To investigate the dynamics of international exchange in the modern period, science, scholarship, and expertise seem like ideal test cases. It is often claimed that ‘science’ has no country and rests much of its legitimacy on a sense of universalism and objectivity. Exchange and transfer across national boundaries—either on amicable terms or by emulation of rivals—have been essential to developing fields of scholarship and claims to authority over numerous questions. Additionally, new technologies deriving from scientific and technical expertise, such as shipping, railway transport, and telegraphic and
radio communication, provided the infrastructural foundations which bound the increasingly interconnected world from the nineteenth century onwards. Yet these developments co-existed with countervailing processes: claims to scientific progress often rested on intensely national or imperial projects; internationalisms were often based as much on the exclusion of particular groups as wide connections; and infrastructural consolidations were as important for integrating and differentiating nation-states, national economies, and imperial systems as they were for international connections. These tensions ensure that histories of these processes are potentially of great interest in investigating the dynamics of exchange and transmission in the modern world, and how this operated in terms of wider patterns of integration, differentiation, and rivalry.

The development of ‘transnational’, ‘transfer’, and ‘entangled’ history (and the attempts to define these various approaches) is a complex area, although it has been summarized well in a number of recent articles and studies. Two historiographical currents within it are particularly relevant for the four volumes being reviewed here. The first is the ‘new international history’. Over the past decade or so, a body of literature investigating the rise of ‘internationalist’ culture in the early twentieth century has led to something of a rebranding of ‘international history’ (formerly a synonym for fairly traditional diplomatic history). While still examining international relations, the field has been broadened through being connected with cultural, social, and intellectual history and used to illustrate the significance of non-state actors, civil society groups, and international


institutions, and how wider commitments to ‘internationalism’ manifested among a whole range of actors. As well as deepening understandings of how the international systems of the early twentieth century operated, these studies have also led to an interesting terminological shift. ‘Internationalism’ is increasingly being recognized as the term used by nineteenth- and twentieth-century actors for the processes of cross-national exchange that would often be termed ‘transnational’ by modern historians. 3 Focusing on this allows specific contemporary conceptions of cross-national exchange to be examined, sidestepping the potential ambiguities of the term ‘transnational’ (and also its problematic terminological inflation, as it becomes something of a historical buzzword).

Similar directions have been followed within the history of science, even if a relative slowness in adopting ‘transnational’ approaches in this field has been cited in some recent discussions. 4 ‘Scientific internationalism’ and its relationship with the ‘nationalization’ of science have generated persistent (if slightly sporadic) interest, 5 and relate well with the ‘new international history’. More expansively, there has also been a move within the history of science to regard circulation and movement (often on a global scale) as the key object of study, much deriving from Jim Secord’s call for the idea of ‘knowledge in transit’ to serve as a new master organizing principle. 6 In doing so, historians of science have examined how scientific models, approach-
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es, and methods have been mediated and transformed as they moved across a range of different contexts, strongly affected by the specifics of particular localities but also by the processes of transmission and actions of ‘go-betweens’. With history of science methods being extended to encompass the ‘history of knowledge’ more generally, and connected with other fields such as the history of expertise over social questions and educational history, it seems as if pairing these approaches with other forms of international history is a logical step.

***

The four books reviewed all link these two historiographies in some manner (sometimes explicitly, other times in their general approach), being illustrative of wider attempts to carry ‘transnational’ and ‘internationalist’ history models into the history of science, knowledge, and expertise. They had their origins in either conferences or networks of academics, but manage to avoid the potential problems in the ‘conference proceedings’ genre of unevenness and excessive heterogeneity by all being organized around clear themes and well-selected case studies. Given that they are all written within quite new fields and that most of the contributors are early-career scholars, many of the contributions are testings of ideas and the initial publications in wider programmes of research. They therefore show individual corners of what will hopefully be a range of very interesting monograph projects appearing over the next few years, and offer an overview of the potentials—but also some of the limits and areas for further investigation—within the international and transnational history of knowledge.

The volumes all have a similar chronological focus on a ‘long nineteenth century’ of varying durations (sometimes starting as early as 1750 and ending as late as 1950). Within this, there is a general centre of gravity around the years 1880 to 1914, a period which the edi-

7 Two particularly interesting collections on this line are Simon Schaffer, Lissa Roberts, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo (eds.), The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770–1820 (Sagamore Beach, Mass., 2009); and Bernard V. Lightman, Gordon McOuat, and Larry Stewart (eds.), The Circulation of Knowledge Between Britain, India, and China: The Early-Modern World to the Twentieth Century (Leiden, 2013).
tors of one of the collections call ‘the heyday of internationalism within the emerging transnational sphere’. This is an excellent direction, as much work in transnational history, and particularly ‘the new international history’, has tended to focus on the interwar period, and particularly forms of internationalism centred around the League of Nations. Stretching the chronology back more firmly into the nineteenth century in some respects relativizes the internationalism of the 1920s and 1930s as a damaged and reconfigured version of a more confident international culture in the earlier period. Taking this longer duration also establishes the importance of nineteenth-century modes of organization and institutionalization for developments in the twentieth century, something quite significant given that nineteenth-century history seems to have declined in fashion somewhat over the past few years. Where the books differ is in how they approach issues of internationalism, exchange, and transmission, with all four adopting quite different spatial categories and objects of study. Their organizing principles show the different ways that transnational history and the history of knowledge can be connected, and how they can be related to a variety of methodological approaches and historical questions. It therefore pays briefly to characterize each of the volumes in terms of their specific features.

*Shaping the Transnational Sphere* is the most tightly organized and coherent of the collections, although this is partly because its contributions engage with one of the most established and well-studied areas within transnational history, namely, the role of ‘experts’ engaged in social reform movements. In this respect, it is the volume which most directly represents a ‘reading back’ of the themes of the new international history into the long nineteenth century. The volume sets out to explore ‘the activities of networks and non-state actors beyond and below national borders that were particularly important for the dissemination of reform ideas and practices’, illustrating how they operated within and helped to develop a ‘transnational sphere . . . the space where encounters across national borders took place’. The case studies examine the cross-border relations of

---

8 Davide Rodogno, Bernhard Struck, and Jakob Vogel, ‘Introduction’, in *Shaping the Transnational Sphere: Experts, Networks and Issues from the 1840s to the 1930s* (New York, 2015), 1-22, at 8.
9 Ibid. 2.
‘expert’ groups, mostly social reformers and a variety of philanthropic organizations (including child welfare groups, Jewish migration assistance, and large American foundations), which are shown to have interacted across national borders to form a wider domain of transnational activity. This is not presented as invariably successful or unproblematic, however. It was often quite tense, uneven, and operated in a stop–start manner, with a slow consolidation in the early nineteenth century, quickening around the years 1880 to 1914, and then dealing with a series of ruptures and revaluations after the First World War.

*Transnationale Bildungsräume*, meanwhile, has a similar (if more theoretically engaged) approach and more specific case studies. Here attention focuses on educational institutions, particularly universities, schools, research institutes, and educational reform groups. These are unified through the category of ‘Bildungsräume’ (‘spaces of education’), ‘which were constituted in the form of personal networks, representation and reception in media, and institutional cooperation as well as through the creation or use of international forums’. The spatial framework means not only that international, national, and local levels can be interrelated, but also that they can be investigated within the same category as physical spaces, such as schoolrooms and university buildings, and wider ‘imagined spaces’ around linguistic and disciplinary communities. Notably, the constitution of these *Bildungsräume* is given a strong ideological dimension, growing from ideas of improvement, the instillation of values, and concepts of the ‘civilizing mission’. In this way, educational institutions are shown to have developed in a way which not only reconfigured older relationships and regions of activity, but also drew coherence from a series of shared values and assumptions.

The contributions in *Anglo-German Scholarly Relations*, meanwhile, adopt a slightly different approach, explicitly focusing on a bilateral relationship between scholars in two different national communities. Interactions between British and German scholars are traced in a variety of areas, including anthropological projects, popular science

---

publishing, Antarctic exploration, and participation in scientific meetings and congresses. While this might seem, at first glance, a less sophisticated approach than the transnational spatial orientations of the above two volumes, it is one that has real advantages. Given the iconic status of the ‘rise of Anglo-German antagonism’ as a test case in much international history, this remains a historiographically significant relationship to examine,¹¹ and the focus on it allows very close and subtle studies across a variety of fields. The contributions in the volume also situate the Anglo-German relationship within much wider linkages, with relations between scholars in these two countries not occurring in a vacuum, but being strongly affected by interactions with their counterparts in other European countries, the USA, and colonial empires. In some respects, therefore, by showing the significance of these multiple relations, the studies (possibly counter-intuitively, but to great effect) actually use the bilateral relationship to illustrate much wider systems of connection.

*Information Beyond Borders* is the most eclectic of the four, based around the category of ‘information’. While the book is technically subtitled with the chronology ‘in the Belle Époque’, the chapters veer quite far from the classic years of this period, covering the same long nineteenth-century timeframe as the other books. The category of ‘information’ is not really conceptualized or defined, but the individual chapters present the diversity of forms of information, and the international relationships around its exchange, very well, showing a fluid and dynamic set of transfers where ‘people, publications, objects and ideas — as information — in all its many formats and carriers moved ever more freely and quickly to and fro across the boundaries of the European states and beyond them’.¹² While the case studies are less clearly organized than in the other three volumes, they are often in more innovative areas—the introduction explicitly notes

¹¹ For general accounts of this, see Jan Rüger, ‘Revisiting the Anglo-German Antagonism’, *Journal of Modern History*, 83/3 (2011), 579–617; and Andreas Fahrmeir, ‘New Perspectives in Anglo–German Comparative History’, *German History*, 26/4 (2008), 553–62.

them as ‘unusual and suggestive’—with chapters on the role of telegraphic networks, business magazines, news agencies, and library management systems. There are also numerous excursuses into questions of language (a key issue in transnational exchange which is often under-examined in the other volumes), and a strong focus on communications technologies and information management.

It should be apparent from the above that a methodological distinction exists between those volumes whose analytical focus is based on defined objects of study or relationships between specific national contexts (more traditional means of conducting transfer and transnational history), and those which focus more on ‘spaces’ where transnational activity was conducted. In practice, however, there is less difference between the actual case studies in the four volumes than this might initially suggest. The spatial frameworks are incredibly interesting on a conceptual level and the theoretical discussions give a great deal of food for thought, but they appear difficult to pursue in practice. It is quite telling that in the two volumes which are explicitly constructed around a spatial frame of analysis (Bildungsräume and Shaping the Transnational Sphere), most of the chapters continue to deal with bilateral relationships, ‘perceptions’ of one national context by individuals or institutions in another, or the formation and activity of self-defined ‘international’ organizations. How to fully implement the theoretical discussions around the category of space, rather than use it to foreground (still certainly worthy and interesting, but rather more traditional) studies of international organizations and cross-national perceptions, is something that still needs to be developed.

***

The case studies in these volumes are expectedly varied. There are a number of consistencies, however, which show interesting dimensions around the international history of ideas and knowledge. In particular, there is a set of institutions which persistently feature across all the volumes. The first are the major international expositions which were held across the nineteenth century and appear in

13 Ibid. 13.
numerous chapters as focal points for international culture. As showcases of scientific and technical innovation and self-consciously ‘international’ and ‘universal’, these seem to be some of the clearest examples of the connection between science, expertise, and internationalism. Many chapters investigate them in some way, particularly in terms of their organization and in the arrangement of their exhibits. The second common case study are international congresses of scientists and reformers, which were held with increasing regularity and in increasing diversity from the later nineteenth century onwards. Across the volumes, we have accounts of international gatherings of (among others) sanitary engineers, chemists, telegraphers, social reformers, Orientalists, and idealist philosophers, meeting in various locations to discuss common questions and define their communities. Finally, there are also international organizations devoted to specific causes, especially those concerned with social reform and education, or which served as associations for particular professional or ‘epistemic communities’. Notably, as is presented in many of the chapters, such as Stephane Frious’s on sanitary engineers and Martina Henze’s on prison reform, these three objects of study are closely linked: international congresses were often held alongside international expositions, and many international associations had their origins in networks formed through congresses. Highlighting these linkages potentially allows a more integrated study of international organization, illustrating how it moved between these shared institutions and varying degrees of formal organization.

Some other important objects of study also appear at several junctures. The way in which telegraphic systems served as conceptual models for ideas of a world community is a very interesting issue brought up in Frank Hartmann’s contribution in Information Beyond Borders. Multinational companies (including news organizations)

---


15 Frank Hartmann, ‘Of Artifacts and Organs: World Telegraph Cables and Ernst Kapp’s Philosophy of Technology,’ in Rayward (ed.), Information Beyond Borders, 23–34.
are also important players in a number of chapters, and probably deserve further study. Not only did the scale of these institutions dwarf many of the ‘internationalist’ reform institutions which seem to be absorbing most attention, but many philanthropic organizations were founded using fortunes accumulated through international business, and had their internal administration based on business practices. Universities, libraries, and learned societies are also shown as important sites where transnational and international projects were germinated and implemented. In addition, particular individuals active in internationalist projects, such as the creation of universal languages, encyclopedias of the sum of human knowledge, or particular schemes of education reform are also presented as important ‘international actors’. The world of internationalist activity is therefore shown to be both extensive and dense, with a whole range of institutions and modes of organization involved in the formation of cross-border networks.

More informal connections are less frequently examined in the volumes, perhaps because they are more difficult to investigate, requiring archival research in multiple countries rather than clear sets of documents produced by explicitly ‘international’ organizations or projects. This is, however, an area where the close, bilateral focus of Anglo-German Relations pays off significantly. Hilary Howes’s study of how correspondence, publications exchanges, and collaborative research sustained theoretical and methodological interchange between German and British anthropologists in Malaya is an excellent example of how this kind of research can be conducted. Similarly, Tara Windsor’s chapter on the re-establishment of contacts between German and British literary figures after the First World War shows the importance of informal contacts, such as study-trips and personal correspondence, for laying the ground for a

---

resumption of more formal international activity in the late 1920s. These contributions also highlight how significant personal relationships of trust and friendship were for transnational exchange, allowing a much more nuanced appreciation (partly informed by the history of emotions) of how cross-border interactions were formed and fostered. In this way, studies can get behind the often quite banal and formulaic commitments to internationalism which litter speeches and publications at international congresses and expositions, and gain a deeper appreciation of what these relations meant to contemporaries.

The general focuses described above mean that there are also some gaps—or at least areas for further investigation—which cut across all of the volumes. Like the literature on inter-war internationalism, there is still a predominant focus on liberals as international actors in most of the volumes. While there is a call in the introduction of *Shaping the Transnational Sphere* to examine the ‘dark side’ of transnationalism and internationalism (particularly right-wing and conservative internationalist connections, and the cross-national development of the eugenics movement), this is unfortunately not answered in many of the contributions. There is still a general tendency to take for granted that internationalism was primarily connected with liberal ideology, and even calling non-liberal internationalism the ‘dark side’ does suggest an overly moralized conception. Only a few case studies veer away from this, but those that do, such as Vincent Viaene’s study of Catholic internationalism, signal that there is potentially a lot to be done in these areas. In particular, this and other contributions mark out religious history as a major potential field where transnational and international approaches could be usefully turned. This could also be extended not only to the obvious but still surprisingly understudied area of socialist internationalism (mentioned in a few of the chapters, but not closely examined in any of them), and also to internationalism among conservative, right radical, or aristocratic groups.

18 Tara Windsor, ‘Rekindling Contact: Anglo-German Academic Exchange after the First World War’, ibid. 212–32.
A further potential limit (or perhaps an interesting point) about the case studies is that they all focus on highly mobile, educated, or socially well-positioned groups. The actors encountered in the volumes tend to be confident and ambitious figures such as educational reformers, sanitary experts, journalists, economists, and medical professionals. There is much less on involuntary migrants, colonial subjects, or exiles except as they feature as the objects of transnational projects. This is, of course, partly due to the organizing principles of the volumes. Titles referring to ‘experts’, ‘scholars’, and creators of Bildungsräume all indicate that we are dealing with self-conscious (or at least aspirational) improving elites. This does, however, raise the issue of whether, when talking about transnationalism and internationalism, we are primarily dealing with individuals with the power, resources, and mobility which enable them to travel easily across borders and form cross-national alliances. Reading behind some of the chapters, however, there do seem to be additional areas which could be worth studying to give a deeper perspective. Who exactly is learning universal languages such as Esperanto, Volapük, and Ido, and how do they conceptualize international transmission? How do the Eastern European Jewish refugees who are being assisted by Jewish migration assistance charities in Britain, France, Germany, and the USA relate with their metropolitan benefactors? And how do the indigenous peoples being studied by British and German anthropologists (or those providing access to populations of interest to foreign anthropologists) interact with their investigators? While of course more difficult to study, these are questions that deserve further investigation, and offer a way to connect the relatively high-level world of voluntary transnational actors with a much wider range of groups.


This is also paralleled in the geographic focus of the volumes, which tends to be oriented around north-western Europe and the USA. Geographies frequently shrink even further, as ‘Germany’ often means Prussia or the north, ‘Britain’ south-east England and London, France is Paris, and the USA either the East Coast or even just New York City. There are individual chapters in the volumes looking at Italy, Turkey, and Poland, but, with a couple of exceptions, these are usually nodes looking towards or being acted on by groups from these north Atlantic centres. Russia, South America, China, and European colonies beyond India, south-east Asia, and Australasia are largely absent. There are, of course, some insights to be had here, as it indicates that internationalist projects were often carried out from established centres of authority and depended on established geographies of power. On the flip-side, however, it does perhaps reinforce stereotypes of the peripheral and primarily ‘receptive’ nature of actors in eastern and southern Europe, and extra-European contexts. This emphasis is probably not just worth regarding as a gap requiring filling (although more studies of, for example, Russian and South American internationalism would certainly be of great interest), but also something which perhaps reflects the dynamics of nineteenth-century internationalism. Not as something which spread to all countries equally, but something which served as a way of further accentuating the dominance and importance of the ‘core’ countries which most explicitly represented ‘internationalist’ ideals, or as something which was cited by ambitious ‘modernizing’ new elites in other national contexts, who sought to use the language of international civilization and citation of foreign models to build their own authority within the domestic context.

***

Perhaps one of the most interesting issues which all the volumes engage with in some way is how to position these histories of transmission of information, scholarship, and expertise in relation to other historic concerns, either traditional, such as the rise of the nation-state, or more recent, such as the reinvigoration of imperial history and vogue for global history which has almost swept the rug from beneath the feet of the often European-centred transnational
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history. The sense received in some earlier works of transnational history, that it offered a new way of conceptualizing modern history which diminished nations, empires, and borders as something contingent to be ‘moved beyond’ has receded somewhat. The nation-state and the empire have been stubbornly persistent and difficult to ignore. This ensures that all the volumes engage with the following questions. How did transnationalism and internationalism interact with the rise of nation-states, imperial systems, and the hardening borders which were also a key part of the period? And how significant actually were transnational and international projects within a world of consolidating nations and empires? These questions are particularly relevant to the period under examination in the books. A core problem—of how the heyday of internationalism in the period 1880 to 1914 coincided with the dramatic upsurge in national and imperial rivalries, and ended in the explosion of the First World War—looms over all the works, and is indicated in all the introductions and many of the contributions. The relationship between the international and the national therefore becomes a key issue for all the volumes. The strategies used to engage with this, and the explanations that are offered, show some of the insights that transnational history can offer to these wider historical themes.

One issue is how relevant internationalist ideologies actually were in these periods. For example, it is enjoyable to read that a Dutch physician in the 1900s devised a utopian scheme to transform The Hague into a World Capital based on positivist and hygienist principles, but what was the significance of this? Many of the chapters directly engage with questions like this, and none seem wholly unaware of them. One of the strongest examinations is made by Julia Moses in her study of the International Congress on Accidents at Work. While providing a central transnational forum for discussions of work accident legislation, this was an institution which ‘governments could choose to ignore, manipulate or search for new ideas’.

24 Clavin, ‘Time, Manner, Place’ offers a way of coming to terms with this.
26 Julia Moses, ‘Policy Communities and Exchanges across Borders: The Case of Workplace Accidents at the Turn of the Twentieth Century’, in Rodogno, Struck, and Vogel (eds.), Shaping the Transnational Sphere, 60–81, at 62.
It is argued in this and many other contributions that these translation processes required a great deal of mediation and ran into frequent opposition. This is particularly strongly noted in those contributions in *Bildungsräume* which deal with the emulation of foreign (usually German) education systems in other countries. For example, Mustafa Gencer’s study of the emulation of German education practices in the Ottoman empire draws attention to how Turkish educational reformers emphasized both the ‘national’ character of German and Prussian education alongside its ‘universal’ qualities, and how its local implementations needed to be imprinted with a self-asserted sense of ‘Turkishness’. As such, national or local specificities persistently remained important (and were often argued for by contemporaries), and became the prism through which exchange processes were refracted.

This also leads many of the contributions to consider not only what happened when transnational exchange was aimed at, but also what factors militated against it. Global war and national rivalry are the most explicit of these. The First World War serves as a central or culminating episode in many of the chapters, fundamentally transforming internationalist and transnational projects, spurring some on to new intensity, and eradicating others entirely. The chapters which carry across the post-1918 period illustrate the continuities, but also the tensions and transformations, which the war wrought. Tara Windsor’s fascinating chapter on the rekindling of relations between German and British writers in the aftermath of the First World War has already been mentioned, but also notable is Katharina Rietzler’s study of American philanthropic organizations across the period 1900 to 1930, which traces an institutional continuance in American philanthropy, but also how it moved more towards a focus on international law rather than peace activism in a changed international context.

---


National rivalries prior to the First World War are more variably engaged with. The contributions in *Anglo-German Relations* seem to indicate that in most scholarly fields, cooperation and friendly exchanges continued throughout the proposed period of Anglo-German antagonism, answering the question posed in the introduction of whether ‘scholarly relations followed the chronological rhythm of political history’ with a general ‘No’. A split less frequently engaged with, but still apparent, Franco-German antagonism after 1871, also appears as hugely important in either retarding or conditioning particular transnational projects. There is a tendency in many of the chapters for international organizations to seem ‘German-centred’, in particular, those concerned with labour or welfare reform, owing to Germany’s extensive social insurance system, or French-centred, such as many of the international expositions or the educational congresses discussed by Damiano Matasci, where ‘German professors and pedagogues were conspicuous in their relative absence from the transnational arena’. The implications of this, that the key period of internationalism was marked by this strong fault-line, is of major interest. Looking at how these ‘rival internationalisms’ manifested, and why individuals and communities took particular sides, is something which would be a fascinating area of future study.

However, there are also more prosaic and potentially more telling blockages which become apparent from many of the contributions. Those dealing with Australasian developments continue to make references to ‘the tyranny of distance’ and logistical difficulties in causing problems for exchange. But these issues were not just limited to extra-European contexts. One of the most interesting examinations is

32 Heather Gaunt, ‘“In the Pursuit of Colonial Intelligence”: The Archive and Identity in the Australian Colonies of the Nineteenth Century’, in Rayward
Daniel Laqua’s chapter in *Information Beyond Borders*, looking at the formation of the *Annuaire de la Vie Internationale*, an internationalist yearbook organized by activists in Austria and Belgium. A very intriguing section on obstacles to transnational cooperation presents this as a ‘case of shared convictions and ambitions being undermined by practical obstacles and personal frustrations’.33 It was not so much international tensions or ideological differences which worked against collaboration, but delays and irregularity in correspondence, lack of funds, and inability to raise public support or interest. This is a good indication that when looking at the success or failure of transnational relations, it is often mundane issues around communication practices and technologies that are more significant than ideological commitments and wider international relations.

Perhaps the most interesting points come when the relationships between the transnational and the national are regarded not as in opposition, but as mutually constitutive. Transnational and international exchange, even when successfully undertaken, often seems to have created a sense of national difference, as participants became aware of, or argued for, distinctions between communities. Additionally, many activities which seem to be emblematic of national competition, such as the rush for colonies, exploration in ‘unknown’ areas, or arms build-ups, often seem to have depended on adopting techniques from potential rivals, and forms of ‘competitive emulation’, with drives to transfer frequently reflecting a desire not to fall behind potential rivals. The chapters which really engage with this issue, such as Pascal Schillings’s examination of Anglo-German networks in Antarctic explorations, are some of the strongest in the four volumes, showing how intense national rivalry and competition often rested on the emulation and exchange of techniques, and the creation of common discourses. As a result, there is a key point that ‘cooperation and rivalry thus appear as merely different aspects of

---
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Anglo-German connectedness’. This potentially opens a way out of the ‘Why did internationalism fail?’ impasse, and into new analytical territory in both transnational and national histories, allowing international exchange to be examined as something that was bound up in nation-building and national rivalries. One of the early criticisms, indeed, of transnational history was that it reinforced the national categories that historians were aiming to get away from. From these studies of its nineteenth-century manifestations it seems as if this might have been a historical process too, with transnational connections actually being key to forming national boundaries and a sense of distinctiveness.

A similar interesting issue which develops from this (and the metropolitan and north Atlantic focus of these volumes) is how internationalist ideologies connected to colonial ideas and the ‘civilizing mission’ ideologically justifying the rush to European imperialism. As noted above, the links between European educational reform, universalism, and colonial ideologies is a key theme in Bildungsräume. Similarly, Paul Servais’s chapter in Information Beyond Borders also shows how Orientalist congresses bound together colonialist and universalist currents in both their objects of study and organization. In these chapters, the structures of international exchange, often based around networks consolidated from empires, and its ideological foundations, based on notions of improvement, the authority of ‘civilized’ centres, and the asserted need of other countries to emulate them, become of great parallel significance. This connection, which shows how the idealism and optimism, but also the elite structure and paternalistic nature of many transnational and international projects drew off the same impetuses as European imperialism and supported colonial projects, is one of the great gains of these books.

It must also be said, however, that these works do not just interrelate transnational history to traditional narratives of the rise of the First World War and the age of empire and nationalism. Some of the

early promise of transnational history, of highlighting and showing the importance of relationships which have been occluded by these grand narratives, is also readily apparent. Particularly notable are Jana Tschurenev’s study of how early nineteenth-century school reform in Britain and India saw a multi-sided movement of techniques and emulation between the colony and the metropole.36 Stephane Frious’s chapter on sanitary engineers, meanwhile, makes the argument that the most important channels of transmission were not between different countries or from national capitals to ‘provincial’ centres within the same country, but actually saw different urban centres of varying size emulating one another in a highly multilateral and autonomous manner.37 Similarly, Jan Surman’s chapter on the rise of Slavic languages as ‘languages of science’ in preference to German in the late nineteenth century shows how linguistic differences could serve as important means of institution-building and lead to new spatial configurations in scientific networks. Patterns of association based around territorial empires, or which included Slavic-speakers in ‘German-speaking’ communities, began to break down, and new networks linking Poles, Czechs, and other Slavic speakers across national and imperial boundaries became more significant.38

All in all, these books combine to indicate a more sophisticated and multi-faceted understanding of international and transnational currents in the long nineteenth century, and the wide significance of international exchange and internationalist ideologies for issues of knowledge, expertise, scholarship, and science. Notably, these works do not generally present this as a means of countering and relativizing old narratives, but use transnational history to think about these in new ways. The rise of nations and empires, and the lead-up to large historical events such as the First World War, are shown to have been deeply intertwined with a variety of cross-border relationships on a range of scales. In doing so, these works all investigate what

37 Frious, ‘Sanitizing the City’, 44–59.
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Christophe Verbruggen and Julie Carlier call ‘the ever-present tension between different scales and spaces, such as between the local and the transnational’,\(^{39}\) and show how the history of transfer and exchange can reveal different layers in these processes. There still, of course, remain things to develop in the field: moving the geographic focus beyond the North Atlantic; making full use of the concept of ‘space’; and paying more attention to non-liberal forms of transnationalism and internationalism. However, as ‘state-of-the-field’ collections, indications of where work is being conducted, and sources of a range of methodological and conceptual points, these books all repay close reading.
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Some tropes never die. All medievalists have been forced, at some point in their career, to grapple with the outdated and hackneyed notions that continue to colour our perceptions of the Middle Ages. Even in the twenty-first century, the ghost of Burckhardt lingers everywhere: in films, books, and video games that collectively caricature the Middle Ages as simplistic and quaint, forever damned to history’s purgatory of not quite measuring up to modernity. Katharina Behrens’s recently published book *Scham: Zur sozialen Bedeutung eines Gefühls im spätmittelalterlichen England* sets itself the goal of tackling some of these misconceptions. Her study, based on her doctoral thesis, is a wide-ranging look at the concept of ‘shame’ in the Middle Ages. Her work is a response to those authors who judge the Middle Ages against the benchmark of the Renaissance, and who invariably find the level of emotional sophistication in medieval writing to be wanting. Shame as a cultural concept has suffered at the hands of these scholars. Behrens’s study very effectively counters these claims with an examination of medieval shame in its many forms and guises.

Behrens’s goal was to explore the meaning and functions of ‘shame’ in late medieval English society, chronologically framed by a set of documents produced during the reign of Richard II. Her study adds to the growing body of work within the burgeoning field of the history of emotions. She positions herself as a successor to the pioneering work done by Barbara Rosenwein and others on the social uses and cultural underpinnings of specific emotions. Their work comes as a response to the narrative that interprets the history of emotions as akin to a process of maturity. This view places the emotional history of Western civilization on a long upwards trajectory, from the childlike abandon of the Middle Ages towards the emotion-
al restraint of the modern era. Scholars such as Rosenwein and Behrens claim that this approach is untenable; emotions must be judged within the context of the society that creates them, and should not be seen as a linear progression contingent on modern values. Though finding a natural home under the umbrella of cultural history, works such as this really shine when they are allowed to spill over into neighbouring fields of inquiry. Though Scham starts from a core concern with the sociological and anthropological implications of shame as an emotion, Behrens looks far beyond this scope, and deftly includes aspects of juridical, political, intellectual, and religious history as well.

Historical research can never recover the sensory experience of feeling an emotion. Thus we are limited to working from surviving evidence that either discusses shame directly or provides the means of extrapolating the social meaning of shame from past events. Behrens thus splits her evidence into two parts. The first part deals with the literary discourse of shame. Her evidence here comprises texts from four distinct bodies of writing: chronicles, primarily those of Thomas Walsingham, a Benedictine chronicler; religious and didactic writings; legal and administrative works, especially the Letter Books of the City of London; and, finally, what John Burrow dubbed ‘Ricardian poetry’, that flowering of Middle English literature at the end of the fourteenth century best represented by Chaucer, but also including Gower, Langland, and the Gawain-poet. The conclusions reached in her literary analysis reveal no great surprises. Shame depends heavily on the literary genre in which it is found. Courtly literature was deeply bound up with questions of honour; religious/moral texts dealt with the inevitable shame of choosing vice before virtue; and Chaucer’s scathing wit often targeted characters who pretended to false modesty. She concludes that the rich complexity of the medieval corpus cannot be reduced to any single, monolithic set of cultural values. Chaucer, especially, presents an array of ‘conflicting moralities’, which alone should put paid to the notion that the Middle Ages were in any way culturally deficient.

Part two moves away from the close reading of texts to a series of case studies that exemplify the function of shame in late medieval society. Here she uses evidence of a performative nature to analyse the very public ways in which shame served either as deterrent or punishment for social transgressions. As she concludes, every socie-
ty must find ways to enforce norms, and shame seems to have been a particularly effective means of maintaining social control in late medieval England. Her work follows Rosenwein’s lead on categorizing shame as a ‘social’ emotion; that is, shame is produced as a result of interactions with others. One never feels it in isolation, but rather only in connection with a failure to meet social expectations or a transgression of social norms. Thus the public rituals surrounding such actions as pillorying, penance, and begging each worked as powerful regulators within communities. The great interest of this section was seeing how it connects back to broader questions of social and political history. One must understand the extent to which shame was internalized in order to fully grasp, for example, why honour, reputation, and civic pride so frequently appear as grounds for action in civic records. Urban historians, especially, would do well to consider how the discourse of shame informed the broader urban mentalité.

In spite of the universality of emotion as a human trait, unpacking the social meaning of emotions can be remarkably tricky. Not only do social norms morph over time, but so does language. Behrens spends some time discussing England’s late medieval linguistic landscape, including an extensive list of shame-related vocabulary from Middle English, French, and Latin, all of which were in use at the end of the fourteenth century. She chose as her framework the three semantically related German concepts of Scham, Schande, and Schamhaftigkeit. Applying these is rather unusually complicated by the fact that English has lost the distinction between Scham, the internally applied feeling of having erred, and Schande, the feeling of public judgment for having erred. First, it raises the question of why some languages, such as German and French, retain the distinction between public and personal shame, while English does not. Behrens claims that the merging of these two concepts into the unified English word ‘shame’ had already happened by the fourteenth century. It might have been interesting if she had spent more time ruminating on the cultural impact of such a linguistic loss. When all shame is emotively channelled into the unitary concept of ‘personal’ shame, as it is in English, does public shaming become more efficacious? To what extent might this alter the social context of shame? Given that Behrens’s research was concerned with social outcomes, it seems pertinent to question how the social frame-
work of shame could have been shaped or modified by the linguistic peculiarities specific to late medieval England.

Behrens concludes that public shame functioned as a highly effective instrument of social order in late medieval England, even at times cutting across social strata. She illustrates this with the example of the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381. It was not just the ruling class that employed the language of shame against the rebels. The rebels in similar fashion also used propaganda tactics designed to shame and discredit their opponents. Each side tried to leverage public opinion by highlighting a breach of social norms through the medium of public shaming. As Behrens demonstrates throughout the book, these methods were often highly efficacious, though she concludes that shame functions best as a social control within a community structured by personal ties. Whether the same methods continue to be as effective is a matter left open for question. Have we moved away from a communal mentalité to the extent that we no longer understand the discourse of shame in the same way that our medieval counterparts did? Late medievalists who read petitions and bills laden with expressions of shame and dishonour often view them as formulaic constructions that had long lost their meaning. Perhaps this view should be modulated in light of Behrens’s findings. Whatever the answer, this work should prompt us to consider the ways in which our own cultural assumptions colour our historical understanding.

Overall, Behrens’s book more than adequately demonstrates that shame functioned as a powerful social adhesive in medieval England. Moreover, this book should be accessible to a non-specialist audience, as it is thankfully free from the dense jargon that often accompanies scholarly works on cultural history. For those new to the field of cultural history, or the history of emotions in particular, this book is a fine introduction to a complex and fascinating topic.
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How should modern societies accommodate peacefully the erosion of traditional forms of authority, political and religious strife, commerce and self-interest? Can ever-growing religious and moral pluralism be reconciled with stable government and the rule of law? These major questions were not only debated by eighteenth-century political agents and philosophers across Europe; they also underlay most of the renowned historical works written in this period. The link between history-writing and the cultural and economic aspects of the first globalized age was particularly manifest in the works of the Scottish churchman and historian William Robertson (1721–93). Robertson, like many of his Enlightenment peers, applied a stadial theory to the emergence of human civilization (although most of his works did not explicitly expound the basic philosophical assumptions behind this theory). According to the stadial view of history, different modes of subsistence—from hunting and gathering to agriculture to manufacture and commerce—determined the cultural, political, and intellectual progress of various nations. This was not a straightforward precedent of Marxist-style historical materialism: the stadial view, especially as employed by eighteenth-century Scottish authors, was closely intertwined with contemporary discourses on human agency, its unintended consequences and relation to providence, and a moral psychology preoccupied with the tensions between self-interest and the common good.

Contrary to recent views of Robertson’s œuvre as much more traditional than hitherto acknowledged (more rooted in humanistic and Christian vocabularies), László Kontler uses the German reception of his writings to rehabilitate Robertson as an innovative and modernizing Enlightenment author. The works at the centre of Kontler’s inquiry are Robertson’s History of Scotland (1759), History of the Reign of Charles V (1769, especially its extended introduction, ‘A View of the Progress of Society in Europe’), History of America (1777), and Historical Disquisition Concerning the Knowledge which the Ancients Had of India (1791). In addition to these well-known works, Kontler’s study includes an excellent chapter on Robertson’s early sermon of 1755,
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*The Situation of the World at the Time of Christ’s Appearance.* In this chapter Kontler focuses on the supposed tension between Christian notions of providence and the relativist or materialist overtones of a stadial theory of history. By contextualizing Robertson’s work within recent scholarship on the religious aspects of the Enlightenment, he suggests that this tension is not as pronounced as it may initially appear. Robertson’s view of divine action as gradual and progressive left sufficient scope for independent human action; human beings made free choices, which unintentionally furthered God’s general plan.

Throughout the book Kontler uses German translations of Robertson’s works, as well as reviews of the original English writings and their German versions, to assess why and how the Scottish historian was read throughout the Holy Roman Empire. Nevertheless, his main focus is on the University of Göttingen, where enterprising historians, theologians, ethnologists, and legal scholars reviewed and commented profusely on Robertson’s histories. Indeed, Kontler points out the similar predicaments of Scotland and the eighteenth-century Hanoverian electorate: their peripheral link to the British crown (despite significant political differences), the conscious attempt to promote a new culture for the educated public, and the emphasis on moderate Protestantism at the service of a modernizing nation.

One of the greatest merits of the book is Kontler’s careful reading of works by relatively unknown German authors. Next to such major scholars as Johann Stephan Pütter, Christian Gottlob Heyne, Christoph Meiners, and Arnold Heeren, we are also introduced to Johann Philipp Ebeling (pp. 54–6), Ludwig Heinrich von Nicolay (pp. 78–81), Julius August Remer (pp. 112–18), and Georg Friedrich Seiler (pp. 106–11), among many others. While paying serious attention to their attempts to render Robertson in their own linguistic and cultural idioms, Kontler eventually seems to agree with the verdict of posterity by subsuming many of them under the prototype of an ‘ambitious and learned but pedantic and somewhat unimaginative provincial scholar’ (p. 149, concerning Remer).

Another important service rendered by Kontler is his drawing of suggestive links between works by some of these relatively neglected scholars and more major authors and controversies. One such fruitful proposal, even in the absence of decisive evidence, is that
Ebeling’s translation of the sermon by Robertson, published in Hamburg in 1779, could have been a contribution to the raging *Fragmентаestreich* between Lessing and orthodox clergymen. This suggestion is particularly stimulating given the similarity of the themes discussed in Robertson’s sermon and in Lessing’s *Erziehung des Menschen-Geschlechts* (1777–80).

The book deals separately with the contexts of Robertson’s works and German history-writing (ch. 1), the early sermon and the religious Enlightenment (ch. 2), Robertson’s ‘View of the Progress of Society’, the programmatic introduction to his *History of Charles V* (ch. 3), the narrative sections of the *History of Charles V* and the *History of Scotland* (ch. 4), and, finally, Robertson’s histories of overseas cultures in America and India (ch. 5). Each chapter includes a sharp analysis of some of the main themes in Robertson’s original works, especially the organizing stadial idea and the civilizing effects of commerce, before moving on to a discussion of various German reviews, translations, abbreviations, versions, and modifications. Chapter 5 contains a fascinating discussion of the similarities between Robertson’s views on overseas cultures and the observations made by Johann Reinhold Forster and his son Georg Forster following their circumnavigation of the earth with Captain James Cook. Georg Forster, who had close ties to the University of Göttingen, also went on to translate Robertson’s *Historical Disquisition* on India. By exploring the anthropological and historiographical affinities between the young Forster, one of the radical supporters of the French Revolution in Germany, and the conservative Robertson—by contrast to the disagreements between Forster and Christoph Meiners on similar issues—Kontler throws fresh light on the Enlightenment Republic of Letters. As he suggests, ‘the differences which separated such figures did not inexorably divide enlightened opinion until the French Revolution proceeded beyond the stage of benign constitutional improvement’ (p. 183).

While most of the material in chapters 2 to 5 had already been published as journal articles over the last decade, the book profits substantially from new and very useful methodological observations in its introduction. Legitimizing his method of reinterpreting William Robertson himself parallel to surveying his German reception, Kontler suggests that the process of translation may illuminate not only the target culture but also the original work. The ways in which
contemporaries approach a certain text, while deeply embedded in their own cultural contexts, can clarify much of the structure and meanings of the translated work (pp. 6–9). Kontler criticizes studies of Enlightenment translation which highlight a supposedly misleading or wrong rendering of particular terms and themes in the target culture. He argues persuasively against the ‘tendency to represent the agent of translation or reception as blameworthy of oversight, incompetence, or malicious manipulation’, and disapproves of views of reception as ‘a unilinear process of “passing on” ideal-typical meanings from authoritative creators to inferior recipients’ (p. 7). Yet this noteworthy guideline is not always adhered to in the body of the text. There we find recurrent references to the meagre success and ‘blunders’ of translators (p. 56), ‘unintended distortions’ and ‘unwittingly committed errors’ (p. 84), or ‘inadequate terminology and inconclusive usage’ (p. 147) on the part of the German recipients. Such terms do seem to presuppose the translators’ failure to convey a set of originally clear and distinct (or at least very differently intended) meanings.

This point, however, does not detract from the substantial merits of Kontler’s suggestive and important book. Cautious in his assessment of the overall significance of Robertson’s works in Germany, he argues that reception took place intensively and extensively, while direct impact on history-writing is more difficult to identify. Yet this German reception, circumscribed as it may have been, is expertly analysed and valuably employed by Kontler to reassess William Robertson’s own work and the contexts of both its production and its interpretation. This nuanced and well-researched book makes a serious contribution to our understanding of the multiple ways in which history was written, read, used, and debated in the Enlightenment.
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In current speculations about the city of the future, urban gardening is an important issue. Illustrations of these visions resemble a cross between Fritz Lang’s Metropolis and the Hanging Gardens of Babylon: tall buildings overrun by vegetation, crops on every balcony, window ledge, and rooftop. Today the most common and, in terms of surface area, most important form of urban gardening is still the allotment garden, which in recent years has witnessed something of a revival. Though some authors, such as Caroline Foley in Of Cabbages and Kings,1 trace this form of small-scale agriculture back to medieval and early modern predecessors, allotments truly flourished in the industrializing cities of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This is exactly the period Micheline Nilsen, Associate Professor of Art History at Indiana University, covers in her book The Working Man’s Green Space: Allotment Gardens in England, France, and Germany, 1870–1919.

The first chapter defines what an allotment garden is and lists differences and commonalities in the three countries under investigation. The wealth of different names—statutory, temporary, and private allotments in England; Jardin ouvrier, Jardin industriel, or Jardin familial in France; Kleingarten, Schrebergarten, or Laubenkolonie in Germany—indicates different regional manifestations and origins. Nilsen is able to lump them together because they all share a common denominator: these gardens are ‘usually of small size, not attached to a dwelling, they are cultivated by their tenant and family for individual consumption’ (p. 2). Once this premise is established, the three subsequent chapters trace the development of allotments in the three countries by focusing largely on law and politics.

In England allotments were associated with access to landownership. The first allotments were established in the countryside as a reaction to the enclosure of common land. Enclosures deprived the rural population of the ‘waste’ lands that for centuries had con-

tributed to their subsistence. Following the Swing Riots in the 1830s allotments were seen as a means to counter social unrest. This idea became even more prominent following the gradual extension of male suffrage. Men who owned a patch of land, however small, were believed to hold a stake in the nation and therefore to be immune to socialism. According to Nilsen, ‘allotments had become a national political concern’ (p. 31) by the 1870s, an assessment borne out by the number of allotment acts passed during the following decades. By that time allotments were no longer a rural but an urban phenomenon.

German allotments were located outside cities from the start, especially in the densely populated industrial regions of Berlin and the Ruhr. The owners of large industrial companies founded allotments in order to placate their workforce. This may also have been a reason why the leaders of the SPD rejected allotments: sowing, weeding, and harvesting were seen as mere distractions from political engagement. At the same time, however, ‘the milieu of the Laubenkolonien and Kleingärten had a social democratic leaning’ (p. 84). But that was Germany. In France, where allotments became established even later, towards the end of the nineteenth century, the movement had strong conservative and Catholic leanings. Indeed, most of the first Jardins ouvriers were founded either by priests or by people closely affiliated with the Catholic Church.

In terms of numbers, allotments were clearly more important, or at least more numerous, in England than in the other two countries. Before the outbreak of the First World War, there were about half a million allotment plots in England but not even 40,000 in Germany and fewer than 18,000 in France. However, as Nilsen does not compare these developments directly, it is not entirely clear why this was the case. Explanations could include England’s earlier start, its higher degree of urbanization and industrialization, the existence of allotments in the countryside as well as around cities, or other factors.

As Nilsen is an art historian it comes as no surprise that she devotes an entire chapter to the aesthetics of allotment gardens, which she places in the context of an ‘aesthetics of the everyday’ (p. 128). Even though allotments were primarily utilitarian, the laying out of plots and the arrangement of flowerbeds, for instance, were aesthetic practices. It was here more than anywhere else that, according to Nilsen, members of the working classes were able to cultivate
thereir ‘own vernacular visual language’ (p. 147). This chapter is also
the one in which Nilsen gets closest to a social history or Alltags-
geschichte of allotments. However, this aspect remains largely under-
explored in Nilsen’s book and she seems to think so too. At any rate
she regrets the ‘scarcity of voices that relate the experience of being
an allotment holder’ (p. 129). We have to take her word for it, of
course, but it is hard to believe there are not more sources to shed
light on this.

Nilsen also makes surprisingly little use of the illustrations
included in her book. Particularly interesting are the photographs of
the allotment site Ost-Elbien in Berlin, which show bearded men and
austerely dressed women having coffee and playing cards. Clearly
being a member of an allotment association meant much more than
tending to the soil. At least in Berlin, allotments seem to have been an
integral part of working-class socializing. Yet how working class the
Kleingärtner were also remains an open question. Some of the pictures
suggest they were lower middle class rather than working class.

Another aspect that could have been covered in more detail is that
of transnational contacts and exchanges. The First International
Congress of the Jardins ouvriers met in Paris in 1903. In 1926 the Office
international des fédérations des jardins ouvriers, the International
Association of Workers’ Gardens, which still exists to this day, held
its first congress in Luxembourg. However, we learn little about how
and by whom these international encounters were organized, what
questions were discussed, and whether they facilitated cultural
exchanges.

Nilsen’s conclusion brings the story up to the present: as during
the First World War, the Second World War led to an increase in the
number of allotments in order to supplement the food supply. In the
age of affluence after the war, vegetables became so cheap that allot-
ments lost their original purpose. In the 1960s their image was poor
and some fell into disrepair or were turned into building sites. By the
mid 1970s, with an increase in leisure time, earlier retirement, rising
unemployment and vegetable prices, as well as greater environm en-
tal awareness, people looking for an allotment had to put their names
on a waiting list. In the meantime, the function of allotments had rad-
ically altered: ‘gardens and allotments became outdoor living spaces
rather than productive acreage’ (p. 158). And that is still the situation
today.
The Working Man’s Green Space gives a concise overview of the history of allotments in England, Germany, and France in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While rich on politics, organization, and discourse, the book is not the social history some readers may expect from the title. Nor is the comparison fully realized, as the book examines England, France, and Germany separately, leaving readers to search for similarities, differences, and overarching themes on their own. Whether allotments are a relic of a bygone age or a model for the sustainable city of the future remains to be seen. Given recent developments, however, this story seems far from over.
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This book challenges the standard narrative that Catholics were not integrated into the German Empire until the 1890s, or at least not earlier than the years following the Kulturkampf of the 1870s. Instead, Bennette argues, the groundwork for integration into the nation had already been laid with the foundation of the new Reich in 1871. Catholic integration happened not despite the Kulturkampf, but because of it and during it.

Though most scholars agree that Catholics developed their own, alternative version of a nation in the 1870s, little is known about exactly how they profiled it, and whether the status of being an ‘enemy of the Reich’ blocked or encouraged national loyalty. Thus after the publication of a few magisterial studies about the Kulturkampf in Europe,1 Bennette, Associate Professor at Middlebury College, goes back to details and provides a microscopic scrutiny of the years 1871 to 1878 in Germany. After some general remarks on ‘The German Question and Religion’ and the ‘German Epoch’ after 1866, the first part of the book dissects these eight years, dividing them into four phases and following them strictly chronologically.

The first phase covers the years 1871 to 1872. In ‘The Beginning of the German Epoch’, Bennette describes how unification in January 1871 was welcomed enthusiastically by Catholics, though some still regretted the exclusion of Catholic Austria in 1866. Aware of their status as a minority, they established a Catholic protection party and constructed a history of Germany that reached back to the Holy Roman Empire, which had lasted for about 1,000 years, for most of that time as a Catholic realm. Emperor Wilhelm I was seen in the tradition of Barbarossa, not that of any Prussian kings. In this context

the quotation in this book’s title was born: Julius Bachem, the Catholic politician and editor, in 1872 suffered from the liberals’ ‘un-German’ Kulturkampf politics. If this continued, the new nation would have no meaning, would be only an empty body without a soul. This soul was to be fought for by voting for the Centre Party, bringing the Catholics and true Christianity back in.

The second chapter, entitled ‘The Limits of Loyalty Tested’, describes the culminating years of the Kulturkampf (1873 to mid 1875), which marked the low point of Catholics’ confidence in their struggle for the soul of the fatherland. Classical images of Christian persecution in ancient times, or of Catholics being suppressed like the Irish, were revitalized. But they continued to claim their place in the nation.

In a third phase, from mid 1875 to 1877 (‘The Real Threat Emerges’), a solution to the unfortunate situation in the new nation was found in attacking another enemy in order to reach out to the Protestants as potential allies. Anti-Jewish propaganda increased enormously in 1875, but proved to be a failure. It was, according to Bennette, immediately followed by anti-socialism in 1876 (p. 54), which proved to be a ‘far more unifying rallying point for Catholics’ (p. 64) than the antisemitic experiment. The initially positive and inclusive nationalism of Catholics turned into a negative and exclusive nationalism (vocabulary that Bennette avoids).

While efforts to end the Kulturkampf began in late 1877 and 1878, the Centre Party, which is the focus of this chapter while others look at newspapers, started to cooperate with the government as recounted in ‘The Search for Continued Relevance’. Hostility towards socialism grew, but a constructive commitment to social questions was necessary in order to keep workers in the Centre Party.

The second and much longer part of the book systematically asks questions about four significant elements of Catholic national identity. Inspired by the ‘spatial turn’ approach, the first issue concerns Catholics mapping Germany. Located on the periphery of the Reich, Catholics tried to put themselves into its centre. Their newspapers talked about Berlin, a Prussian town, inhabited by Protestants if not ‘heathens’. The ‘soul’ of Germany was not apparent in the capital. In this unfriendly place, the Catholic newspaper Germania appeared in December 1870. This ultramontane daily, on which this chapter is based, frequently reported on Catholic regions such as Bavaria,
Baden, the Rhineland, and Silesia as truly German, perhaps as more German than Berlin. The areas appearing most German, the Rhineland and Westphalia, counted as essential parts of the nation. Regional and religious differences were presented as the soul of Germany. While the Catholic periphery observed the capital, Catholics in the capital integrated the Catholic periphery.

Gender, the second topic, is tackled in a fresh, new way. It is well known that Protestants defined hegemonic masculinity and ascribed femininity to Catholicism. The nation was masculine, while religion and Roman Catholicism were feminized. But did Catholics accept this notion? We might identify a Catholic re-masculinization campaign around 1900, but lack reliable information about the preceding decades and about how Catholics received the reproach of feminization. Bennette shows that Catholics did, indeed, give the nation a feminine outlook. Catholics criticized masculine militarism, and masculine nationalism, favouring a more feminine ideal. Germania, in contrast to Hermann of the Cherusci, represented feminine traits. The main Catholic journal was called *Germania*. The Virgin Mary was strong but female, and masses of women peacefully protesting against *Kulturkampf* sanctions offered passive resistance. The semantics of the violated (‘vergewaltigte’) Church confirms this image. Bennette concludes that Catholics identified with the feminine. Did this give rise to a feeling of exclusion from the masculine nation? On the contrary: Catholics deserved inclusion all the more to complete the male nation with its feminine counterpart (p. 120). Unfortunately, female voices are not consulted in this chapter.

The third issue is the classic one of the battle over schools and scholarship. Catholics rejected the liberal claim to education and *Bildung* before the 1890s, when discussions about inferiority and the

---


3 On this see already Ingo Löppenberg, ‘Wider Raubstaat, Großkapital und Pickelhaube’: *Die katholische Militarismuskritik und Militärpolitik des Zentrums 1860 bis 1914* (Frankfurt, 2009). Although almost half of Bennette’s well-informed book consists of footnotes, some titles, like this one, have been overlooked.
education deficit broke out. By the 1870s the question was already: what is ‘true’ education?

While the third chapter of this second part on schools and scholarship is one of the weaker chapters since it confirms earlier findings, the final chapter is most inspiring. Going back to the spatial turn, it evokes new perspectives of global history. Bennette surveys the Catholic moral geography of Europe and the world. Catholics realized that the creation of Germany changed the balance of power in Europe. If Germany was to be the strongest nation in Europe—not defeated and corrupt France; not capitalist Britain; not sick Austria; and not laughable Italy—it should, since Europe was the world’s leading continent, play the most powerful role in the world, a notion opening the field for later imperialism. German Christianity, Catholics argued, had a worldwide responsibility for humanity and other countries which were still pagan, or barbarian, like Russia. Only if Catholics were integrated, could Germany fulfil its global mission. Thus Catholics warned that the Kulturkampf was the wrong path, leading to national impotence. Again, signs of Catholic integration into colonial and imperialist ambitions occurred not only in the 1890s, but already in the 1870s.

Because of the conflict, the basis for Catholic integration into the nation was laid as early as in the Kulturkampf years, although this nation had a different profile from the hegemonic one. This final statement is substantially derived from the sources of the 1870s. Bennette convincingly argues that Catholics nourished a specific national ideal and aimed for integration into Germany. But their wish should not be seen to indicate that they were actually integrated. Bennette’s findings can also be read in the opposite direction. Catholic national rhetoric about true liberalism, true education, and true Christianity might suggest that they did not feel integrated. The Protestant majority and liberal politics went on excluding Catholics. The Protestant perspective and a comparison with Protestant national rhetoric are missing from Bennette’s book. While they might have felt they were Protestant Germans rather than German Protestants, their fellow countrymen were likely to say that they were, above all, German Catholics rather than Catholic Germans.

One crucial question remains: did Catholics have any other choice? Were they not bound to give assurances that they were not enemies of the Reich, but patriots? Can we trust the propaganda, ranging from
Julius Bachem to his son Karl Bachem, whose history of the Centre Party around 1930 repeatedly emphasized how German, how national Catholics really were?4 In addition to looking again at the signposts on the path of Catholic rhetoric about national loyalty, well known from the sources, it would have been challenging to identify the fine differences between Catholic and Protestant images, as Bennette successfully does in the chapter about gender.

Protestant Germans are known for having been antisemitic. Catholics shared a similar mentality. Bennette defines the outburst of Catholic antisemitism as only ‘temporally specific’ for the year 1875, neither recognizing its starting point around 1871, nor the waves of antisemitism around 1880 and 1893. To claim that there was an ‘absence of vitriol directed at Jews’ before 1875 and a lack of arguments holding Jews and Freemasons responsible for the Kulturkampf is rather strange in light of the evidence that can be found in the sources and literature. As early as 1872 Pius IX himself blamed Jews and Freemasons for the Kulturkampf. And in the same year, Bishop Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler saw ‘liberal Germanness’ as Jewishness: ‘The German folk now goes to the Jews in order to receive instruction about the essence of the German nature’ (deutsches Wesen).5 Statistical evidence suggests that the first wave of Catholic antisemitism lasted from 1871 to 1875.6 However, Bennette’s observation that the term ‘Judenfrage’ was more frequent in 1875 (p. 54), and her interpretation that antisemitism at this time reached the most important newspapers (p. 60), might be true. She certainly does not belong to the apologetic camp which, to the present day, downplays Catholic antisemitism as a marginal phenomenon, preferring to call it anti-Judaism. Instead, her interpretation allows Catholic antisemitism to fit into her scheme of early integration into the German nation. Bennette reduces the allegedly shortlived outburst of antisemitism in 1875 to ‘tactics to integrate in the Reich’ (p. 53), rather than the integration of the Catholic camp itself. The problem is that Bennette con-

5 Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Die Centrums-Fraction auf dem ersten Deutschen Reichstage (Mainz, 1872), 10.
centrates on only a few specific newspapers, such as the Berlin
*Germania*, and only on eight years of the *Kulturrampf*.

However, the question about the exact timing of antisemitism and its dimensions does not affect Bennette’s core argument about efforts for national integration as early as the *Kulturrampf* era. This book is therefore one of the most important works we have about the German *Kulturrampf* era and beyond. From now on historians are likely to be more careful in claiming that Catholic integration only began in the 1890s.
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Looking beyond national borders has become more and more common in research on German history after 1871, and not only since the publication in 2006 of the iconic study, *Das Kaiserreich transnational*. Stefan Manz locates his study in this new research context and analyses Imperial Germany’s transnational relations and entanglements. He takes a global view of the German-language diaspora and, in the process, innovatively links different world regions with each other and with Imperial Germany. He also convincingly combines a number of methods: social history arguments based on statistics feature equally with discourse analysis and case studies.

Manz defines Imperial Germany as a ‘transnational communicative space’ (p. 7) that, he argues, contributed to creating a Greater German Empire going beyond national borders. He calls this space ‘diaspora’, referring to the most recent research, which interprets the term relatively widely. Central aspects, which may appear individually or together, are, for example, the migrants’ idealized collective memory of the homeland that they have left, and an ethnic sense of belonging together along with a problematic relationship with the host country that is, nevertheless, seen as holding out the possibility of a good and tolerant life (see p. 9). For Manz, it is important to see diaspora as a process which is ‘made’ by the migrants. With reference to Rogers Brubaker, he sees diaspora, by analogy with nation-state-building, as a condition that is in a state of permanent flux, something always in the process of becoming (see p. 209).

The study is divided into six chapters. In the first chapter Manz sums up the social history factors leading to the German migrations of the nineteenth century, with a glance at preceding centuries and almost all the regions of the world. I shall look at three of these here. For Eastern Europe, Manz concludes that only in the nineteenth century did ‘nationalist historiography’ recognize different regional (for-
German-speaking groups, some of which had been settled since the Middle Ages, as Germans (but excluding the Jews). Ignoring the ‘multiethnic’ reality on the ground, it preferred to speak of linguistic enclaves (p. 22). In the USA, Manz shows, the National German American Alliance tried to bind emigrants more closely to their country of origin from 1901. In the research, this has been seen as a response to a loosening of ties between German-speaking migrants and Imperial Germany. By taking a global view reaching from eastern Europe to the west, Manz can show, however, that this interpretation is not adequate. Nationalist movements came into being in many places at the same time, and were by no means specific to the USA. As far as internal (west) European migrations are concerned, Manz emphasizes the high degree of fluctuation based on small distances and regional working conditions. He points to significant gaps in the research for Europe as well as for Asia.

In the second chapter Manz looks at the ideas about emigration and Germans abroad circulating within Imperial Germany. This takes him more deeply into his subject, as he explicitly examines the construction of a diaspora. He first defines ‘diaspora’ as a contemporary term which can only really be applied to Germany since the establishment of Imperial Germany. This does not, of course, imply that ‘diaspora’ was tied to ‘nation’, but in the case of Germany, we can only really speak of the active formation of a diaspora with the rise of the nation-state. Manz investigates Imperial Germany’s construction of a diaspora by looking at nationalist and popular publications such as the Gartenlaube, at associations such as the Alldeutsche Verband, and at legislation which granted German migrants the right to retain or regain German citizenship on ethnic criteria. According to Manz, life in Russia, Brazil, and South Africa was imagined as being rural and anti-modern, thus allowing true ‘Germaness’ to flourish. On the basis of various publications, Manz illustrates the practices of an Indeutschnahme which the diaspora designed as a test not only of a German nation, but of an ideal German nation (see e.g. pp. 65–6). The nationalistic publications and associations, along with the citizenship legislation allow Manz to conclude that the creation of a diaspora was a building-block of a ‘right-wing modernity’ (p. 88) that saw Germany in the first row of global actors.

Manz then turns to a systematic analysis of his rich and multi-layered material. Apart from a descriptive chapter on Russia and the
USA, he concentrates on three aspects that are central to nation-state formation: politics, religion, and language. Under the heading of ‘Politics’, Manz looks at the German navy and Germans abroad. Manz sees the Hauptverband der deutschen Flottenvereine im Ausland, which was supported by the Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft and must be distinguished from the Flottenverein, supported by industry, as the only ‘pressure group’ (p. 104) to have most of its members not in Germany but abroad. With the Hauptverband, Manz takes his readers abroad for the first time. Without wanting to reproduce the Eurocentric view of the time under investigation, he explains how the Hauptverband’s nationalist views were adopted in various different regions. In Europe, Manz explores the situation in Britain in detail, perhaps because of his own previous research, but also in response to the gaps in the research on German migration in western Europe that he highlights. The Hauptverband, like most of the German nationalist associations, was largely a middle-class affair and ideologically aligned with Imperial Germany, which sometimes brought it into conflict with its various host countries. In Asia and Australia, institutional encouragement of enthusiasm for the German navy was especially closely connected with the political situation. In colonized countries, such as Australia, for example, efforts were made not to provoke the colonial rulers. This form of restraint, Manz claims, was not practised in the Americas; in Central and South America, in particular, nationalist associations increased in number from 1880. In Brazil and Mexico, a strong loyalty to Imperial Germany was at least outwardly visible. Manz points out, however, that it would be wrong to look only at the nationalist associations. Many German migrants also displayed a great deal of pragmatism for the sake of a conflict-free daily life on the spot.

No naval associations were founded in the German colonies in Africa. In German South-West Africa (today’s Namibia), for example, German migrants generally retained a positive attitude towards Imperial Germany, but developed a ‘hybrid identity’ between the colony and the metropole. This brief section on Africa could have been somewhat longer, as the ‘ideology of dissimilation’ in the colonies, which were seen as part of Imperial Germany, is, ultimate-

2 Ulrike Lindner, Koloniale Begegnungen: Deutschland und Großbritannien als Imperialmächte in Afrika 1880–1914 (Frankfurt am Main, 2011), 312.
ly, difficult to compare with other diaspora phenomena. Overall, Manz comes to the conclusion that the highly popular German navy was deliberately used to drive an expansion of Imperial Germany to include its (former) members abroad. He points out that while the construction of a diaspora was not something entirely new at the end of the nineteenth century, national tendencies were globalized at this time. The Hauptverband and the naval associations were ‘one mosaic piece within this process’ (p. 123).

A chapter on the USA and Russia makes it clear that both countries differed from other places of migration. While there were German nationalist associations and publications in tsarist Russia, the country’s unequivocal demand for loyalty to the Tsar meant that Russia was not a suitable place for the creation of diasporas. And the USA was a special case in that German immigrants identified with the American model of success and progress, making them much more prepared to assimilate than, for example, in Brazil or the colonies, where there were much clearer movements to delineate the immigrants from the local population. Overall, Manz stresses the heterogeneity of the migrants to north America. But this should not be misunderstood as a lack of ‘diasporisation’ (p. 144), as the mass German patriotic reaction to the outbreak of the First World War shows.

In the next systematic chapter, Manz looks at the relationship between religion and the formation of diasporas. Religion here refers mainly to Christianity, and Protestantism in particular. Manz provides only a short digression on Catholics, as Catholic associations and other actors in Imperial Germany only accepted nationalist arguments and began to identify with *Volk* and nation at a late stage. And they referred to the Protestant discourse. Manz presents a triangle of Protestantism, nation-building, and diaspora, whereas previous research has only combined two out of the three factors. He shows impressively how the three aspects were linked and intertwined. For German migrants, he argues, the linking of Protestantism and nationalism or *Volkstum* was a welcome opportunity to bind the scattered community together again. Even secular actors allied themselves with Protestantism in order to disseminate nationalist ideas. In countries which did not foreground or permit the formation of a national diaspora, such as Russia, Manz suggests there was a shift towards religion. In such contexts, connections and solidarity were built mainly via religion.
Schools also contributed to the creation of a German diaspora and a Greater German Empire, as Manz shows in his last chapter, on language. The founding of associations and targeted selection and training of teachers allowed the transnationalization of schools to be institutionalized and centrally controlled. According to Manz, teachers were sent abroad with a dual task. First, they were to teach the children of German migrants and, from 1900, also some children from the local population, and tie them ideologically to Imperial Germany. And after their return to Germany, they were to apply the ‘German-ness’ they had practised and taught abroad to German national education. Given the centrally controlled selection and purpose of education, it is no surprise that most teachers were members of nationalist and conservative associations, and tended towards ‘political conformism’ (p. 239). Taking the example of schools, Manz can once again point to the conflict-enhancing character of diaspora formation. In many countries Germanocentric education was not popular and contributed to the ‘Germanophobic violence’ (p. 254) that erupted in many places from 1914.

In his study Manz takes a global view of attempts to create and maintain a German diaspora. Numerous associations as well as political and religious movements played a part in this. Manz also impressively demonstrates how processes of inclusion and exclusion worked within the diaspora. National movements, for example, sometimes gave women new scope for action, but they were often excluded from membership of associations. Jews were always excluded from the construction of a German diaspora for which the (Protestant) ‘male, educated middle-classes’ (p. 263) were responsible. Manz himself repeatedly concedes that the global view of the making of a diaspora cannot be exhaustive because, for example, it can only begin to perceive the movements for separation from Imperial Germany, and the efforts to conform to the host country.

At the centre of this study is a differentiated approach to the many regions to which (former) German citizens migrated. The pleasure of reading is somewhat diminished, however, by the detailed accounts of the various associations and their often rather small contributions to the formation of the diaspora which occasionally threaten to overwhelm the reader. And this reader would sometimes have preferred a pithy summary to the many, frequently long, quotations which present contemporary voices and point to the broad and often
impressive material basis of the work. Ultimately, however, this form of analysis and presentation leaves an inspiring impression, created by its differentiated approach, methodological diversity, and references to gaps in the research. Finally, it is to be hoped that Manz’s work, with its pioneering global approach, will stimulate further in-depth research on the creation of regional diasporas and similar transnational studies on migration.

Historians of South Asia are already familiar with the name of Kris Manjapra. His first monograph, published in 2010, was a short but innovative biography of the diasporic Indian revolutionary and founder of the Communist Party of India, Manabendra Nath Roy. As M. N. Roy had a truly ‘global biography’ and spent considerable time in Germany during the 1920s, the slim volume already foreshadowed two core themes of Manjapra’s work reviewed here. These commonalities aside, his second book is in an entirely different league both in style and thematic and temporal breadth. The author, who teaches at Tufts University in Boston, has this time steered clear of the obfuscating postcolonial jargon that at times made his first book hard to digest, giving us a fine example of historical scholarship and erudition in *Age of Entanglement*. The book is partly based on the author’s Ph.D. thesis, which was submitted to Harvard in 2007, and thus has been in the making for more than a decade. However, it is not only the meticulous collection and stringent analysis of a vast body of primary sources and literature that deserves praise. For one, Manjapra’s work derives part of its freshness and originality from the fact that he uses recent theoretical insights and perspectives stretching from the Franco-German champions of *histoire croisée* (or *Verflechtungs geschichte*) to more conventional intellectual history and (post-)Subalternist currents such as the reflections of Indian political scientist Partha Chatterjee (pp. 2 and 7). What also renders this study extraordinary is that it is based not only on material in European languages but also on a wide range of writings in Bangla. There are still not many contributors to the burgeoning field of transnational history who possess the linguistic skills required truly to transcend a Eurocentric (or often merely Anglocentric) perspective by giving equal weight to writings in non-western idioms.

The main argument put forward in the 450-odd pages of the book is aptly summarized by the author in the first paragraph: German and Indian intellectuals, Manjapra maintains, collaborated intensely, seeking ‘to destroy the nineteenth-century world order organized by British power’. According to him, this boundary-crossing coopera-
tion had older roots but gained considerable momentum in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. The 1880s ushered in about a half-century of intense Indo-German cultural interaction that was stimulated by three simultaneous developments: first, the challenge to British Raj in India by different varieties of indigenous nationalism; secondly the German challenge to British hegemony in Europe; and, finally, the slow decline of the British Empire (along with the Enlightenment rationality and universalism that it embodied) for internal reasons. Manjapra is primarily interested in intellectual and academic cooperation between Indians and Germans, in the role of the arts and sciences (sometimes cast in Foucauldian vein as ‘counterciences’, pp. 9–10) in the struggle to fill the vacuum left by the evaporating imperial world order. Far from limiting his study to intellectual history in the narrow sense, he promises to link the scholarly and artistic endeavours under scrutiny to the respective political projects of Indian and German nationalism, thus injecting ‘a necessary dose of realpolitik to the transnational intellectual history’ (p. 6). Perfectly understandable in terms of the necessary linguistic and regional expertise but nonetheless problematic are the asymmetries in the units of analysis. Instead of the promised focus on ‘Indians’ and ‘Germans’, Manjapra actually deals with a broad constituency of German-speaking intellectuals from all over Europe (including Switzerland, Hungary, and so on) on the one hand, and a relatively small circle of almost exclusively Bengali thinkers on the other.

The study is divided into two somewhat disproportional parts. The four chapters of Part I, entitled ‘Stages of Entanglement’, explore the broader historical developments of Indo-German connections during the entire period under review (that is, between 1815 and 1945), while six of the seven chapters in the second part provide an in-depth analysis of various ‘Fields of Encounter’. The last chapter in this section offers a rather sketchy survey of post-Second World War developments. Finally, instead of ending the book with an exhaustive conclusion, Manjapra wraps up his main points in a crisp ‘Epilogue’ (pp. 288–92).

Part I is composed in contrapuntal fashion, juxtaposing two chapters on German engagements with India and two chapters on Indian perspectives on (or activities in) Germany. As Manjapra argues in chapter 1, during the first six decades after 1815 the bulk of German scientists and intellectuals identified with the British imperial en-
deavour. Quite a few of these individuals used posts in British India or the armchair exploration of Indian material as a sort of ersatz imperialism, allowing them to follow ‘the British on the high seas to world significance’ (p. 19). Besides the well-known German contributions to Oriental scholarship, the author also covers less familiar ground in this section. Among other things, he elucidates German involvement in colonial forestry, botany, and geography on the subcontinent (pp. 29–32) and assesses the indirect influence of the German education system and cooperative banking methods on India, both of which were admired and copied by British imperial administrators (pp. 33–6). A comprehensive analysis of popular varieties of the German intellectual fascination with India—ranging from towering figures such as Arthur Schopenhauer (pp. 62–3), to forgotten bestselling authors such as Karl Bleibtreu (p. 57) and right-wing academic Indologists (pp. 80–5)—is provided in the fourth chapter. Original as Manjapra’s discussion is, especially when it comes to the lesser known figures (the ‘foot-soldiers of German Orientalism’, so to speak), his argument would be more convincing if he had added a brief glimpse of the situation in the rest of Europe. It is far from clear whether cultural Indomania and professional engagements in the Raj by ‘mercenaries of science’ were, indeed, part of a peculiar German Sonderweg (as implied by the author), or merely the specific expressions of much broader European trends.

Chapters 3 and 5 offer a contrast to the German perspective by zooming in on the discovery of Germany by Indian nationalists. While the third chapter scrutinizes the Germanic fantasies and ascriptions of early swadeshi nationalism (1905–14), Manjapra draws on materials from his earlier book when he looks at the actual Indian presence on the spot in Germany in chapter 5. Most of the Indian exiles in Germany were students, and Berlin in particular hosted a significant sub-continental diaspora during the inter-war period. Manjapra’s conclusion that the knowledge and intellectual stimuli these expats received at German universities and in exchanges with Weimar’s public intellectuals and political activists, who offered ‘a new kind of soft power for Indian nationalists to undermine the British imperial world view’ (p. 89), seems reasonable. Yet here, too, it would have been illuminating to read more about other sources of such ‘soft power’, such as France or Meiji Japan. This gap is especially noticeable in discussions of the important ‘Greater India’ trope, an
ideology that was worked out by Bengali intellectuals in the 1920s in order to boost national pride by constructing a historical legacy of India. Here Manjapra seems to somewhat unduly exaggerate the influence of German partners in dialogue, whereas important French inspirations are only mentioned in passing (p. 101) and influential studies exploring Indian nationalism’s French connection (such as the ground-breaking work of Susan Bayly and Roland Lardinois) are not cited at all.

The chronological coverage of the various stages of Indo-German entanglements serves only as an *amuse-gueule* before Manjapra embarks on his chief project of shedding light on the epistemic resources and channels of communication structuring the protracted encounter between German and Indian intellectuals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He singles out half a dozen fields as particularly relevant for the transnational dialogue of scientists and artists and their impact on the respective national(ist) agendas. Chapter 5 examines the role of academic physics in linked (though in many ways contradictory) projects of building up national pride in India and Germany. Physics, Manjapra persuasively argues, was not only a booming and prestigious science in the first half of the twentieth century, rapidly acquiring an epistemic authority to make claims ‘about the structure of the matter and its practical applications for industry and strategy’ (p. 142), it also happened to be dominated by German scientists and institutions such as the renowned Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin Dahlem. While Indian physicists such as Meghnad Saha and C. V. Raman could thus make use of their German connections to break free from the spell of imperial epistemic hegemony, Weimar Germany instrumentalized the global attraction of its scientific elite institutions to ‘assert itself as a geopolitical World center’ (p. 128) despite the humiliation of defeat in the Great War and the sanctions subsequently imposed by the League of Nations.

Similarly ground-breaking is chapter 6, which grapples with the convergence of Indian (or rather Bengali) concepts of global economy. Following the interactions of illustrious theorists such as Benoy Kumar Sarkar on the Indian side and Bernhard Harms, director of the Institute of Sea Transport and Global Economics in Hamburg on the German, Manjapra highlights the emancipatory role of German science for Indian national(ist) economists. Another odd Indo-German couple presented here for the first time consists of the Indian
economist (and later president of India) Zakir Husain and his German Doktorvater (Ph.D. supervisor) Werner Sombart from Berlin University, whose latent anti-Semitism converged with equally strong overtones of anti-Anglo-Saxonism and anti-imperialism (p. 165) to render his theories attractive for Indian nationalists. Chapter 7 deals with a different kind of ideological support. It examines the political ammunition that was provided by the various currents of ‘Marxist Universalism’. Manjapra once again unearths fascinating material and relates hitherto unfamiliar stories, such as those associated with the transnational career of the trade union activist Franz Josef Furtwängler, who became an influential popularizer of Gandhi in Germany in the late 1920s and early 1930s (pp. 184–8). Yet this is one the weaker parts of Manjapra’s book. For one thing, one wonders if an Indo-German histoire croisée perspective is really the best lens through which to analyse Marxist entanglements in South Asia. This reviewer feels that a somewhat wider angle—Manjapra himself occasionally uses the concept ‘central European’ which, however, is never further explored—would have generated deeper insights. The second point of criticism relates to the concept of ‘red Orientalism’ as used by the author. As presented in this chapter, relations between Indian revolutionaries and the Communist International seem rather harmonious. There is hardly any contextualization within the Stalinist project of tightening Soviet rule in Central Asia, and no mention of the prejudices and politics of racist exclusion that many Asian communists suffered in Moscow, ‘the acropolis of the communist world’ (p. 180), as well as in other centres of the movement.

In chapters 8 and 9 Manjapra is back on the terra firma of the history of science, analysing the Indo-German exchanges in political geography (or ‘geo-politics’) and psychoanalysis respectively. While much has been written on the relationship between Sigmund Freud and his Indian disciple Girindrasekhar Bose, who are the focus of chapter 9, the core argument that psychoanalysis was not a quasi-imperial export from Europe to the wider world but ‘was rather co-constituted by a worldwide group of scholars’ (p. 211) is as bold as it seems plausible. The interactions between scholars such as the German geographer Karl Haushofer (of Lebensraum fame) and the Bengali economist and polymath Benoy Kumar Sarkar, both of whom posited new geo-cultural wholes challenging the imperial world order, are described and brilliantly analysed in chapter 8. They are less well
known than the exchanges between Indians and German-speaking adepts of psychoanalysis and provide a particularly pertinent illustration of the core arguments put forward in *Age of Entanglement*.

In Chapter 10 Manjapra quits the history of science and takes his readers on a *tour de force* through the ‘worlds of artistic expression’ in interwar India and Weimar Germany. In the first section, he reconstructs the border-crossing activities of expressionist painter Stella Kramrisch from Vienna, who became involved with the Tagore circle. She spent more than two decades in India and served as an important go-between for Indian and German painters and art lovers. The subsequent section is also devoted to cultural brokerage, the focus being Bavarian film director Franz Osten, who worked in Bombay for several years in the 1920s and 1930s and produced Indian-themed box office hits in Germany and afforded vital stimuli for the artistic development of emerging Bollywood cinema.

The short eleventh chapter on the alleged decline of Indo-German entanglements after the Second World War is the only disappointment in what is otherwise an excellent book. An attempt to cover the cultural and economic activities of two German states in independent India over four decades is necessarily bound to resort to oversimplifications. Given the box office success of Fritz Lang’s *Tiger von Eschnapur* remakes in the late 1950s, the India craze of the hippy generation in West Germany in the 1960s and 1970s, and the continuing literary engagements with India of leading intellectuals such as Günther Grass, Hubert Fichte, and Peter Sloterdijk, it is hard to be convinced by Manjapra’s hypothesis that ‘popular Orientalism had died in West Germany and Americanism took its place’ (p. 282).

It must be reiterated that, in spite of the few weaknesses indicated above, *Age of Entanglement* is a landmark publication. It demonstrates both how much can be gained by ‘de-centring’ familiar histories and adopting new perspectives, and that the writing of a sophisticated and ambitious piece of transcultural intellectual history in the *longue durée* does not necessarily imply superficiality, but can be combined with sound empirical grounding and a stupendous density of documentation. There is no doubt that Kris Manjapra has written a book to be cherished. It is only to be hoped that the many stimuli provided by his outstandingly comprehensive study will generate further research in the subfields it covers by historians of Germany and other German-speaking countries and regions, as well as by historians of South Asia.
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As the Nazi Party consolidated its grip on power, many of the new regime’s political opponents were forced to flee Germany to escape the terror. Some of those refugees headed to Britain, a number that was to grow over the course of the 1930s. In Britain, however, many of the refugees attracted the attention of the Security Service (more commonly known as MI5) as their politics and activities were deemed to pose a potential threat to national security. Hitherto this aspect of the Security Service’s work has largely escaped the attention of intelligence historians. Armed with the MI5 ‘Personal Files’ on the refugees now available at the National Archives, *A Matter of Intelligence: MI5 and the Surveillance of Anti-Nazi Refugees, 1933–50* aims to correct this omission. In so doing, the book offers a fascinating insight into the attitudes and actions of MI5, and, indeed, the wider British government, towards the political refugees. As an intelligence history, however, *A Matter of Intelligence* is more problematic.

The book is divided into three chronological sections. Part I covers the period from the Nazi seizure of power in 1933 to the outbreak of war in 1939. It starts by considering how anti-communism came to be the Security Service’s central focus in the 1920s, and how this continued to be an important strand of its worldview. It is also argued that as the flow of German and Austrian refugees began to arrive in Britain in the 1930s, MI5’s definition of what a communist was included many groups who were not, but rather were simply anti-Nazi. There certainly were communists among the political refugees, though, and many of the most important, worthy of MI5 files, are introduced.

Part II goes on to develop this further. The coverage and analysis of the refugee groups that sprang up in this period is compelling. The German, Austrian, and Czech refugee groups are analysed in turn. The complexity of refugee politics is made apparent, as different factions competed to control the cultural and political organizations of each national group. In addition, the Security Service’s overwhelming suspicion of these groups, believed to be ‘communist fronts’, and the individuals who ran them is demonstrated. In most cases, MI5’s desir-
ed solution was internment. It appears that in most cases MI5 failed to get its way. The exception, of course, was during the short period of general internment of ‘enemy aliens’ at the height of the invasion scare of 1940. Otherwise MI5 was forced to monitor the individuals they suspected, while lobbying other departments, principally the Home Office, for them to be interned or refused employment in sensitive posts. Here, too, the techniques available to the Security Service are analysed. Of these, the use of informers from within the refugee groups is of considerable importance. The authors demonstrate how this was done, and point to the general low quality of the information obtained. Moreover, the contrast between the informants being described as ‘reliable sources’ by MI5 officers, while simultaneously being monitored by these same officers, is highlighted. Also suspect, in the Security Service’s eyes, were the British supporters of the refugees.

Part III moves on to consider the political refugees, the Security Service, and the early Cold War. Even after the Soviet entry into the war on the Allied side, MI5 continued to monitor and warn others of the activities of the refugees. Clearly the Security Service was right to be worried as there were Soviet spies among the refugees. These spies were also to be found among the foreign scientists who had settled in Britain in the 1930s. Two case studies, of Klaus Fuchs and Engelbert Broda, both examples of ‘atom spies’, are set out. Neither of these cases shows the Security Service in a particularly good light. Fuchs, who volunteered his services to the Soviets in 1941, was only caught as a result of VENONA, the decryption of Soviet signals. Broda was never caught and was only identified after his death.

Taken together these chapters are interesting and engaging. They do, however, flirt with the conspiracy theories surrounding Roger Hollis. Hollis in this period was head of F Division of MI5, responsible for tackling subversive activities. He would later spend nine years as Director-General of the Security Service. It has also been alleged that he was a Soviet spy. In the conclusion to the book the authors state that they have chosen not to reopen the questions surrounding Hollis as the case remains unproven and there is no new evidence. Yet, from the construction placed on Hollis’s role and MI5’s failures, it appears the authors believe there is a case to answer. This is compounded by the total reliance on the works of the two main protagonists (Peter Wright and Chapman Pincher) in the anti-Hollis crusade.
There is a much wider literature on the Soviet spies and on Hollis than this.

More problematic than the flirtation with conspiracy are some of the general conclusions that are offered by the authors and the failure to properly contextualize the work in relation to the intelligence literature. First is the conclusion that MI5 focused too much attention on communist refugees in the run up to and during a war against fascism. This was a consequence of the Security Service’s long tradition of anti-communism. MI5 ‘was unable to suspend this judgement, let alone the surveillance, during the years when the Soviet Union was an ally’ (p. 232). This begs the question, however, of why MI5 should suspend its judgement? The alliance with the USSR was an alliance of convenience. The threat of Soviet espionage did not disappear during the war. On the contrary, it expanded as those groomed during the 1930s, for example, the Cambridge Five, took their place at the heart of the country’s security apparatus—and sent everything they could to Moscow.

In addition, it is argued that the Security Service watched ‘the wrong Germans for the wrong reasons’ (p. 233). Behind this was the highly reductive political reasoning of MI5 and its tendency to see the world through a binary, friend or foe, perspective. More seriously, there was the failure to distinguish between those who posed a genuine threat and those who did not. In the book it is explained that MI5 did distinguish between communist leaders and the rank and file (p. 108), so there was some element of discernment. Moreover, many of the individuals discussed in the text deserved all the attention MI5 gave them. Jürgen Kuczynski, Ursula Beurton, Edith Tudor-Hart, Margaret Mynatt, and Engelbert Broda were all spies, and MI5 made it clear that they were suspected as such. The failure was MI5’s inability to find the positive proof and government departments not accepting their warnings.

Finally, there is the lack of contextualization. The reasons put forward by the authors for the dearth of previous interest in this topic will make intelligence historians bristle. First it is suggested that intelligence historians have been unable to differentiate the surveillance of enemy alien political refugees before and during the war from surveillance of communists during the Cold War. Alternatively, intelligence historians are so invested in the ‘good war’ narrative surrounding MI5 that they have excluded this topic because it does not
fit with that narrative (the intelligence historian as propagandist). Or, finally, it is suggested that intelligence historians have been distracted by the Cambridge Five (p. 233). There is, though, an alternative explanation, and that is that intelligence historians have concentrated on the capture of German agents, double cross, ISOS (the breaking of the German secret service cyphers), deception, and interrogation, because they were more important to winning the war. British intelligence was not so distracted by the refugees as this account appears to argue. MI5 did not spend considerable resources on the communists as is suggested here, and F Division played a relatively marginal role in wartime. While clearly of central importance to the refugees, especially those who suffered the injustice of internment, all the other aspects of MI5’s work have received more scholarly interest because it was more important to winning the war against Germany. That was the focus of MI5 in this period.\(^1\) It is in that context that this book needs to be placed.

\(\text{A Matter of Intelligence}\) is a valuable addition to the literature on the Security Service and the political refugees it watched. It reveals new insights into the lives of the refugees and how they were perceived by the authorities. It is a neglected area and one that is ably filled by this book. Yet the book is not without its problems, not least that the general conclusions drawn do not seem to be totally supported by the evidence presented, and by the fact it fails to place this aspect of MI5’s work into its wider context.
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The forced migrations of ethnic Germans from eastern, central, and south-eastern Europe during and after the Second World War have been the subject of numerous publications: academic studies, polemical accounts, and personal recollections. The opening of relevant document holdings in eastern European archives after 1989/90 inspired new research projects on these resettlements. Human rights discourses, the experience of the war in the Balkans with its massive refugee impact, and international cooperation were further factors that encouraged the study of coerced migrations and what became, in 1992, ‘ethnic cleansing’ in the new, internationally standardized terminology. Case studies of geographical entities, of specific ethnic groups, and comparative analyses have added to our knowledge of this tragic period of European history. As for the ‘flight and expulsion’ of the Germans from eastern Europe, are there still any unknown aspects left for further research at all? The historical context, the early history, and the decision of the Great Powers to remove Germans from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia seem to have been thoroughly investigated in the past.

There is much more need for detailed case studies, and Hugo Service’s book contributes to a better understanding of what happened in postwar Poland, or, to be more precise, in the former eastern German provinces of Upper and Lower Silesia, after 1945. Many recent German studies have focused on collective memory and the political use and misuse of the psychological consequences of ‘flight and expulsion’ in the West German political debate up to 1989, and in reunited Germany after 1990. Nevertheless, with the exception of the perspective of the expellees themselves, which has been part of a specific, highly politicized, and emotional discourse since the early 1950s, we still know very little about how the expulsions were actually carried out. What exactly happened to those Germans who remained in the eastern territories under Polish rule?

Service has chosen a comparative approach, examining how the new local and regional authorities of the two districts of Hirschberg/ Jelenia Góra (Lower Silesia) and Oppeln/Opole (Upper Silesia) dealt
with their ethnic German residents once Silesia had become Polish. In order to contextualize these demographic and ethnic processes, Hugo Service begins with an overview of wartime events in eastern Europe from 1939 to 1944, the Nazi German and Soviet occupation of Poland, and the terror which both dictatorships directed against civilians. In chapter 2 he explains the changes that took place in Poland after the Second World War: the country’s territorial shift towards the west, and the introduction of the communist regime and its ideological and organizational background. In the next chapter the author outlines the final stages of the Second World War in the Oppeln and the Hirschberg districts—the end of the hostilities, the coming of the Soviet troops, and the establishment of peace in central Europe. Service rightly points to the role of ‘chaos and lawlessness’ in the immediate postwar period. The lack of secure structures in a Polish state reborn after six years of occupation is a factor often forgotten in studies on the expulsion of the Germans from Poland. It seems impossible, however, to explain the causalities of this mass exodus without commenting on the specific circumstances that prevailed after the end of the country’s German and Soviet occupations. This issue is not addressed in Service’s book.

Thanks to an influx of refugees from neighbouring Czechoslovakia, the Hirschberg district experienced population growth of about one-fifth in the immediate postwar period. Its local population was almost entirely of ethnic German origin. The Oppeln district was characterized by a ‘typical’ Upper Silesian population structure: a large number of its inhabitants were bilingual, and even though they had been German citizens, the ethnic identity of many was fluid or unclear. The new Polish authorities categorized this group as ‘autochthonous Slavic’. This hypothetical classification helped to support the government’s idea of the ‘recovered territories’—old ‘Piast’ areas which had now ‘returned’ to the Polish motherland. Inhabitants from the Opole district had to undergo a ‘verification’ procedure to prove their ‘Polish’ character. Memberships in Polish associations, any activities in favour of Poland, or simply being Catholic could contribute to the granting of continued residence in the area. This explains why a large part of Upper Silesia’s inhabitants were allowed to remain in their homeland and were not driven out, in contrast to what almost the entire German population of the Hirschberg district experienced.
Service describes the latter case step by step. The ethnic cleansing in Lower Silesia started with a phase of ‘disorganized expulsion’ in spring 1945, an expression that seems much less emotional than the term ‘wilde Vertreibung’ (‘wild expulsion’), widely used in German scholarship. Service also mentions voluntary migrations, but focuses especially on the ‘mass transportation’ following the Potsdam Agreement. A small number of German labourers had to remain in some specific economic areas; the last transports took place as late as October 1947. The course of the expulsions from the Hirschberg district, according to Service, reflects the different stages in how the German population was perceived by the Polish authorities in the years after 1945. At the beginning, they were in a hurry to get rid of the Germans, but over time they began to appreciate their specialized knowledge of the region and of certain industrial branches. For this reason they tried to keep them as experts for a certain time.

The social and cultural processes of integrating the German refugees into East and West Germany have been studied by many researchers. How did the parallel processes of integrating Poles take place in Upper and Lower Silesia after 1945? Hugo Service offers a few answers based on an examination of language and identity policies, repression on the political side, attitudes towards names, and relations between indigenous Poles and newcomers from other parts of Poland. He examines how German cultural traces were partly destroyed, as was the case for many remnants of the Protestant faith, which had been especially strong in Lower Silesia. The Roman Catholic Church, traditionally very important, participated in many ways in this cultural ‘re-Polonization’ of the whole region. The author’s remarks on ‘belonging and not belonging’, and inclusion and exclusion provide particularly interesting insights into the cultural dimensions of forced migration. He also describes the process of social integration through economic aspects as the repartition of the ground. Polish settlers from central Poland, Polish expellees from the former Polish territories east of the river Bug, and Poles returning from western and southern European countries (France, Belgium, Yugoslavia, and so on) had to find a new home in Silesia. One of the interesting details Service unearths is the fact that some of the newcomers in Upper Silesia adopted elements of German vocabulary and assimilated in a manner opposite to what the regime had hoped for.
Chapter 8 deals with the role of Silesia as a waiting room for Jewish displaced persons liberated from the concentration camps. Lower Silesia had truly become a centre for Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, developing a strong social, cultural, and religious life. Most Jews later emigrated to other countries because of a strong anti-Semitic campaign by the communist leaders, which revived long-lived stereotypes among many Polish citizens. In addition to Germans and Jews, the author also considers the fate of other groups, such as foreign DPs, former forced labourers, and former concentration camp prisoners. He also discusses another group which, in this context, might have merited more attention, as it directly affected Lower Silesia: the Akcja Wisła, ethnic Ukrainians and Lemkos from south-eastern Poland who were forced to resettled in the former German-inhabited areas of the new Polish western and northern territories. This measure undermined the plan for an ethnically homogeneous Silesia.

Service’s book provides a good synthesis of the complex ethnic processes in Upper and Lower Silesia after 1945. His study is particularly strong where he presents the results of his own archival research. The structure of the book is reader friendly, even for those who are not specialists in German-Polish postwar history. Nevertheless, the book also has some weak elements. While the author consulted various holdings preserved in the State Archives of Jelenia Góra, Opole, and Wrocław as well as those of the Lastenausgleichsarchiv in Bayreuth (Germany), a dependency of the German Federal Archives that holds documents generated by German refugees and expellees after their arrival in West Germany, one wonders why he disregarded the abundant collections of the Institute of National Memory (Instytut Pamięci Narodowej) for the Polish perspective, or the material generated by the central level of the Polish executive after 1945, for instance, the Ministry of the Recovered Territories (Ministerstwo Ziem Odzyskanych) held at the Archive of New Acts (Archiwum Akt Nowych) in Warsaw. New Polish studies on postwar phenomena in the former German eastern territories underline the significance of their fundamental holdings.1 The high degree of state

---

1 See e.g. Grzegorz Hryciuk, Małgorzata Ruchniewicz, Bożena Szaynok, and Andrzej Żbikowski, Wysiedlenia, wypędzenia i ucieczki 1939–1959: Atlas ziem Polski. Polacy – Żydzi – Niemcy – Ukraińcy (Warsaw, 2008); Beata Halicka,
centralization means that Warsaw’s archives contain a mass of material crucial for the understanding of local and regional political and administrative levels in the years after the end of the Second World War. The reviewer also notes the selective use of literature. Some prominent Polish scholars who have published important studies on the ‘weryfikacja‘ politics and on general postwar history in Silesia are missing from the bibliography, for instance, Ryszard Kaczmarek and Paweł Kacprzak. Overall, however, these critical remarks do not diminish the value of Hugo Service’s book for academic and non-academic readers alike.


In 1963, a ‘weed alarm’ rang on the western side of the border between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. After the leaders of the Socialist Unity Party had sealed the border and triggered collectivization in 1952, fields along the 1,000-mile-long frontier had increasingly been neglected. East German guards sprayed the area with strong herbicides. On the other side, West German borderland farmers and local authorities demanded compensation from regional and central agencies in the FRG. Yet the government in Bonn was anxious to avoid recognizing the GDR and thereby accepting the division of Germany. The Federal Republic’s leading politicians had therefore already rejected frontier farmers’ demands for financial compensation for land that they owned in the east. The rigidity of East German border regulation and the final collectivization drive in 1959–60 meant that a broad strip along the border turned into a ‘no man’s land’. The Federal Republic’s central government authorities, for their part, gradually lost interest in the border region. The economic boom of the 1960s finally induced the young and qualified inhabitants of the borderlands to leave the rural peripheries, both in the GDR and in the FRG.

In five chapters, Sagi Schaefer sheds light on the negotiations between the various actors, their interests and aims, arrangements and compromises regarding the inter-German border. From 1948 to 1952, temporary demarcation lines were solidified (ch. 1). In 1952–3, the beginning of collectivization sharpened conflicts about land use and property ownership along the border (ch. 2). Highlighting the role of frontier farmers, this chapter links research on the formation of borders and boundaries to the history of rural society. Changing the perspective, Schaefer argues that the western (especially West German) policy of non-recognition also shattered cross-border exchange, interactions and networks (ch. 3). In the GDR, the enforced collectivization destroyed private landownership and eastern frontier farmers’ attachment to the land in the latter half of the 1950s and in the 1960s (ch. 4). The impact of West German Ostpolitik on the inter-German border was more ambivalent (ch. 5). While de facto recogni-
tion of the GDR deepened the division between the two German states, détente led to a rapprochement between the FRG and the GDR and their border residents, facilitating travel, especially Grenznahverkehr. The Basic Treaty also created the inter-German Border Committee that regulated the border and paved the way towards a more precise demarcation that was completed as late as 1978. All in all, new channels of communication and exchange emerged, giving rise to regional coordination after the border’s collapse in November and December 1989.

As a history of border formation from the perspective of the actors, Schaefer’s book looks at public interest in the experience of separation in places such as Mödlareuth (situated partly in Thuringia and partly in Bavaria). The postwar history of this divided village has been presented in a local museum since the 1990s, and it was the subject of the German TV series Tannbach in early 2015. Schaefer’s study concentrates on the Eichsfeld region in central Germany, a Catholic enclave in a territory that has been dominated by the Protestant faith since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Catholicism laid the ground for kinship relations and networks that persisted even after Eichsfeld was split between Prussia and Hanover at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. This borderline eventually divided the Soviet, British, and American occupation zones in 1945, and became the inter-German border in the 1950s.

Rather like Edith Sheffer’s pioneering study of the transformation of the border between the Federal Republic and the GDR,¹ Schaefer conceives of the frontier between the two German states as ‘a set of interactive processes of political, spatial, and social division’ (p. 17). Taking up the constructivist turn in border studies,² Schaefer’s excellent book reconstructs the transformation of relations between East and West Germans on both sides of the border. Equally important, the interactions between frontier residents and central and regional

state agencies receive strong attention. Local inhabitants shaped life in the peripheral regions and ascribed meanings to the border, but state agencies imposed considerable constraints on them. Nevertheless, border residents were able to harness central policies for their own ends. In their attempts to receive compensation for the fields that they had lost in the east, for instance, West German frontier farmers appealed to the government in Bonn as victims of ‘Soviet aggression’. Yet the aims and interests of central state authorities and the regional districts differed, both in the FRG and the GDR. Whereas the former were concerned with official relations between the two German states, the latter sought to settle land conflicts and stabilize the local economy, thereby halting the flight from agriculture and the borderlands.

As Schaefer demonstrates, the inter-German border was constructed ‘from below’ as much as ‘from above’. The specific appropriations of central directives by border residents and district local authorities, in particular, show the scope and limits of agency on the border. Although he takes political restrictions into account, Schaefer occasionally tends to underestimate and diminish their impact on border residents, especially on the eastern side. In his account of the final phase of the collectivization of agriculture in 1959–60, for example, the author emphasizes that members of the new Type I collectives managed to preserve some autonomy, as livestock and machinery remained privately owned. Yet they had to share fieldwork in the collectives and were not simply ‘able to protect and maintain their self-perception as independent farmers rather than workers of a state-owned farm’ (p. 136).

In similar vein, Schaefer’s assertion that the ‘balance of power between state and non-state groups and individuals was not clearly tilted in the state’s direction’ (p. 137) in the process of collectivization underrates the constraints imposed on East German farmers. In the divided country, moreover, frontier residents were hardly ‘guardians of national values’ (p. 151). Although he highlights the differences between the GDR and the FRG, Schaefer overrates the similarities between agricultural modernization in the two German states. As he rightly observes, the implementation of reforms like the Land Consolidation Act (Flurbereinigungsgesetz) depended on ‘landowners’ willingness to embrace it’ (p. 148) in West Germany—in stark contrast to collectivization in the GDR. Not least, the author’s interpretation
that the East Germans were mere ‘objects’ and ‘excluded from most decisions about their own future in 1989–90’ (p. 202) ignores the free elections of 18 March 1990 and the ensuing policies of Lothar de Maizières government. Schaefer is surely right, however, in stressing the basic asymmetry of power in the process of unification.

These reservations notwithstanding, Sagi Schaefer’s book is a major contribution to historical scholarship. Going far beyond the history of the inter-German border, it explains the role of specific actors and institutions in the dynamics of the division of Germany from the 1950s to the 1970s. The protracted process of separation confronted borderland residents with problems and challenges that they tried to tackle by cross-border cooperation, a wide range of interactions, or even Cold War rhetoric. The border between the two German states was not only imposed ‘from above’ by central authorities, but its construction was embedded in concrete everyday social interchange. It relied on mobilization as much as on coercion. Schaefer also analyses the strategies used by border residents to circumvent and penetrate the border, though less extensively. Yet it still needs to be investigated whether and to what extent cross-border interaction in the 1970s and 1980s, especially through Grenznahverkehr, eventually facilitated the regional cooperation that emerged from the collapse of the border in 1989. In any case, Sagi Schaefer has convincingly demonstrated that borders are constructed and superseded by human actions, even under restrictive conditions.

Volker R. Berghahn’s new book examines the ‘special relationships’ between the United States and both Britain and Germany in the twentieth century by studying business relations between the three countries. It is no surprise that the relationship between the USA and Britain is called ‘special’ — time and again, politicians from both sides of the Atlantic have emphasized the particularity of the Anglo-American relationship, especially during the two world wars. To speak of a German–American ‘special relationship’, on the other hand, might seem more unusual. By drawing on the statements and speeches of American politicians, businessmen, and journalists, however, Berghahn can show that many American businessmen regarded the German economy as much more dynamic and efficient than the British. According to Berghahn, American enterprises largely conducted business with Britain only during the First World War and then after 1933. After 1918 and again after 1945, German–American business relations were pursued seamlessly, regardless of the deep estrangement during the wartime years, whereas American entrepreneurs’ interest in doing business with their British counterparts abated as soon as the German market was accessible again. Berghahn concludes that the ‘shifts in the balance of German–American “special relations” ran countercyclically to the shifts in Anglo-American business relations’ (p. 10). He therefore regards the American–British–German triangle as an interconnected whole, and not as two separate bilateral relations.

Looking at such transatlantic interconnections between 1900 and 1957 (the book’s title is misleading as the study covers only the first half of the twentieth century), Berghahn concludes that, all in all, the economic relationship between the USA and Germany was a much more remarkable ‘special relationship’ than the Anglo-American one. The backlash from the two world wars notwithstanding, trade and foreign investment between Germany and the USA continued to grow, whereas economic relations between Britain and the USA declined in the long run. Why was this the case? And why did American businessmen consider Germany a much more interesting
market? In general, Americans perceived the British economy as stagnating and, especially after the First World War, as paralysed by labour disputes. Germany, on the other hand, was considered a much more dynamic business location. This is why even after 1945, the calamities of Nazi rule and the Second World War notwithstanding, American entrepreneurs were keen to revive earlier business connections, a process that Berghahn sees as a ‘survival of traditions and institutions that dated back to the late nineteenth century’ (p. 363). In his eyes, the German economy’s revival after 1945 was a consequence of the fact that German enterprises were able to adopt American business principles. Other factors were that the German economy was characterized by an emphasis on high-quality services and products, efficient vocational training, and cooperative industrial relations, all of which gave it a competitive edge over the British economy.

The book is organized into six thematic chapters. The first examines the expectations of the European–American business nexus expressed in newspapers at the turn of the twentieth century. All observers were convinced that the emergence of the USA as a major industrial power would, sooner or later, challenge the predominance of European economies in global markets. Because of their economic performance in the decades before 1914, however, the Germans also had high hopes of being counted among the leading industrialized countries of the twentieth century. The second chapter describes how economic methods were exchanged across the Atlantic. German engineers and entrepreneurs regularly visited industrial centres on the American East Coast to study Taylorism and Fordism. American visitors to Europe, in turn, returned puzzled and disillusioned by what they had seen in Britain, where many industrialists with their Oxbridge classics education had little understanding of the problems of modern production and marketing. The Americans, by contrast, were impressed by German businessmen and the German system of education and training, both of skilled workers and managers and scientists involved in research and development in engineering firms.

As chapter three points out, American relations with Britain became more ‘special’ again with the outbreak of the First World War, until the two sides became formal allies with America’s entry into the war. This relation quickly deteriorated after 1918, however, not least...
because American business elites were determined to undermine the City of London’s primacy as the financial hub of the world in favour of Wall Street. In chapter four, Berghahn describes how American businessmen began to look towards Weimar Germany again after the mid 1920s. With its political system stabilizing, German industry once more seemed a more promising prospect for economic engagement than the rather undynamic British economy. The bursting of the speculative bubble in 1929 and the following Great Depression, however, affected Germany more deeply than Britain, leading to political radicalization and, finally, the Nazi seizure of power in 1933.

Chapter five describes the dilemma many American firms found themselves in when dealing with Germany after 1933. Whereas many withdrew their investments from Germany, companies that had production facilities in the country found it more difficult to cut ties. Some American businesses in Germany, such as IBM and General Motors, became involved in efforts to prevent the outbreak of war, or, once the fighting had begun, supported an armistice as late as 1941. Although Britain and the USA became allies again after the outbreak of the Second World War, their relations were far from harmonious. Since Britain was largely bankrupt by autumn 1940, it could no longer pay for American deliveries of food and weapons and thus became more dependent on American loans, as chapter six points out. The consequences of this increasing economic imbalance were felt especially after the end of the war. When the two countries differed on the issue of maintaining British imperial rule during the Suez Crisis in 1956, President Eisenhower threatened to trigger the collapse of the British currency, which forced the British to withdraw from Egypt.

On the whole, Berghahn provides interesting insights into the thinking of businessmen and politicians on both sides of the Atlantic and convincingly relates their economic concerns to geopolitical deliberations. One downside of the book, however, is the lack of a proper bibliography. The references are merely cited in the endnotes which forces readers to comb through the annotations of each and every chapter to find out what sources and literature the author used. It would be very welcome if renowned academic publishers such as Princeton University Press could spare their readers this bother. This is probably the result of cost-cutting, but it considerably impedes the use of their publications.
Although Berghahn describes an aspect of transatlantic economic cooperation that is often underestimated, he is not the first to compare the productivity of German and American businesses, and point to the greater efficiency of American firms. Nearly a quarter of a century ago, Alfred D. Chandler argued that American and German enterprises embodied two—albeit different—varieties of managerial capitalism. Britain, he argued, remained ensnared in inefficient personal capitalism, and was incapable of developing similar organizational structures to its German and American competitors, which is why the global market share of British firms eroded after the late nineteenth century. Berghahn does not consider Chandler’s study which, although many of its comparative findings have been seriously challenged over the last two decades, is still a cornerstone of today’s business history. By largely neglecting it, Berghahn misses a chance to achieve one of the aims of his study, namely, to ‘persuade social and cultural historians to reintegrate the elements of business cultures and political economy in their research and teaching’ on the one hand, and ‘to convince economic historians not to look exclusively toward quantitative macroeconomics and mathematical modelling, but toward their colleagues in traditional departments of history’ on the other (p. 364).

This approach is highly topical and Anglo-American historians might learn a great deal from their counterparts in Germany, where an intense debate has been conducted on how to integrate cultural history approaches into business and economic history. More than a decade ago, the volume Wirtschaftsgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte set the standard for this endeavour,¹ and a recently published volume, Auf der Suche nach der Ökonomie,² aimed to further advance the debate. It is a pity that Berghahn as a specialist in German history neither mentions this debate among German-speaking historians, nor cites the relevant research literature, as this might have been helpful information for Anglophone scholars.

One of the outcomes of this controversy is that social and cultural historians benefit from the results obtained by economic and busi-

¹ Hartmut Berghoff and Jakob Vogel (eds.), Wirtschaftsgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte: Dimensionen eines Perspektivenwechsels (Frankfurt am Main, 2004).
² Christof Dejung, Monika Dommann, and Daniel Speich Chassé (eds.), Auf der Suche nach der Ökonomie: Historische Annäherungen (Tübingen, 2014).
ness historians, not least because this allows them to sharpen their arguments. It would therefore have been interesting to see how Berghahn could have reconciled the contemporary opinion which is the basis of his book with the quantitative analysis of Mira Wilkins’s *Maturing of Multinational Enterprise* (1974), or her 2004 study *History of Foreign Investment in the United States*. Wilkins’s data shows that throughout the twentieth century, US multinationals favoured Britain over Germany for their overseas investments, and that British investment in the USA consistently exceeded German investment.

But it seems that an analytical approach of this sort is not the primary aim of Berghahn’s impressive overview of how businessmen from both side of the Atlantic assessed each other in the first half of the twentieth century, even though he repeatedly argues for the necessity of bridge-building between economic history on the one hand and political and cultural history on the other. Rather, he is interested in making a novel contribution to the scholarly debate on Americanization and the notion that the twentieth century can be construed as the American century. In 1902, the British journalist William T. Stead published *The Americanisation of the World*. This book attracted a good deal of attention at the time and has also influenced recent historiographical attempts to describe how European societies were shaped by the American way of life, which was seen as a role model or a threat to European values respectively. Fewer scholars, however, have turned the telescope of historical investigation around and examined the attitudes of American elites towards Europe, which is the focus of Berghahn’s study.

Berghahn also mentions repeatedly that his study of transatlantic history could, or perhaps should, be extended to a global history. He justifies this claim by pointing out that both German and American foreign policy was influenced by Japan’s rise to become a global player after the turn of the twentieth century. Such an approach would ultimately transcend the North Atlantic area, which still provides the framework for many business histories, and take into account global


historical studies such as Kristin L. Hoganson’s study Consumers’ Imperium,5 and Sebastian Conrad’s notion of the ‘globalization of the nation-state’. One possible research trajectory would be to examine the extent to which Western businessmen assessed their operations on a global level and compared business opportunities in Europe with those in Latin American or Asian markets after 1900. Berghahn does not elaborate on this idea in any depth. But it is not the least merit of his book that he opens up such research perspectives beyond the beaten path of both conventional business history and American history.