German Studies Association

Newsletter

Volume XXXIII
Number 2
Winter 2008–09

German Studies Association
Main Office:
1200 Academy Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49006-3295
USA
Tel.: (269) 382-3406
Fax: (269) 337-7251
www.thegsa.org
e-mail: director@thegsa.org
Technical Support: techsupport@thegsa.org

German Studies Association

Newsletter

Volume XXXIII
Number 2
Winter 2008–09

Table of Contents

Archives: Past, Present, Future:

In Memoriam:

Letter from the Executive Director

Dear Members and Friends of the GSA,

Our thirty-second annual conference took place from 2 to 5 October 2008 at the Crowne Plaza Hotel – St. Paul Riverfront in St. Paul, Minnesota. In terms of numbers of attendees, it was our largest ever, and in terms of sessions and papers our second largest after the 2007 meeting in San Diego. According to our records, 1028 individuals attended our meeting, the first time in our history that we have broken the thousand mark. And our total of 246 sessions and roundtables was second only to the San Diego conference. We heard a memorable Presidential Address from President Sara Lennox and two outstanding luncheon talks by Professors Gary Cohen and Geoff Eley; all three talks are published in this edition of the *Newsletter*. The conference also witnessed the first meeting of our new Committee on Interdisciplinary Initiatives, the results of which will manifest themselves very clearly at future conferences. Our thanks also go, as always, to Professor Sky Arndt-Briggs of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, for hosting the annual DEFA film evening on Thursday, as well as for making it possible for us to show the new edition of the classic film *Kuhle Wampe* on Saturday night.

We owe a tremendous debt to the tireless members of the Program Committee, without whose efforts an enormous undertaking of this sort simply could not take place. None of them receive any kind of special stipend or reward for this activity. They do it because of their dedication – collectively and individually – to German Studies, and for that we are very grateful indeed. Our special thanks go to our tireless, conscientious, and immensely talented 2008 Program Director (and former GSA President), Professor Patricia Herminghouse of the University of Rochester. Pat is the very embodiment of all that is best in our profession, and the GSA is richer for her innumerable contributions to our endeavors over the course of many years. As Program Director she made many important suggestions for improving our online submission and approval process, and we'll be introducing those changes during the next few months. We'd also like to express our gratitude to the other members of the Program Committee, who devoted many hours, days, and weeks to putting together a rich, multifaceted 2008 conference: H. Glenn Penny, University of Iowa, Diachronic/Interdisciplinary; Benjamin Marschke, Humboldt State University, Medieval, Early Modern, Eighteenth Century; Brent O. Peterson, Lawrence University, Nineteenth Century; Karin Bauer, McGill University, 20th- and 21st-Century Literature and Humanities; Donna Harsch, Carnegie Mellon University, 20th- and 21st-Century History; and Charlie Jeffery, University of Edinburgh, Political Science.

Putting together a conference of this size with our very, very finite resources is always a peculiarly daunting task. Thus I'd like to thank our splendid webmaster, Terry Pochert, for all that he does, and I'd also like to express our gratitude to our technical support and registration desk coordinators, Charles Fulton, Elizabeth Fulton, and Ramaswamy Vadivelu.

Conferences are always important occasions for meeting colleagues, seeing old friends, and saying temporary farewells to some of those old friends as they move to new positions. Ulrich Grothus has been a good friend of the GSA during his years as head of the DAAD New York office, and we wish him much success as he returns to Bonn to become Deputy Secretary General of the DAAD. We look forward to meeting his successor in New York, Sebastian Fohrbeck. And we'd like to welcome Cathleen Fisher as new Executive Director of the American Friends of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

Speaking of conferences, just a few words about the next ones: As noted below, the 2009 conference will take place from 8 to 11 October in Washington, D. C., at the Crystal Gateway Marriott, where we also met in 2001 and 2004. Next year represents the anniversaries of the events of 1989, of the *doppelte Staatsgründung* in 1949, and of the outbreak of World War II in Europe, and it is Schiller's 250th birthday! So there will be plenty of important occasions to commemorate, and I hope that a number of contributions to these and other topics will be forthcoming.

As I noted in my last letter, we've engaged the services of a first-rate conference planning organization, Conference Direct, to help us with our hotel arrangements. Thanks to the superb work of Craig Hendrick at Conference Direct, in recent months we've negotiated and signed contracts for 2011 with Louisville, for 2012 with Milwaukee, and for 2013 with Denver. (We had already signed a contract for 2010 with Oakland.) We hope to sign contracts in the next few months for Kansas City in 2014, Washington in 2015, and San Diego in 2016.

The past few months have been busy ones for many other reasons. In late September, just before our conference in St. Paul, I traveled to Wartburg College in Waverly, Iowa, to present the first annual Gerald R. Kleinfeld Lecture in German Studies. I continue to represent the GSA on the Executive Committee of the Council of Administrative Officers in the American Council of Learned Societies. (Pat Herminghouse is also our official delegate to the annual assembly.) I am now Vice Chair of the Friends of the German Historical Institute and represent the GSA there as well. I consult regularly with our friends at DAAD, the Austrian Cultural Forum, the DFG, the AATG, the Fulbright Commission, the American Friends of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the AICGS, the IASGP, and many more. We continue to be very grateful to H-German for all that they do. And of course our involvement with the Berlin Program in Advanced German and European Studies at the Free University of Berlin continues to be vitally important to us.

As we know, not all is exactly rosy in the academic world generally or in the world of German Studies more particularly. In her "Letter from the President" in this issue, Sara Lennox describes recent threats to German Departments and discusses appropriate responses from the GSA to these threats. As part of this response, in our next issue of the *Newsletter* we shall describe, in greater detail, an extremely important DAAD initiative: the establishment of an online journal for best teaching practices in German Studies called *Neues Curriculum*, supported by the DAAD, the GSA, the AATG, and the Goethe Haus in New York. And of course we are all affected by the catastrophic financial meltdown that is going on around us as I write these lines. Although the GSA's endowment investments and cash reserves have

not been hit as hard as they might have been, we will have to wait and see what emerges from the present turmoil. In the next issue of this *Newsletter* I'll provide a full report on our investment situation as well as a summary of the Board meeting in October and the Executive Council meeting in December.

In addition to the Letter from the President and the texts of the three 2008 conference addresses, this issue contains announcements concerning the 2009 conference; a list of 2009 committee appointments as of press time; an announcement of this year's GSA prize winners and of the 2009 competitions; and a description of the activities of our new Interdisciplinary Committee. Plus we are publishing, as always, the annual report of our Archives Committee as well as an important article by Ulrich Raulff, director of the Deutsches Literarurarchiv Marbach, describing that institution's vitally important work.

Best regards,
David

David E. Barclay
Executive Director

Letter from the President

Dear Colleagues,

Let me start with the good news first. We again had a wonderful, wonderful conference in St. Paul. We must lavishly thank the hard-working Program Committee that put the conference together: Pat Herminghouse (Program Director, Charlie Jeffery (Political Science), Donna Harsch (20th-21st century history), Karin Bauer (20th-21st century literature and cultural studies), Brent Peterson (19th century), Ben Marschke (medieval, early modern, 18th century), Glenn Penny (diachronic and other). I thank so many of you who came to the Friday evening banquet to hear my presidential address, and we also heard splendid luncheon talks from Gary Cohen and Geoff Eley. All three of those talks are printed elsewhere in this newsletter. We were happy to honor that our joint GSA/DAAD prizes could honor Carol Poore for the best book in literature/cultural studies published in 2006/2007 and Cora Granata for the best article in history/social sciences published in the *German Studies Review* published in 2006/2007. We are also so pleased that we could present Michael Auer with our new prize for the best paper submitted by a graduate student, and his paper will soon appear in *German Studies Review.* (The laudationes for those prizes can also be found elsewhere in the *Newsletter.*) We were also happy to be able to thank Ulrich Grothus, the current director of the North American office of the DAAD, as he ends his term to service here and returns to Bonn. As I introduced my presidential address, on "Transnational Approaches and Their Challenges," I remarked that I might be preaching to the converted, since many, many panels

focused on an exciting range of transnational topics, exploring topics that might have been unthinkable even five years ago. Several of those transnational topics were GSA initiatives that we hope will continue. In collaboration with the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the GSA sponsored a panel on "Gender and the Cold War," and that panel will be presented again at the conference of the AAASS to discover how the same work is received by scholars with different disciplinary backgrounds. As well, the GSA sponsored three panels on "African and Asian Responses to German Colonialism" together with the African Studies Association, and two of those panels will also be presented at the African Studies Association. We hope that there further cooperations will continue at subsequent GSA conferences. Now we are also entirely delighted that we have institutionalized such approaches, and our newly-appointed Interdisciplinary Committee, chaired by David Sabean with members Timothy Guinnane, Roe-Min Kok, Jonathan Sheehan, Marc Silberman, and Janet Ward, are overflowing with ideas about how the GSA can pursue a wide variety of new initiatives that will be both interdisciplinary and transnational. Stay tuned for news from this energetic committee!

We continue to be disheartened by the number of "no-shows" at the conference, whose decision to pull out at the last minute blocks the participation of another German Studies scholar in the conference, and who often ruin a well-planned panel by not appearing to give their papers. After much discussion, the GSA Board voted not to reinstitute the draconian three-year "ban" on those who failed to show up without compelling reasons, but from now on we will, like many other academic associations, require that all those proposing papers at the conference be members of GSA. We hope that asking proposers to join the GSA will demonstrate the good-faith that they indeed plan to attend the conference, and of course they will receive all the benefits of membership, including a subscription to *GSR* and the *Newsletter* and the opportunity to participate in all Web-based forums on the GSA website.

Remember that it is never too early to begin thinking about panels for the 2009 conference, back in Washington, DC (Arlington), an easy journey from the German-speaking countries and the rest of Europe. We were surprised this year that fewer conference participants from abroad applied for travel funding from the GSA, and we urge you to contact prospective panelists elsewhere who could learn from and contribute to deliberations at the conference. Some potential panels have already come to the attention of the GSA leadership—one or several panels on other German Studies associations in countries outside of the German-speaking ones, on Asian-German Studies, and on German-Italian relations.

And now for the bad news, which I'm sure none of you has failed to notice. The current economic crisis is sure also to have devastating effects on education, including very specifically on the departments and programs in which German Studies scholars teach. Many searches have already been cancelled, which will have devastating effects on our younger colleagues on the market. We already hear rumors of consolidations and cuts to programs. We are trying to act "proactively" in response to this dire news. Particularly German Departments and programs may be imperiled, and, though we as yet have no concrete data, we suspect that those programs that have not made curricular innovations and built strong alliances with

other campus groups may be in most danger. To address curricular issues, the GSA together with the DAAD, the AATG, and the Goethe Institut New York are launching an on-line journal called *Neues Curriculum* that will allow discussion of curricular changes that have helped to advance German cultural studies. A small subcommittee of the Board has been created to address threats to German programs, whose members include Steve Brockmann, Barbara Kosta, Carol Anne Costabile-Heming, and me. The subcommittee has decided to create a new web-based forum on the GSA website called "German Studies at Risk," accessible only to members of the forum (so that we can speak candidly) on which we can discuss what is happening to German programs around North American and how we can devise strategies to defend ourselves. Though only GSA members can join, we invited anyone interested to participate, including administrators of Modern Language Departments whose own focus may not be German Studies—it's easy enough (and not very expensive) to join the GSA and also receive the benefits of membership, and members with other national language and literature specializations can only promote the further transnationalism of the GSA.

There is no question that these are frightening times, and many of us may find ourselves forced to change plans on which have long counted. But we are not powerless and also not alone. We can act, individually and jointly, to address the crisis on our own campuses and across the nation. The GSA will do its best to address the different situations that German Studies scholars will encounter nationally and internationally in order to assure that German Studies remains visible, vibrant, intellectually exciting, and at the cutting edge of scholarship in the humanities and social sciences. We hope that we also provide you with a community that can sustain your and our optimism and hope in these hard times. Please stay in close touch with us about what is happening on your campus, in your scholarship, and in your life. As I pass on the GSA presidency to the fabulously gifted Celia Applegate on January 1, 2009, I thank you so much for the opportunity to serve you and hope that I have helped to move our field forward in the twenty-first century, and as past president I will still be doing my best to contribute to German Studies even under these current difficult conditions. "Wird schon werden"—this too shall pass.

With collegial greetings,

Sara Lennox

Reports and Announcements

2008 DAAD/GSA Prize Winners Announced

The Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst and the German Studies Association are pleased to announce this year's prize recipients, who were recognized at the GSA's thirty-second annual banquet in St. Paul on 3 October.

The 2008 GSA/DAAD prize for the best book of the last two years in the fields of literature or cultural studies was awarded to **Professor Carol Poore** (Brown University), for her book *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007). The Prize Committee members were Professors Randall Halle, chair (University of Pittsburgh); Nina Berman (Ohio State University); and John McCarthy (Vanderbilt University). In announcing its decision, the committee had this to say about Professor Poore's book:

> Poore's book is the first comprehensive study on disability in German culture. It is a path-breaking study that fully represents the aspirations of the GSA, and promises to lay the foundation for a new field within German Studies. Poore approaches German culture expansively and inclusively from an innovative point of view. Her methodology is innovative and genuinely interdisciplinary, relating literary and other cultural material to institutional history and social, economic, and political events. Poore draws on archival material, and provides sensitive readings of literary texts, films, and various kinds of documents. Her work is marked by clarity of structure and an accessible style.
>
> This study surveys a century of depictions of disability, covering much new terrain. Even when it engages with more densely researched areas, Poore manages to contribute unique and innovative insights. While the Euthanasia Laws and the Nürnberg Laws of the Third Reich have been featured in previous historical scholarship, Poore's thorough examination of the disabled during the Fascist era (including self-perceptions of the disabled) proves excitingly informative.
>
> Not satisfied with simply exposing attitudes and treatment evident in archival material, Poore synthesizes those insights to prompt a rethinking of public displays of the disabled and to consider latent biases that accompany them (both positive as well as negative biases). The study cuts across media to include film and press in its considerations.
>
> The personal dimension of the epilogue that shares Poore's own experience with the reader explains the book's uncommon and illuminating perspective; and it represents an effort to encourage other personal accounts about the perception, reception, and treatment of disability in society at large. It certainly inspired discussion and thoughts on possible future work among the committee members.
>
> The book offers a new direction to German Studies. In as much as this book makes a laudable contribution to German Studies, its foray into new cultural territory also offers a significant expansion to discussions of disability studies more generally.

The article prize for 2008 was awarded for the best article in history or political science that appeared in the *German Studies Review* in 2006–07. The prize this year was presented to **Professor Cora Granata** (California State University, Fullerton) for her *GSR* article "The Ethnic 'Straight Jacket': Bilingual Education and Grassroots Agency in the Soviet Occupied Zone and German Democratic Republic, 1945–1964." The Article Prize Committee included Professors Julia Sneeringer (Queen's College, CUNY); Thomas Lekan (University of South Carolina); and Susan Crane (University of Arizona). In its *laudatio*, the committee stated:

> The prize committee is pleased to award the 2008 DAAD Article Prize to Cora Granata for her essay, "The Ethnic 'Straight Jacket': Bilingual Education and Grassroots Agency in the Soviet Occupied Zone and German Democratic Republic, 1945–1964." Granata's innovative essay on East German policy toward the Sorb minority illuminates an understudied corner of GDR history, showing how a seemingly well-intentioned policy of "demonstrably championing victims of Nazism" through the creation of bilingual schools and street signs in the Lausitz region, ultimately ended up "cultivating and privileging particularistic ethnic thinking" among ethnic Germans. Granata takes what could be merely a niche question of limited interest and opens it up in ways that address broad, important issues such as the role of nationalism in a communist state, local legacies of Nazi ethnic policies, and the complex interplay between rulers and ruled in the GDR. The panel was particularly impressed by the article's sophisticated and subtle incorporation of oral history, as well as its fresh, accessible prose. Granata's work makes a vital contribution to what some have called the "second wave" of GDR scholarship, with its focus on issues of identity, lived experience and the micropolitics of power at the grassroots level.

The GSA is grateful to the members of the prize committees for their excellent work, and it congratulates Professors Poore and Granata for their outstanding achievements.

2008 Graduate Student Prize Announced

As recently announced, the GSA is now supporting a competition for the best paper submitted to it by a graduate student. The winning paper will be published in *German Studies Review*. The review committee for 2008 was composed of Professors Daniel Walther (Wartburg College); Irene Kacandes (Dartmouth College); and Sanna Pederson (University of Oklahoma). The prize was awarded to **Michael Auer**, PhD candidate at Indiana University, Bloomington, for his essay "'Originalnatur' in *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*." In announcing the award, the committee stated:

> This year's recipient of the newly established "GSA Award for Best Paper by a Graduate Student" is Michael Auer. Mr. Auer is a PhD candidate in the Depart-

ment of Germanic Studies at Indiana University in Bloomington, IN. While at Indiana, he was a Max Kade Fellow (2006–07) and an associate instructor (2007–08). He received his masters in philosophy from the Universität Freiburg in 2005. His award winning essay is titled "'Originalnatur' in *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*." In this the inaugural year of the competition, nineteen graduate students from throughout the world submitted original essays which were evaluated on the soundness of their arguments and the appropriateness of the methodology to the topic. Of all the submissions, Auer's essay was the most original in thought and was well situated within the extant secondary literature. His essay takes on the puzzle of the loose structure of the *Wanderjahre*. He suggests that the structural principle is the recognition of the experience of original nature. In various narratives that otherwise seem inconsequential, original nature is shown to be only recognized in retrospect; it is accompanied by the recognition of its loss. Auer also suggests that the open structure is meant to be a lesson to the reader: to accept the lack of closure rather than continue to look for it. In this manner Auer builds on and revises previous interpretations of the *Wanderjahre* by insisting on a more critical role for readers of it.

2009 Prize Competitions

In 2009 the GSA will again make a number of awards. We hope that as members as possible will make nominations and submissions. For the membership of the various prize committees for 2009, please see the committee appointments listed below.

In 2009 the **DAAD/GSA Book Prize** will be awarded for the best book in history or political science that has been published in 2007 or 2008. Nominations and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Richard Bessel (University of York), by **15 February 2009**. The **DAAD Article Prize** will be awarded for the best article in literature or cultural studies that appeared in the *German Studies Review* in 2007 or 2008. Nominations and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Michael Jennings (Princeton University), by **15 February 2009**. The **Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize** will be awarded fir the best book published in 2007 or 2008 that deals with the Holocaust. Nominations and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Nathan Stolzfus (Florida State University), by **15 February 2009**. The new prize for the **Best Essay in German Studies by a Graduate Student**, awarded for the first time in 2008, will again be awarded in 2009. The deadline for submission is **15 February 2009**. At press time the chair of this committee had not yet been identified, but will be announced on the GSA website. Mailing addresses for all the prize committees will also be shown on the GSA website.

A new prize competition, announced in last spring's newsletter, will also take place in 2009: the **SDAW/GSA Award for Best Paper by a Social Scientist**

within Five Years of the Doctorate. Funded by the Stiftung für Deutsch/Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen (SDAW), the award provides a stipend of € 1000, and the paper that is chosen will be published in *German Politics and Society*. Please see the guidelines in the Spring 2008 issue of this newsletter (also available online on the GSA website in .pdf format). Submissions should be made to the committee chair, Professor Louise K. Davidson-Schmich (University of Miami), by **15 January 2009** (please note the date).

GSA Committee Appointments for 2009

Program Committee for 2009 (Washington, DC)

Program Director: Benjamin Marschke (Humboldt State University)
Jason Coy (College of Charleston), Medieval, Early Modern, 18th Century
George Williamson (University of Alabama), 19th Century
Katherine Pence (Baruch College), 20th/21st Century History
Rick McCormick (University of Minnesota), 20th/21st-Century Literature and Cultural Studies
Janet Ward (University of Nevada, Las Vegas), interdisciplinary, liaison to Interdisciplinary Committee
E. Gene Frankland (Ball State University), Political Science

Interdisciplinary Committee (*terms yet to be determined*)

Chair: David Sabean (University of California, Los Angeles)
Timothy Guinnane (Yale University)
Roe-Min Kok (McGill University)
Jonathan Sheehan (University of California, Berkeley)
Marc Silberman (University of Wisconsin, Madison)
Janet Ward (University of Nevada, Las Vegas)

Nominating Committee, 2009:

Chair: Marion Deshmukh (George Mason University), History
Peter Wallace (Hartwick College), History
Mary Rhiel (University of New Hampshire), Germanics

Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies, Selection Committee

Christopher Browning (University of North Carolina), 2008–10 (History)
Myra Marx Ferree (University of Wisconsin), 2007–09 (Sociology)
Beth Irwin Lewis (College of Wooster), 2007–09 (Art History)
Jean Quataert (Binghamton University), 2008–10 (History)
Liliane Weissberg, University of Pennsylvania, 09–2011 (Germanics)
J. Nicholas Ziegler (Univ. of California, Berkeley), 2009–11 (Political Science)

GSA Delegate to ACLS

Patricia Herminghouse, University of Rochester, 2007–2009

Archives Committee

Chair: Rainer Hering (Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein), 2009–2011
Rebecca Boehling (University of Maryland, Baltimore County), 2007–2009
Sara Friedrichsmeyer (University of Cincinnati), 2007–2009
Will Gray (Purdue University), 2009–2011
Gerhard Weinberg (University of North Carolina), ongoing membership

GSA Representatives to Friends of the German Historical Institute

Celia Applegate (University of Rochester), 2008–2010
David Barclay (Kalamazoo College), 2008–2010

The Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize 2009:
Books on the Holocaust from 2007–2008

Chair: Nathan Stolzfus, Florida State University
Catherine Epstein, Amherst College
Samuel Moyn, Columbia University

GSA/DAAD Book Prize 2009:
Books in History/Social Sciences from 2007–2008

Chair: Richard Bessel, University of York
Ann Goldberg, University of California, Riverside
To be decided

GSA/DAAD Article Prize 2007:
Literature/Cultural Studies in *German Studies Review*, 2007–2008

Chair: Michael Jennings, Princeton University
Nicholas Vaszonyi, University of South Carolina
To be decided

SDAW/GSA Best Paper Prize 2009

Chair: Louise K. Davidson-Schmich, University of Miami
Wade Jacoby, Brigham Young University
Jonathan Wiesen, Southern Illinois University

GSA Investment Committee

Chair: David Barclay
Sara Lennox (statutory)
Katherine Roper (statutory)
Celia Applegate (statutory)
Gerald A. Fetz (statutory)
Members (2) to be appointed

First Meeting of New Interdisciplinary Committee

Several members of the GSA's new standing Committee for Interdisciplinary Initiatives met at the conference in St. Paul in order to discuss possible directions for the future work of the committee, which officially commences in January 2009. Members present were David Sabean (committee chair), Jonathan Sheehan, Marc Silberman, and Janet Ward. It is hoped that the committee's function can be that of a clearing-house for interdisciplinary directions in German Studies scholarship. The encouragement of present and former GSA presidents for the existence of this new committee was gratefully acknowledged.

Overall there will be about 25–30 interdisciplinary panels per conference, a space allocation agreed to by GSA Executive Director David Barclay. While most of these interdisciplinary panels will be open topic, the committee will organize a series of cohesively themed panels for each conference program, in order to help blend scholarship both temporally and across the disciplines. For the 2009 GSA conference, the committee is inviting papers for two series of themed panels (with about 5–7 panels per theme), provisionally entitled "Documents of Emotions" and "Walls, Borders, & Boundaries." The call for papers for these themed panels will be advertised in a wide variety of venues. These series of panels can include one or more roundtable discussions of experts, so as to encourage a sense of structured development of ideas within the panels themselves.

Furthermore, the committee is hopeful that it can encourage interdisciplinary colloquia beyond the GSA conferences; create new GSA online "networks"; facilitate interdisciplinary publications; and plan new connections for the GSA with leading interdisciplinary workgroups, associations, and institutes both domestically and in Europe. On a practical note, it was emphasized that a high quality of AV support for GSA conferences remains vital for presentations applying interdisciplinary approaches (especially those in visual culture, art history, musicology, etc.).

Planning for the Next GSA Conference: Washington, D. C., October 2009

The thirty-third annual conference of the GSA will take place October 8–11, 2009, at the Crystal Gateway Marriott in Arlington, Virginia, across the Potomac from Washington, D. C., and conveniently located just one Metro stop from Reagan National Airport.

As usual, the deadline for ALL submissions will be **FEBRUARY 15, 2009**. Submissions will be accepted online after 5 January 2009. Although the GSA encourages all types of submissions, including individual papers, members and non-member participants are urged, where practicable, to submit complete session proposals, **including the names of proposed moderators and commentators.** The latter is extremely important if sessions are to be complete.

Although the Program Committee will certainly not reject four-paper session proposals, submitters are reminded that four-paper sessions tend to inhibit commentary and discussion. On the whole, three-paper sessions are vastly preferable. Please note that, in a session with three papers, individual presenters should speak no more than twenty minutes. In four-paper sessions, it is expected that individual presenters will speak for no more than fifteen minutes. In each case, the commentary should not exceed ten minutes in order to enable as much audience discussion as possible.

As in the past, all submissions will take place online at the GSA Web site (www.thegsa.org). We have responded to your suggestions and concerns, and we have continued to update and streamline the entire submission process. We welcome your comments and ideas. Please go to our Web site at www.thegsa.org/conferences/2009/index.asp for further information.

Call for Papers

GERMAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION
THIRTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The German Studies Association (GSA) will hold its Thirty-third Annual Conference in Washington, D. C., October 8 - October 11, 2009.

The Program Committee cordially invites proposals on any aspect of German, Austrian, or Swiss Studies, including (but not limited to) history, Germanistik, film, art history, political science, musicology, sociology, and cultural studies. Proposals for entire sessions and for interdisciplinary presentations are strongly encouraged. Individual paper proposals and offers to serve as session moderator or commentator are also welcome. Programs of past GSA conferences may be viewed at the GSA website (www.thegsa.org).

Please see the GSA Web site for information about the submission process, which opens on January 5, 2009, and note that ALL proposals must be submitted online; paper forms are not used.

The deadline for proposals is February 15, 2009.

For more information, visit the GSA website or contact members of the 2009 Program Committee:

Program Director: Benjamin Marschke (Humboldt State University)
Jason Coy (College of Charleston), Medieval, Early Modern, 18th Century
George Williamson (University of Alabama), 19th Century
Katherine Pence (Baruch College), 20th/21st Century History
Rick McCormick (University of Minnesota), 20th/21st-Century Literature and Cultural Studies
Janet Ward (University of Nevada, Las Vegas), interdisciplinary, liaison to Interdisciplinary Committee
E. Gene Frankland (Ball State University), Political Science
Please feel to contact the Program Director (marschke@humboldt.edu) or the Executive Director (director@thegsa.org) with questions or comments.

Issues and Discussions in German Studies

[As has been the practice in previous issues of this newsletter, the GSA is interested in furthering discussions on important, timely, and controversial issues in German Studies. We invite comments and encourage debate and discussion on the topics and issues presented here. In this newsletter we are publishing the text of the 2008 GSA Presidential Address by Professor Sara Lennox, presented at the Thirty-Second Annual Conference in St. Paul on 3 October. We are also pleased to publish the texts of the two luncheon addresses that were presented at the same conference. The first, by Gary B. Cohen, Professor of History and Director of the Center for Austrian Studies at the University of Minnesota, reminds us of the importance of Austrian studies in our collective scholarly endeavors. The second, by Geoff Eley, Karl Pohrt Distinguished University Professor at the University of Michigan, represents a series of reflections on the fortieth anniversary of the important events of 1968.]

Transnational Approaches and Their Challenges
GSA Presidential Address, 2008

Sara Lennox
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
President, GSA

In April 2005 critical Latin American scholars hosted a conference entitled "Mapping the Decolonial Turn: Post/Trans-Continental Interventions in Philosophy, Theory, and Critique" at the University of California Berkeley. These scholars, who include such well-known figures as Walter Mignolo, Enrique Dussel, Aníbal Quijano, and Arturo Escobar and who are loosely organized together in a project called "Modernidad/Colonialidad/Descolonialidad," collectively argue that European modernity has been legitimated and fuelled not just by an increasingly globalized capitalism, but also by what Quijano terms the "coloniality of power," the social classification of the world's population around the idea of race to justify white Europeans' domination over other global populations. Quijano maintains: "What is termed globalization is the culmination of a process that began with the constitution of America and colonial/modern Eurocentered capitalism as a new global power. One of fundamental axes of this model of power is the social classification of the world's population around the idea of race, a mental construction that expresses the basic experience of colonial domination and pervades the more important dimensions of global power, including its specific rationality: Eurocentrism. The racial axis has a colonial origin and character, but it has proven to be more durable and stable than the colonialism in whose matrix it was established. Therefore, the model of power that is globally hegemonic today presupposes an element of coloniality" (533). The "decolonial turn" of the conference title refers

to these scholars' efforts to dismantle the Eurocentric assumptions that underwrite the coloniality of power and elaborate their own "decolonial critique" that derives from and speaks on behalf of subalternized and silenced knowledges.

As many of you will recall, Michael Geyer told us in his luncheon speech at the 2006 GSA conference that "the current excitement about transnational history . . . has effectively led to a reorientation of scholarly perspective and an emergent new consensus" (29). In this talk I want to explore whether new transnational approaches like those Geyer heralds may also be viewed as expressions of such a "decolonial turn." Certainly Konrad Jarausch was correct to maintain in his contribution to the H-German forum on transnationalism in January 2006: "Heady proclamations of an impending paradigm change might make younger scholars feel good who are in search of a generational cause beyond postmodernism, but crossing borders is not in itself morally superior." Precisely. Though it probably is something of a gain to understand any particular nation state as inflected by affairs external to it, transnational scholarship, whether deliberately or unintentionally, can readily reconfirm the coloniality of power, or, alternatively, call power into question by forging alliances with those disempowered. In what ways transnational scholarship can pursue emancipatory ends is a question I would like to explore here. To show how transnational approaches can reproduce Eurocentrism, I want first to examine the case of a scholar from a field related to German Studies who, while pursuing a transnational investigation with the best of intentions, remains complicit in the assumptions she hopes to challenge. Then I want to explore the implications for U.S. German Studies of opting for the decolonial turn, and finally I want to propose that U.S. German Studies is indeed embarked in decolonial directions by surveying developments in the various disciplines of German Studies but also suggest additional questions we might explore.

In a 2007 issue of the journal *Theory, Culture, and Society*, political theorist Nancy Fraser tries to build an argument for "the Legitimacy and Efficacy of Public Opinion in a Post-Westphalian World" by undertaking an attempt to "Transnationalizing the Public Sphere," the title of her article. Fraser premises her argument on the assumption that the various developments we term globalization mean that the arrangements of nation-states established in the 1648 Treat of Westphalia now no longer obtain, and she wishes to explore the possibility of extending Habermas's theory of *Öffentlichkeit*, the guarantor of the legitimacy of sovereign power and the possibility of democracy within the nation-state, to address the new conditions. She concedes that: "At least since its 1962 adumbration by Jürgen Habermas, public sphere theory has been implicitly informed by a Westphalian political imaginary; it has tacitly assumed the frame of a bounded political community with its own territorial state" (8). Now she recognizes that "Today, the Westphalian blind spot of public sphere theory is hard to miss" (14), But Fraser optimistically maintains that, should the frame of the public sphere be expanded from the bounded nation-state to include all members of a public who are imbricated "in a common set of structures and/or institutions that affect their lives" (22) and should "new transnational public powers" emerge "that possess the administrative capacity to solve transnational problems" (23), a "transnational public sphere" can come into being enabling global

democratic debate across national boundaries. "Only then," she concludes," will public sphere theory keep faith with its original promise to contribute to struggles for emancipation" (24). Under such new conditions transnationalized public sphere theory could continue to contribute to the realization of the "unfinished project of modernity" towards which Habermasian theory strives.

However, respondents to Fraser's article in the same issue of *Theory, Culture, and Society* protest that Fraser's new version of public sphere theory still rests on Eurocentric assumptions. They point out that the modernizing developments enabling the emergence of the European public sphere never took place in the Third World, and, given the "*post*-postcolonial collapse of confidence in the emancipatory potential of Third World approximations of Westphalian, national developmental states" (Salvatore 49) likely never will. They observe that "The Westphalian model of the public sphere was based on generalizations from the historical and contemporary experience of a small number of western European societies" (Randeria 42) and there is no real warrant to extrapolate a normative global theory from these atypical provincial phenomena. As well, Habermasian public sphere theory and Fraser's emendation of it fail "to locate the development of the nation-state, the emergence of the public sphere and citizenship in Europe within the imperial framework of which these processes were part" (Randeria 42). Finally, they argue that even the assertion that globalization is a new phenomenon rests on Eurocentric assumptions, since most parts of the world have long been shaped by incursions from elsewhere. "For Fraser, globalization amounts to an epochal change because it has cut across state boundaries, undermining state autonomy from both above and below. But from whose perspective is such a change epochal? In order for it to be so, there needs to have been a Westphalian sovereignty phase as norm, which is then threatened by globalization. But this does not correspond to the experiences of most states or civil societies. For most states, global neoliberalization is simply the latest in a long line of ways in which the terms of debate about justice and democracy are set elsewhere" (Hutchings 60).

I begin with the example of Nancy Fraser because her mistakes are instructive. First, even those who decide to pursue new transnational directions may readily enough continue to be blinded by the Eurocentric assumptions that justify their own advantages vis-à-vis the rest of the world: as Marx put it some time ago, "Das Sein bestimmt das Bewusstsein." Secondly, the very option to focus scholarship on the nation-state alone, to be able to ignore transnational perspectives and opt for "das Primat der Innenpolitik" is a consequence of historical privilege that has never been available to everyone; African-American historian Robin Kelley's many scholarly explorations of the consistent transnationalism of African-American scholarship from its outset in the nineteenth century is a striking counter-example. (see Kelley). Finally as a theorist with an unquestionable commitment to human emancipation and with leftist affiliations, Fraser is trying to advance a theory that is emancipatory for everyone, but, as her critics emphatically argue, her failure to problematize her own presuppositions prevents her theory from performing that function; though she responds to the challenges of transnationalism, she has not changed her optic sufficiently to make that model also decolonial so as also to address the circum-

stances and needs of those outside the First World. To paraphrase Frank Trommler who in turn was borrowing from Stanley Fish, "Being decolonial is so very hard to do" (Trommler 210). Nonetheless, as Fraser's example also shows, historical developments are now also compelling us in the direction of a transnationalism that scholars from elsewhere have much longer pursued, and that may be another way that social being determines consciousness. If this is not too shocking a comparison, I might maintain that our present circumstances somewhat parallel those on which Aimé Césaire commented in his 1950 "Discourse on Colonialism": that what was shocking to Europeans about Hitler was "not *crime* in itself, the *crime against man*, it is not the *humiliation of man as* such, it is the crime against the white man, the humiliation of the white man, and the fact that he applied to Europe colonialist procedures which until then had been reserved exclusively for the Arabs of Algeria, the coolies of India, and the blacks of Africa" (13–14). Analogously, it might be postulated that "we," Westerners and mostly white people, now are moved to undertake transnational approaches because in this era of globalization the erosion of the prerogatives of the nation-state and its purchase on legitimacy have made "our" situation more like "theirs." In effect, globalization has allowed "us" to hear previously-silenced voices but is also reducing "us" to something more like their circumstances.

The feminist concept of "positionality" is apt here: the term means both social location and deliberately-chosen political affiliations (see Alcoff). Our social positioning may now lead us to transnational approaches, but whether they will also be decolonial is a matter of our political decision. I hope that we have long-since acknowledged that knowledge and its production are not value-free, but always position themselves vis-à-vis power in some way or other, and there is no way for us as scholars to remain innocent or uninvolved. In my experience, because of the enormous responsibility that comes from studying the nation responsible for the Holocaust, ethical questions have played a bigger role in U.S. German Studies than in some other fields: "Nie wieder!" is a declaration that has always reverberated loudly for us. So I would propose that declaring our allegiance to decolonialism will also be an ethical choice for us: in deciding to undertake scholarship in the interest of the disempowered rather than the powerful, we are choosing a stance of critique and opposition but also one of solidarity. Understanding that I am vastly oversimplifying what are in fact complex multi-polar, multi-facetted, and frequently micropolitical struggles, and recognizing as well that an answer is enabled only by the postulation of a strategic essentialism that doesn't correspond to actuality, I might nonetheless propose that the choice we confront is encapsulated in the words of the old labor song: "Which side are you on?" It is not adequate any more that we familiarize ourselves only with scholarship on Germany or even Europe; in a globalized world, we must make the decision that our reach must be global too. But learning to view our object of study through a new, wider lens will not be easy or certain. We will have to recognize that the day is long past when, as Georg Lukács, say, would have had it, if we just assume the standpoint of the proletariat—or some other similarly oppressed group—truth and the correct path towards a happy future will be revealed to us. To paraphrase Stuart Hall,

we are choosing a decolonialism without guarantees, and even should we declare our solidarity with the disempowered, it will never be clear with which of many contending disempowered groups we should align ourselves, and we will doubtless, like Nancy Fraser, make mistake after mistake as we are learning to think transnationally and decolonially. Nonetheless, that we confront a choice seems clear at least to me. Some Europeans, including some recent Austrian voters, have made their choice, withdrawing into Fortress Europe to defend our First World privileges against the assaults of the invaders at the gates, though, as past weeks have shown, global capital has already made the wall of that fortress very porous. Other more sophisticated Europeans have made apparently more complex choices that also refuse the challenge of decolonialism, like Habermas and Derrida, who continue to insist on prioritizing Europe and its Enlightenment values, as in their 2003 proclamation of the emergence of new European *Öffentlichkeit*, published simultaneously in the *FAZ* and *Libération,* entitled "February 15, or What Binds Europeans Together: A Plea for a Common Foreign Policy, Beginning in the Core of Europe"—though in fact the February 15, 2003, demonstration opposing the U.S. invasion in Iraq was not the mark of a new European concord alone, but of a more globalized opposition to U.S. imperialism—as I know because I participated in the same demonstration in Oaxaca, Mexico, in the company of indignant retired *gringos* and Marxist-Leninist Mexican students. Can we imagine what that proclamation might have looked like if Habermas and Derrida have dared to postulate post-Eurocentric global arrangements? Perhaps we can turn to Marx again, in the hope that he was correct when he maintained that humankind "always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve" and take a leap of faith that in a utopian world justice is both possible and ultimately in everyone's interest, and that our work can contribute to bringing it about. I continue to be stirred by the postulation in *Kein Ort. Nirgends* that Christa Wolf in her turn borrowed from Ernst Bloch: "Wenn wir zu hoffen aufhören, kommt, was wir befürchten, bestimmt" (171).

So, should we make the choice for the decolonial turn, what would we do? Here I will try to survey current German Studies work that moves in a decolonial direction and propose some projects for a decolonial research agenda. In surveying the state of the field, I am following the example of Shelley Fisher Fishkin's 2004 presidential address to the American Studies Association, "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies," which inspired me to chose the topic of my own talk tonight; in proposing a research agenda, I am following the path-breaking example of Ann Laura Stoler and Frederick Cooper in "Between Metropole and Colony: Towards a Research Agenda," their introduction to the 1997 collection *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, which famously begins with the declaration: "Europe's colonies were never empty spaces to be made over in Europe's image, or fashioned in its interests; nor, indeed, were European states self-contained entities that at one point projected themselves overseas. Europe was made by its imperial projects, as much as colonial encounters were shaped by conflicts within Europe itself." In the arena of German social theory and intellectual history, we might, for instance, explore in what respects the German Enlightenment was responsible for introducing the racial categories

that made the coloniality of power intellectually respectable. In their introduction to the collection *The German Invention of Race*, Sara Eigen and Mark Larrimore maintain: "The emergence of a *scientific* theory of race was the product of often fierce debate among scientists and philosophers, many of whom were clustered at universities in German-speaking lands. The figures most often cited include Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottfried Herder, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, Samuel Thomas Sömmering, Georg Forster, and Christian Meiners" (1) In *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak makes the same point even more elegantly: "One might suggest that the end of the 'German' eighteenth century (if one can speak of 'Gemany' as a unified proper name in that era) provides material for a narrative of crisis management: the 'scientific' fabrication of new representations of self and world that would provide alibis for the domination, exploitation, and epistemic violations entailed by the establishment of colony and empire" (7). The purchase of the coloniality of power and the assumption of the preeminence of Europe might continue to be traced forward through the thought of other canonical German thinkers, so that, for instance, Hegel's insistence that Africa is "the Unhistorical, Undeveloped Spirit, still involved in the conditions of mere nature" (99) might be related to other aspects of his thought, and we might probe whether in that light it is really very likely that Hegel nonetheless achieved a single moment of anti-Eurocentric lucidity enabling him to situate the accomplishments of African-descendent revolutionaries at the center of the *Phenomenology*, as Susan Buck-Morss proposes in her effort to rescue Hegel in the essay "Hegel and Haiti." Similarly, we might explore what it means for Max Weber's thought that he inquires "to what combination of circumstances should it be attributed that in *Western civilization*, and in Western civilization only, cultural phenomena have appeared which (as *we* like to think) lie in a line of development having *universal* significance and value" (13) or wonder what it means that, though Horkheimer and Adorno critique Enlightenment, the non-European world does not seem to exist for them at all, its place held instead by nature and the unconscious, as Sabine Broeck has argued (163–169).

In the realm of political, social, and cultural history, German Studies might look more closely at Germans' involvement in voyages of discovery and scientific exploration and also explore how Germans might have immediately or in more mediated ways profited from the slave trade, the industry that financed the expansion of Europe. If race is the category that underwrites the coloniality of power, the lack of work on the salience of the category of race in German history is the more astonishing, as well as the failure to understand the Central-European-specific inflections of race and processes of racialization very different in the German-speaking countries than in the U.S., so that theory elaborated in the U.S. fits Europe very imperfectly. The absence of any detailed comparative history of German colonialism and what German colonists learned from and taught other colonizing powers is also startling, and in thinking about race in Germany and German colonialism we must not neglect to consider the German relationship to Eastern and Southeastern Europe. (Let me thank Ulrich Grothus for this point.) Research is only beginning on German exchanges with other Europeans and Americans, especially white Southerners, to

elaborate changing categories justifying racial subordination and the right of white people to rule the rest of the world. Recent work by Geoff Eley gratifyingly shows how an assumption of colonial prerogative was part of the texture of everyday German life even before Germany formally acquired colonies (Eley, "What"). As Eley observed in his 2007 GSA talk, a splendid example of how to undertake decolonial historical research is provided by Andrew Zimmerman's 2005 *AHR* article, "A German Alabama in Africa," an expanded version of which will soon appear in book form (Eley, "Globalizing"). Zimmerman explores the expedition from Booker T. Washington's Tuskegee Academy to German Togo, where Washington's thought inspired an ambitious program of the *Erziehung des Negers zur Arbeit.* Germans undertook thereby to transform Africans from *Naturvölker* to modern "Negroes," who, while still subordinate to whites, were capable of and expected to undertake the labor required in a modern rationalized plantation economy. This study shows how conceptions of race are themselves demonstrably transnational, how they change to serve different historical purposes while still subject to the coloniality of power, and how they inflect questions that had hitherto seemed German alone, like the politics of internal colonization in the Prussian east.

Finally, historians pursuing a decolonial agenda will want to be certain that Eurocentric assumptions do not creep into their work despite their best intentions. A model of historical research confronting these problems and devising methods to avoid them is provided in another forthcoming book, co-edited by German historian Uta Poiger together with a group of researchers at the University of Washington, entitled *The Modern Girl Around the World.* These scholars investigate the emergence of a new model of femininity "quite literally around the world in the first half of the twentieth century," when, as they put it, "In cities from Beijing to Bombay, Tokyo to Berlin, Johannesburg to New York, the Modern Girl made her sometimes flashy, always fashionable appearance" (Weinbaum 1). The collaborative research group developed three methodological principles to discuss this transnational phenomenon. First, they used the topic of their investigation, the Modern Girl, as what they term a "heuristic device;" that is, they did not take their topic as pre-given or a priori, but rather considered it as one that "emerges in and through the research process and possesses a future orientation" (3). That heuristic device allowed them to recognize "underlying structures of commonality and difference specific to various nation-states, to different colonial and semi-colonial regimes, and to diverse national and international corporate structures" while also remaining alert to unexpected research findings. They were particularly intrigued to discover that Modern Girls appeared nearly simultaneously around the world, which puts into question "widely accepted histories of commercial capitalism, consumption, and visual culture that presume the dissemination of 'modernity' from Europe and North American to the rest of the world" (3). This finding necessitated their developing a method they call "connective comparison," which "scrutinizes the idea of discrete temporal and geographic locations by positioning specific local developments *in conversation with* developments occurring elsewhere in the world.

Connective comparison is, thus, a method that neither reads peculiar phenomena as deviations from an abstracted 'norm,' nor one that measures such developments

against those postulated by theories of inevitable modernization…. Connective comparison avoids establishing temporal priority in a manner that privileges linear causality" (3). Finally, they developed the device of "multi-directional citation" to explain how both actual Modern Girls and representations of them continually incorporated local elements with those drawn from elsewhere. The elaboration of such proposals, in my view pointing in the direction of interdisciplinary investigations that might be post-Eurocentric and decolonial as well as transnational, were enabled, they acknowledge, only as a consequence of the collaboration of eight women with academic specializations in many different disciplines and areas of the world. Such collaboration on a common project is a further departure from the Eurocentric academic tradition of the single (often male) scholarly genius working in isolation, the tyranny of the monograph, and, as an *AHR* forum on transnationalism put it, "the familiar paradigm of a lone historian trudging through the archives" (1455) possibly another condition of a decolonial method that approaches all parts of the world with equal respect.

Decolonial perspectives are of course needed not just with respect to the past, but also in current affairs, and this is perhaps a task for political scientists or public policy analysts. An urgent intervention needed immediately is a response to a recent initiative launched by the Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, as reported in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and *Frankfurter Rundschau* on September 8, 2008. That institute has proposed that the concept of race—*Rasse*—be removed from Germany's *Grundgesetz* as well as its 2006 *Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz*, since biology has proven that race does not exist. But a decolonial analysis could show how profoundly wrong-headed that initiative is. Of course race is, and has always been, a social construction, not a scientific fact, but a social construction that has immensely far-reaching implications. Those who discriminate on the basis of race do so because they believe the category *does* have scientific or cultural validity (as was of course also the case with Jews during the Third Reich), and clauses in these German laws provide protections against those who continue to racialize those they consider Others and discriminate against them on that basis. "Der Begriff Rasse gehört auf den Müllhaufen der Geschichte," proclaims the reporter in the *Frankfurter Rundshau* (Sperber). Well, maybe—but without that analytical category historians will be at a loss to describe the phenomena I have touched on here. And, though it's hard for white Germans to grasp, in the U.S. and among Black Europeans race is also employed as a positive category enabling an understanding of common pasts and presents. Until racial discrimination is abolished, which is to say, until the coloniality of power no longer obtains, the category of race, like categories of gender and ethnicity, remains a necessary construct around which to organize opposition and resistance.

Though my own discipline, German literary and cultural studies, has pioneered in efforts to allow silenced voices to speak—in cultural productions by women, by migrants, by Germans of color—it has perhaps a bit paradoxically found itself somewhat baffled by how to undertake transnational cultural studies. Despite some recent path-breaking books and articles (see Seyhan, Halle, Sieg), German literary studies has still mostly given little thought to what it would mean for a national

literature department to undertake the almost inconceivable project of changing the optic with which we examine our field to repudiate the primacy of national culture. Our appointments are, after all, in *German* departments or programs, and we teach our students the German language. As Benedict Anderson has explained to us, the modern national literatures that we teach played a critical role in helping to make thinkable the notion of homogeneous, empty time on which the imagined community of the nation depends; our disciplinary history and the history of the nation are inextricably entangled. We know very little about the cultures of countries other than those of German-speaking ones, so that we are mostly not equipped either to undertake transnational scholarship ourselves or to provide graduate students and undergraduates with the tools to write from the perspective of the new transnational lens. And as practitioners of German studies we remain much more constrained than our colleagues in English, French, and Spanish Departments, where transnational, if monolingual, studies could be undertaken, because German-language texts are produced almost entirely in three countries of Europe. But German cultural studies scholars too can reach beyond the boundaries of the national state, and the challenge to us now is to figure out how best to do so. Perhaps we can take the lead in showing how national language departments can talk to each other. Perhaps the answer lies in part in collaborative projects with colleagues who focus on other areas of the globe, as we have begun to pioneer at this year's GSA; perhaps the GSA's new Interdisciplinary Committee will help us devise further strategies.

Furthermore, though, as historians increasingly show, the local is almost always inflected by the global, the national by the transnational, the texts or other cultural products we consider may themselves seem not to thematize topics beyond the national. Should we nonetheless be convinced of the importance of transnational and decolonial approaches, we may thus be compelled to develop new techniques of reading, pursing the "epistemology of the trace," as Sabine Broeck has termed it (personal communication). Let me provide one small example of such a trace from a text almost all of you will have read. In Christa Wolf's *Nachdenken über Christa T.*, the patronizing West Berlin cousin of her future husband assures Christa T., already pregnant, that she will not lack for West German consumer pleasures: "Sag, wenn ihr was braucht; wenn du dich genierst, werd' ich böse. Warum soll Siegfrieds unmoralisches Geld nicht euer moralisches Leben ein bisschen verschönern . . . Dass du Bananen kriegst, wenn das Baby da ist, versteht sich" (124). Most obviously, Wolf is underlining, perhaps a trifle heavy-handedly, the difference between materialist West Germans and principled Easterners like Christa T. But bananas don't grow in West Germany either, and in invoking West German access to bananas Wolf locates this small conversation with an entire system of globalized exchange, the exploration of which might allow scholars also to situate this novel in a much broader context than merely the intra-German rivalry for hearts and minds of the year 1968.

So what might be the benefits of a decolonial approach to German literary and cultural studies? Let me suggest some other questions that Germanists—and others—might ask about literary and cultural texts to move our analyses in transnational and decolonial directions. We might ask, for example: How are cultural

representations affected by impulses exterior to the nation-state, say, colonialism, the Cold War, September 11, or the war in Iraq, and how does the cultural product position itself vis-à-vis those impulses? To what degree does the text directly thematize these questions, and how must we read differently to find the answers? How are the national and the transnational explicitly or implicitly represented in the text? Where does the text situate itself with respect to the coloniality of power? How does the cultural product help to constitute, sustain, subvert, think beyond, the nation? Is it possible to read the text against the grain to discern suppressed sub- or supranational aspects that draw national or transnational hegemonies into question? Does the text lend expression to suppressed voices, and, if so, which ones and how? Must we, as in the earlier case of women's writing, read different texts to find those voices? How does the text draw upon the national and/or the transnational to construct identity, subjectivity, solidarity, notions of individual or collective resistance? Can the text be read so as to produce epistemic models different from the dominant ones? How has the text been read and received so as to support and/or contest national or transnational paradigms? How are such readings themselves nationally inflected, and how can reflection upon national readings help us to think beyond the nation? And how can asking such questions help us to elaborate new ways to think about German-language texts within transnational frameworks that contest the Eurocentric assumptions on which the coloniality of power rests? In some ways, our new colonial readings of cultural products will be *Ideologiekritik*; in some ways we will again look to cultural products for possibilities we have not yet formulated of thinking, and living, differently.

On September 22, as I was writing this talk, I discovered a front-page article in the *New York Times* entitled "Conservatives Try New Tack On Campus." Their goal, the reporter informs us, is "to restore what conservative and other critics see as leading casualties of the campus culture wars of the 1980s and 90s—the teaching of Western Culture and a triumphal interpretation of American history" (Cohen). I thought immediately of Benjamin's "Theses on the Philosophy of History": "Only that historian will have the gift of fanning the spark of hope in the past who is firmly convinced that *even the dead* will not be safe from the enemy if he wins. And this enemy has not ceased to be victorious" (255). It appears that renewed efforts are underway to create Fortress America, and that has implications for the critical reach of U.S. German Studies too. On the other hand, in her essay collection *Talisman*, Yoko Tawada, the Japanese-German author who was the GSA's guest in 2007, made the decidedly decolonial proposal: "Eigentlich darf man es niemandem sagen, aber Europa gibt es nicht" (45). What Tawada means by that cryptic comment was perhaps also expressed by a sign at a demonstration in Dublin on May 1, 2004, the day that ten new members entered the European Union: "Another Europe is possible." Perhaps, if this year's election goes the way many of us want, another United States of America may even be possible. And, should they also decide to undertake a decolonial turn, perhaps U.S. German Studies scholars can even help to bring that post-Eurocentric Europe, post-Eurocentric world into being. Si, se puede—Yes, we can!

WORKS CITED

Alcoff, Linda. "Cultural Feminism vs. Poststructuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory." *Signs* 13.3 (1988): 405–36.

Anderson Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991): 24–34.

"AHR Conversation: On Transnational History," *American Historical Review* 111.5 (December 2006): 1441–64.

Augstein, Franziska. "Die Rassenfrage: Muss das Grundgesetz korrigiert werden?" *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 8 September 2008.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations.* Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.

Broeck, Sabine. "Das Subjekt der Aufklärung – Sklaverei – Gender Studies: Zu einer notwendigen Relektüre der Moderne. *Gender kontrovers: Genealogien und Grenzen einer Kategorie.* Ed. Gabriele Dietze and Sabine Hark. Königstein/Taunus: Ulrike Helmer Verlag, 2006. 152–80.

Buck-Morss, Susan. "Hegel and Haiti." *Critical Inquiry* 26.4 (Summer 2000): 821–65.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism.* Trans. Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001.

Cohen, Patricia. "Conservatives Try New Tack On Campuses." *New York Times*, 22 Steptember 2008: 1.

Eigen, Sara, and Mark Larrimore. „Introduction: The German Invention of Race." *The German Invention of Race.* Ed. Eigen and Larrimore. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006. 1–7.

Eley, Geoff. "Globalizing Germany . . . Germanizing the Global." Paper presented at the German Studies Association convention, San Diego, October 4–7, 2007.

—. "What Was/Is the Imperial Imaginary? Britain in Europe and the World, 1815–2003." Paper presented at the Neale Lecture & Colloquium in British History. University College London, 24–26 April 2008

Fish, Stanley. "Being Interdisciplinary Is So Very Hard to Do." *Profession 89.* New York: Modern Language Association, 1989. 15–22.

Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association." *American Quarterly* 57.1 (March 2005): 17–57.

Fraser, Nancy. "Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: On the Legitimacy of Public Opinion in a Post-Westphalian World." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24.4 (2007): 7–30.

Geyer, Michael. "Where Germans Dwell: Transnationalism in Theory and Practice." *German Studies Association Newsletter* 31.2 (Winter 2006): 29–37.

Habermas, Jürgen, and Jacques Derrida. "February 15, or What Binds Europeans Together: A Plea for a Common Foreign Policy, Beginning in the Core of Europe." *Constellations* 10.3 (2003): 291–97.

Hall, Stuart. „The Problem of Ideology: Marxism Without Guarantees." *Marx: 100 Years On*. Ed. B. Matthews. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1983. 57–84.

Halle, Randall. *German Film after Germany: Toward a Transnational Aesthetic.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Philosophy of History*. Trans. J. Ibree. New York: Dover, 1956.

Hutchings, Kimberly. "Whose History? Whose Justice?" *Theory, Culture & Society* 24.4 (2007): 59–63.

Jarausch, Konrad. "Reflections on Transnational History." On-line posting 20 January 2006, H-German@H-net.msu.edu.

Kelley, Robin D. G. "'But a Local Phase of a World Problem': Black History's Global Vi-

sion, 1883–1950." *The Journal of American History* 86 (1999): 1045–74.
Quijano, Anibal. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1.3 (2000): 533–80.
Randeria, Shalini. "De-politicization of Democracy and Judicialization of Politics." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24.4 (2007): 38–44.
Salvatore, Armando. "The Exit from a Westphalian Framing of Public Space and the Emergence of a Transnational Islamic Public." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24.4 (2007): 46–52.
Seyhan, Azade. *Writing Outside the Nation.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Sieg, Katrin. *Choreographing the Global in European Cinema and Theater.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Sperber, Katharina. "Grundgesetz: Rasse soll verschwinden." *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 8 September 2008.
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
Stoler, Ann Laura and Frederick Cooper. "Between Metropole and Colony: Towards a Research Agenda." *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Ed. Stoler and Cooper. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997. 1–56.
Tabener, Stuart, ed. *German Literature in the Age of Globalisation.* Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2004.
Tawada, Yoko. *Talisman.* Tübingen: Konkursbuch, 1996.
Trommler, Frank. "The Future of German Studies or How to Define Interdisciplinarity in the 1990s," *German Studies Review* 15.2 (1992): 201–17.
Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* Trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
Weinbaum, Alys Eve, Lynn M. Thomas, Priti Ramamurthy, Uta G. Poiger, Madeleine Y. Dong, and Tani E. Barlow. "Chapter One: The Modern Girl as Heuristic Device: Collaboration, Connective Comparison, Multidirectional Citation." Unpubl. Manuscript.
Wolf, Christa. *Kein Ort. Nirgends.* Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1979.
—. *Nachdenken über Christa T.* Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1971.
Zimmerman, Andrew. "A German Alabama in Africa: The Tuskegee Expedition to German Togo and the Transnational Origins of West African Cotton Growers." *American Historical Review* 110.5 (December 2005): 1362–98.

Reinventing Austrian and Central European History[1]

Gary B. Cohen
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

The last twelve years have seen a remarkable upswing in scholarly interest and acclaim in North America and Western Europe for works on the history of Imperial Austria and its successor states. In the United States two monographs on nineteenth and early twentieth century Austria, Pieter Judson's *Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848–1914* (Ann Arbor, 1996) and Maureen Healy's *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in the World War I* (Cambridge and New York, 2004), have won the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize of the American Historical Association for the best first book in modern European history. In contrast to twenty years ago, editors at premier university presses now welcome the interesting and highly original new studies which scholars are producing. These days there is a whole generation of early modern historians in the English-speaking world working on the Habsburg lands, many of them taught or at least inspired by Robert J. W. Evans, who are joining colleagues in Poland, the Czech and Slovak republics, Hungary, and Austria in reinvigorating work on the early modern era. All this represents an enormous reversal of fortunes compared to twenty or thirty years ago.

When I was a graduate student and new Ph.D. during the early and middle 1970s, there was only a small coterie of historians in Western Europe and North America who worked on those lands, some highly eminent to be sure. Many of them had personal connections to Central Europe, and they tended to be narrowly concerned with questions specific to the experience of Habsburg Central Europe. For the nineteenth and twentieth centuries those questions included, in particular, the rise and fall of the monarchy, considered largely as a unique entity; the rise and eventual triumph of the various nationalist movements; the troubled experience of the parliamentary states during the interwar period; the advance of Nazi power and influence after the mid-1930s; and then the history of Soviet-style communism in much of the region or alternatively the development after 1945 of a democratic Austrian Republic based on a corporatist social partnership.

Thirty years ago, outsiders to the field of nineteenth and twentieth-century Austrian and Central European history could readily perceive a distinct parochialism in the typical modes of question-asking in this field. From a critical perspective, the established lines of research on the conflict-ridden cabinet and parliamentary politics of the late imperial and interwar periods and on the ideology and political bases of the various nationalist movements might seem intellectually desiccated, if not simply blind alleys. In the various national historiographies of Central Europe, one found almost no comparative impulses and little trace of the new analytic and conceptual impulses which were enlivening research on the history of Germany,

---

[1] Luncheon address, German Studies Association, 3 October 2008, St. Paul, Minnesota.

France, Britain, and the United States during the 1970s and 1980s. During the 1960s Czech, Polish, and Hungarian historians made some promising starts in social and economic history and socio-political and socio-cultural studies, and Polish and Hungarian scholars were able to continue these efforts on a limited scale during the 1970s and 1980s. Still, official Marxist-Leninist ideology and the constraints of deeply ingrained nationalist narratives in communist-ruled Central Europe placed severe limits on new historiographic impulses and any scholarly revisionism. In Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania, in particular, communist academic authorities found it convenient to uphold staunchly nationalist narratives of their countries' early modern and modern histories.

Thirty years ago, many historians of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the Austrian Republic were also wedded to deeply entrenched narratives about the long-term decline of the imperial polity and the failure of the first republic, to a strong preference for political and diplomatic history, and often to a strongly positivist approach of conducting thorough research in primary sources with little resort to heuristic tools from the social sciences or to the development of explicitly articulated conceptual schemes. In Austria from the 1960s through the 1980s, historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries made their most significant and original contributions to the study of constitutional and legal developments, international relations, and, after a slow start, the workings and social bases of national socialism, but there was only a limited resonance of the new methodological initiatives made by historians in West Germany, France, and Britain. The thin literature on the First Austrian Republic contrasted sharply with the large array of studies on Weimar Germany.

Until the 1990s, whether in Central or Western Europe or in North America, the historical writing on Central Europe during the long nineteenth century was the most obviously constrained by the older conventional narratives and approaches, particularly when compared to work on the medieval and early modern periods. For the nineteenth century the typical focus was on the *Sonderweg* of the Habsburg monarchy's long-term political decline, the retarded and largely abortive development of parliamentary institutions, and the rise of the national movements and nationalist contention. In contrast, research on Central Europe during the medieval and early modern eras was more closely connected to historical work on the German states and Western Europe. Since World War II, historians of early modern Habsburg Central Europe have shared with their colleagues in German, French, and British history common interests in state-building, the development of the institutions and relations of corporate society, religious reform and reaction, and since the 1960s and 1970s a growing interest in the development of economic and social structures and popular culture. These days the best writing on society and culture in Habsburg Central Europe during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries is just as fresh and at times iconoclastic as that on the German states, France, or North America; and it has benefitted from the same cross fertilization of research in anthropology, sociology, economic and demographic history, and cultural studies. Similarly, the best historical writing on Central Europe after 1945 which we have seen since the 1980s has displayed an eclectic taste in its analytic approaches and

strongly international perspectives underlying its conceptualizations. It is historical research on Central Europe during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which has seen the most radical transformation since the late 1980s.

Since the 1980s research on Habsburg Central Europe during the long nineteenth century, particularly by West European and North American scholars, has broken through many old paradigms. The historians doing the best work in this field are truly reinventing it. This enterprise does not mean simply abandoning the older concerns with political action, nationalist political movements, and the relationship between society and the state, but rather asking fundamental questions in new and more sophisticated ways about (1) the development of popular loyalties to community, nation, and state; (2) the bases and supporting structures for political action in society; and (3) how citizens' relationships with the state, in all its aspects and layers, developed and changed. This involves, among other things, systematically analyzing popular sentiments and allegiances; examining social and political loyalties as dynamic phenomena which waxed and waned among various segments of the population; and seeing the state with all its segments as a dynamic and active force in society with which various elements of civil society interacted in complex ways. Asking such questions also means developing a keener awareness of structural relationships in popular and elite political action, in social groupings and solidarities, and in the development of popular culture than was the habit thirty years ago. Viewed against the examples of the best work in modern German, British, French, or North American history over the last three decades, there is much that may be familiar in the analytic methods which scholars are deploying now to study modern Central European experience; but the new conceptualizations which they are developing to address the specific issues and conflicts of modern Central Europe are yielding new levels of understanding that are attracting interest far beyond those working in this field.

It is perhaps not surprising that scholars in Britain and North America have played a prominent role in challenging the old paradigms for understanding Central Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They tend to take much broader, international perspectives, are less bound by the conventional Central European nationalist narratives, and are more eclectic in their analytic approaches than their Central European counterparts or even many of their colleagues in Germany or France who work in the Central European field. Some of our older continental European colleagues have been openly skeptical about the new analytic initiatives of the North American and British colleagues, but today one finds an increasingly positive reception for the North American and British work and indeed many of the same new scholarly impulses among the most internationally oriented younger historians working in Poland, the Czech and Slovak Republics, Hungary, Slovenia, western Ukraine, and Austria.

I. IDENTITIES AND LOYALTIES

The new research of the last several decades on the development of popular loyalties to community, nation, and the state has had perhaps the strongest impact in challenging older historical thinking about Central Europe during the nineteenth

and early twentieth centuries. Conventional Central European narratives focused on the rise of the nationalist political movements, their efforts to organize popular support, and the struggles for national rights against the Habsburg Monarchy and the dominant German and Hungarian nationalities. Nationalist leaders themselves, however, talked about older popular loyalties to local communities, the historic crown lands, and the Habsburg sovereign; and the nationalists complained about those in the population who spoke the national language but were indifferent, ambiguous, or flexible with regard to national loyalties. Nonetheless, the nationalist historical narratives largely excluded the phenomena of indifference and ambiguity and imputed innate national identities or at least a proto-nationalist identification to all those who spoke the national languages and/or followed the majority religion of the respective nations even before the rise of the modern nationalist political movements. Taking a frankly essentialist view of the nation, many nationalist historians in Central Europe saw their nations as existing long before the modern nationalist movements arose; and they envisioned national identity as an encompassing, largely unchanging loyalty which they claimed—or at least implied—trumped loyalties to local community, *Stand* or class, traditional territorial state, or ultimately the monarchy.

The conventional nationalist historical narratives saw the differences among the peoples of the Monarchy as rooted in age-old distinctions of language, religion, and other cultural factors which were presumably passed along through shared history, family descent, and continuing residence in particular territories. Such abiding cultural or *ethnic* differences created ipso facto a conscious and embracing sense of *groupness* for each nation. Nationalist leaders among the non-dominant groups blamed the Habsburg polity for superimposing legal, political, and economic inequalities on the pre-existing cultural differences in the population which only added to each group's sense of separateness and created the grounds for political conflict in the modern era. Contemporary nationalists and later historians commonly pictured the development of the national movements as "revivals" or "rebirths" of their nations, which had presumably existed as well-defined ethnic groups in previous ages.

Nineteenth-century nationalists were obviously proud of their own political and organizational efforts in mobilizing members of their nations to improve their conditions. For nationalists, the building of the modern national political movements had a history to be studied. Individuals' membership in the nation as such did not have a similar developmental history, since identity was typically considered as an age-old given, a *primordial* inheritance of the defining cultural factors. As long ago as 1948, however, even the British historian A. J. P. Taylor, who otherwise accepted the conventional view of the inevitable triumph of nationalist politics over the multinational empire, warned against simply assuming that use of a particular language during the nineteenth century automatically determined loyalty to a national group. In *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809–1918: A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary* (London, 1948), Taylor pointed out that many peasants in Central and Eastern Europe lacked real ethnic or national consciousness and that townspeople could expediently adopt the language that was

locally dominant. Nonetheless, historians by and large were slow to follow up with systematic studies of popular national identification.

The actual experience of nationalist activists in Central and Eastern Europe and in many other parts of the modern world, in fact, belied the common historical assumptions about individuals' membership in each nation being determined automatically by cultural heritage and family descent. Nationalist activists often confronted the task of winning the support and engagement of individuals who were bilingual or multilingual. In many cases the modern nationalist intellectuals had to "create"—"revive" as they commonly termed it—a standardized national literary language and then campaign for their target populations to learn that language, give it preference in their daily usage, and have their children educated in it rather than whatever was the language of power and governance, be it German, Magyar, or Polish.

Nationalist activists themselves often had to admit that, in territories where multiple languages and religions coexisted, many individuals long remained indifferent to nationalist appeals, crossed the cultural lines in their daily social relations, and were politically ambiguous or mutable in their loyalties to one or another national cause. Such ambiguity or indifference was another reality which nationalist historical narratives have often underestimated or ignored, but a growing body of research from the last two decades has opened up the discussion of ambivalent identities and multiple loyalties. Well into the early twentieth century, in fact, personal allegiances to the sovereign or the state; to local community, region, or historic territorial state; or to corporate status group or social class remained stronger for some segments of the Central European population than loyalty to those who shared one's language or other nationally charged cultural characteristics. In fact, up to World War I and in some cases after, many had not articulated a clear and distinct national loyalty.

The newer historical and social science scholarship on modern national movements in Central Europe and around the world which has developed since the mid-1980s takes seriously the process of nation-building not merely as a matter of political mobilization but also as a social and socio-cultural phenomenon, whereby nationalist activists developed popular loyalties to nation and supporting social and political solidarities. This challenges directly the nationalist historical narratives which assert the previous existence of their nations as peoples, but it does so by giving added significance to the work and impact of the modern nationalist activists in building their national movements.

Studies such as the Dane Peter Bugge's *Czech Nation-Building: National Self-Perception and Politics 1780–1914* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Aarhus, 1994), and the American Pieter Judson's stunning *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006) demonstrate how nineteenth-century Central European nationalists had to work to develop in popular consciousness a sense of which cultural characteristics would define the national group and to create social solidarities and boundaries to demarcate one group from another, boundaries which had often had not existed previously and which not all in the population were eager to embrace. I tried to examine such pro-

cesses for the formation of the German minority in Prague during the mid- and late nineteenth century as far back as my 1975 doctoral dissertation, although a number of established Central European historians at that time were not yet prepared to accept such a constructivist view of national identity and group solidarities. More recently, Jeremy King's work on Budějovice, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans* (Princeton, 2002) has had a strong appeal because he studies the development of both Czech and German national identification and group solidarities over a long span of time in the context of one medium-sized town where ambiguity, indifference, and mutability with regard to identities long remained realities for a significant fraction of the population. Looking more broadly at the ideological and political development of the Czech national movement in the nineteenth century, Bugge has argued that the Czech nationalist intellectuals and political activists, in fact, insisted so much on the unifying factor of language for the Czech nation because so little else in everyday life separated Czech-speakers from their German-speaking neighbors in Bohemia and Moravia. By the time King's book was published in 2002, the scholarly community of modern historians and political sociologists was prepared to embrace such findings, and there was a robust conceptual and analytic vocabulary available to deal with such phenomena.

The publication of theoretical works on the social and political construction of national loyalties since the mid-1980s by Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, and more recently Rogers Brubaker and Etienne Balibar has aided greatly historical writing on modern Central Europe. Those theoretical works have greatly increased scholarly interest throughout the social sciences and humanities in the processes of developing national identification and have made us aware of the illogic of assuming a priori the existence of national identities and the sense of belonging to a national group, when that is precisely what we should be examining and analyzing in order to comprehend the rise of modern nationalism.

Since the publication of Jeremy King's book, other scholars have joined in showing how much better we can understand nineteenth and twentieth-century nationalist political agitation by taking seriously the continuing reality of ambiguity and mutability with regard to national loyalties. Tara Zahra's recently published, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948* (Ithaca, 2008) offers the first thorough analysis of the social and political circumstances which made Czech nationalists during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries so determined to put controls on which schools children would be permitted to attend in districts which had both Czech and German-language instruction. Czech nationalist politicians were determined to stamp out ambiguity and indifference about national loyalty. Having fastened on language use as the key to identity and group solidarity, they had to control the language in which the children of the nation were educated. The title of Zara's book may at first sound lurid, but it derives directly from the rhetoric of Czech nationalist activists.

Much of the research published so far on the dynamics of constructing national loyalties and the struggles against ambiguity and indifference have dealt with the Czech- and German-speakers in the Bohemian lands or Slovene- and German-speak-

ers in southern Styria and Carniola (Slovenia today), but Tomasz Kamusella, in his book, *Silesia and Central European Nationalisms* (West Lafayette, IN, 2007), has broken with the conventional Polish nationalist narrative and begun to examine ambiguities and conflicts regarding identity in part of modern Poland. Some in the group of younger historians in L'viv and at the Central European University in Budapest are also beginning to do similarly.

Not all historians have readily accepted the findings of the recent studies that Central European nationalists engendered their nations in the modern situation, to borrow from Ernest Gellner's famous formulation, or that ambiguity and indifference remained significant factors in society into the early twentieth century. Even while granting that nationalist political movements are fundamentally modern, many historians still want to find older roots for the willingness of individuals and groups to identify with national causes. Miroslav Hroch and Anthony D. Smith, for instance, reject the more radically constructivist accounts as excessively "voluntarist," and I think that there is considerable merit in arguments for the historic roots or predispositions of particular social elements to identify with national causes when the latter emerged as political phenomena. Hroch argues that "intellectuals can 'invent' national communities only if certain objective preconditions for the formation of a nation already exist." In Hroch's vision the process of forming a nation, in fact, is "not preordained or irreversible," but requires pre-existing objective relationships, be they "economic, political, linguistic, cultural, religious, geographical, or historical" (Miroslav Hroch, "From National Movement to the Fully-Formed Nation: The Nation-Building Process in Europe," *New Left Review* 198: 3–20). Researching and interpreting the multilayered, historically conditioned processes of national identification in concrete situations is exactly what many historians of modern Central Europe are now doing.

It is anyone's guess as to how long it will take for historians in Central Europe who have been reared on the traditional nationalist narratives to begin to study the persistence of ambiguity and indifference regarding national identity into the early twentieth century. A few brave younger scholars are beginning to examine this phenomenon, and the reactions to some of the latest publications from North America and Western Europe will be an important test of receptivity, particularly in the Polish, Czech, Slovak, and Slovene scholarly communities.

II. BASES AND STRUCTURES FOR MODERN PUBLIC LIFE

Along with the path breaking new approaches to the development of nationalist politics and loyalties to nation compared to other social and political allegiances have come more sophisticated analyses of the bases and supporting structures for political action and popular political culture in modern Central Europe. Again, the concepts and analytic approaches which historians have increasingly applied since the 1980s to Central European history will not seem novel to historians of modern Germany, France, and Britain or North America; but they have fundamentally transformed our understandings of the development of the liberal and conservative politics of the middle and late nineteenth century; of radical nationalism, Christian social movements, and social democracy; and then communism, fascism, and late

twentieth-century democracy.

Here, too, historians working in North America and Western Europe, informed by broad comparative perspectives and social science conceptualizations, have made some of the most important breakthroughs. In 1978 the American Bruce Garver published *The Young Czech Party, 1874–1901, and the Emergence of a Multi-party System* (New Haven, 1978), which analyzed its social bases and modes of organization, highlighting the party's effective use of the autonomy granted by Austrian law to city governments and the provincial diets and the Young Czechs' pivotal role in the transition from middle-class *Honoratioren* parties to mass politics.

John W. Boyer's monumental two-volume study of the Christian Social movement in Vienna and the Austrian Alpine lands, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848–1897* (Chicago, 1981), and *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna: Christian Socialism in Power, 1897–1918* (Chicago, 1995), marked a fundamental turning point in our understanding of the social bases of urban liberal politics in late nineteenth-century Austria. He replaced the old simple dichotomy between liberal parties of notables and populist mass-based parties with a more sophisticated analysis which emphasized the direct, linear connections between the German liberals' deferential politics of middle-class citizens in clearly defined communities and the populist, antisemitic lower-middle-class communitarianism of the Christian Socials which arose to displace the liberals in Vienna and Lower Austria.

A few local studies published in the 1980s such as William Hubbard's *Auf dem Weg zur Großstadt: Eine Sozialgeschichte der Stadt Graz 1850–1914* (Munich, 1984); my *Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861–1914* (Princeton, 1981; rev. 2nd ed., West Lafayette, IN, 2006); and Evan B. Bukey's *Hitler's Hometown: Linz, Austria, 1908–1945* (Bloomington, 1986) advanced understanding of the structures of urban politics. This body of work helped lay the foundations for Pieter Judson's subtle analysis of the evolution of German liberal politics in Imperial Austria and the almost seamless transition into middle-class and lower middle-class German nationalist politics as well as Laurence Cole's insightful examination of German national loyalties in late nineteenth-century Tirol, *"Für Gott, Kaiser und Vaterland": Nationale Identität der deutschsprachigen Bevölkerung Tirols 1860–1914* (Frankfurt and New York, 2000).

Historians in Central Europe have embraced more readily the new approaches to understanding the social bases and structural transformation of modern political action than they have the rethinking of national identification. The opening of archives in the former communist lands and lifting of taboos in those countries regarding which political movements could be studied has made possible a growing stream of interesting new works. Many large gaps remain, but we now have a sizable literature on various nationalist, agrarian, Christian Social or Christian Democratic, and Social Democratic parties in the various lands of the Habsburg Monarchy and its successor states during the late nineteenth century and interwar period, written by Czech, Polish, and Hungarian scholars, as well as English-speaking historians. Sophisticated scholarly studies of the fascist parties and the communists are still too few, but historians in the post-communist countries have made a start here, too.

Among historical studies produced in Austria over the last decade, we find an excellent understanding of the political structures and practices which underlay political life during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Hans Peter Hye's *Das politische System in der Habsburgermonarchie: Konstitutionalismus, Parlamentarismus und politische Partizipation* (Prague, 1998); Lothar Höbelt's *Kornblume und Kaiseradler: die deutschfreiheitlichen Parteien Altösterreichs 1882–1918* (Vienna and Munich, 1993); and the essays in the recent volumes of the Austrian Academy of Science's collective project, *Die Habsburgermonarchie, 1848–1918* which deal with parliament and political parties and political culture and civil society. There is still a dearth of good work on the Austrian First Republic, but Erika Weinzierl, Gerhard Botz, Ernst Hanisch, and by now many others have examined National Socialism in Austria with great sophistication. Ernst Hanisch's magnificent synthesis on twentieth-century Austrian society and politics, *Der lange Schatten des Staates: Österreichische Gesellschaftsgeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1994), is a wiser, more sensitive and more readable overview of how social and political structures and relations between society and the state have developed over the course of that century than any book I know for any other Central European country.

III. SOCIETY AND A DYNAMIC STATE

Hanisch's focus on the evolving relationship between society and the state and his emphasis on the continuity to the present in the powerful role played by the state in Austrian society brings us to the third important new dimension of recent writing on modern Austrian and central European history: new understandings of the evolving relationships between citizens and the state and the continuous role of the state as a dynamic force in society during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Most of the general surveys of modern Habsburg and Central European history depict the Habsburg monarchy as having suffered a seemingly irreversible decline over its last century, beset by rising and irresolvable nationalist conflicts and a frequently paralyzed governing system which could not accommodate the rise of mass politics or any genuine democratization. Liberal revolutions failed in 1848, and only after military defeats in 1859 and 1866 did the Habsburg state accept a constitutional system; but in this traditional view no genuine and successful liberalization followed. The crown, bureaucracy, aristocracy, and Catholic Church remained powerful forces, and when parliamentary conflicts turned into political stalemate, the state was all too happy to resort to bureaucratic absolutism and rule by decree. The conventional emphasis on political conflict and stalemate and on the seeming immobility of the state structure, particularly after the 1867 Austro-Hungarian compromise, often hid the fact that a system of modern state services and law and modern notions of citizenship developed in almost continuous processes after the 1860s.

The older historical literature took due note of the rise of political parties and interest groups, but primarily as sources of conflict and as players in the tragic failures of liberalization and democratization, whether under the monarchy or during the two decades after 1918. Until the last twenty years, historians took little note

of the structural transformations in public life signified by the development of the parties and interest groups and active popular participation in political action. All this manifested, in fact, the development of a vigorous and multifarious civil society and modern concepts of citizenship. Citizens and groups of citizens functioning in that civil society, whether they supported national liberal, radical nationalist, Christian Social, agrarian, or Social Democratic ideology, pressed increasingly to influence the policymaking and legislative work of the state wherever they could gain a footing.

The Austrian state, as John Boyer has emphasized, allowed much more autonomy for city and communal governments and the Länder than did the systems of governance in Prussia and many of the other German states. In the Austrian crown lands at least, that autonomy, along with the steady growth after the 1880s in the responsibilities of the communes and the Länder for public services, meant an increasing penetration of political parties and societal interests into policymaking and the work of government even if there was no fundamental democratization of state decision making. Czech historians have long understood the importance of the autonomous communal and provincial bodies; recently the historian Milan Hlavačka has written of the half century before 1913 as a golden age of autonomous government in his *Zlatý věk České samosprávy: Samospráva a její vliv na hospodářský, sociální a intelektuální rozvoj Čech 1862-1913 [The Golden Age of Bohemian Autonomous Self-government: Autonomous Self-government and Its Influence on Economic, Social, and Intellectual Development]* (Prague, 2006). By the 1880s and 1890s the central ministerial authorities and their representatives in the provincial governors' offices were increasingly sensitive to the agitation of the parties and interests groups and regularly engaged in complex negotiations with them, either with or without the mediation of the provincial diets and parliament.

The emphasis in the new scholarship on the growth of civil society, the increasing civic engagement of citizens, and the penetration of society into the workings of government does not deny the continuing power of the crown and state administration up to the last months of World War Il nor the contentiousness of parliamentary politics and the resulting weaknesses of parliament institutions vis-à-vis the state administration, whether in the late imperial period or the interwar years. Rather, the new work is giving us a deeper and subtler understanding of what bases of support the parties and interest groups had in society and how those interests influenced and negotiated with the still powerful state administration.

The older historical literature typically presented portraits of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries full of contradictions: a late nineteenth century dominated by the ambitions of populist nationalist politicians, Christian Socials, agrarians, and Social Democrats for self-government for their various constituencies, a self-government which ostensibly could never be satisfied by the seemingly immobile Habsburg state. Popular loyalties to the old state presumably declined steadily over the late nineteenth century as national identities grew stronger, even though hardly any of the Habsburg state's critics and opponents, in fact, wanted complete independence—itself another major contradiction in the traditional narratives. Those accounts typically presented the collapse of the monarchy in 1918

as a great opportunity for democratization, followed by the tragic failure in much of the region to create strong, stable, democratic polities before 1939.

Before World War I, perceptive observers of imperial Austrian politics, such as Karl Renner, understood that Austria's nationality conflicts signified, in fact, a "struggle for the state" rather than against it. After 1918 many of the most ardent nationalist politicians consciously strove to preserve significant parts of the legal and administrative structures of the old Habsburg state to use in service of their own interests under the new flags. Again, during the interwar period much of the political striving and contention did not aim at revolutionizing the whole system of government but rather represented the efforts of various societal interests to capture parts of the existing state structures for their own advantage. The result was that strong state bureaucratic authority, carefully delineated autonomy for local and regional governmental units, and a preference for corporatist solutions to economic and social problems that were typically negotiated outside of elected legislative chambers persisted in much of Central Europe from the last decades of the monarchy to well beyond 1918.

In this third major aspect of the recent scholarship on modern Central Europe, scholars are connecting their new, subtler understandings of popular political identification with a re-examination of citizens' attitudes toward the state and their relations with it. Increasingly, historians are joining social scientists in understanding popular political loyalties as complex and dynamic processes of identification, in which community, region, professional grouping, social class, religion, and nation as well as the state might be objects of simultaneous popular allegiance. Nearly all the studies mentioned here have important new things to say about how parties, interest groups, and individual citizens interacted with a changing state and its institutions over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and how citizens were increasingly implicated in the state's administrative work, law- and rule-making, policing and defense measures. This new scholarship is increasingly interested in long-term chains of development in political culture, behavior, and institutions which transcend the old dividing lines of 1867, 1918, 1938, and 1945.

The cultural and political pluralism, the multiple fault lines and points of contention which have always given a special appeal to the historical experience of Habsburg lands and the Central European successor states, their politics, social relations, and culture, still draw us to study this part of the world. The new approaches deployed during the last two decades are enabling us to examine in much more sophisticated ways the development, dimensions, and meanings of popular loyalties; the structures and bases for civil society and popular political engagement; and the complex and dynamic relations of citizens and social groups with the state. If the rest of the historical profession and the academy now finds the scholarship in this field much more interesting than twenty or thirty years ago, there are very good reasons for that.

Telling Stories about Sixty-Eight: Troublemaking, Political Passions, and Enabling Democracy[1]

Geoff Eley
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

In the months before he died, Teddy Adorno was engaged in a tense correspondence with his old friend and longstanding collaborator in the Institute for Social Research, Herbert Marcuse, who unlike Adorno had remained in the United States after 1945, teaching from 1965 at the University of California in San Diego. In the first half of 1969, the pitched battles between radical students and the authorities in both California and West Germany were at a sustained peak. On "Bloody Thursday," 15 May, Governor Ronald Reagan sent police into People's Park in Berkeley armed with bird shot, buck shot, and tear gas, leading to the death of one student and at least 128 severely wounded; during the subsequent repression the National Guard were sent in to occupy the city; other California campuses saw large-scale strikes in solidarity, including Marcuse's own UCSD. The drama interrupted Marcuse's correspondence with his friend, who was watching similar events unfold in Frankfurt. But there was a vital difference, for in Frankfurt Adorno was himself at the center of the storm. Building in intensity over a period of several years, radical attacks on the political quietism of Adorno's Institute had come to a head on 31 January 1969, when a group of students including Hans-Jürgen Krahl, one of Adorno's doctoral students and an SDS leading light, occupied a room in the Institute. Adorno called in the police, who cleared the building, placing Krahl under arrest with 75 other students. After much dithering, amidst broadening confrontations, Adorno persisted with charges against Krahl alone, whose trial eventually occurred in July.

Since January 1969, much to Adorno's disquiet, Marcuse had been intending to visit Frankfurt to discuss their differences en route for a summer in Italy. Originally proposing just a small gathering of faculty, Marcuse rapidly realized that he couldn't come to Frankfurt without speaking to the students. The University was in complete turmoil. More to the point Marcuse was now touted constantly as the movement's prophet: the blurb for the mass market edition of *One Dimensional Man* placed him in a pantheon with "Mao Tse Tung, Che Guevara, and Ho Chi Minh." During the early months of 1969 his notoriety gathered pace, while in Frankfurt Adorno's lectures drew ever-worsening confrontations. The two friends' letters now teetered toward estrangement. On 5 April 1969, with a heavy heart, Marcuse wrote that in light of what he had learned about the events at the Institute, the situation had "decisively" changed:

> In short: . . . if I accept the Institute's invitation without also speaking to the students, I will identify myself with . . . a position I do not share politically. To put it brutally: if the alternative is the police or the left-wing students, then I am with the students – with one crucial exception, namely, if my life is threatened

---

[1] Luncheon address, German Studies Association, 4 October 2008, St. Paul, Minnesota.

> or violence is threatened against my person and my friends, and that threat is a serious one. Occupation of rooms . . . would not be a reason for me to call the police . . . I still believe that our cause (which is not only ours) is better taken up by the rebellious students than by the police . . .

He continued in a vein of ethical frankness and resolution:

> You know me well enough to know that I reject the unmediated translation of theory into praxis just as emphatically as you do. But I do believe that there are situations, moments, in which theory is driven further along by praxis – situations and moments in which theory kept separate from praxis ceases to be true to itself. We cannot banish from the world the fact that these students are influenced by us (and certainly not least by you) – I am very glad of this and I am ready for patricide, however painful that can sometimes be. And the means they use to translate theory into action? We know (and they know) that the situation is not a revolutionary one, not even a pre-revolutionary one. But this situation is so terrible, so suffocating and demeaning, that rebelling against it forces a biological, physiological reaction: one can bear it no longer, one suffocates, and one needs some air. And this fresh air is not that of a 'left fascism' (*contradictio in adjecto*!). It is the air that we (at least I) also some day want to breathe, and it is certainly not the air of the establishment. I discuss with the students, and I attack them if I think they are being stupid and playing into the hands of the other side, but I would probably not call to my aid worse, more awful weapons against their bad ones. And I would despair about myself (us) if I (we) would appear to be on the side of a world that supports mass murder in Vietnam, or says nothing about it, and which makes a hell out of any realms that are outside of its own repressive power.

Without overtly breaking with his friend, Adorno had been digging himself in. He drew the line tightly around the defense of the West German status quo, including its international alignment with the anti-Communist U.S, while deriding the proceduralist obsessions of participatory democracy and invoking "the danger of the student movement flipping over into fascism." In response, Marcuse mounted a careful defense of the student movement's critical potential. He affirmed the need to defend "parliamentary-democratic institutions where they still work in favor of freedom rights and against the sharpening of repression." He had absolutely no time for the ultra-left slogan of "destroy the university," describing it as "a suicidal act." But he refused to agree that the only alternative to giving one's unconditional support to "*this* democracy" would be the inevitable slide into "neo-fascism." Despite all its confusions and excesses, and its vulnerability to provocateurs, the student movement was now a vital source of critique, an impulse towards dissent, and a "catalyst" for change, one that gave a hook for the "new, very unorthodox forms of opposition" then in process of emerging. Under the circumstances, critical theory's responsibility was to offer support: "it is precisely in a situation such as this that our task is to help the movement, theoretically, as well as defending it against repression and denunciation."[2]

As Marcuse wrote those words, in late July 1969, the witch hunt was in full spate against him, now joined to his dismay by Max Horkheimer, who was quoted by *Der Spiegel* as accusing him of simplifying and coarsening "Adorno's and my thought." Thus Marcuse's patient explication of his ethico-political standpoint in his private letters occurred in lurid counterpoint with the frenetic public theater of student activism, whose intransigence was being ratcheted ever more extravagantly forward. On June 18th Adorno cancelled his lectures on the "Introduction to Dialectical Thought." In mid-July when his case came to trial, Hans-Jürgen Krahl received a suspended sentence for violating a ban on entering the university and a fine for disturbing the peace. Against this backcloth, Adorno had remarked to Horkheimer that he found Marcuse's arguments in defense of the student movement "monstrous" (*ungeheuerlich*). Relations seemed headed inexorably for a rift. Then, on 6 August, Adorno died. Six months later, on 14 February 1970, the 27-year old Krahl died in a car accident.[3]

In drawing up our balance sheet of the meanings of 1968, we do well to remember these powerful ethico-political dimensions. Yet neither of the currently ascendant approaches does justice to the big eventfulness that inspired the stand Marcuse thought himself compelled to take, the urgent momentousness which he described to Adorno. To a remarkable degree, for example, our perceptions are still dominated by the youthful participants in the events themselves, now increasingly graying and in search of absolution, locked in an endless time loop of ritual recollection, kvetching their way through the anniversaries that roll around every ten years. The prevailing tones here are now those of disavowal, for which Götz Aly's recent confessional offers one of the most sensationalizing and disingenuous examples.[4] This salience of the selective and contentious commentaries of the participants themselves is perhaps surprising. There's a small gem of an essay by John Berger on Alexander Herzen (written as it happens in 1968), in which he reflects on the kind of political horizon that was produced after 1848 in the exilic imaginary of disabled revolutionaries compelled endlessly to re-experience the loss of their political hopes.[5] Yet it took only TWO decades before the melancholy of the failed revolutions of 1848 became dissolved in a fresh convulsion of history,

---

[2] I base this account on the detailed documentation in Wolfgang Kraushaar (ed.), *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung: von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail 1946 bis 1995*, Vol. 2: *Dokumente* (Rogner & Bernhard bei Zweitausendeins: Hamburg, 1998), 530–696. The specific quotations are taken from the following letters: Marcuse to Adorno, 5 April 1969, 601–2; Adorno to Marcuse, 19 June 1969, 653; Marcuse to Adorno, 21 June 1969, 653–55.

[3] See Esther Leslie, "Introduction to Adorno/Marcuse Correspondence on the German Student Movement," *New Left Review*, 233 (January-February 1999), 118–36. See also Hans-Jürgen Krahl, *Konstitution und Klassenkampf. Zur historischen Dialektik von bürgerlichen Emanzipation und proletarischen Revolution. Schriften, Reden und Entwürfe aus den Jahren 1966–1970* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Neue Kritik, 1971).

[4] Götz Aly, *Unser Kampf: 1968— ein irritierter Blick zurück* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 2008).

[5] John Berger, "Alexander Herzen," in *The Look of Things: Essays by John Berger*, ed. by Nikos Stangos (New York: Viking Press, 1974), 80–86.

while Herzen had also retained a relation of optimism to a progressive image of radical futurity. For our own case, though, neither of those factors pertains: it's now FOUR decades since the failed revolution of 1968 rather than just two; and the optimism of History's assured progressive movement is no longer there to be summoned.

A further version of the disavowal narrative highlights the self-indulgence and narcissism of particular middle-class generations, severing the cultural dissidence of "sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll" from the politics of 1968 and retelling it as a straightforward story of hedonist irresponsibility and excess. Here sixty-eight is constructed as a kind of phase, something finite and ephemeral, something that was "not inhaled." There's a larger version too, in which the cultural divisiveness of our own present gets traced back to the extremism and excesses of an earlier cultural radicalism and its supposed destructiveness. In that way, "1968" becomes joined to "1989" in a seamless story of the dangerousness of all big thinking about social transformation. If in Aly's *mea culpa* sixty-eight becomes reduced to just one more version of the totalitarian temptation, in a kind of grotesque inversion of the Maoist posturing learned in its author's youth, then this retelling of the story becomes a warning against the dangers of utopianism or any radical commitment to the possibilities of large-scale societal change. Political disappointment becomes translated into an epistemological police action. "1989" subsumes "1968" to refute the validity of any grand-scale theorizing.[6]

The second prevailing view, which consists properly of an *analytic* rather than merely a *posture* can be best summed up in the title of one of Axel Schildt's essays from 2001: namely, "Before the Revolt."[7] That is, the main weight of scholarly historiography has for some years been shrinking the importance of the events of 1968 themselves, so that the longer-run accumulation of societal changes during the 1960s as a whole can be emphasized instead. We can see this consensus already inscribed in the pages of Schildt's and Sywottek's *Modernisierung im Wiederaufbau* published in 1993, and by the time its successor volume appeared in 2000, *Dynamische Zeiten: Die 60er Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften*, the perspectives had fully coalesced.[8] Rather than focusing "exclusively on the revolt

[6] See especially this statement by Richard Rorty, quoted in Paul Berman, *A Tale of Two Utopias: The Political Journey of the Generation of 1968* (New York: Norton, 1996), 296: "I hope we have reached a time when we can finally get rid of the conviction common to Plato and Marx, the conviction that there *must* be large theoretical ways of finding out how to end injustice. I hope we can learn to get along without the conviction that there is something deep – such as the human soul, or human nature, or the will of God, or the shape of history – which provides a subject matter for grand, politically useful theory." He then warns us against seeking any kind of "successor to Marxism" in the sense of "a large theoretical framework that will enable us to put our society in an excitingly new context." We need a more "banal" language of political theory instead.

[7] Axel Schildt, "Vor der Revolte: Die sechziger Jahre," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 25 May 2001, B 22-23/2001, 7–13.

[8] See Axel Schildt and Arnold Sywottek (ed.), *Modernisierung im Wiederaufbau. Die westdeutsche Gesellschaft der fünfziger Jahre* (Bonn:Dietz, 1993); Axel Schildt, Detlef

of 1968," Schildt has argued, we should be focusing on "the entire 1960s as a phase of far-reaching societal transformation." In this view, being able to grasp the key political and cultural changes presupposes freeing our perceptions from the distorting effects of the noise and spectacle "of the last third of the decade," thereby liberating ourselves from the telos of '68. In this perspective the later events need to be given a much broader context that allows us to predate them to the beginning of the decade. Grounded by increasingly rich social-historical analyses of the consequences of postwar reconstruction and the normalizing of the consumer economy, this analysis insists that the relevant "oppositional departures" were generated out of "political occasions, perceptions, and motivations," formed in that earlier time, including the "rise of a New Left" itself. In that sense "1968" turns into an exaggerated symptom of "a dynamic modernization of West German society and its political culture" that in 1960 was already in train.[9]

A great deal of this is persuasive. Aside from Schildt, the most decisive illuminations of the broader institutional and intellectual contexts of the changes of the 1960s have come from Ulrich Herbert's team in Freiburg, especially in the books of Christine von Hodenberg and Dirk Moses.[10] In light of these contributions we can see the earlier 1960s as the context for a maturing generational critique of the democracy-constricting claustrophobia of the political culture of the "CDU state." Through that critique, a definite cohort of the intelligentsia pressed for a new climate of polite pluralism, national civility, and reasoned public exchange, in a drive for the fundamental "politicizing of the public sphere."[11] In that sense the ideal of an invigorated culture of democratic civility grew from an increasingly dense debate during the early 1960s over the desirable meanings of publicness for West German democracy, which was always explicitly linked to the overcoming of authoritarian traditions. If we go all the way with the logic of this view, "1968" then recedes as a "singular event" to reappear as the surface manifestation of a much longer history,

---

Siegfried, and Karl Christian Lammers (eds.), *Dynamische Zeiten. Die sechziger Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften* (Hamburg: Hans Christians Verlag, 2000). These emblematic volumes have no counterpart in the English-speaking world, although a variety of conferences, dissertations, and particular projects began playing off their influence. The most important Anglo-American interventions, such as the otherwise excellent volume edited by Philipp Gassert and Alan E. Steinweis, *Coping with the Nazi Past: West German Debates on Nazism and Generational Conflict, 1955–1975* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006), retain an oblique relationship to the problematic of 1968 per se, and we are still waiting for any programmatic volume in the English-speaking world that might frame the subject in any encompassing way.

[9] This summary is a paraphrase of the abstract of Schildt's article, "Vor der Revolte"; the final quotation is taken from his final paragraph, 13.

[10] See Christina von Hodenberg, *Konsens und Krise. Eine Geschichte der westdeutschen Medienöffentlichkwit 1945–1973* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006); A. Dirk Moses, *German Intellectuals and the Nazi Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Ulrich Herbert (ed.), *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland. Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung 1945–1980* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2002).

[11] The quoted phrase is taken from a paper Christine von Hodenberg presented at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 12 April 2001.

"embedded within longer processes of political, social, and cultural change ranging from the 1950s to the 1980s." [12] Those events only make sense as the symptom of "a fundamental liberalization of politics, culture, and society already proceed[ing] long before 1968."[13]

In some versions of this argument the constructive importance of "1968" shrinks to virtually nothing. Rather extraordinarily, it disappears literally ENTIRELY from the pages of Konrad Jarausch and Michael Geyer's *Shattered Past*. In a work that sets out to reconstruct the pluralized ground from which the histories of Germany's twentieth century might now be rewritten, that erasure becomes perhaps the most eloquent silence of all.[14] More commonly, measured against the longer-run underlying changes, '68 becomes merely a disruption, a distraction from the more important places where democracy was being made. Hostile verdicts easily follow. The main effect of the student movement, according to Heinrich August Winkler, lay beyond its own confused and divided actions in the unintended impetus given to the Federal Republic's "westernization."[15] Against the intentions of the 68ers, Claus Leggewie argues, "The thematizing of the legitimacy crisis" ended up conferring only "a higher measure of legitimacy."[16] The only significant consequences of 1968 were thus DESTRUCTIVE:

> . . . thinking in Marxist categories was a regression; in their political praxis the 68ers behaved quite undemocratically, and at all events contributed nothing to democratization; instead, they set into motion the spiral of violence towards terrorism; they were successful only in the dismantling of authorities, while failing yet again in the necessary creation of new values.[17]

Ever reliably, Hans-Ulrich Wehler now provides the pointed, no-nonsense formulation: "Politically, the German 68er movement failed all along the line."[18]

But a verdict such as that implies a remarkably primitive understanding of the

---

[12] Views attributed to Siegried Mews and Konrad Jarausch, Summary of Proceedings, "Germany's 1968: A Cultural Revolution?", University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 11–12 April 2008, http:www.h-net.org/-german/pdf/20080527_1968.pdf., 2, 4.

[13] Edgar Wolfrum, "'1968' in der gegenwärtigen deutschen Geschichtspolitik," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 25 May 2001, B 22/23, 29.

[14] Konrad H. Jarausch and Michael Geyer, *Shattered Past: Reconstructing German Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003). See also Konrad H. Jarausch, *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans, 1945–1995* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 156–81.

[15] Heinrich August Winkler, *Der lange Weg nach Westen, Vol. 2: Vom "Dritten Reich" bis zur Wiedervereinigung* (Munich: Beck, 2000), 252.

[16] Claus Leggewie, "Der Mythos der Neuanfangs – Gründungsetappen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: 1949 – 1968 – 1989," in Helmut Berding (ed.), *Mythos und Nation. Studien zur Entwicklung desr kollectiven Bewußtseins in der Neuzeut* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996), 296.

[17] Wolfrum, "1968," 30.

[18] Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte, Vol. 5: Von der Gründung der beiden deutschen Staaten bis zur Vereinigung 1949 – 1990* (Munich: Berck, 2008), 310–21, excerpted on the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* Web site: http://lesesaal.faz.net/wehler/texte.php?tid=7.

relationship between popular political mobilizations, nascent societal crisis, longer-run social changes, and subsequent effects. Here I need to make a key point about big societal crises like 1968: what they leave behind may only cohere long after the immediate noise has died away. In particular, the relation of lasting effects to willed desires will be full of ironies and disappointments. What people want will differ from what they actually get. As William Morris famously expressed this in *A Dream of John Ball*: "I . . . pondered how [people] fight and lose the battle, and the thing that they fought for comes about in spite of their defeat, and when it comes turns out not to be what they meant, and other [people] have to fight for what they meant under another name."[19] Crucial is the chemistry of the crisis itself: that combination of determined, daring, and often reckless direct action, largeness of vision, institutional vulnerability or readiness, and surrounding popular ferment, which together are able to unlock the space and allow power-holders of the necessary courage and astuteness – or cynicism – to seize the time. The outcomes won't coincide with what revolutionaries had demanded; they may actually amount to what often seem quite modest changes. But they were only compelled onto the agenda to begin with by the crisis and its disruptions.

In the time that's left I'd like to make a series of general points about the specific features of the West German 1968, each of which represented an innovatory impulse or departure, which not only brought existing tendencies to a dramatic head, but also ratcheted them forward into a new and unexpected space while enabling longer-lasting changes for the future. In other words, while it would be foolish to diminish the importance of the work done on the earlier 1960s, those arguments don't come close to exhausting what we need to say about the big eventfulness of "1968" itself, and they certainly don't explain the lasting changes of the subsequent two decades. Running through each of the points I want to make is the red thread of the ethico-political dimension with which I began this talk. For in rendering the passions 1968 intelligible we need something a bit more sophisticated than Wehler's sneering caricature of a "lifestyle revolution" of the "involuntary avant-garde of a capitalist consumer society," whose sole enduring result was a "free course" for its "crass hedonism and individualism."[20] Other deeply and passionately thought and felt commitments were in play.

FIRST, therefore, I want to mention the internationalism that was essential to the élan of 1968. In common with student movements elsewhere, the West German activism was propelled by outrage against the war in Vietnam and by a wide range of Third World solidarity actions. As the FRG lacked a recent history of colonialism, this salience was all the more striking. The APO's first major action in West Berlin was against the visit of Moise Tshombe on 18 December 1964; the organizing framework for the SDS left around Dutschke came from Third World actions, including the *Viva-Maria* Group in early 1966, the disruption of *Africa addio* on 2 August 1966, and the impact of the translation of Fanon's *Wretched of*

[19] William Morris, *A Dream of John Ball* (1887), quoted by Edward P. Thompson, *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary*, 2nd ed. (London: Merlin, 1977), 722.

[20] Wehler, *Gesellschaftsgeschichte, Vol. 5*, 321.

the Earth later that year; the wider public impetus was provided by the two Vietnam demonstrations of 5 February and 10 December 1966; and the major radicalizing moment of the Ohnesorg killing occurred during the demonstration against the Shah of Iran on 2 June 1967. Moreover, the immediate prelude to the dramatic national events of April-May 1968 was the International Vietnam Congress of 17–18 February in West Berlin, accompanied by an impressively militant demonstration. The sense of joining a genuinely internationalist student culture, embracing Third World universities as well as those of the two Europes and North America, was essential to the ambience of 1968, and this was very marked in the FRG.[21]

SECOND, partly because of its extreme isolation from the SPD, the SDS leadership culture had an especially self-conscious relationship to theory. The key circles emerged during 1967–68 from a systematic engagement with Marxist, socialist, and anarchist traditions, usually with a broadly Central European bent. Here Rudi Dutschke's intellectual formation was emblematic. Exploring successively Kolakowski, Lukacs, and the 1920s Comintern as potential dissertation topics, while establishing contacts with Marcuse, Lukacs, and especially Ernst Bloch, he moved eclectically through the continental Marxist traditions. He did so with a facility harder to imagine in, say, France, where intellectual curiosity only occasionally registered ideas from elsewhere, or Britain, where knowledge of European traditions came later, with *New Left Review*'s ambitious translation program in the 1970s.

Dutschke's outlook was *Western Marxist* in Perry Anderson's sense. It was anti-Stalinist as opposed to anti-Communist, non-economistic, and drawn to the philosophical critique of capitalism via themes of domination and alienation, as opposed to the political economy of classical Marxism. What emerges above all is the broad-gauged catholicity of the intellectual referents and the *cautious* utopianism at the center of his ideas. Despite the endemic adventurism of 1968, Dutschke's socialism was tempted neither by insurrectionary fantasies nor by the revived vanguardism of the Maoist and Trotskyist sects. His "long march through the existing institutions" was a gradualism aimed at shifting the terms of public debate, so that an organized Left could begin reaching beyond its marginal status. Dutschke's careful disavowal of maximalist expectations in 1967–68 impresses far more than the rhetorical revolutionism that seemed uppermost at the time.[22]

---

[21] The best brief introduction to the context of the APO in the 1960s is still Karl-Werner Brand, Detlef Büsser, and Dieter Rucht, *Aufbruch in eine andere Gesellschaft. Neue soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1986), 54–71. Also Karl Otto, *Vom Ostermarsch zur APO. Geschichte der außerparlamentarischen Oposition in der Bundesreprublik 1960–1970* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1977); Tilman Fichter and Siegward Lönnendonker, *Kleine Geschichte des SDS. Der Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund von Helmut Schmidt bis Rudi Dutschke*, 4th ed. (Essen: Klartext, 2007); Tilman Fichter, *SDS und SPD. Parteilichkeit jenseits der Partei* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988); Willy Albrecht, *Der Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund (SDS). Vom parteikonformen Studentenverband zum Repräsentanten der Neuen Linken* (Bonn: Ditz, 1994). For the overall outlook of the APO, see Wolfgang Kraushaar, "Dekmodelle der 68er-Bewegung," *Aus Politik und Geschichte*, 25 May 2001, B 22-23/2001, 14–27.

[22] This assessment is based on a comprehensive reading of Dutschke's writings, which after

Otherwise, these were some important features of his thinking, which reached significantly down into the 1980s in the political culture of the new social movements and The Greens:

1. Dutschke's Marxism was **anti-Leninist** – not out of any hostility to the Bolshevik Revolution as such, but in its critique of vanguardism and centralism. This also implied a critique of the Bolshevik model of socialist construction, and Dutschke's dissertation sought to define the Russian Revolution's specificity in that sense.[23] Stressing the sovereignty of the "social movement" over that of the "party," his political outlook moved him logically in the direction that in 1978–80 eventually produced The Greens.

2. The intellectual impulses were larger than Marxism *per se*, and embraced a **larger philosophical-ethical vision of human emancipation**. Here Ernst Bloch was central, as was Helmut Gollwitzer, a senior spokesman of that postwar ethical Christianity based in critical Protestant theology, who aligned himself publicly with the New Left in the 1960s and 1970s. In Dutschke's and the German New Left's formation, these non-Marxist ethical commitments were a major strand.

3. The parameters of Dutschke's thought were **Central European** as much as specifically German, with Prague and Budapest always part of the orbit. Here the Prague Spring was the complement to Lukács's *History and Class Consciousness*. Of course, the GDR was also part of this problematic: from Bloch (who taught in Leipzig from 1949 to the building of the Wall in 1961), through Dutschke himself (who migrated to West Berlin two days before the Wall was built), to Rudolf Bahro (released from prison to West Germany in 1979), critical engagement with the "actually existing socialism" across the border remained a key impulse for the West German New Left.[24]

In each of these ways, Dutschke and the central current of eclectic SDS Marxism had clear affinities with the Socialist Humanism affirmed so passionately by a

---

his death became available in a variety of editions and forms. The most useful are: *Die Revolte: Wurzeln und Spuren eines Aufbruchs* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1983); *Mein langer Marsch: Reden, Schriften und Tagebücher aus zwanzig Jahren* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1980); *Geschichte ist machbar: Texte über das herrschende Falsche und die Radikalität des Friedens* (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1980); and *Aufrecht gehen: eine fragmentarische Autobiographie* (Berlin Kreuzberg: Olle and Wolter, 1981). For the category of Western Marxism, see Perry Anderson, *Considerations on Western Marxism* (London: New Left Books, 1976). See also Ulrich Chaussy, *Die drei Leben des Rudi Dutschke: Eine Biographie* (Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1983); Gretschen Dutschke-Klotz, *Wir hatten ein barbarisches, schönes Leben. Rudi Dutschke. Eine Biographie* (Cologne: 1996); Jürgen Miermeister, *Ernst Bloch, Rudi Dutschke* (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1996).

[23] Rudi Dutschke, *Versuch, Lenin auf die Füße zu stellen. Über den halbasiatischen und den westeuropäischen Weg zum Sozialismus. Lenin, Lukács und die Dritte Internationale* (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1974).

[24] See Rudolf Bahro, *The Alternative in Eastern Europe* (London: New Left Books, 1978), and *From Red to Green* (London: Verso, 1984).

variety of heterodox western European left intellectuals during the 1960s, in an intellectual coalescence that seemed to promise the best possibility for a Left revival after the crisis of Stalinism in 1956.[25] That Socialist Humanism never attained the influence in the mainstream movements of the Left to which its exponents had aspired. But it *did* become one significant strand in the outlook of the The Greens. Green politics was a resumption of the anti-authoritarianism of the APO, with its characteristic fascination with the bases of liberation/emancipation, shading into the equally important counter-cultural explorations of alternative ways of being. The foregrounding of direct democracy and participatory forms was part of this, linked to the primacy of the social movement as opposed to the party. In that sense, the APO was the first of the new social movements. Viewed in these terms, the student movement of the 1960s signified the first stirrings of a phenomenon that became, sociologically and culturally, ever more fundamental to the possible forms of a dissident or oppositional politics.

THIRD, within the emergent forms of a reconfigured Left politics, feminism became a vital impulse, both taking its place in the course of the 1970s with the *Bürgerinitiativen*, ecological activism, the "alternative scene," youth dissidence, and the peace movement among the new social movements, and becoming a vital dimension of the new radical discourse as a whole. However, while ambiguously consistent with the anti-authoritarian ideals of the APO, the women's movement only emerged historically, as we know, in the course of angry confrontations with the movement's sexism and misogyny. The spectacle of origin always bears redescribing: a speech attacking patriarchy by Helke Sander for the West Berlin Action Committee for the Liberation of Women (formed in May 1968) at the Frankfurt delegate conference of the SDS in September 1968, whose ribald belittlement by the male leadership provoked the famous tomato attack by Sigrid Rüger on Hans-Jürgen Krahl. The incident sparked the formation of autonomous women's groups, which now turned the anti-authoritarian axioms against the shortcomings of the movement's own political culture ("Liberate the socialist stars from their bourgeois pricks," as the "lop-them-off leaflet" famously put it). After a phase of localized experiment, the emergent women's movement coalesced around the abortion campaign at the first Women's Congress in Frankfurt in March 1971.[26]

This feminism had already begun an anti-authoritarian learning process of its own in the setting of the *Kinderläden* and comparable locally grounded initiatives. By the time the abortion campaign wound down in 1975, it left behind a grass-

---

[25] See Edward P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays* (London: Merlin, 1978), 92–102; and for the general category of Socialist Humanism, Erich Fromm (ed.), *Socialist Humanism: An International Symposium* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965).

[26] As already mentioned above, Hans-Jürgen Krahl was a leading Frankfurt SDS theoretician and an old-guard anti-authoritarian, who died in a car accident in 1970 at the age of 27. Sander's speech is reprinted in Edith Hoshino Altbach, Jeanette Clausen, Dagmar Schultz, and Naomi Stephen (eds.), *German Feminism: Readings in Politics and Literature* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1984). The "lop-them-off leaflet" is reprinted in Jürgen Miermesiter and Jochen Staadt (eds.), *Provokationen: Die Studenten und Jugendrevolte in ihren Flugblättern 1965–1971* (Darmstadt and Neuwied, 1980), 223f.

roots milieu of reading groups, informal women's centers, seminars, conferences, international exchanges, and early lesbian groups. This was already blossoming into a more elaborate feminist public sphere of alternative bookshops, publishers, magazines, annual Women's Summer Universities, women's studies and research centers, and last but not least Women's [Safe] Houses, along with the associated subculture of self-help, medical self-care, and women's health networks. This supportive environment allowed the women's movement to withstand the repressive turn that accompanied the "German autumn" in 1977, while providing the foundations for a dispersed but no les significant continuation of the women's movement. That movement was the opposite of an organizationally cohesive milieu. But it constitutively shaped the public presence of The Greens.[27]

From the basic anti-authoritarian commitments to the stress on personal liberation, consciousness-raising, and a subversive political style, the new women's movement supplied a vital bridge to 1968. The women's movement originated in a tense and complex relationship with the student radicalism of the sixties. But, as elsewhere, it was unimaginable **without** the latter, and emerged from the contradictions it produced. For all the continuing fraughtness, the new social movements of the later 1970s and early 1980s ratified a fundamental transformation in the **very category of the political** and the complex range of meanings it was thought to contain. As a result of the explosions of 1968 and subsequent years, the possible entailments of "politics" became profoundly different than before.

FINALLY, in some ways THE most salient feature of the German events, as opposed to those elsewhere in Western Europe, was the exceptionally adversarial relationship of New Left radicalism to the existing left-wing party. The SPD was notable for the degree to which it systematically marginalized its own left after the Godesberg turn of 1959. Partly this meant explicitly repudiating the party's Marxist heritage. But oppositional voices were systematically excluded from the party's counsels—from the Easter March movement, to individual Leftists who stood out against the party's Cold War stance. Thus the SPD had expelled SDS in 1960, replacing it with the more compliant SHB (Social Democratic Higher Education League), which was itself pulled to the left in the late 1960s—whereupon the SPD withdrew its financial support in 1969, severed official relations in 1971, and banned its use of the "social democratic" label in June 1972. The SPD's entry into the governing coalition in December 1966 further emphasized its isolation from the emerging radical currents.

But here we have an interesting paradox. For in striking contrast with, say, Britain and the USA, where the polarization helped return the Right to government in 1970 and 1968 (and France where the 1968 election gave De Gaulle its plebiscitary endorsement), in West Germany it made the SPD into the governing party for the first time since 1930. In 1972, the continuing polarization delivered

[27] From April 1984 to March 1985, the Green *Bundestag* caucus had an all-women leadership, and during 1983–87 women became a majority of the whole parliamentary group, rising from 40 to 57 percent—an achievement hard to imagine in the Left's parliamentary profile in either Britain or France, though less so in the Low Countries and Scandinavia.

the SPD's highest support ever, finally surpassing the electoral strength of the CDU. In other words, the disarray of the anti-authoritarian movement during 1969 coincided with the SPD's breakthrough to government. Measured against the upswing in the party's membership and that of the JUSOs, together with the emergence of the *Bürgerinitiativen* which originally worked *with* the grain of the party's popularity, the APO's falling apart into sectarianism, violence, and atomized grassroots activity conferred a remarkable opportunity on a social democratic party imaginative enough to seize the time. But instead of harnessing the new radical-democratic potential – instead of "daring more democracy" – the SPD tethered its own imagination, while the anti-terrorist measures and the *Berufsverbot* tightened the public sphere against the emergent culture of participation. Under Schmidt, the SPD squandered its chances, battened down the hatches, and reopened the cleavage with the extra-parliamentary Left. In sharp contrast with Britain, Italy, and France, where by the mid-1970s the generational radicalism was flowing through the existing left-wing parties, in West Germany the second half of the 1970s saw a powerful return of the radicalizing logic of 1967–68. The SPD's intransigence against extra-parliamentary activity made it much harder to reabsorb the New Left generation in the following decade. The long-term consequences were disastrous: entirely leaving aside its reactive haplessness during the mid 1960s and 1968 itself, the SPD failed in the early 1970s; it failed again during 1977–78; it failed again in response to the peace movement and the rise of The Greens; it failed dismally in relation to 1989 and unification; and it's continued to fail ever since. The SPD is a broken party. The worst squandering of an opening to the future in 1968 was not that of the 68ers, but rather that of the SPD.

Archives: Past, Present, Future

[From its very inception, the GSA has recognized the centrality of archives – and of access to archives – for our work as scholars of German Studies. In this edition of the newsletter we thus maintain our tradition of publishing the annual report of the Archives Committee, so ably chaired by Rainer Hering, in this issue. We are also pleased to publish a description of the famous Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach by its director, Ulrich Raulff. His article is a timely reminder that archives are essentisal to ALL scholars of German Studies, not just historians. In 2009 – the 250th birthday of Schiller – the Deutsches Literaturarchiv will organize a roundtable at the annual conference of the GSA.]

GSA Archives Committee Report 2008: Das Personenstandsreformgesetz und seine Konsequenzen für die Forschung

Rainer Hering
Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein

1.) Eine einschneidende Veränderung im deutschen Archivwesen zeichnet sich für das Jahr 2009 ab – die Novellierung des Personenstandsgesetzes. Die Führung von Personenstandsunterlagen oblag in Deutschland bis zum Zweiten Kaiserreich den Kirchen, die Taufen, Eheschließungen und Sterbefälle in Kirchenbüchern vermerkten. 1874 wurde im Rahmen der Trennung von Staat und Kirche in Preußen und ein Jahr später im Deutschen Reich mit dem ersten Personenstandsgesetz dieses Monopol beendet und das Personenstandswesen eine ausschließlich staatliche Aufgabe (Reichsgesetz über die Beurkundung des Personenstandes und über die Eheschließung vom 6. Februar 1875). Im "Dritten Reich" wurde 1937 das zweite deutsche Personenstandsgesetz erlassen, das an der Beurkundung in klassischen Personenstandsbüchern festhielt, aber das Heiratsregister mit der Bezeichnung "Familienbuch" versah. Damit war eine Ausweitung des bisher nur auf die Eheschließung bezogenen Registers verbunden, die die Familienforschung erleichtern sollte. Der zeitgenössische Hintergrund der nationalsozialistischen Rasse- und Familienideologie ist offenkundig. 1957 wurde das Personenstandsgesetz neu gefasst.

Durch das 2007 verabschiedete und am 1. Januar 2009 in Kraft tretende Gesetz zur Reform des Personenstandsrechts verändern sich die Benutzungsmöglichkeiten für Personenstandsunterlagen gravierend. Bislang war es so, dass die Unterlagen ungeachtet ihres Alters ausschließlich in den Standesämtern aufbewahrt wurden. Auskünfte durften nur an Verwandte in gerader Linie oder zu begründeten amtlichen Zwecken erteilt werden. Dadurch wurde nicht nur die Familienforschung stark beeinträchtigt, auch der wissenschaftlichen Forschung war der Rückgriff auf diese Quelle verwehrt. Dies führte dazu, dass es schwierig, vielfach sogar unmöglich, war, Geburts-, vor allem aber Sterbedaten von Personen zu ermitteln. Diese Situation ändert sich nun erfreulicherweise ab 2009.

Zunächst einmal wird die Zugänglichkeit von Unterlagen in den Standesämtern für wissenschaftliche Zwecke grundsätzlich möglich. In diesem Kontext müssen

die Standesämtern Betroffenen auf deren Anfrage Auskunft für das Forschungsvorhaben und Gelegenheit geben, schutzwürdige Belange gegen die Benutzung gelten zu machen.

Für die historische Forschung ist es nützlich zu wissen, wie es zu besondern Beurkundungen kommt: Wird eine Anzeige für die Beurkundung des Sterbefalls eines Häftlings der ehemaligen deutschen Konzentrationslager entgegengenommen, so kann dies neben dem Sonderstandesamt in Bad Arolsen auch bei dem Standesamt des Anzeigenden erfolgen. Dieses informiert dann das Sonderstandesamt in Bad Arolsen darüber, so dass auf jeden Fall dort die Information vorliegt. Sterbefälle von Angehörigen der ehemaligen deutschen Wehrmacht oder diesen in personenstandsrechtlicher Hinsicht gleichgestellten Personen aus Anlass des Zweiten Weltkrieges sind von dem Standesamt zu beurkunden, in dessen Bezirk der Verstorbene seinen letzten Wohnsitz oder gewöhnlichen Aufenthalt hatte; dies gilt für Sterbefälle im Inland und im Ausland. Liegt der letzte Wohnsitz oder gewöhnliche Aufenthalt des Verstorbenen nicht im Inland, so beurkundet das Standesamt I in Berlin den Sterbefall. Gleiches gilt, wenn der letzte Wohnsitz oder gewöhnliche Aufenthalt nicht bekannt ist.

Die entscheidende und für die historische Forschung einflussreichste Veränderung ist die Auflage, dass Personenstandsunterlagen nach bestimmten Fristen an die jeweils zuständigen Archive abgegeben werden müssen und dann Archivgut werden. Damit gelten nicht mehr die Benutzungsbedingungen der Standesämter, sondern die des jeweiligen Landesarchivgesetzes. Für die Fortführung der Personenstandsregister gelten folgende Fristen:
Eheregister und Lebenspartnerschaftsregister 80 Jahre
Geburtenregister 110 Jahre
Sterberegister 30 Jahre.

Konkret heißt das, dass nun alle Eheregister bis 1928, die Geburtenregister bis 1898 und die Sterberegister bis 1978 an die Archive abgegeben werden müssen. In den folgenden Jahren kommt jeweils ein weiterer Jahrgang hinzu, ab 2038 folgen auch die Familienbücher. Nach Ablauf dieser Fristen sind für die Benutzung der Personenstandsunterlagen – unabhängig vom Lagerungsort – allein die archivrechtlichen Vorschriften maßgeblich. Es dürfen dann auch keine Personenstandsurkunden mehr aus diesen Registern ausgestellt werden. Allerdings besteht die Möglichkeit, von den Archiven entsprechende Nachweise, z.B. beglaubigte Ablichtungen, zu erhalten.

In der offiziellen Formulierung des Gesetzes heißt es in Anlehnung an die Terminologie der Archivgesetze des Bundes und der Länder, dass diese Unterlagen zur Übernahme "anzubieten" sind. Angesichts der grundlegenden Bedeutung dieser Personenstandsregister besteht jedoch für die Archive nicht die Möglichkeit, die Archivierung zu verweigern. Der seit Einführung der staatlichen Personenstandsregister geltende Grundsatz ihrer dauernden Aufbewahrung bleibt auch jetzt unangetastet und ist im Gesetzgebungsverfahren zu keinem Zeitpunkt infrage gestellt worden.

Anders verhält es sich mit den so genannten "Sammelakten", in denen Dokumente, die einzelne Beurkundungen in den Personenstandsregistern betreffen, aufbewahrt werden. In den Sammelakten werden alle im Rahmen der Beurkundung

eines Personenstandsfalles erhobenen Sachverhalte belegt. Zugleich beinhalten sie Angaben, die in den Personenstandsregistern, die sich auf Kerndaten konzentrieren sollen, nicht festgehalten werden. Vor allem zu den Heiratssammelakten wurden beispielsweise Staatsangehörigkeitsnachweise, Geburts- und Heimatscheine, Beschäftigungsnachweise, Militärausweise und später beigefügte Scheidungsurteile und Sterbemitteilungen genommen. Die Sammelakten müssen nicht dauerhaft aufbewahrt werden, sie müssen aber auch nicht vernichtet werden, so dass die Entscheidung über ihre Archivierung vielmehr bei den jeweiligen Archiven liegt. Angesichts des besonderen Aussagewertes der Sammelakten, der sonst nicht dokumentiert ist, ist hier an die Verantwortung der jeweiligen Archive zu appellieren. Einige Beispiele sollen das deutlich werden lassen: Gerade für die Erforschung des "Dritten Reiches" und insbesondere für das Aufklären der Schicksale jüdischer Opfer bieten die Sammelakten zu den Sterberegistern oft Informationen, z.B. über Todesursachen, die anderweitig nicht überliefert sind. Interessant ist in diesem Kontext auch die Frage, wer den Todesfall meldet. Die Heiratssammelakten enthalten – sofern eine Scheidung erfolgte – in der Regel die Scheidungsurteile, was für die Dokumentation der gerichtlichen Praxis zwischen 1933 und 1945 nicht ohne Bedeutung ist, z.B. im Fall der "Mischehen". Auch würde es wohl niemand begrüßen, wenn Heiratssammelakten mit den Unterschriften und Dokumenten von Albert Ballin oder Dietrich Bonhoeffer im Reißwolf landeten.[1]

Aber auch rechtlich-praktische Erwägungen sind in diesem Kontext nicht von der Hand zu weisen. Gerade wenn das Melde- und Reisepassregister nicht mehr vorhanden sind, kann im Fall von Einbürgerungsanträgen der Nachweis der Staatsangehörigkeit durch die Sammelakten erbracht werden. Vom Nachweis der deutschen Staatsangehörigkeit des Vaters bzw. Großvaters hängt es aber ab, ob ein Nachkomme eingebürgert wird.

Die historische Forschung sollte ihre Anforderungen an die Archive klar formulieren.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich festhalten, dass aus den staatlichen Personenstandsregistern nach Ablauf der genannten Fristen aussagekräftiges Archivgut wird. Dies gilt auch für die Sammelakten, denen gegenüber den Registern eine höhere Aussagekraft zukommt. Diese wichtige Veränderung ist von den Archiven wie von der Forschung seit langem gefordert worden. Familienforscherinnen und Familienforscher sowie wissenschaftliche Nutzerinnen und Nutzer erhalten somit erstmals Zugang zu diesem zentralen biographischen Quellenkorpus. Auf die zuständigen Archive – sofern keine zentralen staatlichen Personenstandsarchive bestehen, werden das in der Regel die zuständigen kommunalen Archive sein – wird eine große Zahl von Benutzungen zukommen. Grundsätzlich gilt das Standortprinzip,

[1] Zur Bedeutung der Sammelakten vgl. Jürgen Sielemann: German Laws Ruling Access to Genealogical Records. In: Avotaynu. The International Review of Jewish Genealogy, Vol. X no. 2 Teaneck 1995, p. 25–30; zum Kontext mit weiteren Literaturhinweise vgl. Ulf Bollmann: Aktuelle Probleme bei der Archivierung personengeschichtlicher Quellen. In: Genealogie 28 (2007), S. 747–60. Für wertvolle Hinweise und Berichte aus jahrzehntelanger praktischer Erfahrung danke ich Ulf Bollmann und Jürgen Sielemann (Staatsarchiv Hamburg).

d.h. für die Archivierung der Personenstandsunterlagen sind dann in der Regel die Archive der jeweiligen Städte, Ämter oder Gemeinden zuständig.

Zugleich wird die Führung der Register spätestens ab 2013 ausschließlich in elektronischer Form erfolgen, so dass mittelfristig die Archive diese in digitaler Form zu übernehmen haben. Zugleich aber bietet dieses Gesetz die Chance, in kommunalen Bereichen, in denen es trotz entsprechender archivgesetzlicher Vorschriften keine Archive gibt, solche einzurichten. Dadurch könnte sich auch die kommunale Überlieferungslage insgesamt deutlich verbessern.

2.) Am 30. April 2008 wurde mit einem Festakt die Archivöffnung des Internationalen Suchdienstes in Arolsen begangen. Es handelt sich um das weltweit größte Archiv über zivile Opfer des "Dritten Reiches" und enthält 26.000 laufende Meter Unterlagen über Konzentrationslager, Inhaftierungen und Zwangsarbeit, die über 17,5 Millionen Menschen Auskunft geben. Bislang waren diese Bestände des Internationalen Suchdienstes nur Opfern der nationalsozialistischen Gewaltherrschaft und deren Familienangehörigen zugänglich (vgl. die Berichte des Archives Committee der letzten beiden Jahre). Eine Kopie der Daten befindet sich im United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington und ist dort benutzbar.

Der Internationale Suchdienst in Bad Arolsen untersteht den elf Staaten des Internationalen Ausschusses für den Internationalen Suchdienst (Belgien, Frankreich, Deutschland, Griechenland, Israel, Italien, Luxemburg, Niederlande, Polen, Großbritannien, USA). Grundlage sind die Bonner Verträge von 1955 und das Änderungsprotokoll von 2006. Im Auftrag des Ausschusses wird der ITS vom Internationalen Komitee vom Roten Kreuz (IKRK) geleitet und verwaltet. Finanziert wird die Einrichtung aus dem Haushalt des Bundesinnenministeriums. Der Haushalt des ITS beläuft sich auf 14 Millionen Euro jährlich.

Der Internationale Suchdienst verfügt in seiner Zentralen Namenkartei über 50 Millionen Hinweise zu 17,5 Millionen Menschen. Die Dokumente umfassen rund 26.000 laufende Meter. Die Bestände sind gegliedert in die Zentrale Namenkartei, Inhaftierte, Zwangsarbeiter, Displaced Persons, Kinder-Sucharchiv und Sachdokumente. 2007 beschäftigte der ITS 322 Mitarbeiter.

Der Internationale Suchdienst und seine Vorgängerorganisationen haben seit 1946 insgesamt 11,8 Millionen Auskünfte erteilt und drei Millionen Korrespondenzakten angelegt. Im vergangenen Jahr gingen mehr als 61.000 Anfragen aus über 70 Ländern ein. Rund 132.000 Auskünfte wurden 2007 erteilt. Der Rückstand bei den humanitären Anfragen wird im Sommer dieses Jahres abgebaut sein.

2008 sind bislang 3800 Anfragen aus 57 Staaten für circa 7600 Personen eingegangen, davon rund 50 Prozent online über die neue Website des ITS. 3500 Anfragen waren humanitär, 300 wissenschaftlich begründet. Die meisten Anfragen kamen aus Deutschland, den USA, Polen und Israel. 252 Anfragen wurden von Überlebenden der Verfolgung durch das Naziregime gestellt. Die Abteilung Suchdienst des ITS, die sich direkt mit der Familienzusammenführung befasst, bearbeitet derzeit 4000 Fälle. Nähere Informationen sind im Internet zu finden: www.its-arolsen.org

Erfahrungen mit der Benutzung dieser Unterlagen sind noch nicht eingegangen, daher wird um entsprechende Berichte gebeten.

3.) Grundsätzlich steht das Archives Committee für Fragen, Probleme und

Hinweise zum Archivwesen im deutschsprachigen Bereich zur Verfügung. Auch Anregungen und Vorschläge für Veranstaltungen auf GSA-Konferenzen werden gern entgegengenommen.

Rainer Hering, Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein, Prinzenpalais, 24837 Schleswig, Germany (rainer.hering@la.landsh.de)

Literature Is More Than Books! The German Literature Archive in Marbach

Ulrich Raulff
Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach

The Origins

Almost everybody in the English-speaking world knows about the National Portrait Gallery in London. And many Americans may have personally or via internet consulted the British Library. Both institutions played a vital part in the foundation of what is today the German Literature Archive in Marbach (Deutsches Literaturarchiv – DLA). For both of them were important places of collecting and exhibiting – activities which were and still are crucial for Marbach. It is significant that the well-known Chandos portrait of William Shakespeare was the first picture to enter the National Portrait Gallery's collection. From the beginning, in the gallery as well as in the British Library artifacts were on display side by side with autographs and manuscripts.

A teacher of German from Stuttgart saw both London institutions during a journey in the years 1882–83. He was fascinated by them and wrote in his diary: "Such a thing we should have in Germany, or at least in every German state on its own. My own country Württemberg could contribute a very nice collection." During the 1890 conference of the Modern Philological Society which took place in Suttgart he established a temporary exhibition on Friedrich Schiller. By assembling manuscripts, portraits, and documents, it gave an important impulse towards the future establishment of the Schiller Archive and Museum in Marbach, the poet's birthplace. This plan was further strengthened by Wilhelm Dilthey, who propagated the foundation of archives for literature in a lecture in 1889.

Archive, library and museum were the pillars on which finally, in 1903, the Schiller Archive and Museum was erected. The longstanding cooperation of the Marbach Schiller Society with the king of Württemberg, local officials, and the art-loving financier Kilian von Steiner led to success. Funds and gifts were so generously given that the museum, built as a pseudo-classical chateau which stood in sharp contrast to Schiller's very modest, timber-framed birthplace, could be inaugurated..

Literary Estates from Schiller to W. G. Sebald

What was on display in the Schiller Museum, and what was collected in the Schiller Archive? At first, the collections assembled in Marbach featured literary estates with a distinct connection to the region, i.e., to Swabia and Württemberg. It goes without saying that Schiller stood in the center of interest: family descendants gave pictures, books of his library, letters, and manuscripts. Similar items were

purchased through second-hand booksellers and at auctions. In addition to Schiller the archive collected documents and memorabilia of Hölderlin, Uhland, Schwab, and other writers of southwest German extraction.

After 1945 the focus changed completely. The archive made efforts to acquire the estates of German writers who were persecuted by the Nazis, of those whose works were burnt and forbidden, and those who emigrated. It was an attempt to bring an important part of German literature back to Germany. The archive's holdings grew rapidly. As a consequence a new institution within the old building was founded in 1955: the Deutsches Literaturarchiv. What Weimar was to the GDR, Marbach became to the western part of Germany, the central collecting place for literary estates. While Weimar concentrated on the age of Schiller and Goethe, Marbach's mission focused on German literature from 1750 to the present with emphasis on the twentieth century.

The archive grew further, and in the 1970s a separate archive building was erected, with subterranean depots, reading rooms, and offices. Further extensions became necessary due to the continuous increase of holdings and personnel. Today nearly two hundred persons work in the scholarly or technical staff of the German Literature Archive, as archivists, librarians, curators, restorers, and in many other positions.

By now the archive's holdings encompass about 1200 estates – of writers, philosophers, specialists in German studies, and other literati. Apart from manuscripts by Schiller and Hölderlin you may find those of Hermann Hesse and Alfred Döblin, of Heidegger, Jaspers, Hannah Arendt and Gadamer, of Paul Celan, Hilde Domin and W.G. Sebald. Of prime importance is the collection of handwritings by Kafka with the complete manuscript of *Der Process*, the "Letter to His Father," and other correspondence. Of special interest are the different archives of publishing companies such as Cotta, Fischer, Rowohlt and others.

Approximately twenty-five million sheets of paper give an overview on literary life in the German-speaking world from the early enlightenment to the immediate present. And the collecting is continuing: writers such as Martin Walser and Peter Handke have given important papers into the custody of the archive.

Museums of Literature and Art Collection

Two museums give aesthetically ambitious insights into the huge holdings of the archive. The Schiller-Nationalmuseum, which will reopen after a thorough renovation in November 2009, features a host of documents and memorabilia from German literature between1750 and 1900. The Literaturmuseum der Moderne presents German literary life from 1900 to the present in more than 1100 objects. Permanent and temporary exhibitions give testimony to the importance of literary estates and the study of manuscripts for scholarly research. They are constantly seeking to highlight new and intriguing features that make the encounter with authors and their literary works memorable, stimulating broad and independent investigation. Research work in these museums is necessary, possible, and expressly desired.

Founded as a literary archive, Marbach has become a great resource for German and Cultural Studies in general. Writers' estates usually include more than books,

manuscripts, and autographs. They contain school reports, identification cards, passports, photographs, and other personal belongings. Even clothes and art works are part of the Marbach holdings. It is therefore understandable that the archive appeals strongly not only to Germanists, editors, biographers, and interpreters but also to adherents of cultural history, art history, and the history of ideas.

They all profit from the archive's collections. In addition to books and manuscripts there are huge holdings of non-written documents. Nearly 200,000 objects in the art collections concern literary life in all its manifestations. Paintings and sculptures of writers, death masks and writing tools, "relics," photographs (sixty thousand prints), and posters enable students to explore the history of mentalities and social life. Sound recordings, films, theater programs, and flyers of publishing companies allow insights in the history of media and cultural organizations. The well integrated archives of publishing companies are a valuable resource for the history of book production and marketing, royalties as well as the design of book jackets.

Resources for Research, Service and Accommodation

Of course, the Deutsches Literaturarchiv houses a huge library. Its holdings represent the most important special collection of modern German literature. Some 750,000 volumes and nearly a thousand journals are at the users' disposal. Separately stored are authors' and scholars' libraries, including invaluable books with dedications, annotations, and additions, as well as special collections (e.g., criminal literature, popular literature, adventure novels, Nazi literature, and many others). The so-called documentation center houses vast holdings of leaflets, brochures, flyers, paper clippings, theatre programs, audio and video media with a connection to German literary life.

Catalogues have been given particular attention from the beginning. They are amazingly effective tools for both literary and cultural historians. In the manuscript department, for example, there is also a separate catalogue of the receivers of letters. The online catalogue (accessible via www.dla-marbach.de – »OPAC Kallias«) makes it possible to order books and manuscripts before an intended visit at Marbach so that the ordered material is already ready when the user arrives. Copies and photographs may be produced in the archive's own studios.

A scholar who comes to Marbach for research and writing may live self-contained on the campus of the Literaturarchiv amidst the assembled buildings of archive, library, and both museums of literature. The guesthouse (Collegienhaus), built in 1993, offers thirty one-room apartments, each including a bathroom and a small kitchen. Prices are moderate, and living together with other guests from all over the world is an exciting and stimulating experience.

The reading rooms' statistics show a broad diversity of users. Scholars, students, teachers, and readers with general interests do their work in the library and the manuscripts' department. Besides Germans, there are visitors from over forty countries all over the world: from the United States as well as from Britain, Italy, and Spain, from Romania as well as from Poland, China, and Korea.

Thirty fellowships are available for all kinds of researchers and research projects. They are internationally competitive and have been awarded to fellows from many

European countries, from Africa, Asia and the Americas. An overview of the fellowships is given on the homepage (www.dla-marbach.de).

American Friends of DLA Marbach

In a recent evaluation by the German Science and Humanities Council, the Literaturarchiv was singled out as exemplary in its scholarship program and its promotion of young researchers. Following the Council's suggestion to intensify the exchange with departments of German studies at foreign universities, the Literaturarchiv has founded the "American Friends of DLA Marbach" with the purpose of strengthening the contacts with American scholars, especially students and young researchers. A group of professors at American universities has agreed to help in reaching out to the young academics and raising funds for fellowships and research projects. Though the guest list from the U.S. is already quite impressive – and many American doctoral students and scholars have used the Marbach archive to their benefit – the new initiative has received broad attention and promises to initiate new and intensify existing contacts. Students and scholars will receive every assistance during their stay.

In order to present the Deutsches Literaturarchiv to a broader American public we plan a round table for the 2009 conference of the GSA. We hope we can show the necessity, the advantages, and the pleasure of archival work. Everybody concerned with German or Cultural Studies should be aware of our motto: Literature is more than books!

In Memoriam

Agnes Fischer Peterson
March 8, 1923, Berlin – September 1, 2008, Los Altos, California

Agnes F. Peterson, who served as reference librarian and curator of the Central and Western European Collections of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University for 41 years, and who was a pioneering member of the German Studies Association, died in Los Altos, California, on September 1, 2008. She had been in ill health for several months. The cause of death was heart failure. In accordance with her wishes, there was a small, private burial service. She is survived by her husband of 53 years, Professor Louis John Peterson.

Agnes Peterson was first hired by the Hoover Institution Library on April 16, 1952, after having received her undergraduate degree in history at the University of Toronto and receiving her master's degree, also in history, from Radcliffe. She had previously worked with the documentary film program of the National Film Board of Canada and the California Historical Society in San Francisco, where she was a research assistant. Agnes was a loyal colleague to Hoover Library founding co-director Ralph Lutz, a Stanford faculty member, who specialized in German history. Her work with Lutz and her collegial friendship with his son-in-law, history

professor Charles Burdick, ensured a chain of continuity with the very origins of the Hoover Institution.

Softly voiced, rigorously accurate, unfailingly polite, and intellectually curious, Agnes found her forte as West European curator, first de facto and then officially in 1958, a position she held until she retired in 1993. She ordered tens of thousands of books for quite literally thousands of scholars, often expediting processing to ensure that a visiting researcher would receive the very latest publications. She facilitated the acquisition of some of the most valuable archival collections at Hoover, such as the Louis Loucheur papers, additional Rosa Luxemburg materials, Himmler's early diaries, the Karl B. Frank papers, oral histories with European public figures conducted by Keith Middlemas, and videos and posters relating to German reunification. For decades she managed the Library's depository role for the publications of the emerging European Community. The list of collections established under her tutelage is long.

Many milestones marked her career. In 1980, she was awarded the Order of Leopold II by Belgium. In recognition of her research and writing, she was appointed Hoover Institution research fellow in 1986. In 1990, she received the Distinguished Service Award of the Stanford University Library Council.

While at Hoover, together with Grete Heinz, Agnes compiled a guide to the content of 146 reels of microfilm containing Nazi party documents: *NSDAP Hauptarchiv: A Guide to the Hoover Institution Microfilm Collection.* She participated in organizing the filming of the documents. She also wrote several definitive bibliographical works and published guides to the Hoover Library's collections. Again, with Grete Heinz, she compiled two works on the French Fifth Republic. Her work with historian Bradley F. Smith on Heinrich Himmler appeared in 1974. In 1980 she compiled the first guide to the Holocaust research materials in the Library and Archives. She was recognized as a leading expert on the work of the German communist heroine Rosa Luxemburg, and wrote several pieces on the life of Luxemburg's previously little-known assistant, Matilde Jacob, whose papers Agnes traced down like a sleuth. Her carefully written book reviews, published in *Library Journal*, *History: Review of New Books*, *German Studies Review*, *Central European History*, and on H-Net, were especially esteemed by scholars as an insider's analysis.

Throughout her decades at the Hoover Library, Agnes Peterson consistently put the research of library patrons ahead of her own work. Generations of historians benefited from her matchless knowledge not only of the Hoover collections but of European history. She would locate new sources and consistently followed through, matching researchers with the most pertinent materials for their topics. Scholars recall trying to stump her about esoteric subjects, only to hear her say, "Let's see, I think we have just the thing." In thanks, her name appears in the acknowledgments of countless volumes on modern history. Some of the researchers she helped include Barbara Tuchman while she worked on the *Guns of August*, William L. Shirer for his work *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, John Toland during his research for *Infamy: Pearl Harbor and Its Aftermath*, as well as Ambassador George Kennan and Professors Gordon Wright and Gordon Craig. During the Cold War,

she was famous for maintaining cordial ties on both sides of the divide. Even the formidable East German ideologue Kurt Hager was impressed when he read about her collecting work.

Agnes took a special pleasure in assisting talented, young graduate students and watching them develop into accomplished historians. In just one of many examples, while in Munich in 1965, she helped facilitate an archives research visit for a Stanford graduate student, Sybil Halpern Milton, who later went on to serve as senior historian at the U.S. Holocaust Museum. They had met in 1962 when Sybil was a first-year graduate student, and she and Agnes remained lifelong friends and colleagues.

Without fanfare, but with determination, Agnes also helped found several important academic organizations, first by appreciating the value of creative if ephemeral ideas, and then by carefully implementing them through committee work, tireless memo-writing, and board meetings. In 1979 she secured facilities and funding at the Hoover Institution for one of the founding meetings of the German Studies Association. She served as secretary/treasurer of the organization, then known as the Western Association of German Studies. It is now the preeminent professional organization for the study of Germany in the United States. She was equally active in the American Historical Association and the American Library Association.

She served on several other boards, including the World War II Studies Association, the Conference Group on Central European History, the consultants' panel of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Stanford Bookstore.

For all of her strong ties with faculty at universities around the world, she had a deep appreciation of the work done by non-academics. In 1980 she helped found the Institute for Historical Study, which continues to promote the work of unaffiliated historians. In 1987 she assisted a talented, non-academic businessman to launch the Great War Society, an organization she provided with both logistical support and access to resources in the early years. It still thrives.

The 1980s were a time of particularly great activity for Agnes. She initiated and coordinated a series of free public lectures at Stanford, beginning with the 1981 academic year and continuing until her retirement. In this series, entitled Tower Talks, she organized a total of 95 book talks by distinguished scholars and public figures such as Professor Peter Paret, physicist Edward Teller, diplomat Philip Habib, and Trotsky's grandson Esteban Volkov. Each speaker received a gracious introduction and a follow-up letter from Agnes, who was surely one of the most prodigious thank-you letter writers of modern times. Since the talks on new books were rather formally structured, she simultaneously coordinated a series of free form roundtable discussions for works in progress.

In short, Agnes Peterson documented the transformation that took place in the second half of the twentieth century. In her own words: "When I started working, the second World War was just over, the cold war had begun, and now, when I have stopped working (at least officially), the cold war is over and the whole world has changed. Few people have the chance to get to do what they like to do, in such exciting times, and get paid for it."(Speech on the occasion of a Festschrift presented to her by the Great War Society, August 18, 1994.)

Few who benefited from her guidance, however, were aware of her distinguished family's achievements: characteristically, Agnes rarely discussed them. Many of her closest friends did not know that her grandfather, Emil Fischer, received the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1902. Despite her family's deep ties to Germany, Agnes's father, Hermann Fischer, a biochemist in Berlin, was so disturbed by the growing Nazi menace in the 1930s that he voluntarily relocated the family first to Switzerland and then to Canada in 1937. Before leaving, he took her to the Louvre to see the Greek sculpture "Winged Victory," and assured her that this represented the real Europe. Hermann Fischer eventually became professor of biochemistry in 1948 at U.C. Berkeley, where he remained until his death in 1960. The Fischer family quietly preserved the best of European culture during self-imposed exile while contributing to American academic life.

Agnes Gertrud Margarete Ilse Fischer Peterson will be remembered especially for her legacy of tolerance, her devotion to history, her consistently ladylike bearing and way of being, and her infinite number of kindnesses to family and friends. Agnes was, as several scholars have pointed out, "an institution within the Institution."

Elena S. Danielson and Alison Owings
Stanford University

Wendelin Schmidt-Dengler
May 20, 1942 – September 7, 2008

In the days following Wendelin Schmidt-Dengler's unexpected death of a pulmonary embolism in early September, one thing became clear in Vienna: Here, as in the rest of Austria, all literary and cultural roads led to him. In the Department of German at the University of Vienna, of which Professor Schmidt-Dengler was the chair, one assistant professor spoke of an "implosion"; co-workers and administrators stared at each other wordlessly or passed one another with downcast eyes. The silence in the university halls stood in stark contrast to the public discourse generated by the renowned literary critic's passing. The media rushed to honor the telegenic and congenial professor, a frequent guest on public radio and television channels; prominent authors spoke widely about Schmidt-Dengler's importance to literature. In the many newspaper obituaries and internet postings that continue to appear, people repeatedly stress Schmidt-Dengler's seminal role in the cultural landscape of the postwar period.[1] As many emphasize, the Zagreb-born Germanist revolutionized the way Austrians think about their culture. In expanding their view of the canon, he exerted an influence beyond the country's borders. His most recent prize was the "*Preis der Kritik*," or "Critics Prize," to be awarded at the 2008 Frankfurt Book Fair. Ninety-nine bottles of wine and a collected edition of Heinrich Heine were to go to Schmidt-Dengler for his cultural mediation – a true maverick's books for a fellow non-conformist.

Schmidt-Dengler was a leading proponent of experimental Austrian writers in the 1960s, long before the works of the *Wiener Gruppe* or Vienna Group (Friedrich Achleitner, Konrad Bayer, Gerhard Rühm, Oswald Wiener) found general acceptance.[2] He was also among the first to champion the works of Thomas Bernhard and was the driving force behind the Suhrkamp Verlag's 22-volume critical edition of Bernhard's works. Schmidt-Dengler's decades-long reflections on the conditions and characteristics of the author's oeuvre are collected in the influential volume *Der Übertreibungskünstler: Studien zu Thomas Bernhard* (*The Exaggeration Artist: Studies of Thomas Bernhard*, 1986). In this book, Schmidt-Dengler sought to confront the polemical discourse Bernhard generated during the last years of his life with a more nuanced study of Bernhard's hyperbolic rhetoric. Schmidt-Dengler also contextualized Bernhard's work within Austrian literary traditions, outlining affiliations with the authors Heimito von Doderer, Ernst Jandl, and Peter Handke, all of whom were among Schmidt-Dengler's scholarly concerns. (In one charming anecdote, Schmidt-Dengler told of an encounter with Thomas Bernhard: Bernhard approached Schmidt-Dengler in the Café Bräunerhof, where Bernhard was a regular. Schmidt-Dengler, already well known through his media presence, was ready for any question. Asked, somewhat disappointingly, whether the newspaper lying next to him was free, Schmidt-Dengler, in his own words, demonstrated his "familiarity with Bernhard's oeuvre and answered with the title of one of Bernhard's prose works: 'Yes'."[3])

I suspect that Schmidt-Dengler's particular esteem for Bernhard's themes and style had less to do with any natural proclivity toward superlatives or exaggeration – in his book, Schmidt-Dengler is at pains to deconstruct the binary schemas haunting Bernhard's prose – than with the Austrian professor's fascination with the various pedagogues and mentors that form a guiding thread through Bernhard's works. Schmidt-Dengler was interested in the educators who remain critical of the institutions to which they are indebted and who manage to convey this analytical, occasionally rebellious, spirit to the young people under their tutelage. Unsurprisingly, Schmidt-Dengler was one of the most outspoken critics of his university's administration, reminding readers of the daily paper *Der Standard* that changing the names of departments or merging institutes has little to do with educational improvement and everything to do with budgetary shortcuts. Many of those readers had at some point been students of the famed professor, attending his lectures on "Austrian literature after 1945." In his obituary in *Falter*, critic Klaus Nüchtern estimated that half a million listeners attended these lectures during Schmidt-Dengler's lifetime.[32]

Professor Schmidt-Dengler certainly returned the admiration students felt for him. In his last newspaper essay published in September, he lauded students' continuing engagement with literature and spoke of the necessary provocation that challenging texts pose. The closing paragraph of the article, entitled "*Und sie können es doch*" ("And Yet They Can Do It"), now reads like a resumé of the four decades Schmidt-Dengler spent in classrooms and lecture halls in Vienna, Pisa, Naples, Klagenfurt, Salzburg, and Graz, as well as at Stanford and Washington University in St. Louis. He pays homage to the very students who are now expressing their

grief on many web sites: "Whoever teaches others to read or just wants to practice it [with them] doesn't have an easy time," he writes, "but from experience I can say that there are always surprises when young readers work through difficult texts. And the talk about students who are getting worse and worse is simply obsolete" *("Wer heute das Lesen lehren oder auch nur üben will, hat es nicht leicht, aber aus meiner Praxis kann ich sagen, dass es immer wieder Überraschungen gegeben hat, wenn sich junge Leser an komplexen Gebilden abarbeiten. Und die Rede von den Studierenden, die immer schlechter werden, ist schlicht obsolet*").[33] Schmidt-Dengler was also dedicated to the training of young professors and to the expansion of Austrian Studies abroad. As the head of the Werfel Scholarship Program, he gathered young academics for monthly seminar meetings in his office, during which they presented excerpts from recent projects. A yearly conference was devoted to topics ranging from Elias Canetti to the formation of the German-language canon in other countries, with particular focus on the countries of the former Eastern bloc. Many of these young Germanists have stressed that his financial and intellectual support was crucial for their training. His support also made possible their many publications on topics ranging from the experimental author Brigitte Falkner to the Büchner Prize winner, the Romanian-born Oskar Pastior.

Related to his desire to convey his commitment to literature – hardly confined to Austrian writers of the twentieth century (Schmidt-Dengler studied classical philology in addition to German literature; his most recent essay project was to be on Plutarch) – was Schmidt-Dengler's intention to preserve it for future generations. As head of the *Literaturarchiv* at the National Library, he committed resources and time to the acquisition and publication of important literary holdings. As befits a reader of Bernhard, whose novels and plays revolve around our inability to distance ourselves from our forebears' legacy, Schmidt-Dengler collected materials on diverse authors. Among the better known artists are Konrad Bayer, Erich Fried, Josef Haslinger, Ernst Jandl, Ödön von Horváth, Theodor Kramer, Hilde Spiel, and Dorothea Zeemann. His most recent acquisition was the *Vorlass* (as opposed to the *Nachlass*) of Peter Handke, of which he was understandably proud.

Schmidt-Dengler's enthusiasm for Austrian literature drew people into his orbit in Vienna, but he was peripatetic in pursuing his interests. In the month he passed away, Schmidt-Dengler was to have traveled to a Celan-seminar in the former Galicia, together with the Czech translator of Kafka's works (also a Werfel scholarship recipient). At the end of the month, he planned to take part in a tour of Thomas Bernhard's various homes in Upper Austria with some of his co-workers and co-editors from the Literary Archive at the National Library. Finally, on September 28, he intended to travel to the United States, where he was to be fêted in New York and Washington, DC, for his 2007 prize as "*Wissenschafter des Jahres*" or "Scholar of the Year." In New York, an evening was planned to discuss the merits of Austrian literature with another former student, now Deputy Director of the Austrian Cultural Forum New York, Martin Rauchbauer. The event carried the title "Why We Need Austrian Literature." This was meant less as a provocation than as an assertion of a conviction; it arose from his belief – now shared by many of us – that we do in fact *need* Jelinek, Bernhard, Mayröcker, Handke, Schuh, Menasse, Winkler, Roth,

Achleitner, Flor and the numerous others to whose writing he directed our attention.

Whether speaking about marginal literary figures in a radio program on the highly regarded station Ö1 or on the most recent European soccer championship (he was an avowed fan), Schmidt-Dengler managed to convey his viewpoints with lucidity, humor, and an appealing self-deprecation. For those of us who remain involved with Austrian literature as educators and scholars, we will attempt to follow in his Bernhardian footsteps, letting his dedication to testing and retesting the boundaries inspire our own commitment to art and to others.

Fatima Naqvi
Rutgers University

---

[1] See http://www.kakanien.ac.at/weblogs/senior_editor/2008/09/wendelin+schmidt+dengler++1942-2008++nachrufe/ and http://germanistik.univie.ac.at/nachrufe-und-erinnerungen-wendelin-schmidt-dengler-1942-2008/.

[2] A recent publication about the *Wiener Gruppe* pays homage to his influence. Editors Thomas Eder and Juliane Vogel, dedicating the volume of essays to Schmidt-Dengler for his 65th birthday, write: "Ohne ihn würde die österreichische Literatur nicht wahrgenommen, wie sie ist, und wäre die Literaturwissenschaft um zahllose Impulse ärmer" ("Without him, Austrian literature would not be seen for what it is, and literary studies would be deprived of his myriad impulses"), *verschiedene sätze treten auf: Die Wiener Gruppe in Aktion*, eds. Juliane Vogel and Thomas Eder (Vienna: Zsolnay, 2008) 6.

[3] See also Anne-Catherine Simon's obituary in *Die Presse*, "*Schmidt-Dengler gestorben: Er hat die Literatur geliebt*," which conveys some of the pleasure his interviewers had when speaking with him, 8 Sept. 2008, <http://diepresse.com/home/kultur/news/412641/index.do?from=simarchiv>.

[32] These lectures have been collected in the volume *Bruchlinien: Vorlesungen zur österreichischen Literatur, 1945–1990* (Salzburg: Residenz, 1995).

[33] See his article "*Und sie können es doch: Die Studierenden werden nicht schlechter, sie provozieren nur. Gut so*" ("And Yet They Can Do It: Students Aren't Getting Any Worse, They're Just Provoking Us. Good Thing"), *Der Standard* 6/7 September, 2008: 48.

Institutional Patrons

American Friends of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation
American Institute of Contemporary German Studies
Austrian Cultural Institute
Austrian Fulbright Commission
The Canadian Centre for German and European Studies/Le Centre canadien d'études allemandes et européennes at York University & Université de Montréal
Cornell University
Freie Universität Berlin
Friedrich Ebert Stiftung-Bonn
Georgetown University/Center for German and European Studies
German Historical Institute
Gesellschaft für Deutschlandforschung
Grinnell College
Hannah-Arendt-Institut, TU Dresden
Harvard University/Center for European Studies
Hoover Institution, Stanford University
Illinois College
Indiana University, Institute of German Studies
Konrad Adenauer Foundation
Leo Baeck Institute, New York
McGill University
Max Planck Institut für Geschichte
Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsinstitut Potsdam
Nanovic Institute for European Studies at the University of Notre Dame
Northern Arizona University
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum
University of Arkansas, Fulbright College
University of California–Berkeley/Institute for European Studies
University of Colorado
University of Florida/Center for European Studies Program
University of Minnesota/Center for Austrian Studies
University of Minnesota/Center for German, Scandinavian, and Dutch
University of Montana
University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill
University of Pennsylvania
University of Richmond
University of South Carolina
University of Wisconsin/Center for European Studies
Western Washington University
Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung (ZZF) Potsdam

German Studies Association
David E. Barclay, Executive Director
1200 Academy Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49006-3295 USA