helps to document how during the difficult *Kulturkampf* years German Catholics cast their missionary gaze on India, which served as a surrogate, replacing losses at home in Germany. This is an intriguing compensation argument, one that has a rough parallel in P. J. Marshall’s *The Making and Unmaking of Empires* (2005), which shows how the loss of
American colonies in North America in the eighteenth century led to the elevation of India to become the greatest jewel in the British global empire’s crown. While the German Catholics were unable to achieve what the British empire-builders did, exposing their ambitions provides insight into Germans of the early Kaiserrreich.

Another issue Myers examines is India’s role for Germans experiencing the developing rift between science and religion during the late nineteenth century. German interest in India came to fulfil a response to anxiety about the cultural despair that Fritz Stern examines in _The Politics of Cultural Despair_ (1974) and the crisis the religious faced as they experienced competition from a growing body of evidence for biological evolution and other sciences that challenged traditional religious narratives. Buddhism emerged as a way to bridge religion and science for contemporaries such as physician and ‘arm-chair Indologist’ Paul Dahlke, who, unlike most contemporary university Indologists, visited India by making at least seven trips to Ceylon, built a Buddhist centre in a Berlin-Frohnau house that still is active,¹ and published several books on Buddhism (pp. 97, 103). Among his arguments, Dahlke made the claim that both biology and religion depended on an evolutionary process of progress to form knowledge (p. 100). On the other hand, adherents of traditional faiths such as Catholicism, like many religious Europeans of the era, hated and feared Buddhism. Nevertheless, this Asian interloper did serve the purpose of negative integration, a reviled ‘other’ against which Eurocentric xenophobes could rally (p. 114). Catholic Jesuit Peter Sinthern (born 1870), for example, wrote against the dangers of rising world religion in the ‘Buddhification of Christianity through Theosophy’, lamenting recent threats to what he saw as a Catholic universal mandate. Sinthern also took the opportunity to swipe at the old nemesis of Catholicism, Protestantism, for which he blamed the origins of Theosophy (p. 123). Yet Theosophy owed more to a global amalgamation of many traditions, with a large dose of South Asian religious traditions, as its founder Madame Blavatsky moved the organization’s headquarters to India.

Permeating German national integration and the rise of science were questions about Imperial Germany’s international place in the sun, its drive to acquire overseas colonies. Myers’ analysis reiterates

the pan-European links between Germans studying India and the British ruling over it at the time. Wilhelm Hübbe-Schleiden, for example, viewed the Indians as poor but content under British rule, while in Europe, poverty-stricken classes were growing in power and dissatisfaction (p. 162). German travellers, fellow Europeans, believed the version of colonialism of their British hosts. The most critical of the German Protestant theologians, Bonn’s D. Theodor Christlieb, for example, wrote an essay in 1877 that criticized the British opium trade and materialism, but nevertheless praised the ‘significant steps’ they had taken to reduce famine (p. 153). This German acceptance of pro-British civilizing mission arguments is noteworthy, as the British were vulnerable to much potential criticism. Mike Davis in *Late Victorian Holocausts* (2001) shows how Victorian bureaucrats such as Lord Lytton could organize an expensive Durbar in 1877 to celebrate Queen Victoria assuming the title of Empress of India while millions of ordinary Indians starved and died because of the free market systems the British had introduced into their colonial administration. Indians themselves, such as R. C. Dutt and Dadabai Naoroji in *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India* (1901), documented how the British were draining India of its wealth, hindering Indian industrial development. At the same time, however, as Myers argues, German criticism of British colonial rule took a less controversial cultural rather than material angle. Both Hübbe-Schleiden and Christlieb thought that Germans would provide better colonial administrators and spiritual guides, aligning themselves with the German colonial ambitions of the era. Hübbe-Schleiden thought that the prosaic British lacked the cultural powers of Germans to ‘tap into India’s most precious “jewel” — its deep spirituality’, thus asserting a unique Indo-German connection (p. 165).

Although Myers, like Suzanne Marchand in *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire* (2009), is dismissive of what he argues is Edward Said’s overemphasis on power relations, he nevertheless does address and document the pro-colonial views of Germans such as Hübbe-Schleiden who used India to imagine their own imperial ambitions, even if illusionary.

Myers well understands the nuances of religious and intellectual currents of the era he examines, and develops these connections persuasively. For example, he notes the Pietistic roots of introspection, a peculiar Christian approach that in turn informed the German under-
standing of Buddhism (p. 93). The work does a discerning job connecting the figures and texts he picks to currents in German history such as the Kulturkampf and colonialism, as noted above. He is also aware and sensitive to counter-currents and figures cutting against the grain of the times (p. 90). He critically looks at Pfungst’s biography of Schultze, noting Schultze’s strong Protestant religious commitment that skews the work (p. 87). Myers spends ample time critically examining texts and introducing readers to their authors and the times and activities that shaped their thoughts.

One potential criticism concerns how representative the texts and figures he chose actually are. How do the authors he picks fit into wider fields? What other areas, scholars, popularizers, are worth examining? In his defence, these questions echo Werner Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle, reflecting an insoluble trade-off between depth versus breadth that any scholar faces in examining a topic. Myers resolves this dilemma by picking a handful of seemingly important, leading figures and examining their works in some detail. He helps to chart the trees in his chosen area carefully, while the overall forest outline of Indo-German studies, although clearer, remains shrouded—the venue for further exploration, as one book cannot capture the entire landscape into which others are venturing.

Myers’ work sheds sustained light on a field that has enjoyed a bumper crop of Indo-German studies during the past decade, part of a larger emphasis on topics spanning world cultures in contact, transnational interaction, and globalization. Myers is responding to, and building upon, recent scholarly books on Indo-German connections.2 These studies after the millennium, in turn, rest upon the shoulders of works largely responding to Edward Said’s Orientalism.

2 These include, e.g.: Kamakshi P. Murti, India: The Seductive and Seduced ‘Other’ of German Orientalism (2001); Dorothy M. Figueira, Aryans, Jews, Brahmins: Theorizing Authority Through Myths of Identity (2002); Todd Kontje, German Orientalisms (2004); Indra Sengupta, From Salon to Discipline: State, University and Indology in Germany, 1821–1914 (2005); Bradley L. Herling, The German Gītā: Hermeneutics and Discipline in the German Reception of Indian Thought, 1778–1831 (2006); Tuska Benes, In Babel’s Shadow: Language, Philology, and the Nation in Nineteenth-Century Germany (2008); Pascale Rabault-Feuerhahn, L’archive des origines: Sanskrit, philologie, anthropologie dans l’Allemagne du XIXe siècle (2008); Jörg Esleben, Christina Kraenzle, and Sukanya Kulkarni (eds.), Mapping Channels between Ganges and Rhein: German-Indian Cross-Cultural Relations (2008); Nicholas A. Germana, The
(1978), including Patterson-Black’s 1985 translation of Raymond Schwab’s *Oriental Renaissance* (1950), William Halbfass’s *India and Europe* (1988), and the collection by Breckenridge and van der Veer that contains an important article by Sheldon Pollock on the complicity of German Indology with Nazism, ‘Deep Orientalism?’.

Myers’ study adds to this growing corpus of material by emphasizing religion, including Protestant and Catholic versions of Christianity, as well as Buddhism and Theosophy. This approach yields interesting insights, such as how German Catholics suffering cultural attacks under the programme of national unification in Germany helps to explain their later animosity to Indian nationalism and the Indian independence movement (p. 75). Myers makes good use of sources with in-depth readings of key texts that help to put their authors into their context, fleshing them out. Leipzig Indologist Ernst Windisch in his 1919 history of Indology looked at texts disembodied in time and context, as if the Orientalists themselves who wrote the works did not matter. Criticizing this decontextualized history of the discipline, Hamburg Indologist Albrecht Wezler in 1993 called for a team of scholars to reapply this stripped away flesh to the bare bones of Indology’s history, to put it into the context of its social,
historical, and contemporary intellectual life. Myers does an admirable job along these lines, adroitly examining the biographical detail of figures and relating them to their historical milieu. He also thoroughly examines the texts they have written, showing where the context informs the texts themselves. For example, it is important to understand the contemporary context of the positive response to Edwin Arnold’s poem about the Buddha, The Light of Asia, to grasp German Jesuit Christian Pesch’s vitriolic stream of five articles ‘denouncing’ and ‘lambasting’ Arnold’s work, as it was threatening to spread interest and affection for Buddhism in Europe (p. 114).

Myers’ book is an excellent place for scholars, graduate students, and advanced undergraduates to expand their knowledge about the relatively new and growing field of Indo-German studies. Like any good researcher, Myers explores other avenues for further examination, raises questions to develop, and opens veins well worth mining for more ideas. This volume should therefore spur on yet more fruitful work in the area of Indo-German interactions.
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‘The whole point about writing a history about a country is that we can liberate ourselves from the dead hand of the past. The whole point of knowing about the past of humanity in Australia is to prevent all of us, the Aborigines, the British, the Europeans, and the Asians, from being doomed to go on repeating the past.’ These words from Manning Clark’s Eric Johnstone Lecture, delivered in Darwin on 1 July 1987, are reprinted on the first page of David S. Bird’s *Nazi Dreamtime: Australian Enthusiasts for Hitler’s Germany*. As recent studies in German by Johannes Voigt (2011) and Hermann Mückler, Gabriele Weichart, and Friedrich Edelmayer (2013) have reminded us, it was some time before the former British dominions in the South Seas came to terms with the fissures, inconsistencies, and legends of their history, thereby trying, in Manning Clark’s words, to liberate themselves from the dead hand of the past. Clark’s words could therefore also have been put on the front of Andrew Francis’s book on the treatment of enemy aliens in New Zealand, replacing ‘Australia’ with ‘New Zealand’ and ‘Aborigines’ with ‘Maoris’. Both books deal with chapters of their country’s history which forced them to give up ideas about themselves that they had grown accustomed to and that were dear to their hearts. The fact that there were enthusiasts for Hitler even as far away as Australia, and that New Zealand’s dealings with enemy aliens in the First World War were no better than Australia’s, as described in 1989 by Gerhard Fischer, are some aspects of the past that the two nations would like to undo as much as possible in the present.

Bird’s study deals with those Australians who were attracted to Nazi Germany and, to a varying extent, to National Socialist ideology after Hitler’s seizure of power in 1933. The author’s main aim is to write a history of the men and women he describes as ‘well-meaning dreamers’ or fellow-travellers—writers, poets, mystics, academic thinkers, and sometimes just tourists. Most of those who visited Germany in the 1930s, including members of government such as attorney-general Robert Menzies (who later denied it) were impressed by what they saw. They regarded the National Socialist leadership as of high quality, and the patriotism they observed as deep rooted. The German example was often taken as a model around which to construct new concepts of nationalism in Australia, whether in the form of imperial patriotism, extreme Australian chauvinism, or even a white ‘Dreamtime’, a bizarre concept that postulated an ‘Aryan’ aboriginality. This latter view ‘accepted the aboriginal concept of “Dreamtime” (Alcheringa) as a fitting symbol in the hope that it could provide the key for a broader, white Australian “Dreamtime”’ (p. 166).

Bird begins with a short overview of authoritarian, fascist, and National Socialist groups in Australia, pointing out that the different movements did not agree amongst each other about Australia’s future political structure, or which foreign model to follow. At the beginning the main focus is on Eric Campbell’s New Guard. Bird calls him a ‘dictator with nobody to dictate to’ (p. 15). Although one of the members of his organization managed to disrupt the official opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, Campbell’s movement was not recognized by the leaders of fascist Italy or National Socialist Germany. Other Nazi enthusiasts in Australia, such as A. R. Mills, did not fare much better, but were nevertheless proud to call themselves ‘National Socialists’ (p. 31), at least for a while. Bird names a few men and women who later denied that they were Nazi enthusiasts or had spoken positively about Hitler’s Germany. In five chapters Bird portrays the people who were, to a greater or lesser degree, part of a group of Nazi enthusiasts. Among them were W. J. ‘Billy’ Miles, the financial brawn and journalistic brain behind the ideas of the Australia First Movement (p. 54); P. R. ‘Inky’ Stephensen, a former Communist who became the main editor of the right wing Publicist; Adela Pankhurst Walsh and her husband Tom Walsh, who, however, always refused to accept anti-Semitism as an integral part
of National Socialism (pp. 92–7); writers such as Xavier Herbert, Rex Ingamells, and Miles Franklin; and Odinists such as A. R. Mills and Hardy Wilson. Bird describes their lives in a detailed but rather incoherent manner. Sometimes it might have been better for the author to look at what held these men and women together rather than providing such detailed accounts of individual lives and views. On the other hand, Bird provides interesting insights into the thinking of some important Australian academics and writers, such as Xavier Herbert, Ian Mudie, Alan Chisholm, Augustin Lodewycks, and the latter’s well known son-in-law, Manning Clark. All of them—even if they never acknowledged it after the war—had shown some sympathy for National Socialist and/or Australia First ideas, although almost never openly. Clark was never an enthusiast for Hitler’s ideology, but was impressed and inspired by Nazi architecture (pp. 208–13).

The second part of Bird’s book, comprising chapters 8 to 12, deals with the Second World War period when it became more difficult to show sympathy for ideas of a ‘Nazi Dreamtime’. Some of those who had been attracted to Nazi Germany, National Socialist ideology, and/or the ideas of Australia First began to distance themselves explicitly, as in the case of Manning Clark, whereas others, such as Melanie O’Loughlin, Hardy Wilson, and A. R. Mills became more radical. While their focus before the war had been on cultural and literary aspects, during the war the aims of Nazi enthusiasts became more political. In chapter 10 Bird looks in greater detail at poet Ian Mudie, who in July 1941 put forward Stephensen as the leader Australia so desperately needed, and tried to gain the support of fellow writers for a more political movement. In this context Mudie stressed that Australians were not Europeans. He claimed to be confident that a new Dreamtime was near, when sheep would give way to kangaroos and ‘Europecentricity’ [sic] would finally be overcome (pp. 281–7). It is a pity that Bird discusses these ideas only in regard to an ‘Australian völkisch movement’ (p. 286) and research on National Socialist ideology, and not against the background of recent postcolonial research and the concepts of global history.

In his final two chapters the author deals with the reticence of the Australian authorities in dealing with Nazi enthusiasts at the end of 1941 and early in 1942, and with the internment of some of the major figures of the Australia First movement in March 1942. Unfortunately,
Bird hardly discusses the issue of internment itself, focusing instead on Ian Mudie’s loyalty to the interned Stephensen and the distance that Rex Ingamells tried to keep in order to protect his Jindywoborak Movement from the Australian authorities. In the last chapter Bird also includes information about four Australians who participated in the activities of the Nazi-sponsored British Free Corps, and Kay de Haas, an Australian woman who supported the Nazi propaganda effort during the war and was therefore banned from returning to her home country after 1945 until her brother’s intervention finally allowed her to go back. These examples are not really linked to the rest of the book and therefore seem a little out of place. They confirm the impression that the author’s main contribution has been to collect material on Nazi enthusiasts in Australia. This material is still waiting to be put into the context of a global history of enthusiasm for Nazi ideas before and during the Second World War. The lack of a conclusion is typical for a book which is more of a ‘quarry’ for further research than a thorough analysis of the Nazi Dreamtime.

Andrew Francis’s study of dealings with enemy aliens in New Zealand during the First World War includes the global context to a much larger extent than Bird’s study. It constitutes the long-awaited complement to Gerhard Fischer’s 1989 work on the issue in Australia. Francis is also much more aware than Bird of recent research on pro-imperial sentiments and issues of citizenship and national identity within the British Empire. It is therefore a little surprising that the author begins with an uncritical and unreflected presentation of the enthusiasm for war in New Zealand, which he calls an ‘extension of the European mood’ (p. 1). Given that, according to Australian and European studies, the enthusiasm at the beginning of the war was to a large extent a constructed phenomenon of the middle classes, this reviewer would have expected the author to have been a little more critical on this issue. Francis continues with an analysis of immigration in New Zealand and the various laws governing this. Although the country was open to migrants from all parts of the world, British settlers always remained a large majority and minorities, especially those from China and the Dalmatian part of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, often suffered prejudice, especially at times of war or economic crisis. Settlers of German origin were at first not affected by the worsening global relationship between Britain and Germany (Boer War, maritime build-up, German expansion into the South
Pacific), although the press became more critical of the Hohenzollern empire. What happened, however, was that issues of Britishness and loyalty to the mother country and the Empire became more and more important. The groundwork for the virulent anti-German campaign during the Great War was thus laid (p. 46).

Francis’s second chapter deals with New Zealand’s response to the outbreak of the war, which he describes as one of ‘overwhelming enthusiasm’ (p. 67) with only very few dissenting voices. Whether they were German troops in Belgium or German-born settlers in New Zealand, they at once became a problem that had to be dealt with. There was no differentiation, and settlers of Scandinavian or Swiss origin could not be sure of not becoming a target of anti-German activities. Naturalization, which had been handled in a very liberal manner in New Zealand before 1914, was no help at all. Right from the start of the war, but more so after the sinking of the Lusitania and the beginning of the Gallipoli campaign, which saw a rising number of New Zealand war dead, pressure from the press to do something about enemy aliens began to mount. As in Britain and Australia (Francis refers to the studies by Panayi and Fischer3), the New Zealand government took measures against men of enemy origin, both naturalized and not naturalized, mainly in response to these growing demands from the public and the press. Unfortunately, in this context Francis discusses only the years at the beginning and the end of the war, but has nothing to say about 1916, which in terms of the British Empire was significant in regard to the intensification of the war effort.

The author then looks at living conditions in the two main internment camps at Somes Island near Wellington and Motuihi Island close to Auckland, where German and Austro-Hungarian citizens, and later also naturalized settlers of German origin, were at first interned. Interestingly, Francis includes a map (opposite p. 152), on which he shows what parts of New Zealand were settled by immigrants from German-speaking Europe. On this map the author also includes Swiss and Polish migrants, about whom it would have been interesting to read more than just that many of the non-British settlers who were not German were mistaken as such and vilified in a similar manner (p. 16). In regard to the living conditions in the camps

3 Panikos Panayi, The Enemy In Our Midst: Germans in Britain during the First World War (Oxford, 1991); Fischer, Enemy Aliens.
Francis again focuses on press demands not to favour those who were better off. Here, too, it would have been interesting to find out more about life in the internment camps, perhaps something similar to Nadine Helmi and Gerhard Fischer’s 2011 account of the life of German internees in Australia during the First World War.4

Francis then looks at a single case, that of George von Zedlitz, a German-born professor of modern languages at Wellington’s Victoria College. Unlike other German residents, he was not dismissed from his post at the outbreak of the war, and therefore became the focus of anti-German feelings. The affair finally turned from an internal university matter into a national crusade. Zedlitz’s offer of resignation was not accepted by the College Council, and he was finally dismissal under the terms of the Alien Enemy Teachers’ Act, passed by parliament in 1915 in response to public pressure. In this chapter Francis is at his best, as he is able to show the inconsistencies of New Zealand’s policy on enemy aliens. Zedlitz was dismissed—and not reinstated after the war—but received a year’s salary as compensation and words of regret from the College Council (pp. 153–80).

In the following two chapters Francis links the policy on enemy aliens to economic warfare in the form of Imperial and New Zealand Trading with the Enemy legislation, and compares the New Zealand experience with that of Canada. Not surprisingly, many companies tried to profit from the war by accusing business rivals of being German. As across the Tasman Sea in Australia, measures were taken to displace German economic interests after the war. Unfortunately, Francis does not discuss the influence of the economic war conferences in Paris in 1915 and 1916 on New Zealand policy, the role of the country in the global economic war, or the impact of economic warfare on New Zealand’s internal economy. This would probably have gone beyond the scope of this book. This critique, however, might encourage the author to undertake another study, looking at New Zealand’s experience of economic warfare. Francis’s penultimate chapter is more convincing, as it compares New Zealand’s experience with that of Canada. Here he shows that alternatives were possible if New Zealanders had been as mature in regard to their sense of nationhood as Canadians, and had trusted their government to

4 Nadine Helmi and Gerhard Fischer, The Enemy at Home: German Internees in World War I Australia (Sydney, 2011).
deal with things if necessary (pp. 247–9). The author, however, could have delved more closely into the issue of what greater maturity in regard to the sense of nationhood might mean.

Francis finishes his study by remarking that New Zealand was never more British than during the First World War, and that the press played a large part in conveying the hatred of Germans that was never as great during the Second World War as during the First World War. He ends with the words: ‘Lessons, it seems, had been learnt’ (p. 267). This brings us back to Manning Clark’s words quoted at the beginning of this review, to the effect that the whole point of knowing about the past is to prevent us from being doomed to go on repeating it. For all their weaknesses, the two studies by Bird and Francis have the merit that they focus on aspects of the history of Australia and New Zealand that are not well known so far, at least in Europe, and that deserve greater attention from academics in a discipline that aims for a more global approach to its subject.

One of the big themes of German historiography is the question of why the Weimar Republic failed, and what caused its failure. It has long been argued that its burdens were too heavy to bear, or even that it was a republic without any republicans, but recent research goes down different paths. It emphasizes the potential of German democracy, and has shown that the new system had many supporters who were committed to democracy symbolically as well as politically. The work under review fits into this research field. Taking as examples the veterans’ associations Reichsbund der Kriegsbeschädigten, Kriegsteilnehmer und Kriegerhinterbliebenen (Reichsbund of War Disabled, War Veterans and War Dependents) and Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold (Reichsbanner Black-Red-Gold), Benjamin Ziemann focuses on the republican part of contested commemorations in the Weimar Republic. The overwhelming presence of the First World War in Germany’s political culture even after war’s end underlines its far-reaching nature and shows that German society during the Weimar Republic was ultimately shaped by the consequences of war. Nonetheless, the republic did not face the growing right-wing nationalist movement without a chance, as the author stresses. The history of Weimar is not a tragedy but, he insists, must be regarded as open. The book convincingly argues that in the context of commemorating the war, left-wing forces played an important part, developing their own representations of the war with republican and moderately pacifist topoi.

Ziemann begins by outlining the years up to 1923 which, he argues, were shaped largely by criticism of the war and the Kaiserrreich. Numerous recently founded organizations were able to bring tens of thousands of people on to the streets under the slogan ‘Never again war’. A highly diverse and by no means only hardline left-wing journalism discussed the war from a republican point of view. The essential narratives that, until the 1930s, republicans

* Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).
repeatedly brought up in relation to the First World War date from this time and shaped their culture of remembrance (which is why the author repeatedly comes back to them). They condemned the corruption and incompetence of the Wilhelmine elites who had caused the war and contributed to defeat. Thus they forcefully rejected the claim that the collapse had ultimately been the fault of left-wingers and democrats who had administered the infamous stab in the back. The imperial army was represented as a system of oppression that privileged officers and tormented common soldiers. The *Etappe* (rear area) in particular came to epitomize these conditions. The common soldiers at the front were seen as victims of war, something that must be avoided in future. Thus for many, Ziemann argues, it was an obvious conclusion to draw that 1918 was the year of liberation from both the Kaiserreich and war (chapter 1).

The beginning of the Weimar Republic’s phase of consolidation, starting in 1924, witnessed the founding of the Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold, whose institutional development and positioning in the politics of remembrance Ziemann investigates. (The Reichsbund is a little neglected by contrast.) Ziemann shows that the Reichsbanner created a public framework that structured individual memories of the war by connecting the discourses negotiated in the association’s publications and at commemorations with experiences of war and milieu cultures (chapters 2 and 3). His investigation of the memorials and ceremonies underlines that the republicans by no means left the field of memory to right-wing forces, but appeared as actors in the political public sphere deep into the provinces. Nonetheless, they were only able to influence the design of memorials in communities where the SPD had a majority. Often the search for a commemorative symbol that all of Weimar’s political camps could agree on failed, and this is why no Reich memorial was built in Germany. At local level, an alliance between the Church and the citizenry was able to implement its symbolic and political ideas, especially as the Reichsbund and its sympathizers tended to concentrate on the welfare of survivors in the early years of the republic. Although the Reichsbanner found it difficult to assert itself against a conservative consensus in the culture of remembrance, it developed its own rituals and took part in commemorations (chapters 4 and 5).

Not only commemorations, but also war journalism was increasingly contested. Martin Hobohm was one of the few historians sym-
pathetic to the republican cause in the Reichsarchiv, which was dominated by the old military elites. His example shows that moderate or critical accounts of the war were not welcomed by the official historiography, which, in fact, tried to prevent them. Its series Schlachten des Weltkrieges (Battles of the World War) ensured the Reichsarchiv’s domination in the field of popular accounts of the war. The left had nothing to set against this national power of interpretation, as individual publications by pacifist and republican officers had no comparable impact and distribution. In the Reichstag’s committee of enquiry, too, critical accounts of the army’s collapse in 1918 did not go unchallenged (chapter 6). In the final chapter, Ziemann takes a more chronological approach and investigates the period 1928 to 1933 as a time when memories of the war were more strongly politicized and mediatized than before. As an example he takes Erich Maria Remarque’s *All Quiet on the Western Front*, which appeared as a newspaper serialization, book, and film, and was hotly contested. As the republicans lacked their own popular accounts and the Nazis attacked democracy through Remarque’s work, the republicans adopted it as their narrative of the war. They also used it to defend Weimar, although the book’s complex statements did not necessarily coincide with their own set of values.

The main question that arises on reading *Contested Commemorations* concerns the scope of the narratives presented here. The author quite rightly relativizes the (nevertheless given) significance of the membership figures of the many veterans’ associations, where the republicans were ahead by a whisker. Rather, he suggests, the strengths and weaknesses of the symbols and narratives employed were crucial (p. 269), and he constantly refers to them. Ziemann makes qualifications without succumbing to the temptation to grant the republican groups under investigation too much relevance. On the contrary, he constantly works out the limits of republican interventions and representations. Occasionally they lacked the institutional backing to advance their interpretations; in some arenas of remembrance they engaged too late; women played almost no part. A central problem that emerges is the victimization narrative. If, in the republican discourse, ordinary soldiers were considered victims of a war instigated by unscrupulous elites, there was no interpretation of the past that could integrate the ruptures and sufferings caused by the war positively into individual biographies, or instru-
mentalyze them collectively for republicanism. The further debate about contested commemorations may perhaps look at whether memories of the war provide an example of left- and right-wing narratives and symbols temporarily coming closer to each other, or even overlapping. Ziemann rejects the argument that the Reichsbund’s parades concealed the same sort of militarism that was visible in the Stahlhelm. He also provides much evidence to show that anti-militarism and internationalism were strongly anchored in the Social Democratic milieu both before 1914 and after 1918. Even if the discourse on the war was ‘class-based’ (p. 92), we know that leading Social Democrats during the Kaiserreich, such as August Bebel, were especially critical of folkloric forms of militarism and by no means rejected a militant patriotism in principle. Ziemann denies this for his period of investigation, although there is some evidence that patriotic or nationalist motifs played a part in republican memories of the war, at least temporarily, and that partisans of the left also approved of them.

Why did Weimar fail? Ziemann makes clear that the end of the republic cannot be explained in terms of contested commemorations alone. They are an example, however, of how republican values were undermined by the growing attractiveness of right-wing narratives of the war. Around 1930 they had achieved a position of hegemony for many reasons. At first the republicans were unable to position a broad palette of successful war narratives on a media mass market that was increasingly dominated by national, heroic, and romanticizing motifs. Narratives of this sort appealed to young people who had not taken part in the war themselves, and to sections of the labour force. The National Socialists fully backed such escapist narratives, which seemed to point a way out of the depression that had hit these groups hard since 1929. Memories of the war were also an area of confrontation in which ideas of political order were negotiated. Although Ziemann discusses the problem of images of the past and hopes for the future in the introduction, his later account says little about their significance in this context. By the crisis at the latest, left-wing narratives were probably less attractive than right-wing ones. This is about the only criticism that can be made of this important book. Taking largely unknown protagonists (Fritz Einert, Paul Freiherr von Schoenaich, Hermann Schützinger) and presenting convincing examples, it demonstrates the continuing presence of repub-
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Republican forms of remembering the war in German society until 1933. Weimar was not condemned to fail from the start, but had numerous and well-organized supporters. Ziemann traces its workings by presenting a stringent and differentiated argument that always stays close to the research and the sources. That the reader wants to know more about certain aspects of the investigation shows that this account will stimulate new research.

CHRISTOPH NÜBEL is a Research Fellow (Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter) at the Humboldt University of Berlin and author of Die Mobilisierung der Kriegsgesellschaft: Propaganda und Alltag im Ersten Weltkrieg in Münster (2008). His current research project is on the idea of security and monarchy in Britain and Prussia during the nineteenth century.
Historians often present the twentieth-century history of Berlin as marked by a number of fundamental ruptures. Within less than fifty years, no fewer than five political systems ruled over the city. Experiences of war, persecution, and division further suggest that historical research has to divide Berlin’s past into separate periods. By studying the history of individuality between the late Weimar Republic and the construction of the Berlin Wall, Moritz Föllmer’s monograph *Individuality and Modernity in Berlin* questions this compartmentalization. Providing fascinating insights into the ways in which Berliners lived during these turbulent times, the book offers a more nuanced portrayal of the continuities and breaks in the city’s history. Föllmer’s study is therefore a valuable and inspiring contribution to German history in the twentieth century.

The book is chronologically split into three parts, each containing three chapters. In the first part, Föllmer demonstrates that claims about individuality were ubiquitous in public debates in Berlin between the late 1920s and Hitler’s rise to power. Various contemporary novels and newspapers described capitalism and the economic hardships of the late Weimar years as engendering a crisis of individuality in the German capital. Föllmer compellingly shows how media depictions of dooming isolation and changed gender roles portrayed the need for a ‘stable and controlled self’ (p. 40) that was increasingly difficult to attain in the fast-paced environment of the city. At the same time, other contemporary accounts rendered a different, more positive relationship between the urban environment and the cultivation of individuality. Flexibility, authenticity, and consumption were portrayed as paving the way for individuality in Berlin during the late Weimar Republic. Instead of clinging to old gender roles, for instance, some tabloids argued that men could take a more flexible approach to relations between men and women and still stay ‘true to themselves’ (p. 51). Furthermore, following the example of outstanding Personenlichkeiten such as the pilot Elly Beinhorn was depicted as a pathway to becoming an individual, as was indulging in individualized consumption. According to Föllmer,
these competing claims about individuality proved difficult to integrate into liberal democracy and thus undermined progressive politics in the German capital. He shows that various political groups could use the focus on the individual in Berlin to attack the Weimar Republic as an impersonal and corrupt system.

The third chapter on Berlin during the Weimar Republic introduces the notion that Nazism did not simply pit the individual against the collective, but that it offered a particular understanding of individuality to non-Jewish Berliners. The possibilities of cultivating individuality under Nazi rule are further explored in the second part of the book. Föllmer argues that the Nazis introduced a distinction between legitimate individuality and illegitimate individuality. While he describes certain political claims as well as racial difference as having constituted illegitimate individuality, Föllmer illustrates that Nazism was oriented towards fulfilling the individual aspirations of a limited number of Berliners by fostering suburban housing, praising sport activities, or lauding individual leadership. It is a strength of this part of the book that it describes in detail how Jewish Berliners were at the same time deprived of the very means of maintaining their lives in the city. By analysing several individual life stories, Föllmer shows that the quest for individual agency under Nazi rule created a fundamental tension between selfhood and an obligation towards others for many of these city dwellers, thus raising new questions about their individuality. While the book pays much attention to the effects of Nazi persecution on the lives of a number of people, it is limited to the experience of Jewish Berliners, thus losing sight of other persecuted groups, such as homosexuals or Roma. Despite this shortcoming, Föllmer clearly illustrates that Nazism was not per se opposed to individuality in the city, but ‘that “private aspirations and desires” were often couched in Nazi ideology and intimately linked to the Third Reich’s success’ (p. 103).

After the defeat of Nazi Germany, two separate political systems with differing positions on individuality emerged in Berlin. The third part of the book analyses this development throughout the 1950s. The immediate post-war years saw a focus on self-help in the eastern and western parts of the city that was conducive to claims of individuality. In the destroyed urban environment, a focus on individual achievement could help to overcome material hardship. At the same time, the emphasis on individuality made it easier for city-dwellers
to dissociate themselves from Nazism, which was mainly portrayed as based on a collective ideology. As the Cold War unfolded, the German Democratic Republic had to walk a fine line between catering to the individualist aspirations of a much needed skilled middle class consisting of doctors, engineers, and other professionals, and collectivist rhetorics. Föllmer demonstrates that the preferential treatment of this middle class led to the resentment of many working-class Berliners, whose individual expectations often remained unfulfilled. It is a central argument of this part of the book that the conflicts surrounding individuality ultimately led to more dictatorial politics in the eastern part of the city. In West Berlin, tension between an individuality based on material goods and a value-based individuality appeared during the 1950s. Föllmer shows that political actors such as the mayor of West Berlin, Ernst Reuter, called for the cultivation of immaterial values as a way of becoming an individual. This clashed with the more mundane priorities of some West Berliners for individualized consumption. Drawing on these debates, the third part of the book demonstrates that the continued coexistence of controversial claims about individuality, rather than the linear development of ‘individualization’, marked the history of West Berlin well into the 1960s.

*Individuality and Modernity in Berlin* renders classical accounts of the history of Germany during the twentieth century more complex. By demonstrating that the debate about becoming an individual in Berlin spanned the period from the late Weimar Republic to the divided city in 1961, Föllmer provides evidence against a history of ‘liberalization’ that portrays the post-war era in West Germany as the continued rise of individuality. His study is therefore in line with other works questioning some of the narratives that have long been seen as part and parcel of the ‘success story’ of the Bundesrepublik.\(^1\) Furthermore, the book provides compelling insights into the urban history of Berlin. Föllmer analyses an impressive number and variety of sources, ranging from articles in the tabloid press to personal suicide notes. Drawing on these documents, his book provides a needed monograph on relations between the history of the city and its inhabitants. *Individuality and Modernity in Berlin* takes up many issues that have been addressed in other contexts as a history of the self or

\(^1\) Dagmar Herzog, *Sex after Fascism: Memory and Morality in Twentieth-Century Germany* (Princeton, 2005).
a history of subjectivity. While the book thus offers an empirical study that can fruitfully be connected to a number of questions raised by current research, its analytical focus on individuality remains less convincing.

Föllmer grounds his analysis in well-established theories of individuality from philosophy and sociology. At first sight, taking issue with the concept of individuality might thus seem merely like a question of intellectual inclinations—a more or less opaque quarrel between, for example, structuralists and post-structuralists. The theoretical outline of *Individuality and Modernity in Berlin* carries, however, considerable weight for its empirical findings. Throughout the book it remains unclear whether there is a single, clearly circumscribed ‘modern individuality’, or whether this study is about a variety of ‘multiple individualities’, as both terms are used in the analysis. The problem with ‘multiple individualities’, on the one hand, is that much like the concept of ‘multiple modernities’, it risks becoming an empty signifier with little analytical value, bringing together diverse histories from medieval Japan, the Russian Revolution, or post-war Germany. Approaching individuality as a single characteristic of ‘modernity’, on the other hand, leads to highly universalistic claims that are fraught with the pitfalls of the concept of modernity itself. Föllmer states, for instance, that Berlin was a key site of the ‘history of modern individuality’. But how is the German capital’s past more instructive for such a history than the study of other places, such as Buenos Aires, Delhi, Tokyo, Moscow, or Münster? The answer that Föllmer’s book provides, that Berlin occupies a special place because of its prominence in existing theories about individuality, simply reproduces the regional bias of these theories without historicizing or questioning them.2 Drawing on the concept of a single ‘modern individuality’, furthermore, carries the risk of reiterating modernity’s claims about ‘universal man’—the dangers of which have so importantly been pointed out by critics of theories of modernity.3

Despite this critique, *Individuality and Modernity in Berlin* is a pioneering study and makes stimulating reading not only for historians

---


of twentieth-century Germany, but also for scholars interested in the history of subjectivity and the self. Most importantly, Föllmer’s study offers a useful perspective on the breaks and continuities in German history. As the author himself points out, the book can also advance the conversation about claims of individuality during the twentieth century. In doing so, it provides historians with insights into the opportunities and challenges of writing about concepts such as individuality or subjectivity.


Jost Hermand’s book brings together three distinct strands of arts and culture during the Third Reich: the officially sanctioned and supported culture; the culture of ‘inner emigration’; and the culture of those who were forced into exile. He discusses these strands in isolation, but also puts forward an intriguing argument which seemingly acts as a powerful link. Hermand asserts that between 1933 and 1945 ‘talk of indispensable cultural standards was ubiquitous and unrelenting’, not only among Nazi officials but all other Germans too, including those in inner emigration and exile. Hermand asks why even some of the artistically most ambitious art forms were ‘viewed as politically important’ during the Third Reich (p. xii). He rightly identifies this struggle over high art as a fascinating research question, something that might seem paradoxical today, when all high art is marginalized in Western societies, as Hermand argues. Indeed, the question of how and why the different factions within German society held on to their claims to high culture and fought over cultural ownership of the same composers, painters, and playwrights, and why they regarded this as a debate of the utmost importance, raises interesting issues.

In the first part of the book Hermand turns his attention to official cultural politics. The Nazi regime successfully played to different agendas, and the fact that a coherent strategy for the arts remained elusive actually contributed to this success. Bourgeois audiences in particular were appeased by a continuation rather than an abrupt break in their cultural habits and practices. The ‘night of the long knives’, the socialist second revolution advocated by large sections of the SA, did not happen. On the contrary, the more radical views were silenced in June 1934. Bourgeois audiences were pleased to see classical drama and opera remain in theatre repertoires; major art exhibitions celebrate the ‘masters’ of the past; Bach, Beethoven, and Mozart continue to be performed by leading orchestras and conductors; and the literary canon published in lavish new editions. Similarly, the regime quite happily supported popular entertainment, and fostered the cinema and the radio in particular. Despite loud pronouncements about the need for a radically new *völkisch* cul-
ture (as put forward by the Rosenberg circle in particular), this never materialized. This was almost certainly the reason why Nazi cultural politics overall were so successful. They were radical in theory but quite pragmatic in practice.

This, however, held true only for the majority of Germans who were prepared to arrange themselves with the regime. For the politically, sexually, or racially persecuted the Nazi regime was anything but pragmatic—and it is in this area that Hermann’s approach (and silence) is not quite convincing. Apart from the artists in inner emigration or exile, Hermann is not concerned with the victims of the regime in any great detail. The activities of the Jüdischer Kulturbund, for example, are mentioned only very briefly on little more than half a page (pp. 41–2). Important issues such as that works by Jewish composers and playwrights were immediately banned after the Nazi takeover of power in 1933, or the importance of the relentless persecution of Jews following the Nuremberg Laws in 1935 and their eventual deportation and murder after 1941 are hardly discussed in this study.

Also, Hermann too readily associates specific cultural practices with particular social classes, which is problematic. For example, it was not only the ‘lower classes [who] surrounded themselves with the blare of popular music, went to see B movies, paged through magazines, danced the shimmy or the Charleston, or read bestsellers and dime novels’ (p. 32); middle-class Germans enjoyed these pursuits as well. Similarly, it was not only the ‘upper classes’ who enjoyed ‘esthetic and spiritual pleasures in the theater’, or read ‘challenging literary works’ (p. 32). When discussing the arts during the Weimar Republic, Hermann refers to the ‘culture of the underclass [who] focused on unsophisticated entertainment needs’, which stood in clear contrast to the ‘educated middle classes [whose culture was] based chiefly on the classical artists of the German cultural heritage’ (p. 34). These distinctions are too simplistic and do not take into account significant and successful attempts by trade unions to get workers into the bourgeois theatre (for example), and by so doing to influence cultural pursuits that pre-1918 seemed out of their reach. Equally surprising is Hermann’s uncritical use of terms such as ‘negroid’ and ‘negro’ without quotation marks (pp. 73–4). In view of existing research in these areas, Hermann’s claims seem anachronistic and unbefitting a study which otherwise arrives at some succinct conclusions.
Nazi Fascism, Inner Emigration, and Exile

Hermand is at his strongest when working out the struggles within the Nazi party and its main protagonists concerning a strategy towards the arts. He convincingly posits that the ‘contradictions in Nazi concepts of culture were based both on lack of ideological clarity and on the fact that the party functionaries responsible for cultural policy held conflicting views’ (p. 4). Although this is not a radically new finding and corresponds to existing research, it is certainly worth repeating in the context of this study. At various points throughout the book Hermand stresses that the Nazis’ cultural policy was so successful precisely because there was none. Goebbels’s pragmatic approach allowed different art forms to continue even if they did not wholly subscribe to völkisch ideals. Concert programmes, theatre repertoires, major exhibitions, as well as novels, magazines, and popular music continued almost as they had done during the Weimar Republic, even if some of the main protagonists (for example, in theatre and operetta) were no longer permitted to perform. Goebbels was keen to reach the masses, preferably through radio and cinema, and was quite happy to do so with unashamedly entertaining formats which seemed to have little to do with concepts of Bildung or cultural education. Ideas of an ‘eternally German culture’ (p. 34) were constantly put forward, but what this meant in reality was never fully explained. Defining ‘enemy stereotypes’ was much easier for the regime than stating its ‘objectives’. In all art forms the revolutionary zeal of the early years of the Third Reich was quickly supplanted by a more traditional approach to aesthetics, as in painting, for example, where Hitler favoured a return to tried and tested genre painting (p. 65), or in the theatre, where the more radical approaches to open air performance (Thingspiel) gave way to a return to proscenium arch bourgeois theatre practices (pp. 105–6). In terms of architecture, too, plans for the massive reconstructions of whole cities such as Linz, Munich, and Berlin did not progress past the planning stage, and other, smaller-scale projects often avoided any obvious politicization.

In the second part of his book Hermand turns his attention to inner emigration. Hermand usefully introduces this chapter with a definition of inner emigration and the artists who were forced into it. He reminds us that we are speaking of only a tiny minority of artists who had never—not even during the Weimar Republic, and often quite deliberately—entered the mainstream. Even artists such as
Ernst Barlach, who are celebrated today and seem to exemplify a significant movement of artists in quiet opposition to the Nazi regime, never played any significant role during the Third Reich and were almost entirely sidelined. Instead of suggesting a powerful movement, they point to the futility of open opposition and the tragedy of losing any kind of public voice. The art of inner emigration, Hermann asserts, developed ‘in that ideological gray area between aversion and accommodation’ (p. 145), and had very different effects on different artists. Whereas the writers of the inner emigration had the most difficult time, largely because of strict censorship, composers found it a little easier, particularly if they concentrated on instrumental music. Painters and sculptors in inner emigration were often able to continue working as normal, although they had to forgo public exhibitions. They could, however, still sell their work privately. Hermann reminds us, therefore, that we cannot make generalizations in this area (p. 146).

In the third part of his book Hermann turns his attention to the artists in exile and rightly points to the fragmentation of the exile community, geographically as well as ideologically. As early as 1935 Wolf Franck lamented a situation in which different emigrant communities lived side by side seemingly without taking any notice of each other: ‘Businessmen wanted nothing to do with politicians, social democrats wanted nothing to do with communists, those with connections wanted nothing to do with helpless aliens, and the rich definitely wanted nothing to do with their poor companions in misfortune.’ Many artists found it difficult to find work, mostly because of language problems. Celebrated novelists got by writing for second-rate films, composers did likewise, and politically committed émigrés often had to throw their convictions overboard to find work. Kurt Weill, for example, wrote songs for the commercial theatre on Broadway. Only a minority were able to continue their artistic work, such as Brecht, who was fortunate enough to find financial backers almost everywhere he went in exile.

What is missing at the end of Hermann’s illuminating volume is a proper conclusion returning to the fascinating question posed at the beginning concerning the struggle over cultural territories, especially in relation to high art. The volume ends with a postscript on the exile chapter, but this does not really bring the different strands together again. This feels very much like a missed opportunity.
Overall, Hermand’s emphasis on particular cultural practices linked to specific social classes fails to convince. He also overplays the success of high art during the Third Reich. Despite official claims, high culture never entirely dominated theatre and opera repertoires, cinema programmes, and literature. The hunger for entertainment continued, and operetta, comedies, and musicals ruled. Despite these criticisms, Hermand is to be congratulated on successfully bringing together a significant amount of information in a study which covers a great deal of ground. The resulting book may not be ground-breaking and some of its theoretical underpinnings seem a little outdated, but it is nevertheless a tribute to Hermand’s vast knowledge of the topic, and his ability always to be in control of his material. A worthwhile select bibliography rounds off a useful volume, which is further enriched by a number of fascinating illustrations.
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Although the exile of European Jews in Shanghai is a well-known chapter in the history of Jewish escape from the death throes of Nazi Germany, covered by a number of eyewitness memoirs and documentaries as well as specialist monographs, new aspects are still coming to light. Both volumes under review here, despite vast differences in content and methodology, provide a fresh look at the topic.

Steve Hochstadt’s Exile in Shanghai essentially provides an oral history of the Jewish sojourn in Shanghai, drawing on a collection of almost 100 taped interviews which the author himself conducted with former Jewish refugees who lived in Shanghai. The volume presents excerpts from thirteen of these interviews, representing the young generation who reached Shanghai mostly as teenagers or young adults. Although the eyewitness accounts are very much at the centre of the book, the author’s role is crucial. Hochstadt has selected and rearranged passages to provide a coherent narrative and, in addition to a general introduction and conclusion, has written introductory comments to all of the excerpts, placing them in their historical context.

The excerpts are organized into nine chapters, tracing the lives of the narrators from the 1930s until well into the post-war era. The first chapter details the mounting anti-Semitic violence of the 1930s; the violence and humiliation during the pogrom of 9 November 1938 in particular convinced many Jews that it was time to turn their backs on Germany. Shanghai was not the refugees’ preferred destination, but its international sectors were the only place where no immigration restrictions existed (they were only introduced in the summer of 1939). Nonetheless, the journey, described in chapter two, was presented by many as an exhilarating experience. Chapter three deals with the refugees’ attempts to eke out a living in the bustling inter-
cultural metropolis of Shanghai. Although Jewish organizations cared for them from the day of their arrival, many experienced their sojourn as deprivation. The extent to which they adapted to their new circumstances was determined by individual ability, but also by generation—young people found it easier than the elderly. The fourth chapter describes the increasing hardship after the Japanese, who had occupied the Western enclaves in the city at the start of the Pacific War, concentrated all Jewish refugees in the ‘designated area’ of Hongkou in 1943. Chapters five and six deal with the immediate post-war situation, as the capitulation of Japan gave the Jews a greater feeling of security without removing at once their unstable situation and uncertain future. The following two chapters describe the circumstances under which the refugees left Shanghai and trace the often circuitous routes they took to settle in the United States. All of the thirteen interviewees went to the USA, one spent a lengthy stint in Israel, and only two eventually relocated to Germany. Other destinations of refugees from Shanghai are not represented in the volume. In the concluding chapter, the narrators give a general assessment of their time in Shanghai and the meaning they attribute to it now.

Although the individual life stories follow quite different trajectories, patterns do emerge. One is the almost constant confrontation with bureaucratic obstacles. Conflict with Nazi authorities was particularly painful and humiliating, but the Shanghai Municipal Council (SMC)—the administration of the International Settlement—and even the consular authorities of post-war destinations were not particularly welcoming either, and occasionally downright anti-Semitic. Another pattern is the social isolation of the German and Austrian Jews. If anything, they sought for contacts within the ‘Western’ segments of Shanghai’s population. Despite the crucial importance of Jewish organizations, there was not much intercourse with other Jewish groups, such as the Baghdadi and Sephardic Jews, or Jews from Eastern Europe, the latter being seen as culturally different on account of their Orthodoxy. Relations with the Chinese were equally complex. Except for children, few of the Jewish refugees from Germany and Austria bothered to learn the Chinese language (many more learned English than Chinese); yet many of the narrators noted growing Chinese nationalism and hostility, especially after the Second World War, when imperialism was finally liquidated and the
Republic of China regained full sovereignty over Shanghai. Rather unsurprisingly, the interviewees take Shanghai’s cosmopolitanism for granted, and hardly ever delve into its morally questionable imperialist underpinnings.

Throughout the volume, Hochstadt, whose own grandparents took refuge in Shanghai, maintains a critical empathy with the interviewees. The emphasis is on the narrators’ experiences, their suffering in Germany, and their attempts to cope with poverty, appalling sanitary conditions, sickness, uncertainty as to their future, and the shock of losing close relatives (in some cases entire families) as a result of the Holocaust. Yet Hochstadt is aware of the limitations of oral histories. He is careful to demonstrate how different people had varying degrees of knowledge about the same event (p. 237); and he also shows how individuals or incidents, such as the chicanery of one particular Japanese official, or the accidental bombing of Jewish residences by the Americans in July 1945, acquire a disproportionate importance in the memory of the interviewees, especially as ‘[m]ultiple deaths were uncommon’ in the Shanghai ghetto (p. 165). It is interesting that the interviewees’ retrospective assessment of their time in Shanghai is overwhelmingly positive. As suggested above, it is likely that as young people, they found it easier to cope with the hardship than did the older generations.

Gao Bei’s slim monograph examines the same phenomenon from a diametrically opposed angle, providing a comprehensive survey of Chinese and Japanese policy towards Jewish refugees from Europe. As she states in the introduction, Shanghai’s openness to European Jews when all other states had closed their borders was an immediate result of the Sino-Japanese War. While passport control had been exercised by Chinese National Government for the entire city before the war with Japan erupted in the summer of 1937, it broke down after the Japanese took control of the Chinese districts (p. 5).

Gao’s investigation proceeds in three steps. She begins by taking a look at the Chinese side, examining various plans to settle Jewish refugees in the southwest (or, alternatively, the northwest) of China and then examining the Chinese Republic’s visas policy. Plans for the settlement of Jews came from within the Nationalist government, or were suggested to that government by prominent Jews. From the Chinese perspective, such projects could help to enlist the support of the Western democratic powers, in particular the USA, in the war
against Japan. However, as well as being impractical, they eventually came to nothing because they threatened to alienate Germany, still nominally an ally of China. The Chinese government, however, directed its consulates to be liberal in issuing visas to Jewish refugees. The famous case of the consul-general in Vienna, He Fengshan (also mentioned in Hochstadt’s book), who became one of only two Chinese ‘Righteous among the Nations’ acknowledged by Yad Vashem, was exceptional only in one particular respect. While disobeying his superior, the pro-German ambassador in Berlin, Chen Jie, he carried out the Foreign Ministry’s instructions to the letter. According to Gao, the issuing of visas to Shanghai can be viewed as ‘a vehicle to pursue the de facto, or even de jure, recognition by the Western countries of its claim to this “lost territory” ’ (p. 55).

The remaining two substantive chapters are devoted to Japan’s policy vis-à-vis the Jewish refugees, with the signing of the Tripartite Pact between Japan, Germany, and Italy in September 1940 regarded as the crucial turning point. For early Japanese policy, Gao has identified the two ‘Jewish experts’, army colonel Yasue Norihiro and Inuzuka Koreshige, as the architects of the early policy formulations—a typical example of how the military shaped the political process. Yasue’s and Inuzuka’s recommendations were not to follow the German example, and to treat Jews living in Japan, China, and Japan’s satellite state Manchukuo equally to other foreign nationals. In contrast to earlier studies, Gao disputes that these measures were in any way ‘pro-Jewish’ (pp. 6–9), pointing to their utilitarian character. Japanese policymakers saw the Jewish refugees as a means of attracting American–Jewish capital for the development of Japan’s satellite state of Manchukuo, and of improving relations with the United States. Although the possibility of Jewish settlement in Manchukuo (again suggested by Jewish representatives) was discussed in 1939–40, the German–Japanese rapprochement sealed by the Tripartite Pact in September 1940 marked a turning point in Japan’s attitude towards the Jews, in part because the ‘Jewish experts’ had lost out to pro-German groups within the military. While the Japanese authorities had acceded to the SMC’s request to restrict the admission of Jews into Shanghai as early as mid 1939, its policy now grew harsher. As the Jews had ceased to be politically useful, especially after the attack on Pearl Harbor and the beginning of the Pacific War, the Japanese decision-makers were now more pre-
pared to listen to German recommendations. About a year after Pearl Harbor, preparations began for the creation of the ‘designated area’. The Japanese consul in the Lithuanian capital of Kaunas, Sugihara Chiune, who as late as 1940–1 enabled more than 2,000 Jews from Poland to emigrate to East Asia—a case analysed in detail by Gao but also mentioned by Hochstadt—was the solitary exception.

In its broad outline, Gao’s argument is entirely convincing. She is no doubt right to emphasize that the rescue of the Jews was ‘an accidental result’ (p. 137) in the sense that policies vis-à-vis the refugees were determined by the international situation and by (arguably) overriding political concerns. She tends, however, to downplay the similarities between the Chinese and Japanese approaches, which both oscillated between an attempt to garner support in (or mend fences with) the United States, and the desire for an alliance with Germany. Gao sees a fundamental difference between the two policies in that the Japanese ‘Jewish experts’ ‘regularly threatened’ (pp. 55, 137) the Jews with violence if they refused to acquiesce in their assigned role, whereas the Chinese did not. However, the only substantial evidence to bolster this claim comes from an internal Japanese debate (pp. 103–4); no evidence is presented to show that such threats were made either towards the Jews or the Western democratic governments. The same goes for the influence of anti-Semitic ideas on the ‘Japanese experts’ (pp. 80, 91). Again, little systematic evaluation is offered as to just what ideas Yasue and Inuzuka picked up, apart from rather shallow stereotypes of Jewish influence on the US economy and public opinion, and how they influenced their policy formulations. Finally, Gao occasionally uses stock phrases from the lexicon of Chinese historiography, such as the notion that Japan ‘contrived’ the Marco Polo Bridge incident in July 1937 (p. 31), or that the rule of the Nationalists was marked by ‘corruption and frequent ineptitude’—assertions that, in this form at least, are debatable.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, Gao offers a valuable contribution to the field in for the first time presenting a synopsis of both the Chinese and Japanese policies towards Jewish refugees, and qualifying the assumption that the Japanese were ‘much more accommodating to the refugees’ than the SMC (as made by Hochstadt, p. 59). In the epilogue, Gao herself stresses the importance of the refugees’ own perspective (p. 128). Overall, the two books reviewed here complement one another ideally, looking at the experience of the Jewish
refugees to Shanghai as well as the frameworks that made these experiences—and, however accidentally, the rescue of about 16,000 Jews—possible.

This book focuses on Rudolf Peierls and Klaus Fuchs, two physicists who emigrated from Germany in 1933 and had successful careers in Britain. While Fuchs’s career broke off abruptly in 1950 when he was convicted as a spy for the Soviet Union, Peierls was one of the most influential and respected physicists in Britain until his death. In seven sections, the book traces the life stories of the two physicists, placing the main emphasis on the years of emigration from Nazi Germany to Britain and their integration into the scientific community of their host country, that is the 1930s and 1940s. The author is less concerned to assess their scientific achievements than to present the social context in which they lived and worked. Their life stories are connected by the author’s hypothesis that ‘Fuchs’ and Peierls’ ethnicity, their socialization and schooling in Germany along with their exposure to German culture before coming to the United Kingdom were instrumental in shaping nuclear culture in their host country’ (p. 2).

This is an interesting approach, but it is not always coherently and consistently followed. For one thing, it is not entirely clear what the author means by ‘nuclear culture’, and for another, some of the biographical and historical premisses on which it is based do not apply, especially to Klaus Fuchs. Unlike Peierls, who arrived in Britain as a fully trained physicist with an established reputation in the scientific community, Fuchs was a student in the early stages of his studies when he left, and certainly not a ‘junior scientist’ (p. 33). He only finished studying in Britain, where he then entered the profession. It is thus questionable to what extent his ‘German education’ could have played an ‘important role in establishing a new approach to nuclear science during the Second World War’ (p. 2), especially as the author does not explain this further historically, but simply asserts it. Repeated references to the presumed ‘close collaboration of theoretical and experimental atomic scientists’ remain vague. This did not really represent a specifically German research tradition, and the German uranium project, for example, failed largely because of a lack
of precisely this sort of close collaboration. And the subtext of these chapters almost suggests that on the eve of the Second World War, Britain lacked a specific and highly developed ‘nuclear culture’, although physicists such as Ernest Rutherford, James Chadwick, and John Cockcroft, to name but a few, along with their students, were among the most important pioneers of modern nuclear physics.

Thus several aspects of the approach chosen by the author remain unclear, including his understanding of Big Science. Although he refers to important works by Peter Galison and others, he does not mention the fundamental German-language studies on this topic written in the 1980s and 1990s by Margit Szőllösi-Janze and Helmuth Trischler. These could, for example, have helped to answer the question of what distinguished the Atomic Energy Research Establishment (Harwell) and other recently founded British physics institutions from the established institutes, and to what extent they fulfilled the criteria for Big Science research institutions generally accepted in the history and theory of science. How Peierls and Fuchs (and others) influenced the development of their specific profile could also have been examined more closely, because the statement that ‘the Los Alamos research culture of Big Science’ was, as it were, exported to Britain after the Second World War by Fuchs and Peierls (pp. 68 ff.) is only half the story.

Laucht does not mention that while Fuchs was accepted as an excellent up and coming young scientist, he played a rather marginal role in the administration and making of science policy. Peierls’s influence in this respect also needs to be scrutinized. What his specific contribution to the development of the British Atomic Energy Research Establishment was should be explained, and placed in relation to scientists such as James Chadwick and Patrick Blackett. Large-scale research was not only a requirement of nuclear physics. Its roots lay equally in the research programmes for aviation and radar that were also pursued extensively in Britain. These aspects would have profited from a more in-depth account.

Anyone who believes, on the basis of these criticisms, that this is an uninteresting and inconsistent book, however, is wrong. On the contrary, I would heartily recommend it, as it is written with historical expertise and rooted in archival research. Its strengths lie in the biographical detail it provides on the two protagonists and which, on a number of points, goes beyond what can be found in the existing
biographical literature on Fuchs and Peierls. This applies especially to Peierls and his role in the establishment and early history of the British atomic scientists’ movement and its interaction with corresponding developments in the USA. The latter accounts for a good third of the volume, in which Peierls is the main focus. Laucht provides a detailed account of the life and work of this outstanding physicist, which naturally concentrates on his work in social policy while his scientific achievements are mostly dealt with summarily. This study does not provide a biography of Peierls in the strict sense, and thus does not close this particular research gap.

Because of his arrest and incarceration for spying, Fuchs is largely left out of the last third of the book, which deals with the social responsibility of scientists and Peierls’s activities in this context. Yet Fuchs was also a physicist who asked himself these questions, not least after moving to the German Democratic Republic. The author could have reflected further on this within the concept of parallel biographies. He could have explored to what extent Fuchs’s later commitment was to Communist orthodoxy, to the party of actually existing socialism and its raison d’État alone, or whether it also contained nuances based on his Anglo-American (or perhaps Protestant) experiences. This, however, would have required the author to immerse himself in the political history and culture of the GDR, which would have gone beyond the scope of the approach taken here.

But more detail could have been provided through a more thorough examination of the relevant secondary literature. For example, the author’s statement concerning ‘Fuchs’ very low profile in the GDR’ (p. 175) must be critically questioned. It should also be noted that political power and cadre organizations such as the SED, of whose central committee Fuchs was a member, and peripheral mass organizations such as the Society for German–Soviet Friendship, whose membership and activities in the GDR were of merely acclamatory significance, are named in the same breath without the necessary differentiation being made between them (p. 185). And Fuchs’s stay at a curative spa near Moscow, at a home run by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (p. 175), was less a sign of favour for its former master spy than a reflection of his high position within the GDR’s nomenklatura, whose health insurance probably paid for the cure. And finally, it should be pointed out that, in contrast to the author’s opinion (p. 175), the Soviet Union never publicly acknowl-
Klaus Fuchs and Rudolf Peierls

edged its most important atomic spy, denying him any recognition for his achievements until his death in 1988. For Fuchs personally, this would have been very important.

These are, however, marginal criticisms which in no way detract from the significance and historical value of the book. This lies in its linking of the two biographies and its pursuit of the question of what influence scientific emigrants had on the science culture of their host countries. In this context it is astonishing, and should be the subject of further research, that two of the leading protagonists in the establishment of the British nuclear scientists’ movement, Rudolf Peierls and Josef Rotblat, were emigrants. In this respect, the book is very stimulating and can be recommended to a wide readership, from political scientists to historians of science and physics, as well as physicists themselves.
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This is not the first book about the bombing of Dresden in the Second World War. Nor is it the first study of the memorial culture that this cataclysmic event has spawned. But *After the Dresden Bombing* is a perceptive monograph that interweaves cultural history with literary criticism in order to analyse with great sensitivity the ways in which the destruction of the city on 13–14 February 1945 has found expression in photography, architecture, fiction, and film from the end of the war to the present. Anne Fuchs is Professor of German at the University of Warwick, and has published widely on the contested memory of the Second World War in contemporary Germany. Her familiarity with the general terrain and current trends in literary and cultural theory shows up strongly in the book. Fuchs’s objectives are twofold. At one level, she is interested in the process by which the destruction of a German city at the end of the Second World War—one among dozens of others, in a country that for years had unleashed unprecedented violence upon the world—became a powerful symbol of the destructiveness of war in general, locally, nationally, and internationally. At another level, her aims are far broader: ‘Dresden’ is treated as a case study for what the author claims may well be a ‘new mode of doing cultural history’.

To this end, Fuchs develops the twin concepts of ‘impact event’ and ‘impact narrative’. ‘Impact events’ are defined as ‘historical occurrences that are perceived to spectacularly shatter the material and symbolic worlds we inhabit’ (p. 10). Because of their extreme violence, they defy easy integration into received cultural patterns and idioms. As Fuchs makes clear, however, ‘impact events depend on impact narratives for their power to unfold’ (p. 11), narratives which, just like myths, have the ability to adapt to changing circumstances while at the same time remaining stable at the level of their most basic meanings.

The study is organized in seven chapters, which form four thematic blocks, concerned with the visual, architecture, fiction, and film. Most attention is paid to the decade or so following the end of the war, when the memorial culture took shape, and the two decades after German unification in 1990, when Dresden managed to reinvent
After the Dresden Bombing

itself as a city defined by both destruction and architectural splendour. The chapters on ‘literary voices’ in particular, however, also offer observations on developments in the 1960s and 1970s. As Fuchs demonstrates, it was above all writer Kurt Vonnegut’s ‘Vietnamization’ of the bombing in his counter-cultural novel, Slaughterhouse-Five (1969), which helped to lift ‘Dresden’ out of a local context and turn it into a global icon.

For a theoretical framework that seeks to link narratives to events, Fuchs passes over immediate responses to the air raids of 13–14 February 1945 surprisingly lightly. She claims that the ‘contemporary target audience’ was taken by surprise by the bombing, and that the attack was perceived by the ‘popular imagination’ as an ‘icon of gratuitous and excessive violence’ (p. 6). Here, Fuchs may well be right, but the problem is that we cannot know unless we engage seriously with contemporary voices and develop some kind of typology. ‘Popular imagination’ and ‘contemporary target audience’, at any rate, are far too general terms to carry much explanatory power. Perhaps immediate responses were more varied than the idea of an impact event as ‘excessive rupture’ allows? (p. 13) For a committed National Socialist, for example, it is well possible that the world was not turned upside down by the bombing of Dresden, but rather that the event served to strengthen a view of the world which held that ‘International Jewry’ was bent on a war of annihilation against the German people as a whole.

These concerns notwithstanding, I think the concept is heuristically useful. It allows for the author to explore continuity alongside change in the memorial culture of the Dresden bombing. The widespread lament over the destruction of the city’s architectural heritage, for example, could draw on a readily available ‘template’ that had long represented Dresden as a peaceful city of culture and architectural splendour that rivalled Florence in Italy (p. 5). At the same time, the concept puts emphasis on the very inadequacy of these templates in giving expression to events whose excessive nature in many ways defied the imagination (p. 13). Finally, the approach fully acknowledges that different genres tend to follow ‘pathways’ of their own, that is, that it will not do to treat the inscription on a monument as if it was an academic essay on cause and effect. In adopting the framework of ‘impact event’ and ‘impact narrative’, Fuchs manages to re-centre the scholarly debate on the memory of the Dresden bombing.
from the ‘presentist’ concern with politics that has come to dominate much of the current literature. This is an important achievement.

Yet, at the same time, the study betrays the limits of an approach that is very well-versed in the latest (and not so latest) theory, be this collective memory, trauma theory, the spatial turn, or reception theory, but appears to be rather dismissive of what the author calls ‘traditional historical research’ (p. xiii). While Fuchs is right to point out that military history as traditionally understood cannot account for the ‘global iconicity’ that the bombing of Dresden has gained in the ‘post-war imagination’, her own ‘cultural–historical study’ surely presents its own problems. It seems to me that Fuchs tends to analyse cultural artefacts without engaging closely enough, on the basis of archival evidence, with the circumstances in which they were produced, by whom and to what purpose. This is quite apart from the fact that there does exist, Fuchs’ claim notwithstanding, a sizeable body of historical work not just on the conduct of the air war, but about the post-war memorialization as well.¹

To give two examples: early on in her study, Fuchs introduces a statement by Gerhart Hauptmann as a ‘first version of the Dresden impact narrative’. In it, the writer famously claimed that ‘those who have forgotten how to weep will learn it again on the annihilation of Dresden’. While the text is quoted in full and interpreted as the expression of a ‘double movement of expression and erasure’, that is, as an attempt to put into words an experience that is, in fact, beyond verbalization, the specific circumstances in which it was produced and first used are referred to only in passing. We learn that Hauptmann’s statement was broadcast on German radio on 29 March 1945 and that, despite its ‘exploitation’ for German propaganda, the text remained popular after the defeat of Nazi Germany, and has, indeed, continued to be so until the present day (p. 14).

But this begs as many questions as it answers. After all, the text was broadcast (and apparently written) six weeks after the bombing of Dresden, in circumstances that, arguably, were rather different from mid February. By late March, the Western Allies were crossing the Rhine while, for a brief interlude, it appeared as if the advance of

¹ See e.g. the important study of Hamburg by Malte Thießen, Eingebrannt ins Gedächtnis: Hamburgs Gedenken an Luftkrieg und Kriegsende 1943 bis 2005 (Munich, 2007). See also Jörg Arnold, Dietmar Süß, and Malte Thießen (eds.), Luftkrieg: Erinnerungen in Deutschland und Europa (Göttingen, 2009).
the Red Army on the Eastern front had been slowed down. Why did Hauptmann make his voice heard at this point in time? Who prompted him? Did he need to be prompted? Furthermore, Fuchs gives only one version of the text, although there were, in fact, at least two. As an annotation in volume 11 of Hauptmann’s Collected Works makes clear, the printed version, which was published in early April in three German newspapers, was abridged in such a way as to obfuscate Hauptmann’s important caveat that there were ‘good souls in England and America’ who felt just as deeply about the destruction of the ‘Florence on the river Elbe’ as did the old writer himself.²

The same tension between theoretically informed analysis and a certain empirical looseness is evident in Fuchs’s discussion of the second defining artefact of the Dresden bombing, Richard Peter’s photo book, Eine Kamera klagt an, which contained, among other well-known photographs, the famous panoramic view of the devastated city with the allegorical figure of Bonitas in the foreground. I agree with Fuchs’s assessment that the book transcends the Cold War context in which it was produced and that the central images defy the Socialist teleology into whose service the photographer and/or the publisher sought to press them. I also find the suggestion stimulating that the book’s power derives in large part from an ‘alliance between the beautiful and the melancholic’, which draws on modes of representation and ways of seeing that ultimately hark back to early nineteenth-century Romanticism.

Yet, at the same time, the ‘traditional’ historian feels some unease when, in the section that opens the discussion of Peter’s book, two factual statements are open to question. Fuchs writes: ‘In 1949 . . . Richard Peter published . . . Eine Kamera klagt an with a print-run of 50,000 copies which quickly sold out’ (p. 32). In fact, the book was not published in 1949, but in 1950, in the context of the first elections to the People’s Chamber (Volkskammer) in the GDR, which were held on 15 October on the basis of a single list of candidates.³ Nor did the initial print-run of 50,000 copies sell out ‘quickly’, as Fuchs claims.

Indeed, in January 1952, one year after publication, the publisher decided to reduce the retail price from DM 8.50 to DM 6.50, an indication, perhaps, that actual sales had not met the high expectations, or alternatively, of a change of course in the memory politics of the SED state. Does this matter? I think it does, both with regard to our understanding of the cultural reverberations of the Dresden bombing and to our ideas about ‘doing cultural history’. It seems to suggest that in the timing as well as the marketing of Eine Kamera klagt an, politics loomed even larger than has commonly been assumed.

As After the Dresden Bombing demonstrates, a theoretically informed approach can yield rich insights into the workings of the cultural memory of the bombing and restore complexity to a subject that too often has been treated in reductionist terms, as a mere expression of Cold War antagonisms or of exculpatory tendencies. At the same time, there is a danger of prioritizing theory over empirical research when, in fact, both are needed in order to burst open new ‘pathways’ in the study of cultural memory.

4 Ibid. 149.
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In 1948 Erich Honecker, then chairman of the Free German Youth Movement (FDJ), declared that ‘sport is not an end in itself, but the means to an end’ (p. 18). This clear statement, pointing to a utilitarian and politicized understanding of sport, became the ideological backbone of GDR sports, and the starting point for the rise of a unique, state-controlled sports system. Much has been published in German on this particular sports system, and many of these books have come out of the Centre for the Study of Contemporary Sports based at the University of Potsdam (Arbeitsbereich Zeitgeschichte des Sports). Significantly less, however, has been published on GDR sport in English. This gap has now been filled with the study by Dennis and Grix on sport under the German Communist regime. The publication is primarily based on research produced by German colleagues enriched by additional source material.

The co-authors explain their approach as a unique mix of historical and political science-based analysis. They aim to show the links between the development of sport in the GDR and the character of national and international sports systems today. They attempt to deconstruct the myth of a ‘well-oiled and harmonious system that thrived on the mutually supportive relationship between elite and mass sports, providing ample provision for both’ (p. 3). Showing how contested the field of high-performance sport in the GDR actually was, they hope to reach wider conclusions about the functioning of the GDR dictatorship itself.

The nine chapters of the study look first at the establishment of the high-performance sports system (1–3) and the role of doping (4–5). Two chapters focus on the contested identity of the sports system, drawing on the examples of football and mass sports (6–7). The final two chapters embed GDR sports in a wider international/comparative context and present key themes and findings.

The study begins with a broadbrush picture of the different layers of the politicization of sport with particular focus on the role of international sporting successes in legitimizing the GDR in the eyes of its citizens and the international public. The following chapters present
two more detailed studies of the development of East Germany’s elite sports system and of how young sporting talents were found and promoted.

The authors divide the evolution of the GDR as a sporting nation, developing from very difficult beginnings to become an athletic superpower, into five phases: anti-fascist, anti-militaristic sport, 1945–7; a Soviet-type state-socialist model, 1952–6; further centralization and the ascendancy of elite sports, 1957–67; key reforms in the elite sport sector 1967–9; and, finally, the crystallization of the standard elite sports model, 1969–74/5. The chapter introduces the structures of the GDR’s elite sports system and key figures such as Manfred Ewald, one of the most powerful East German sports officials, and highlights conflicts of interests between the various bodies involved in the running of the tightly knit elite sports system. Yet the state exerted almost total control over the system by tracking numbers, keeping statistics, and implementing ever new planning mechanisms.

Apart from the structures of the elite pyramid training centres, special sports schools, and sport clubs, the authors discuss the key mechanisms of the talent-scouting system from the hosting of youth Spartakiades to the introduction of a broad talent-spotting system called ESA (Einheitliche Sichtung und Auswahl) in 1973. GDR school children were constantly measured and tested to spot athletic talent at a very early age. The authors make interesting points, but fall short in exploring these further, for example, the observation that ESA was part and parcel of ‘everyday life at school for GDR children’, which sounds worth exploring in further research on everyday life in the GDR. They also point to the high-powered performances at the Child and Youth Spartakiades, already explored by Molly Wilkinson Johnson in an important study.1

Chapters four and five look at what is probably the most widely discussed aspect of the GDR’s high-performance system. Since the mid 1960s, state-controlled doping programmes were developed in interaction between state actors, sports officials, and what the authors call ‘pressures from below’ (p. 85). The authors demonstrate how contested the system actually was, marked by internal rivalries and a constant struggle for ever more resources and influence between its

key institutions, such as groups attached to party high commissions and ministries of state, industrial complexes, sports organizations, research institutes, and medical services.

The authors courageously blur the boundaries between assumed victims (athletes) and perpetrators (trainers, doctors, and sport officials). It was the combined ‘greed’ (p. 104) for prestige and financial benefits on the part of athletes, the ‘greed’ of trainers for medals and standing in the competition with other clubs for prestige and talent, and the state’s overarching goal of demonstrating the superiority of socialism over capitalism (and also its desire to shine within its own bloc rivalry) that allowed the inhuman doping system to flourish. It is therefore convincing yet striking to read that the state-controlled doping system was implemented to control ‘wild’ or uncontrolled doping. As much as everyone would agree that the doping of unknowing children and young adults as practised in the GDR is a crime, we must also acknowledge that many athletes worldwide use performance enhancing drugs knowingly and willingly. The authors therefore discuss the development of the GDR’s doping system in an international and comparative perspective. Ultimately, however, they reach the conclusion that the large degree of state control over the GDR’s doping system sets it clearly apart from Western doping practices.

Taking football and the relationship between mass and elite sports as examples, the authors explore the most contested fields in the GDR’s sports system. With the highly unpopular decision to relocate many traditional teams, GDR sports officials cut local roots and traditions as early as the 1950s, offending many fans. After that, football developed as a minefield created by various strong political, economic, and regional actors who, for many different, sometimes personal, reasons fought for control over the game. The state never achieved full control over football, which was also significantly harder to medicalize and manipulate than more mechanical sports such as track and field. This explains the GDR’s strikingly unsuccessful presence on the international football scene. It also explains how football could remain the sport with the most space for individual aims and goals.

The individual aims, goals, and demands of GDR citizens are articulated even more strongly in the chapter on the tensions caused by declining investment in mass sports and the growing financial and structural gap between mass and high-performance sports.
Making use of *Eingaben*, petitions from citizens to state and party officials, the chapter shows the increasing disharmony within the GDR’s sports system and a growing impatience on the part of citizens with the pressures and shortages caused by the rapid economic decline of the 1980s. This chapter reveals one of the significant shortcomings of Dennis’s and Grix’s work: their inability to embed their findings in current debates not just about GDR sport, but also about the country’s culture and society. The stories they tell are signifiers of conflicts, but the causes and circumstances of these conflicts remain largely in the dark.

The final part of the study looks at the legacy of the GDR’s sports system, its talent-scouting and fostering mechanisms, in the context of a process which the authors call the ‘convergence of elite sport development’ (p. 172) on a global scale. Here they compare the elite sports systems of East Germany, the UK, Australia, and China, arguing that a convergent high-performance system, differing only in the degree of state control, developed, although given the scope of the chapter they cannot go into the subject in any great depth. The chapter itself and, in particular, its focus on the period after the 1970s, is highly problematic. Globalization and cultural exchange processes, and sport as an actor, commodity, and product in and of global exchange processes since the nineteenth century, date back to earlier times and must be taken into consideration.

From the start, athletic ideals, training methods, and scientific knowledge travelled the globe alongside athletes and their trainers and coaches participating in international competitions such as the Olympic Games. A global history of sport with a focus on sports science, training mechanisms, and ideologies attached to specific attitudes towards athletic performance is an open and promising field of research, but does not fit well into this narrow study of GDR sport. The book finishes with the authors summarizing their arguments, highlighting again the contestations and conflicts in the high-performance sports system with competing individuals fighting for resources and personal and international prestige. They also point out the importance of existing regional and traditional understandings of the meaning of sport among fans, athletes, and trainers in producing ever new conflicts.

Dennis and Grix have produced a first concise and compelling English-language summary of the vast research done on GDR sport.
The book will surely prove valuable for teaching the subject and, it is to be hoped, will encourage further research in the field now that the basic facts are easily accessible. Even though the authors highlight important possible fields for future research, such as the tensions and conflicts within the sports system, they tend to follow the dominant approach in German sport history too closely, with its focus on structures, elite actors, state resolutions, and a controlled sport and science sector.

This perspective fails to shed light on the functioning of sport between different societal actors, an approach whose value has been demonstrated, for instance, by Molly Wilkinson Johnson (with her focus on leading sports figures, events, and fans), and German historian Klaus Latzel, who has written an outstanding study of the power relationships within sport and pharmaceutical industries (in this case Jenapharm).² Indeed, future research on sport in the GDR will only thrive if scholars either contribute to more recent approaches developed in GDR historiography, or if they use sport as a prism through which we can better understand the nature of the GDR dictatorship more generally.

Two leading historians of the GDR, Paul Betts and Jan Palmowski, have defined two fields that should be taken seriously when writing the history of GDR sport. Betts has traced the creation and production of a unique socialist version of modernity in the context of East German everyday life. Even though Betts formulates his ideas in the context of how individuals (and the state) contested the private sphere, his notion that there was a particular socialist idea of the ‘modern’ could be extremely valuable in conceptualizing the ideals of a socialist athlete. Through training and medicalization, the socialist athlete embodied the values of modernity and placed these on the international stage.

Palmowski, in his work, highlights the importance of regional celebrations and spectacles as contested fields in which regional identity was preserved and state control challenged, up to the point when the state lost its citizens in 1989. A future study of GDR sport events should go beyond Spartakiades and Deutsche Turn- und Sportfeste, analyse the cultural performances taking place during regional sports competitions, and explore, in particular, the tensions between

² Klaus Latzel, Staatsdoping: Der VEB Jenapharm im Sportsystem der DDR (Cologne, 2009).
regional collective identities and the artificial vision of a socialist nation fostered by the East German regime.

In short, the gap of a cultural history of GDR sport has yet to be filled. Sport provides a unique prism through which the relationship between science, the body, and the public in the GDR can be analysed. It is to be hoped that the fact that a key text on GDR sport is finally available in English will inspire future work on the history of sport science in the GDR, the cultural ramifications of the ideology of scientific-technological progress, the everyday life of those doing school sport in the GDR, and the role of regional sport spectacles.

UTA BALBIER has been Director and Lecturer in the Institute of North American Studies, King’s College London, since 2010. Previously she was a Research Fellow at the German Historical Institute, Washington DC, and taught at Jacobs University Bremen. She is the author of Kalter Krieg auf der Aschenbahn: Der deutsch-deutsche Sport 1950–1972. Eine politische Geschichte (2007) and is now completing a monograph on Billy Graham’s revival campaigns in Europe and the USA in the 1950s and 1960s.