
German Studies Association Newsletter

**Volume XLII
Number 2
Winter 2017-18**

German Studies Association Newsletter

Volume XLII
Number 2
Winter 2017-18

Table of Contents

Letter from the President	3
Letter from the Executive Director	7
GSA Election Results Announced	11
Planning for the Forty-Second Conference of the GSA	12
Call for Seminar Proposals	13
Call for Panels, Roundtables, and Papers	14
Guidelines for Submitting 2018 Proposals	15
2017 Prize Winners Announced.....	19
2018 Prize Competitions Announced	24
Call for Information about Dissertations in German Studies	24
GSA Archives Committee Report 2017	26
The GSA Interdisciplinary Networks, 2017-18	40
GSA Committee Assignments, 2017-18	42
Hartmut Lehmann, "Luther Decade and Reformation Commemoration: A First Assessment" ..	44

Letter from the President

Deutschland im Herbst!

I have just begun to appreciate the joys of fall. While Miami is not without seasons (hot and wet, hot and not-so-wet), somehow life seems more serious under grey skies and, usually, an umbrella. Long rides out to the Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv in Golm on the Regio have given me plenty of time to reflect on the 41st Annual Meeting of the German Studies Association from which I returned just a few weeks ago. Looking back on those four days in Atlanta has also caused me to start forward at "things to come," not only toward the next Annual Meeting in Pittsburgh (which was my home for seventeen years), but also to reflect on the annual meeting in broader and more substantive ways and with crystal ball in hand, on the future 40 years.

The GSA certainly has reason to be proud of its accomplishments over the last four decades. Our membership has grown substantially and our conference is always well-attended. It is also my impression that the generational representation in terms of the numbers of established and early career scholars is balancing out as more and more newcomers find places on the program and attend regularly. The number of international participants seems to have increased as well and, while the greatest numbers come from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, the rest of the globe is also represented. Thus we have, I believe, every reason to congratulate ourselves with the thought that the GSA appears to be offering a "product" (!) that is in demand.

While Atlanta was not the biggest meeting we have had (that was in Denver in 2013), I was gratified by how many special events circulated around the core parts of the conference. There were a number of very well attended receptions and several book presentations. In addition, the various committees of the GSA spent many hours—several beginning at 6:30 a.m.!—discussing the short-, medium-, and long-term future of the GSA. On the horizon are many opportunities but also challenges. While the GSA is by no means as large as the AHA, OAH, MLA or other such mega-organizations, its business requires the almost virtually full-time commitment of our very active Executive Director and also of our Secretary-Treasurer, as well as those who run the registration and help desks. I suspect that conference-goers do not fully realize just how much work for the GSA happens behind the scenes and throughout the year. We also rely very heavily on the generosity of our volunteers: officers, board members, and committee members whose often very time-consuming tasks make for the smooth running of the organization throughout the year and not just for those pleasant four days in late September or early October. Do let me urge anyone who wants to become more involved in the work of the organization to volunteer. We are always looking for people to participate on one of the many committees that require repopulating each year. If you want to serve on a committee or help in any other way, please let me know directly at mlindemann@miami.edu.

I think that one reason the GSA can look back on such a successful four decades is that we have been willing to take chances and innovate: signs of continued intellectual vigor have been especially plentiful over the last decade, but the trend is actually older.

- (1) The GSA has become more ecumenical over time. When I, an early modernist, first attended GSA in the late 1980s, there were few (sic!) panels that treated the period before 1800. Indeed, I was placed on one that went under the enticing title of "Varia." Today, that is no longer the case. Early modern and medieval history and literature are well represented. But there has also been a vast expansion in the number of panels and participants in contemporary history and literature, as well as in cultural studies and on panels devoted to discussing and analyzing themes and subjects diachronically. Just as obvious is the enormous expansion of the number of interdisciplinary panels and, of course, of the Seminars that are interdisciplinary by definition. The work of the Networks has contributed massively to several of these changes. We still have our *Sorgenkinder*—fields that are not well represented—but the Program Committee has worked hard to try to rectify these problems, and with considerable success.
- (2) The GSA has also moved away from the standard format of three-(four-)paper panels, with commentator and moderator and away from the "read" paper. For my part, I would hate to see the traditional panel go the way of the Dodo but it may be the moment to remind people that there is an art to doing a really good presentation and there is also a need to remind presenters of the "rules of the game," rules that are, unfortunately, often ignored. All too often, panelists fail to provide commentators with papers on time, fail to adhere to time guidelines, or present papers that differ substantially from the one the commentator received. Equally distressing is that the audience is all too often excluded from the discussion, and very often because the presenters and commentators have vastly exceeded the time allowed. I have sat through far too many of those sorts of panels, but I have also vastly enjoyed the ones that work well, where presenters and audience members vigorously engaged in an intellectual exchange that spilled out into the hallways. Series of linked panels devoted to one theme also have the advantage of stimulating conversations that flow over several days. In Atlanta, one could over three days follow topics such as "War, Violence, and Visual Culture," on Luther and the Reformation, or on "Tales of the Anthropocene." Such congeries have in the past germinated the idea for theme volumes as well several books in the SPEKTRUM series that is another great success story for the GSA thanks to the work of the general editor of the series, David Luebke, Marion Berghahn and her editorial "team," and, of course, the many participating volume editors and contributors.
- (3) The seminars have been a great success as well. We have now reached saturation on the number of seminars that we can offer. One of the most critical functions of the seminar, besides the obvious one of deep discussion of current academic issues, is the way in which it allows an intimate, extensive interaction between established scholars and newcomers. The seminars have also generated collections of articles that have appeared, for example, in the GSA/Berghahn SPEKTRUM series. While this letter will reach you too late to submit a proposal for 2018, let me urge anyone who has a bright idea for a seminar for the GSA in 2019 in Portland, Oregon to consider submitting it to the Seminar Committee (chair: Margaret Menninger) of the Program Committee. Good ideas are always welcome. It is never too early to start planning!

- (4) Arts Night, the brain-child of our current Past President, Irene Kacandes, has been another marvelous innovation and offers the perfect venue for a series of excellent cultural events on Thursday evening, alongside the traditional DEFA film series which continues to be very popular. I hope that many of you enjoyed this years' Arts Night presentations: the fabulous Trey Clegg singers, Eric Jarosinski's "Bitter Schön," and Jake Krakovsky's one-man play, "Yankl on the Moon." I know that Irene and her Arts Night committee would welcome suggestions for next year's Arts Night in Pittsburgh.
- (5) The number of Roundtables has also grown substantially. One type has been devoted to the discussion of new books with the author, such as the panel on Willi Winkler's Luther biography, on David Luebke's *Hometown Religion*, and on Nina Berman's *Germans on the Kenyan Coast*. Equally interesting were a series of roundtables/panels devoted to the discussion of issues and trends. I want to mention, just for instance and among many others, the panels on "Confessionalization: The State of Play," on the borders and definition of Austrian Studies, and on the origins and historiographical approaches to Holocaust and Genocide. All evoked lively discussion among the panelists but also, happily, saw the audience participating vigorously as I observed at the sessions I attended.
- (6) Professional panels have also grown in number and serve an important function especially for our early career colleagues. But there was also much for the "old hands" to learn as well from panels on digital humanities, "New Careers in German Studies, and the several Roundtables on publishing.

Finally, at the end of this letter, I would like to return for a moment to the critical issue of finances. The GSA has grown in its ambitions, its programs, and its needs. We want to become ever more something like a "full service" organization that is active and important to our membership *outside* the framework of the annual conference. To do this, and indeed to sustain what we already do so well, we need to engage more actively in fund-raising. Many of our new programs, such as Arts Night, are relatively expensive (and, I hasten to add, worth every pfennig, if we still had pfennig) as is the cost of running the conference in general. The very generous support of The Halle Foundation (Atlanta) made much of this possible in 2017. Our campaign "40 for 40" raised a nice sum, but we did not get the 100% participation that we had originally hoped for when we launched the initiative. Members can still contribute, perhaps in the spirit now of "The Future 40 Years." (<https://www.thegsa.org/members/contribute>) At this point I would also like to point out the cost-effectiveness of lifetime memberships; you pay once and it is a good deal (unless you wait too long...). It also helps the organization with an influx of cash; thus it is a win-win situation. I would also like to thank the many members who have given so generously to the GSA; your contributions (no matter what the size) are greatly appreciated. Finally, last but hardly least, I cannot end without thanking our good friends at the DAAD and the Austrian Cultural Forum New York for their many years of generous support for the GSA. This is also the moment to acknowledge with gratitude the German Embassy in Washington D.C. for its financial support in making possible Professor Hartmut Lehmann's

banquet address. We could hardly exist if we lacked the support of these organizations and the GSA would be poorly intellectually as well as financially without them.

With best wishes,

Mary

Mary Lindemann
President, German Studies Association

Letter from the Executive Director

Dear members and friends of the German Studies Association,

Our forty-first annual conference is behind us, and we've been busy taking stock and getting ready for the next one: and a few more after that as well. In this day and age, where relatively few "big box" hotels are available to host meetings like ours, and it is getting increasingly difficult to find bargains, we've booked hotels through 2023 and are looking at options for 2024 through 2026 (our fiftieth anniversary). In 2018 we'll be in Pittsburgh at the Wyndham Grand Downtown, and in 2019 at the Hilton Towers in downtown Portland, Oregon.

This year our conference was attended by 1275 people, about our average attendance in recent years. Our attendees came from 32 countries, with the United States, Germany, Canada, Austria, the UK, and Switzerland sending the largest numbers. As usual – and as Mary Lindemann points out in her "Letter from the President" – the conference included a number of high points, several (but by no means all) focusing on the quincentenary of the Reformation: Hartmut Lehmann's banquet address, the remarkable Arts Night performance by the Trey Clegg Singers, a shuttle to the Kessler Reformation Collection at Emory University, and others. Of course, there were plenty of other highlights as well, from the wonderful events of Arts Night to the memorable addresses by Kathleen Canning and Randall Halle. We had a record number of early-morning seminars, and, as our Saturday-evening Networks reception and the program itself showed, the Interdisciplinary Networks are thriving.

As always, we could not function without the help of a variety of groups and organizations, including old friends like the DAAD, the Austrian Cultural Forum New York, the German Embassy, the German Historical Institute in Washington, and several agencies of the Austrian government. Plus we have new friends, such as the Oesterreichischer Austauschdienst, which we were happy to welcome to the GSA for the first time. And also for the first time we presented the Radomír Luža Prize in Central European Studies of the World War II Era – sponsored by Center Austria at the University of New Orleans and the American Friends of the *Dokumentationsarchiv des Oesterreichischen Widerstandes* – at the GSA banquet.

Mary rightly points out in her Letter that we received a very generous conference grant from The Halle Foundation, based in Atlanta, which made our Arts Night events possible. As long as I'm mentioning fundraising, we have received funding from the Max Kade Foundation to support two additional postdocs for one-year stays at the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies at the Free University of Berlin. This year's winners are Maureen Gallagher and Scott Krause. We have received funding from the Max Kade Foundation to support two more postdocs in 2018-19.

As we look to the future of the GSA, successful fundraising is going to be absolutely essential. We've introduced a number of important innovations in recent years to keep up both with the times and especially with current professional and intellectual developments. We've introduced

a new conference submission and management system. We have a conference app, and hope in the not-too-distant future to replace the paper program entirely. Soon we'll be improving our website functionality as the Johns Hopkins University Press goes over to the Drupal content management system. We've introduced the Networks and the seminars. We introduced the *Spektrum* publication series. We provide LCD projectors in every breakout room, and several special AV rooms for sessions that require high-quality sound. We will upgrade a lot of this equipment in 2019; given high hotel rental costs, they essentially amortize themselves within a year or two. We need to do much more, from assuring that we can get WiFi throughout our conference hotels to making effective use of social media not only at the conference but throughout the year. We are especially eager to get funding to provide domestic travel support for our North American members, in addition to our existing travel funds for non-North American members. We want to do more for contingent and early-career faculty. We try constantly to improve our service to our members, and welcome criticism and suggestions (as well as, to be honest, the occasional pat on the back!). And there is so much more we can and should do. It's our goal to become YOUR society throughout the entire year, open and transparent for the entire membership.

Moreover, we're part of a larger effort to protect and expand the role of the humanities in general and German Studies in particular: in our public life, in our public discourse, and in our systems of higher education. Thus we support the efforts of the German Embassy and Foreign Ministry in connection with their various *Deutschlandjahr* activities in 2018. (Google it. It's important.) We are one of 70-plus academic societies represented in the American Council of Learned Societies; I meet twice a year with my fellow ACLS executive directors, a vital lifeline to national and international issues relevant to the entire humanities community. The GSA is also an active member of the National Humanities Alliance, which lobbies throughout the year on behalf of the humanities and international education.

But all these things cost money. The conference itself is getting more expensive from year to year, even as we struggle to keep prices down. An example: We own our own LCD projectors and sound equipment, as noted above, and ship them around the country to save money. But even with that, we typically pay between \$25,000 and \$30,000 each year for AV rental costs. (Indeed, rising AV costs represented a significant discussion topic at the most recent meeting of ACLS executive directors in Fort Worth, Texas.)

We all have to think of future expenses, so I ask your forgiveness if I mention something *in eigener Sache*. If all goes according to plan, I'll retire from the GSA within several years. (I've recently retired from teaching at Kalamazoo College.) Our veteran secretary/treasurer, Jerry Fetz, will also retire in a few years. Any transition involves additional expenses, especially as the requirements of our respective offices have increased significantly in recent years. Fortunately, the GSA Board – in happy contrast, I must say, to the boards of some other academic societies – has been considering the transition issue for some time. But, still, there will be financial implications.

Thus we need YOUR support, now more than ever. Every contribution helps: every dollar, every euro, every pound. And if you can't afford it – we're keenly aware of the financial pressures most academics in the humanities and social sciences face each day – please help us make contact with local foundations and potential donors in your area whom we might contact.

But let me return to our recent conference. The GSA is a team, and every conference is the result of extraordinary efforts by a large number of people. First, without the Program Committee – entirely staffed by volunteers from our members – the conference simply could not happen. Kudos to the 2017 Program Committee:

Program Director: Benjamin Marschke, Humboldt State University
 Pre-1800 (all fields): Rita Krueger, Temple University
 19th-century (all fields): Brian Vick, Emory University
 20th/21st-century history: Astrid M. Eckert, Emory University
 20th/21st-century history: Annette Timm, University of Calgary
 20th/21st-century Germanistik: Christine Rinne, University of South Alabama
 20th/21st-century Germanistik: Qinna Shen, Bryn Mawr College
 Contemporary politics, economics, and society: Jonathan Bach, The New School
 Contemporary politics, economics, and society: Pamela Swett, McMaster University
 Interdisciplinary/Diachronic: Joanne Miyang Cho, William Paterson University
 Interdisciplinary/Diachronic: Martin Nedbal, University of Kansas
 Single papers: Jared Poley, Georgia State University
 Single papers: Faye Stewart, Georgia State University

Seminars

Chair: Heikki Lempa, Moravian College
 Maria Mitchell, Franklin and Marshall College
 Carrie Smith-Prei, University of Alberta

Special thanks as well to our team “on the ground”: Elizabeth Fulton, our indispensable operations manager; Craig Hendrick, our exceptionally skilled conference planner from ConferenceDirect; Charles Fulton, our AV and IT guru; Terry Pochert, our peerless webmaster; Sally Scheuermann, who has volunteered for our registration desk for several years; and Daniel Huffman, our cartographer. (Yes! Where did you think our hotel charts come from? We decided to engage Daniel when I saw how useless most hotel maps and charts are.) Special thanks too to Irene Kacandes, our immediate past president, for all the work and all the creativity she has devoted to Arts Night from the beginning.

Finally, I hope you'll indulge me in a true confession, again *in eigener Sache*. Some of you may know that I'm writing a history of West Berlin in which, among other things, I describe the careers of David Bowie and Iggy Pop in that divided city during the late 1970s. As it turned out,

Iggy Pop was himself staying in the Atlanta Sheraton while we were there for the conference!
So guess who went to Iggy's Atlanta concert with Board member Jared Poley? It's not ALL work,
though I suppose it was also a form of academic research!

All best wishes for the holiday season and for a wonderful 2018!

Best regards,

David E. Barclay
Executive Director, German Studies Association

GSA Election Results Announced

In the spring the GSA conducted an election for three positions on the Board: two in history and one in literature/cultural studies. The Nominating Committee presented a slate of candidates, and the election results were as follows:

History: Donna Harsch, Carnegie Mellon University

History: Thomas Lekan, University of South Carolina

Literature/Cultural Studies: Christina Gerhardt, University of Hawai'i

The terms for the new Board members will begin on 1 January 2018, and they will serve for three years. The elections were extremely close, and the GSA is deeply grateful to all the candidates for their willingness to serve. Without you, there would be no GSA.

Finally, a special note of thanks to the Board members whose terms are expiring: Jennifer Kapczynski (Washington University in St. Louis), H. Glenn Penny (University of Iowa), and Jared Poley (Georgia State University). Many thanks and much appreciation to each of them for their exemplary service to the GSA!

Planning for the Forty-Second Conference of the GSA Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 27-30 September 2018

The forty-second annual conference of the GSA will take place from 27 to 30 September 2018 at the **Wyndham Grand Pittsburgh Downtown**, 600 Commonwealth Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15222.

The **Call for Seminar Proposals** follows below. After four years, our seminars have proved to be a rousing success. Please note that the deadline for submission of seminar topics – announced on the GSA website – was 11 November 2017, and will have passed by the time you read this. Applications for participation in seminars will open on **5 JANUARY 5 2018**. Again, see below for details.

The “traditional” **Call for Papers** also follows below. Please note that the deadline for submitting “traditional” paper, session, or roundtable proposals the deadline for ALL submissions will be **15 FEBRUARY 2018**.

Detailed conference submission guidelines can be found below. Submissions for “traditional” papers, sessions, or roundtables will be accepted online (www.thegsa.org) after 5 January 2018. (Again, please note the earlier deadline for seminar proposals.) Only online submissions will be accepted. Paper proposals or proposals submitted by e-mail will not be accepted. 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. The GSA also encourages the submission of thematic series that might include UP TO BUT NO MORE THAN four related sessions, and it also vigorously supports interdisciplinary sessions, including sessions that are organized in conjunction with our interdisciplinary Networks.

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 of “traditional” papers, sessions, and roundtables will take place online at the GSA Web site (www.thegsa.org). Please do note that all presenters, including moderators, commentators, seminar participants, and roundtable participants, must be members of the German Studies Association at the time of submission. For information on membership, please go to the GSA website (www.thegsa.org).

German Studies Association Annual Conference 2018

Call for Seminar Proposals

The 42nd GSA Conference in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (27-30 September 27-30 2018), will continue to host a series of seminars in addition to conference sessions and roundtables.

Seminars meet for all three days of the conference. They explore new avenues of academic exchange and foster extended discussion, rigorous intellectual debate, and intensified networking. Seminars are typically proposed and led by two to three conveners and they consist of 12 to 20 participants, including scholars from different disciplines and at different career stages. Seminars may enable extended discussion of a recent academic publication; the exploration of a promising new research topic; engagement with pre-circulated papers; an opportunity to debate the work of scholars with different approaches; the coming together of groups of scholars seeking to develop an anthology; or the in-depth discussion of a political or public policy issue, novel, film, poem, artwork, or musical piece.

In order to facilitate extended discussion, seminar conveners and participants should participate in all three seminar meetings. Please note that seminar conveners and seminar applicants who have been accepted for seminar participation will not be allowed to submit a paper in a regular panel session. However, they may take on one additional role in the conference as moderator or commentator on another session independent of their enrollment in a seminar, or they may participate in a roundtable.

Although we accept proposals from conveners who have directed a seminar during the past two consecutive years, we give preference to newcomers and thus encourage the rotation of seminar conveners in similarly-themed seminars. We further recommend that those conveners contact the coordinators of the [Interdisciplinary Network Committee](#), Professors Pamela Potter (pmpotter@wisc.edu) and Winson Chu (wchu@uwm.edu), to establish an official GSA Network on their topic.

The application process has two steps. Initially, we invite you to submit a preliminary proposal that includes the following items:

- Title
- Names of conveners
- A 150-word description of the seminar's subject (which will eventually be used in the call for participants, the printed program, and the online program/mobile app)
- A 50-word description of the format of the seminar (which will also appear in the call for participants, etc.)

These items were due by 13 November 2017. Please submit your application online at <https://www.xcdsystem.com/gsa>. Your username and password are the same ones you use to log in to your GSA profile at <https://thegsa.org/members/profile>.

Please note that you must be a current member of the GSA to submit a proposal. If you need your password reset, please contact Ms. Ursula Gray (UG@press.jhu.edu) at Johns Hopkins University Press. If technical questions or problems arise with the submission interface itself, please contact Elizabeth Fulton at techsupport@thegsa.org.

At this point, the GSA Seminar Committee will provide suggestions and assistance for the final submission, which is due by December 13, 2017. The committee will then review seminar proposals and post a list of approved seminars and their topics on the GSA website by early January 2018.

The GSA Seminar Committee consists of:

Margaret Eleanor Menninger (Texas State University) | mm48@txstate.edu (Chair)
 Maria Mitchell (Franklin & Marshall College) | maria.mitchell@fandm.edu
 Faye Stewart (Georgia State University) | fayestewart@gsu.edu

Please direct all inquiries to all three of us.

German Studies Association Annual Conference 2018

Call for Panels, Roundtables, and Papers

The German Studies Association (GSA) will hold its 42nd Annual Conference from 27 to 30 September 2018 at the Wyndham Grand Pittsburgh Downtown in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (USA).

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, anthropology, musicology, religious studies, sociology, and cultural studies.

Proposals for entire sessions, for interdisciplinary presentations, and for series of panels are strongly encouraged (though we discourage thematic series of more than four panels). Individual paper proposals are also welcome. The call for seminar proposals has been distributed separately.

Please see the GSA website for information about the submission process for “traditional” papers, sessions, and roundtables, which will open on 5 January 2018. The deadline for proposals is 15 February 2018.

Please note that all proposed presenters must be members of the German Studies Association. Information on membership is available

In order to avoid complications later, the Program Committee would like to reiterate two extremely important guidelines here (the full list of guidelines is available on the GSA website):

- (1) No individual at the GSA conference may give more than one paper or appear on the program in more than two separate roles. (Participating in a seminar counts as delivering a paper.)
- (2) If a paper proposal requires high quality sound equipment, that justification must be made in detail at the time of submission.

For more information, please see our previous conference programs, a detailed list of submission guidelines, and contact information for the 2018 Program Committee at <https://thegsa.org/conference/current.html>

The 2018 Program Committee consists of:

Program Director: [Benjamin Marschke](#), Humboldt State University
 Pre-1800, all fields: [Rita Krueger](#), Temple University
 19th Century, all fields: [Martha Helfer](#), Rutgers University
 20th/21st-century History: [Andrew Donson](#), University of Massachusetts-Amherst
 20th/21st-century History: [Joe Perry](#), Georgia State University
 20th/21st-century Germanistik: [Christine Rinne](#), University of South Alabama
 20th/21st-century Germanistik: [Qinna Shen](#), Bryn Mawr College
 Contemporary Politics, Economics, and Society: [Sarah Wiliarty](#), Wesleyan University
 Contemporary Politics, Economics, and Society: [Pamela Swett](#), McMaster University
 Interdisciplinary/Diachronic: [Benita Blessing](#), Oregon State University
 Interdisciplinary/Diachronic: [Martin Nedbal](#), University of Kansas
 Single Papers (all fields): [Katherine Aaslestad](#), West Virginia University
 Single Papers (all fields): [Deborah Janson](#), West Virginia University

Seminars

Chair: [Margaret Menninger](#), Texas State University
[Faye Stewart](#), Georgia State University
[Maria Mitchell](#), Franklin & Marshall College

Guidelines for Submitting 2018 Proposals Forty-Second Annual Conference

27-30 September 2018
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Submission of Proposals for Individual Papers or Entire Panels

- All papers and panels must be submitted via the GSA website.
- All prospective participants, including moderators and commentators, must be paid members of the German Studies Association for the current year.
- All papers and panel titles must conform to the style guidelines of either *The Chicago Manual of Style* or *Historische Zeitschrift*.
- Papers in both English and German are welcome.
- The submission deadline is **Thursday, 15 February 2018**, at midnight Eastern Standard Time.
- Organizers of entire sessions should submit a 300-500 word session description, with 350-600 word abstracts for each paper in the session.
- Individual paper submitters should submit a 350-600 word abstract.
- Please indicate, using the drop-down menu, the field/area/chronological period to which you wish your session or paper to be assigned.
- For assistance with the online submission process or with dues payment, first contact Elizabeth Fulton at helpdesk@thegsa.org.

Rules for Presenters

- No individual may undertake more than one "presenter role," defined as giving a paper or participating in a seminar. Participating in a roundtable is not considered a presenter role.
- No individual may undertake more than two roles altogether, including a presenter role. Thus, an individual may give a paper and offer commentary on a separate panel. No individual may present two papers, nor may any individual participate in a seminar and present a paper.
- No individual may submit two or more papers or apply to two or more seminars.
- Individuals may both present a paper (or participate in a seminar) and participate in one roundtable.
- An individual who has been accepted to a seminar may not withdraw in order to submit a paper.

Composition of Panels

- A complete panel must comprise a moderator, a commentator and no fewer than three and no more than four papers. Incomplete panels may be submitted, but their acceptance and/or eventual composition then becomes the purview of the Program Committee.
- Graduate students may not serve as commentators, and there may not be more than two graduate student papers on any panel.

- There may not be more than two individuals on any panel from the same institution.
- Co-authored papers are permitted, but each presentation is limited to two co-presenters. A co-presentation counts as one presentation role for each speaker, for scheduling purposes.
- Proposals for panel series must be limited to no more than four related panels.

Requests and fees for audio and/or visual equipment

- All breakout rooms will be equipped with LCD projectors that have VGA cables. Please be sure to bring an appropriate adapter for your laptop.
- Laptops will not be provided.
- The standard projectors **do not** have sound support. Please see below if your presentation will require sound.
- Presenters requiring separate sound equipment must request it during the submission process. Assignment of panels to rooms specially equipped for sound is at the discretion of the Program Director or the Executive Director.

Scheduling Changes

- The Program Director and the Executive Director reserve the right to move papers from one session to another at their discretion.
- Single papers that are not initially accepted will be put on a waitlist in case of future openings. Authors are free to decline this option. Final decisions will be sent on Friday, June 1st, 2018.
- New papers **may not** be substituted in cases of participant withdrawal. Only papers received by the original submission deadline will be considered.
- When participant withdrawals result in a panel with two papers, or a roundtable with two participants (excluding moderator), such sessions may be cancelled at the discretion of the Program Director and the Executive Director if no other alternative can be found.

Withdrawal from the Conference

- **All individuals withdrawing from the conference must inform the GSA directly.** Please contact Elizabeth Fulton at helpdesk@thegsa.org to confirm your absence.
- Anyone who cancels after **1 June 2018** for any reason other than medical or family emergency will not be permitted to submit another proposal for two years.
- Lack of travel funding is not a valid reason for withdrawal. All non-North Americans are eligible for our travel grants, and there is no deadline for application.
- Individuals withdrawing from the conference after acceptance of their papers and/or panels will not have their fee for membership in the GSA refunded.
- Registration fees for cancellations will be refunded, but will incur a cancellation penalty of 50% of the fee. Exceptions may be made for illness or other serious and unforeseen circumstances. No refunds are available for cancellations after 1 September 2018. For more information, contact Elizabeth Fulton at helpdesk@thegsa.org.

2017 Prize Winners Announced

The German Studies Association is pleased to announce the following prizes, which were awarded at the Forty-First Anniversary Conference in Atlanta on 6 October 2017:

DAAD Book Prize for best book in History and Social Sciences published in 2015 or 2016

The winner is **Professor Greg Eghigian** (Pennsylvania State University), *The Corrigible and the Incorrigible: Science, Medicine and the Convict in Twentieth Century Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015).

Here is the prize committee's *laudatio*:

Greg Eghigian's book, *The Corrigible and the Incorrigible: Science, Medicine and the Convict in Twentieth Century Germany*, traces scientific, medical, and administrative approaches to criminality, policing, incarceration, efforts at rehabilitation, and therapeutic practices across 20th century Germany. Impeccably researched, fluidly written, beautifully crafted, and measured in tone, this study is driven by a desire to probe the "correctional imagination"—namely, an aspirational project, both punitive and rehabilitative, that mobilized notions of "good and bad, normal and pathological, corrigible and incorrigible" to shape the management of criminal behavior and the fate of offenders. Revising Foucault, Eghigian astutely emphasizes the chronic disparity between ambitions and reality: the plans of those with power always fell short. Nonetheless, the sum of such efforts had a lasting impact and produced "influential visions of crime, the criminal and human nature." Eghigian's work shows, among other things, how rehabilitation efforts could emerge as much out of anxiety about the threat of recidivism as out of optimism or progressive social science.

Based upon archival research that spans three regimes (National Socialist, East German, West German), sophisticated in its use of theory, and masterful in its deployment of an impressive range of multi-disciplinary scholarship, the book is written in engaging prose and clearly articulates its substantial intellectual and historiographical contributions. Prof. Eghigian's nuanced analysis is sometimes surprising and always thought-provoking, undermining conventional views and narratives regarding the Third Reich and its relation to developments in the Weimar, Cold War, and post-Cold War eras. His insights, moreover, transcend the German context, shedding light on conceptions of "criminality" as well as penal and therapeutic practices in liberal democratic states. Erudite and ambitious, this book demonstrates what a specialized historical study of Germany has to offer other fields. It is an exemplary piece of scholarship that makes an original contribution to German historiography and speaks beyond the German context to interrogate the ways that criminality and the human capacity for improvement have

been – and continue to be – understood and addressed in the broader North Atlantic world of the 20th and 21st centuries.

Prize Committee: Professors Heide Fehrenbach (History, Northern Illinois University, chair), David Ciarlo (University of Colorado—Boulder), and Daniel Riches (University of Alabama).

DAAD Article Prize for best article in Literature and Cultural Studies published in the *German Studies Review* in 2015 or 2016

The winner is **Professor Maria Makela** (California College of the Arts), "Rejuvenation and Regen(d)eration: *Der Steinachfilm*, Sex Glands, and Weimar-Era Visual and Literary Culture," *German Studies Review* 38, no. 1 (February 2015) 35-62.

Here is the prize committee's *laudatio*:

Maria Makela's well-argued and well-formulated essay, "Rejuvenation and Regen(d)eration: *Der Steinachfilm*, Sex Glands, and Weimar-Era Visual and Literary Culture," has an impressive range for its interdisciplinary breadth and depth, engaging at once visual, literary and film studies, medical discourses, as well as gender and sexuality studies. While it makes a unique contribution to its discreet area of inquiry, it also puts a vast array of fields into conversation with ease. Makela uses an interdisciplinary approach to consider *Der Steinachfilm* (1923), about which little has hitherto been published. Makela presents the era's lively discourse about sex, gender formation and appearance, and also on aging and rejuvenation. Eugen Steinach, a professor of physiology at the University of Vienna and the most of famous endocrinologist of the era, experimented with the transplantation of ovaries and testicles and argued that hormones helped to define the physiology of sex and gender identity. This turn of the century discourse, which intensified at the end of World War I and throughout the 1920s, provides the context out of which *Der Steinachfilm* arose. The film had two iterations: a scientific version released in 1922, entitled *Steinachsforshungen* (Steinach's Research) and the popular version released in 1923. This film and the related scientific and popular discourse inflected much Weimar-era cultural production and provide new perspectives on the era's canonical visual and literary texts, including Anton Räderscheidt's painting "Selbstbildnis" (Self-Portrait, 1928), Vicki Baum's novel *Helene Willfüer* (1929), Hannah Höch's photomontages and Til Brugmann's literary grotesques.

Makela's article deftly reads together Weimar-era medical and scientific discourses; visual, literary and filmic texts; and sex and gender studies, making a substantive contribution to these fields. Additionally, it is so accessibly written that one could assign it to undergraduates or give it to people outside academia. An impressive range of

illustrations underscores the power of the argument. A very well-written, engaging, and edifying read!

Prize Committee: Professors Christina Gerhardt (University of Hawai'i, chair), Tobias Boes (University of Notre Dame), and Sonja Klocke (University of Wisconsin—Madison).

Sybil Halpern Milton Prize for best book in Holocaust Studies published in 2015 or 2016

This year the committee awarded the prize equally to two books. The winners are **Professor Wolf Gruner** (University of Southern California), *Die Judenverfolgung im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren. Lokale Initiativen, zentrale Entscheidungen, jüdische Antworten 1939-1945* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2016), and **Professor Gavriel D. Rosenfeld** (Fairfield University), *Hi Hitler! How the Nazi Past Is Normalized in Contemporary Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Here is the prize committee's *laudatio*:

The Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize for 2017 is awarded equally to two books: Wolf Gruner, *Die Judenverfolgung im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren. Lokale Initiativen, zentrale Entscheidungen, jüdische Antworten 1939-1945* (Wallstein Verlag, 2016) and Gavriel D. Rosenfeld, *Hi Hitler! How the Nazi Past is Normalized in Contemporary Culture* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).

In *Die Judenverfolgung im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren. Lokale Initiativen, zentrale Entscheidungen, jüdische Antworten 1939-1945* (Wallstein Verlag, 2016), Wolf Gruner argues that the Czech Protectorate became a testing ground for Nazi policies implemented elsewhere. Gruner's research convincingly revises the dominant view in the historical literature that the implementation of the Holocaust was organized centrally in Berlin. Gruner shows that occupied Czechoslovakia was a site of innovation and local initiative in the persecution of Czech Jews and that non-German antisemitism played a greater role than has been previously acknowledged. This groundbreaking and well researched book displays Gruner's masterful command of the historiography on the Holocaust. Additionally, he challenges assumptions that Jews passively accepted their fate, by documenting their creative and tenacious struggle. Gruner's book makes a major contribution to Holocaust research.

Gavriel D. Rosenfeld's *Hi Hitler! How the Nazi Past is Normalized in Contemporary Culture* is an outstanding contribution to the study of the historiography, memory, and fictional representation of the Holocaust and Nazism in both high and low realms of our contemporary culture. Rosenfeld criticizes the term "normalization" as an impulse to domesticate history that forecloses a moral engagement with the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust. The focus of the book is on normalizing Nazi history and

culture in Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States, Eastern Europe, and Israel in the 21st century. Rosenfeld's extensive research covers the evolution of cultural memory across genres and moves deftly from trivial Internet memes to counterfactual historical narratives that bridge the historical and the literary. With its lively style, useful theoretical framework for analysis, and its illuminating presentation of novels, movies, and memes, the book should have a major impact on future scholarly studies and impact popular views of normalization, as well.

Prize Committee: Professors Donna Harsch (Carnegie Mellon University, chair), Jonathan Skolnik (University of Massachusetts--Amherst), and Reinhard Zachau (University of the South).

Graduate Student Essay Prize for 2017

The winner is **Claudia Kreklau** (Emory University), for her essay on "Travel, Technology, and Theory: The Aesthetics of Ichthyology during the Second Scientific Revolution." It will be published in a forthcoming issue of the *German Studies Review*.

Here is the prize committee's *laudatio*:

On behalf of the GSA Committee charged with deciding the 2017 Graduate Student Essay Prize, we are delighted to present the Committee's choice of the essay, "**Travel, Technology, and Theory: The Aesthetics of Ichthyology during the Second Scientific Revolution**," by **Claudia Kreklau**, Emory University. The decision was very easy, with all judges independently coming to the same verdict.

Most immediately, the essay stood out for its clear organization, its accessible, lucid writing, and its deep level of research. Each of the reviewers independently noted that they could *understand* this essay even though the topic was beyond their own area of expertise. I would like to highlight that this—understandability—was a key reason for the unanimous nomination, because presenting research such that a wide audience can follow and find it interesting is a skill that is sometimes underappreciated in the academic world. Yet Claudia Kreklau achieved just that, and we hope she will continue to nurture that skill as she advances in her career.

The essay posits that knowledge of the world was tied to three things—world travel, technology, and aesthetics—specifically using the example of fish/fishes, and how knowledge and appreciation of fish/fishes increased during the second scientific revolution around 1800. For the overwhelming majority of human existence, the sea was perceived as threatening, and creatures inhabiting that world below water were seen as ugly and horrid. Early naturalists encountered fish only in their dead form—slimy, pale, and smelly—and so it is not surprising that early representations of fish, in books, for instance, reflect that unpleasant perception. However, as this essay shows,

between 1780 and 1840, perceptions of fish changed. Technological advances in printing with color plates contributed to that, as it became possible to depict fish in life-like colors. Advances in seafaring technology and underwater exploration, making travel safer and allowing more easily to observe fish alive in their natural surroundings surely were just as important for this shift in attitudes.

The essay is based on a wealth of records and sources from all across Europe, including publications, scientific cabinet collections, and travel accounts. Whether one comes from the angle of the historian, or literary scholar, or naturalist, this essay offers innovative and persuasive perspectives on the intersection of the natural world with technology and human intervention. As Keklau shows, the emerging perception of the natural world shows many parallels in different cultural settings. Characteristic for central Europe is that here, attitudes toward the natural world were shaped by aesthetics and romanticism more than elsewhere in Europe.

Prize Committee: Professors Almut Spalding (Illinois College, chair), Margaret Lewis (University of Tennessee, Martin), and Jeffrey Luppé (Indiana University, South Bend).

Radomír Luža Prize in Central European Studies of the World War II Era

In addition, Center Austria at the University of New Orleans and the American Friends of the *Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstandes* for the first time presented the annual Radomír Luža Prize in Central European Studies of the World War II Era at the GSA banquet. The winner was **Erin R. Hochman**, Southern Methodist University, for her book *Imagining Greater Germany: Republican Nationalism and the Idea of Anschluss* (Ithaca/NY: Cornell University Press, 2016).

Here is the committee's *laudatio*:

Hochman's *Imagining Greater Germany* is in perfect alignment with Radomír Luža's classic *Austro-German Relations in the Anschluss Era*, in fact, her book represents a sort of prequel to Luža's book. It is a serious work of comparative history on the important question of who supported "democracy" in Weimar Germany and the First Austrian Republic? Her focus on "cross-border" contacts of Germany's and Austria's "entangled" interwar histories of the "Pro-Anschluss" movements on both sides of the border is an innovative new approach on Austro-German relations. Her chapter on "symbols" of the new democratic republics (flags, anthems, state holidays) adds a lot of new information on the domestic contestations of these symbols. This is a well-written, deeply researched history that will honor this first Luža Prize to be administered by the GSA.

Heartiest congratulations to our 2017 prize winners!

2018 Prize Competitions Announced

In 2018 the GSA will again make a number of awards. We hope that as many members as possible will make nominations and submissions.

In 2018 the **DAAD/GSA Book Prize** will be awarded for the best book in Germanistik or cultural studies published in 2016 or 2017. Inquiries, nominations, and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Mara Wade (German, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, mwade@illinois.edu), by **20 February 2018**. The other members of the committee are Professors Vance Byrd (German, Grinnell College) and Deniz Göktürk (German, University of California, Berkeley).

The **DAAD Article Prize** will be awarded in 2018 for the best article in history or social sciences that appeared in the *German Studies Review* in 2016 or 2017. Inquiries, nominations, and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Yair Mintzker (History, Princeton University, mintzker@princeton.edu), by **20 February 2018**. The other members of the committee are Professors Harry Liebersohn (History, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana) and Laurie Marhoefer (History, University of Washington).

The prize for the **Best Essay in German Studies by a Graduate Student** will again be awarded in 2018. The deadline for nominations and submissions is **15 March 2018**. Papers should be 6,000-9,000 words in length. The winner will be published in the *German Studies Review*. Nominations and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Margaret Lewis (History; University of Tennessee, Martin, mlewis47@utm.edu). The other members of the committee are Professor Holly Yanacek (German, James Madison University) and Peter Yoder (History, Independent Scholar).

The **Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize** is awarded every other year, and will again be awarded in 2019 for the best book in Holocaust Studies published in 2017 or 2018.

Call for Information about Dissertations in German Studies

The German Studies Association is continuing its tradition of posting information in the spring newsletter about dissertations completed in any area of German (that means: Austrian, German, Swiss, German diasporic) Studies (any discipline or interdisciplinary). If you received your Ph.D. in 2016 or 2017, you may be listed in the Spring 2018 newsletter (no repeats, however!). If you have supervised a dissertation that was completed in 2016 or 2017 that has not already been listed, please encourage the author to submit a description following the guidelines below.

Send an email to Johannes von Moltke (moltke@umich.edu) anytime before March 17, 2018. Please type "GSA dissertation list" in the subject line

Be sure to include (in this order, please):

1. Name (Last, first)
2. Title of Dissertation
3. Institution and department in which it was defended
4. Name of dissertation director(s)
5. Month and Year of Defense (or degree if no defense)
6. Abstract of the dissertation of 200 or fewer words in either English or German. (150 words is desired length, 200 words an absolute limit. Longer abstracts will be shortened)

Please forward this notice to any institutions or individuals for whom you believe it is relevant.

Yours,

Johannes von Moltke
GSA Vice President

Möglichkeiten archivischer Arbeit

Aktuelles aus deutschen und amerikanischen Archiven

GSA Archives Committee Report 2017¹

Rainer Hering, Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein

Gliederung:

- 1.) Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln
- 2.) Internationaler Suchdienst (ITS) Bad Arolsen
- 3.) Bundesarchiv
- 4.) Literaturarchive
- 5.) GSA Archives Committee

1.) Am 3. März 2017 jährte sich der Einsturz des Historischen Archivs der Stadt Köln zum achten Mal. Seitdem ist das zentrale Ziel weiterhin, möglichst zeitnah viel Archivgut wieder benutzbar zu machen. Dabei geht es im Wesentlichen um folgende Aspekte:

- die Rekonstruktion der durch den Einsturz aus dem Herkunftszusammenhang gerissenen Bestände
- Fortschritte bei der Restaurierung, u. a. der planmäßige Abschluss der Vakuumgefriertrocknung
- eine verstärkte Nutzung der Archivalien und Digitalisate
- die zunehmende Internetpräsenz und
- weitere Schritte auf dem Weg hin zu einem Bürgerarchiv durch Ausbau der Serviceleistungen
- die Verringerung der Zahl der Asylarchive und die Konzentration des Archivgutes auf Magazinflächen im Rheinland bis zum Bezug des Neubaus in Köln.

Seit September 2014 sind Flächen im ehemaligen Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, Abteilung Rheinland, in Düsseldorf angemietet worden. Dort entsteht ein großes Asylarchiv mit einer Lagerfläche von ca. 20 Regalkilometern. Dadurch kann die Bergungserfassung auf die Standorte Köln und Düsseldorf konzentriert werden.

Auf ursprünglich 20 Asylarchiven waren die geborgenen Unterlagen verteilt worden. Die dafür erforderlichen fachlich adäquaten Lagerflächen wurden dem Kölner Stadtarchiv, teilweise mehr als sieben Jahre lang, unentgeltlich zur Verfügung gestellt – ein ganz besonderes Zeichen der Solidarität und des Zusammenhaltes in der archivischen Fachcommunity. Jetzt sind die Unterlagen weitgehend nach Düsseldorf verbracht worden. Besondere Anteilnahme in der

¹ The Archives Committee consists of Jennifer Rodgers, Malgorzata Swider, Gerhard Weinberg, Meike Werner, and Rainer Hering (chair).

Öffentlichkeit erregte die Räumung der insgesamt knapp eintausend Regalmeter im nördlichsten Asylarchiv, dem Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein in Schleswig. Verschiedene überregionale Fernsehsender, der Norddeutsche Rundfunk und etliche Printmedien (sogar eine dänischsprachige Zeitung) berichteten im Januar über den Abtransport des Kölner Archivgutes aus dem hohen Norden.

Zugenommen hat die Nutzung: Dies betrifft das „Digitale Historische Archiv“ mit mehr als 40.000 User-IP-Adressen, aber auch die Anzahl an Anfragen, die weiterhin ansteigt. Ein Grund für diese Zunahme dürfte auch die zunehmende Verfügbarkeit von Archivgut sein. 1.573 Seiten füllt die aktuelle Version der „Liste der wiederbenutzbaren Archivalien“

(http://www.archive.nrw.de/kommunalarchive/kommunalarchive_i-l/k/Koeln/BilderKartenLogosDateien/20160601_im_Original_nutzbar.pdf)

Die Nachfrage nach Unterlagen des Archivs steigt weiterhin, 2015 waren es 3.300 Anfragen. Dies ist auch eine Folge der Nutzerorientierung für alle Prozesse und Verfahren. Viele Abläufe können „on demand“ angestoßen werden, d.h. dass bei konkretem Nutzerinteresse kann die Bearbeitung von Archivgut innerhalb der feststehenden Abläufe priorisiert werden. Das liegt auch an den Fortschritten der sogenannten Bergungserfassung – also der ersten Stufe der Identifizierung von einsturzbedrohtem Archivgut. Hier ist es im vergangenen Jahr bereits gelungen, die 1.000.000. Bergungseinheit zu erfassen. Jede dieser Bergungseinheiten ist in der Archivdatenbank recherchierbar, wobei mehr als die Hälfte davon ihrem Bestand wieder zugeordnet werden konnten. Weiterhin liegen für alle erfassten Bergungseinheiten summarische Schadensbeschreibungen vor, sie sind neu verpackt und mit einem Barcode versehen. Bis Ende 2018 soll alles Archivgut, das nicht nass geborgen wurde, erfasst sein.

Der Bau eines neuen eigenen Gebäudes hat begonnen, die Baugrube am Eifelwall ist erstellt worden. Am 17. März 2017 erfolgte die Grundsteinlegung durch die Kölner Oberbürgermeisterin Henriette Reker. In ihrer Ansprache würdigte Frau Reker nicht nur das neue Gebäude für Stadtarchiv und Rheinisches Bildarchiv als „Europas modernstes kommunales Archiv“, sondern sie verwies auch auf die Bedeutung der geborgenen Bestände und die internationale Nutzergemeinschaft, die das Kölner Archivgut am neuen Standort unter besten Bedingungen einsehen können soll. Die Messingkartusche, die in den Grundstein eingemauert wurde, enthält im Übrigen neben den bei dieser Gelegenheit üblicherweise eingebrachten Gegenständen (Münze, Zeitung vom Tag) auch ein Trümmerstück des eingestürzten Archivbaus. Dies soll zukünftigen Generationen Erinnerung und Verpflichtung sein, die Geschichte der Stadt Köln und des Stadtarchivs über den Einsturz hinweg zu sichern und zu überliefern. Ein schlüsselfertiges Gebäude soll dem Archiv Anfang 2020 übergeben werden.

Inzwischen erhob die Staatsanwaltschaft vor dem Landgericht Köln Anklage gegen fünf Mitarbeiter der beteiligten Bauunternehmen und zwei Mitarbeiter der Kölner Verkehrsbetriebe. Diese müssen sich, wenn das Landgericht ein Verfahren eröffnet, wegen Baugefährdung und fahrlässiger Tötung verantworten. Für diese strafrechtliche Seite des

Verfahrens gilt eine Verjährungsfrist von zehn Jahren, das heißt, wenn bis dahin in erster Instanz kein Urteil ergangen ist, muss das Verfahren eingestellt werden. Aus Sicht des Archivs ist allerdings das parallel laufende zivilrechtliche Verfahren weitaus entscheidender, denn hier geht es um die Schadenersatzpflicht des Verursachers – und es besteht keine relevante Verjährungsfrist. Der hier anzubringende Gesamtschaden wird derzeit mit ca. 1,2 Mrd. EUR beziffert, wovon 350 bis 500 Mio. EUR auf die Wiederherstellungskosten des Archivguts entfallen könnten.²

2.) Der Internationale Suchdienst in Bad Arolsen (ITS) 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 wurde der ITS jahrzehntelang vom Internationalen Komitee vom Roten Kreuz (IKRK) geleitet und verwaltet. Am 9. Dezember 2011 unterzeichneten die elf Mitgliedsstaaten zwei neue Abkommen über die Aufgaben und die Administration des ITS. Das Internationale Komitee des Roten Kreuzes zog sich Ende 2012 aus der Leitung des ITS zurück. Neuer institutioneller Partner ist das Bundesarchiv, finanziert wird die Einrichtung aus dem Haushalt des Bundesinnenministeriums.³

Über die Suche von Personen und das Klären von persönlichen Schicksalen hinaus wird die Erschließung der Unterlagen eine stärkere Rolle spielen. Der ITS wird sich weiter von einem Suchdienst hin zu einem Zentrum für Dokumentation, Information und Forschung entwickeln. Damit soll dauerhaft die Zukunft dieser Einrichtung am Standort Bad Arolsen gesichert werden.

Das Archiv des Internationalen Suchdienstes in Arolsen (ITS) ist mit 30 Millionen Dokumenten 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. Die Originaldokumente und die Zentrale Namenkartei des International Tracing Service wurden 2013 in das UNESCO-Register „Memory of the World“ aufgenommen.

Digitale Kopie der Daten befinden sich derzeit im US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington sowie in Israel (Yad Vashem in Jerusalem), Polen (Nationales Institut des Gedenkens in Warschau), Belgien (Archives Générales du Royaume), Luxemburg (Centre de Documentation et de Recherche sur la Résistance), in Frankreich (Archives Nationales) und in Großbritannien (Wiener Library in London) – darunter auch Unterlagen über die Deportation französischer Widerstandskämpfer, die Ausbeutung französischer Zwangsarbeiter sowie die Verfolgung der Juden nach der Besetzung Frankreichs durch die Deutschen. Bislang wurden

² Sachstandsbericht von Dr. Ulrich Fischer vom Historischen Archiv der Stadt Köln vom 31.05.2017.

³ Vgl. International Tracing Service (ITS): Jahresbericht 2015. Neue Zugänge zum Archiv des ITS. Bad Arolsen 2016.

etwa 88 Millionen Abbildungen und über sieben Terabyte an Daten an diese Einrichtungen überreicht, darunter Dokumente zu Konzentrationslagern, Ghettos und Gefängnissen (ca. 18 Millionen Abbildungen), die Zentrale Namenkartei des ITS (ca. 42 Millionen Abbildungen), Registrierungskarten von Displaced Persons (ca. 7 Millionen Abbildungen) sowie Unterlagen zum Thema Zwangsarbeit (ca. 13 Millionen Abbildungen), zu DP Camps und zur Emigration (4,5 Millionen Abbildungen).

Besonders hervorzuheben ist die Onlinestellung des Gesamtinventars im Januar 2017. Es bietet einen Überblick über die Archivbestände des ITS, zu denen rund 30 Millionen Dokumente über die nationalsozialistische Verfolgung und Zwangsarbeit sowie das Schicksal der Überlebenden zählen. Seit 2013 sind die Originaldokumente des Archivs Teil des UNESCO-Weltdokumentenerbes „Memory of the World“.

Durch das Gesamtinventar werden Themenrecherchen und die Vorbereitung eines Archivbesuchs für Forscherinnen und Forscher erheblich leichter. Das Inventar bietet grundlegende Angaben zu den einzelnen Teilbeständen. Dazu zählen zum Beispiel der Titel, der Umfang, die Signatur und eine kurze inhaltliche Beschreibung. Die durchsuchbare Inventarstruktur wird als navigierbarer Baum angezeigt. Daneben kann nach Stichworten recherchiert werden. Das Gesamtinventar steht in deutscher und englischer Sprache zur Verfügung.

Die Erschließung der umfangreichen Bestände ist jedoch nicht abgeschlossen. Der ITS hat sich aus Gründen der Transparenz bewusst entschlossen, auch vorläufig oder oberflächlich erschlossene Bestände im Gesamtinventar anzuzeigen. Die bereits bestehenden Angaben zu den Teilbeständen werden schrittweise um detaillierte Bestandsbeschreibungen ergänzt, um einen tieferen Zugang zu den Dokumenten zu ermöglichen. Das Gesamtinventar auf der Website bildet den aktuellen Stand der Erschließung ab, da die Daten direkt aus dem digitalen ITS-Archiv abgerufen werden.

Link zum Gesamtinventar: <https://www.its-arolsen.org/archiv/bestandsueberblick/gesamtinventar/>

Die erhaltenen Überreste der Kartei der Reichsvereinigung der Juden in Deutschland umfassen 32.264 Meldekarten, insbesondere zu jüdischen Schülern, Emigranten und Verstorbenen. Auf den Karten finden sich neben Namen auch Informationen wie Geburtsdaten, Berufe sowie Adressen aus der Zeit vor den Massendeportationen der jüdischen Bevölkerung ab 1941. Hermann Göring hatte 1939 die Gründung der Reichsvereinigung der Juden in Deutschland angeordnet. Alle Menschen, die nach den Nürnberger Gesetzen als Juden galten, mussten sich melden. Diese Kartei diente der Gestapo dazu, die Deportationen zu organisieren. Zwischen 1947 und 1950 gelangten 32.264 Karten aus dieser Kartei ins Archiv des ITS. Darunter befindet sich zum Beispiel die „Berliner Schülerkartei“, die vom Leben der jüdischen Kinder während der Verfolgung zeugt und biografische Angaben zu den Kindern und ihren Eltern sowie

Informationen zu den besuchten Schulen enthält. Diese Karten können Interessierte in aller Welt nun einsehen.

Zum anderen hat der ITS zusätzlich 15.000 Dokumente über die Todesmärsche online gestellt, von denen ein erster Teilbestand bereits 2015 auf dem Internet-Portal publiziert wurde. In den späten 1940er Jahren hat der ITS an der Rekonstruktion der Todesmärsche gearbeitet und Augenzeugenberichte sowie Lagepläne von Grabstellen zusammengetragen. 1950 wurde eine sogenannte „Identification Unit“ gegründet, mit dem Ziel, den vielfach unbekannten Toten ihre Namen zurückzugeben. Die Dokumente über die versuchte und in zahlreichen Fällen auch gelungene Identifikation der NS-Opfer ergänzen nun den Bestand über die Todesmärsche im Online-Archiv des ITS. Im Online-Portal sind die Todesmärsche mit georeferenzierten Dokumenten auf einer Landkarte veranschaulicht. Wenn Nutzer auf Ortsnamen klicken, sehen sie die damit in Verbindung stehenden Dokumente, zum Beispiel die Antworten auf Fragebögen, die an Kommunen geschickt worden waren oder jetzt neu die Unterlagen über das Identifikations-Programm.

Die Zahl der Anfragen an das Archiv ist im Jahr 2016 weiter gestiegen: 15.635 Antragsteller wendeten sich an den ITS, 2015 lag die Zahl bei 15.418. Rund 15 Prozent der Anfragen (2.189) kamen 2016 von Forschern, Wissenschaftlern und Pädagogen.

Über 2.000 Mal traten Überlebende der NS-Verfolgung 2016 in Kontakt mit dem ITS. Ein Grund dafür sind Renten für bisher ausgeklammerte Opfergruppen. Durch eine Änderung in der polnischen Gesetzgebung erhalten jüdische NS-Verfolgte Renten, die zur Zeit der Verfolgung in Polen waren, seitdem aber außerhalb des Landes leben. Hinzu kommt die Reform der Ghettoernten, die nach einer Schätzung der Deutschen Bundesregierung für circa 40.000 noch lebende Ghetto-Arbeiter bedeutsam ist. Um die Renten zu erhalten, benötigen die Überlebenden vom ITS Bescheinigungen über Verfolgung und Inhaftierung. „Die Anfragen der hochbetagten Überlebenden haben beim ITS derzeit absoluten Vorrang“, erklärt ITS-Direktorin Floriane Hohenberg. „Wir tun alles, damit sie schnellstmöglich ihre Ansprüche geltend machen können. Mit dem polnischen Amt für Kriegsveteranen und Opfer von Unterdrückung gibt es eine enge Zusammenarbeit. Der ITS stellt die Unterlagen für eine zügige Abwicklung direkt auf Polnisch zur Verfügung.“

Deutlich gestiegen ist die Zahl der Personen, zu denen die Antragsteller Informationen gesucht haben. Bezogen sich die Anfragen 2015 noch auf 21.909 Personen, stieg die Zahl 2016 um zwölf Prozent auf 24.456. Im vergangenen Jahr kamen die Anfragen aus 73 Nationen, vor allem aber aus Deutschland (3.267), darauf folgen Polen (2.469), die Russische Föderation (1.702) und die Vereinigten Staaten (1.325).

Nähere Informationen sind im Internet zu finden: www.its-arolsen.org.

3.) Bundesarchiv

3.1 Novelliertes Bundesarchivgesetz in Kraft getreten

Am 16. März 2017 ist das „Gesetz über die Nutzung und Sicherung von Archivgut des Bundes“ vom 10. März 2017 (BGBl. I S. 410) in Kraft getreten. Das Bundesarchivgesetz wurde neu strukturiert und modernisiert, um es an die Bedürfnisse der Informationsgesellschaft anzupassen und die Nutzerfreundlichkeit zu erhöhen. Dazu schreibt uns der Präsident des Bundesarchivs Dr. Michael Hollmann⁴:

Das neue BArchG – Was ist neu oder anders?

§ 3 Aufgaben des Bundesarchivs

Zu den gesetzlich definierten Aufgaben gehört nun auch ausdrücklich die Digitalisierung von genuin analogem Archivgut und die digitale öffentliche Zugänglichmachung von Archivgut über das Internet.

Das Bundesarchiv ist ausdrücklich ermächtigt, Unterlagen, die nicht bei den anbieterpflichtigen Stellen des Bundes entstanden sind, zu übernehmen, wenn sie dem Bundesarchiv angeboten werden und das Bundesarchiv deren bleibendem Wert festgestellt hat. Damit sind insbesondere Nachlässe oder Unterlagen von Vereinen, Verbänden etc. gemeint.

§ 5 Anbietung und Abgabe von Unterlagen

Unbeschadet des Grundsatzes, dass die anbieterpflichtigen Stellen des Bundes selbst entscheiden können, wann sie dem Bundesarchiv Unterlagen zur Übernahme anbieten, sollen Unterlagen spätestens 30 Jahre nach der Entstehung der Unterlagen angeboten werden. Es handelt sich um eine Soll-Vorschrift, da es bei nahezu allen öffentlichen Stellen Unterlagen gibt, die deutlich länger als 30 Jahre noch benötigt werden, die bei archivischer Bewertung aber für kassabel befunden würden (z. B. Bauunterlagen zu Dienstgebäuden). Auf diese Weise wird sichergestellt, dass durch die archivische Bewertung nicht Unterlagen vernichtet werden, die zwar keinen bleibenden Wert im Sinne des Bundesarchivgesetzes, wohl aber fortdauernde Bedeutung für die anbieterpflichtige Stelle haben.

Erstmals erhält das Bundesarchiv die Legitimation, Daten aus nicht abgeschlossenen IT-Anwendungen – als Datenschnitte – zu übernehmen, wenn diesen Daten bleibender Wert zukommt. Damit verbunden ist die einvernehmliche Festlegung von Transferstandards.

§ 6 Anbietung und Abgabe von Unterlagen, die Geheimhaltungs-, Vernichtungs- oder Löschungsvorschriften unterliegen

⁴ Freundliche Mitteilung von Dr. Michael Hollmann vom 07.07.2017.

Unterlagen, die einer Geheimhaltungsvorschrift unterliegen, sind dem Bundesarchiv ebenfalls anzubieten. Das Bundesarchiv hat mit der Übernahme die noch bestehenden Geheimhaltungsaufgaben in der gleichen Weise zu beachten, wie zuvor die anbietende Stelle.

Unterlagen der Nachrichtendienste müssen nur angeboten werden, wenn sie deren Verfügungsberechtigung unterliegen – eine Einschränkung, die insbesondere für die Verschlusssachen anderer deutscher oder ausländischer Dienststellen gilt. Außerdem müssen Unterlagen solange nicht angeboten werden, solange zwingende Gründe des Quellen- und Methodenschutzes bzw. des Schutzes der Identität der ND-Mitarbeiter dem entgegenstehen. Diese Regelungen für die Nachrichtendienste ergaben sich schon früher aus den entsprechenden Regelungen z. B. des Sicherheitsüberprüfungsgesetzes oder der Verschlusssachenanweisung; mit der BArchG-Novelle sind diese Regelungen im BArchG quasi „auf den Punkt“ gebracht worden.

Dem Bundesarchiv können auch Unterlagen angeboten werden, die Vernichtungs- bzw. Lösungsverpflichtungen unterliegen, wenn die entsprechenden gesetzlichen Regelungen die Anbietung an das Bundesarchiv als Löschungssurrogat ermöglichen. Bei einschlägigen Gesetzgebungsverfahren ist künftig zu prüfen, ob Daten tatsächlich gelöscht werden müssen oder nicht ersatzweise ins Archiv übernommen werden können.

§ 7 Zwischenarchiv und digitales Zwischenarchiv

Die seit mehr als 40 Jahren bestehenden Zwischenarchive werden erstmals im BArchG erwähnt und damit als gesetzliche Aufgabe des Bundesarchivs anerkannt. Gleichzeitig wird mit der Definition eines digitalen Zwischenarchivs diese Aufgabe auch auf den Bereich genuin digitaler Unterlagen ausgedehnt.

§ 9 Veräußerungsverbot

Eine wichtige Neuerung ist die Feststellung der Unveräußerlichkeit von Archivgut des Bundes. Künftig kann dessen Besitz weder mit Zeitablauf eressen noch gutgläubig erworben werden.

§ 10 – 15 Nutzung von Archivgut des Bundes, Schutzfristen etc.

Die bislang im § 5 BArchG (alt) zusammengefassten Vorschriften zum Archivgutzugang sind in der Novelle im Wesentlichen übernommen, aus systematischen Gründen aber auf mehrere Paragraphen (§§ 10 bis 15) verteilt worden. Folgende Detailänderungen wurden in der BArchG-Novelle vorgenommen:

§ 10 Nutzung von Archivgut

Die Möglichkeit, eine Nutzung an Auflagen zu binden oder unter dem Vorbehalt des Widerrufs zu erteilen, wurde aus der Benutzungsordnung des Bundesarchivs in das Gesetz selbst übernommen. Dies gilt auch für die Vorschrift, dass die Archivgutnutzung in der Regel in der vom Benutzer beantragten Weise erfolgen soll.

§ 11 Schutzfristen

Die Schutzfrist zur Nutzung von personenbezogenem Archivgut wurde reduziert. Künftig können derartige Unterlagen 10 Jahre nach dem Tod der betreffenden Person bzw. ersatzweise 100 Jahre nach deren Geburt frei benutzt werden.

Archivgut, das Geheimhaltungsvorschriften des Bundes unterliegt, darf definitiv erst 60 Jahre nach seiner Entstehung genutzt werden.

Erstmals wird explizit festgestellt, dass die Schutzfristen für Amtsträger in Ausübung ihrer Ämter oder Personen der Zeitgeschichte nicht gelten, sofern nicht deren schutzwürdiger persönlicher Lebensbereich betroffen ist.

Weiterhin sind Unterlagen, die sich auch nach mehr als 30 Jahren noch in der Verfügungsgewalt der anbietungspflichtigen Stellen befinden, auch vor der Anbietung an das Bundesarchiv nach den Regeln von § 11, Abs. 1-5, § 10, § 12 und § 13 nutzbar (früher § 5 Abs. 8).

§ 12 Verkürzung und Verlängerung von Schutzfristen

Neu ist auch, dass neben wissenschaftlichen Forschungs- und Dokumentationsvorhaben auch das Informationsinteresse der Öffentlichkeit als berechtigtes Argument zur Schutzfristverkürzung anerkannt wird (keine weitere Privilegierung von Wissenschaft gegenüber Presse).

§ 14 Rechte der Betroffenen

Das bislang für Betroffene (bestimmte oder bestimmbare natürliche Person – siehe Begriffsbestimmung in § 1 Ziffer 3) geltende Recht auf Aktenauskunft steht nun auch den Angehörigen zu (Ehegatten, Lebenspartner, Kinder, Enkelkinder, Eltern und Geschwister der Betroffenen – siehe abschließende Definition in § 1 Ziffer 1).

Die bislang genannten Ansprüche „Dritter“ wurden ersatzlos gestrichen.

§ 16 Übermittlung von Vervielfältigungen von Archivgut des Bundes vor Ablauf der Schutzfristen

Das Bundesarchiv wurde mit dieser Vorschrift erstmals auch gesetzlich ermächtigt, Kopien von Archivgut auch dann an andere Archive, Bibliotheken, Museen oder sonstige Forschungseinrichtungen abzugeben, wenn die Schutzfristen noch nicht abgelaufen sind. Als Voraussetzung dafür muss zum einen ein besonderes öffentliches Interesse an der Weitergabe bestehen und zum anderen muss die betreffende Einrichtung sich explizit verpflichten, die im Bundesarchiv geltenden Zugangsbeschränkungen (Fristen etc.) in gleicher Weise zu beachten und anzuwenden wie das Bundesarchiv. Diese neue Vorschrift zielt auf die frühzeitige Bereitstellung von Kopien z. B. für Yad Vashem oder das USHMM.

Neu sind einige bis dato untergesetzlich geregelte Fragen betreffend die Einsichtnahme in die laufende Registratur anbieterspflichtiger Stellen, das Anbietersverfahren und die Nutzung von Archivgut durch diese Stellen.

3.2 Gurlitt-Unterlagen digital zugänglich

Das Bundesarchiv hat ca. 22.000 Dokumente geschäftlichen Charakters aus dem Nachlass des Kunsthändlers Cornelius Gurlitt (1932-2014) digitalisiert und für Provenienzforschungen in den Lesesälen des Bundesarchivs in Bayreuth, Berlin-Lichterfelde, Freiburg und Koblenz zur Verfügung gestellt. Erschlossen werden sie durch ein 250 Seiten umfassendes Findbuch. Bereits seit 2016 sind die Fotos aus dem Nachlass im Bundesarchiv recherchierbar.

3.3 Unterlagen der Kunst und Antiquitäten GmbH (KuA) erschlossen

Ein wichtiger Bestand für die Erforschung der Kulturgutverluste in der DDR ist online recherchierbar – die Akten des Betriebs Kunst und Antiquitäten GmbH für die Provenienzforschung erschlossen. Mit der **Kunst und Antiquitäten GmbH (KuA)** verfügte die DDR seit 1973 über einen zentralen Außenhandelsbetrieb für den Export von Gebrauchsgütern und Antiquitäten ins westliche Ausland. Sie exportierte im großen Stil gebrauchte Möbel, antiken Hausrat, Nippes und Antiquitäten über Großabnehmer vor allem in der Bundesrepublik, Belgien und den Niederlanden an Antiquitätenhändler und Trödler in aller Welt. Die KuA war Teil von Alexander Schalck-Golodkowski's Firmenimperium Kommerzielle Koordinierung (KoKo). Ihre Hauptaufgabe bestand deshalb darin, durch schnellen Warenumsatz möglichst hohe Valutagewinne für die DDR zu erwirtschaften.

Dem stand ein bald erkennbarer Mangel an hochwertigen Waren gegenüber. Die KuA versuchte diesem Problem durch ein Wechselspiel von Anreizen und Druckmitteln abzuwehren. So bot sie im Tausch für besonders wertvolle Antiquitäten Westautos oder andere Konsumgüter an. Doch sie beteiligte sich auch an anrüchigen, wenn nicht kriminellen Geschäften: Gemeinsam mit den Steuerbehörden brachte sie Antiquitätenhändler und -sammler durch fingierte Steuerverfahren um ihre Sammlungen und verkaufte sie ebenso in den Westen wie Wertsachen, die von Stasi und Zoll bei Paket- und Grenzkontrollen eingezogen worden waren. Vorgeworfen wurde der KuA während der "Wende" aber vor allem der von ihr maßgeblich betriebene Ausverkauf des

kulturellen Erbes der DDR ohne Rücksicht auf die Regeln des Kulturgutschutzes. Grund genug für einen Exportstopp im Herbst 1989 und die bald folgende Abwicklung des Unternehmens.

Parallel zum Gebrauchtwarenexport dehnte die KuA ihr Sortiment im Lauf der Jahre stetig aus: über Altmaterialien wie Pflastersteine oder Bahnschwellen auf Produkte aller Art, wie Biertische, Torf oder Schnittblumen. Im Gegenzug importierte sie für ihre DDR-Zulieferer vor allem Bürogeräte und Spezialmaschinen aus dem Westen.

Die KuA hinterließ rund 74 lfm. an Dokumenten, die jetzt in 1929 Verzeichnungseinheiten im Bundesarchivbestand **Betriebe des Bereichs Kommerzielle Koordinierung (DL 210)** erschlossen vorliegen. Dabei handelt es sich vor allem um Kaufverträge und Lieferpapiere mit umfangreichen Listen, aber auch Ankaufbelege und Listen eingezogener Kunstgegenstände. Schriftwechsel, Protokolle von Verkaufsreisen und Bewirtungsbelege geben darüber hinaus lebendige Einblicke in den Geschäftsalltag der KuA und die praktischen Abläufe innerhalb der Geldbeschaffungsmaschinerie der KoKo.

Vor allem das Exportmonopol der KuA für Antiquitäten aus der DDR macht ihre Akten zur zentralen Quelle für die Aufarbeitung der damit verbundenen Machenschaften und für die Suche nach unrechtmäßig entzogenem Kulturgut. Bei der archivischen Erschließung des Bestandes war es dem Bundesarchiv deshalb wichtig, diese Suche nach Möglichkeit zu unterstützen. Über die Rechercheanwendung des Bundesarchivs Invenio lassen sich deshalb auch von der KuA exportierte Kunstwerke recherchieren, wenn ihr Wert und die Beschreibung in den Lieferlisten hoffen lassen, dass entzogene Gegenstände wiedererkannt werden könnten.

3.4 Projekt Weimarer Unterlagen online

Im Schriftgutbereich werden aus zahlreichen Beständen ganze Aktengruppen digitalisiert, so z.B. aus dem Bestand R 43 I Reichskanzlei, R 904 Waffenstillstandskommission, NY 4035 Nachlass Waldemar Papst, RM 20 Marinekommandoamt der Reichsmarine und Kriegsmarine und R 201 Vollzugsrat der Arbeiter- und Soldatenräte Groß-Berlin.

Der Bestand R 705 Informationsstelle der Reichsregierung ist vollständig für die Digitalisierung im Jahr 2017 vorgesehen. Er umfasst 75 Akteneinheiten und enthält ausschließlich Unterlagen aus den Jahren 1918 und 1919.

Die Informationsstelle wurde am 10. November 1918 beim Rat der Volksbeauftragten, ab Februar 1919 bei der Reichsregierung eingerichtet. Ihre Aufgabe war die Sichtung und Sammlung aller Nachrichten aus dem gesamten Deutschen Reich und deren Weiterleitung an die Reichsregierung bzw. die zuständigen Fachressorts. Bereits am 31. März 1919 erfolgte die Auflösung der Informationsstelle.

3.5 Verfahrensakten des Bundesverfassungsgerichts

Zum 15. August 2016 startete das Projekt zur Ordnung, Bewertung und Erschließung der Verfahrensakten des Bundesverfassungsgerichts von 1951 bis 1990; bis Ende 2020 sollen über 90.000 Akten bearbeitet werden. Gegenstand des Projektes sind die Verfahrensakten des Bundesverfassungsgerichts (BVerfG), die unter Geltung zweier Vereinbarungen zwischen dem BVerfG und dem Bundesarchiv aus den Jahren 1979 und 2000 mit ungeklärtem Rechtsstatus an das Bundesarchiv abgegeben und daher bislang auch nicht archivisch bearbeitet wurden. Die 2013 erfolgte Ergänzung des § 35b Bundesverfassungsgerichtsgesetz (BVerfGG), mit der die bisher nur als Altregistraturgut abgegebenen Unterlagen des BVerfG zu Zwischenarchivgut bzw. Archivgut des Bundes wurden, gab nun den Anstoß für das Projekt.

Bearbeitet werden sollen rund 90.000 Akten, die meisten davon Verfassungsbeschwerden und Verfahren zur abstrakten und konkreten Normenkontrolle. Erschlossen werden derzeit die Verfahren zur abstrakten Normenkontrolle nach Art. 93 Abs. 1 Nr. 2 GG bzw. § 13 Nr. 6 BVerfGG, in denen auf Antrag der Bundesregierung, einer Landesregierung oder eines Drittels der Mitglieder des Bundestages die Vereinbarkeit einer Rechtsvorschrift mit dem Grundgesetz geprüft wurde. Sie gewähren interessante Einblicke insbesondere in die gesellschaftspolitischen Debatten der frühen Bundesrepublik, so zum Deutschlandvertrag („Generalvertrag“) und dem beabsichtigten Beitritt zur Europäischen Verteidigungsgemeinschaft, zur Vorgeschichte des KPD-Urteils oder zum Streit um das Saarstatut. Zu den genannten Themen waren zum Teil mehrere, nicht immer mit einer Entscheidung endende Verfahren unterschiedlicher Art anhängig, deren Bezüge nun erstmals deutlich werden.

Die Zugänglichkeit der Akten richtet sich dabei v.a. nach den Regelungen des § 35b Abs. 5 BVerfGG. Dieser bestimmt, dass für die Einsicht in „beim Bundesarchiv oder durch das Bundesarchiv als Zwischenarchivgut“ aufbewahrte Akten „nach Ablauf von 30 Jahren seit Abschluss des Verfahrens die archivgesetzlichen Regelungen“ gelten. „Entwürfe von Urteilen, Beschlüssen und Verfügungen, Arbeiten zu ihrer Vorbereitung und Dokumente, die Abstimmungen betreffen“ stehen 60 Jahre nach dem Entscheidungsdatum zur Einsichtnahme zur Verfügung.

Während also die „normalen“ Verfahrensakten in der Regel 30 Jahre nach dem Entscheidungsdatum in die Benutzung gehen können, bleiben vor allem das „Votum“ genannte Gutachten, das ein als Berichterstatter in der Sache beauftragter Richter des BVerfG seinen Kollegen vorlegte, sowie die mit persönlichen Anmerkungen versehenen Handakten der Richter für 60 Jahre geschützt.

Auch wenn die Akten, die weit über die veröffentlichten Entscheidungen hinausgehende Einblicke in die Arbeitsweise des Gerichts erlauben, erst nach und nach erschlossen und in der Recherchedatenbank Invenio des Bundesarchivs zugänglich gemacht werden, kann vom Benutzungsteam des Bundesarchivs bereits jetzt mittels des Aktenzeichens nach einem bestimmten Verfahren recherchiert werden. Die Recherchedatenbank Invenio ermöglicht dann

neben einer navigierenden Suche über die Bestandsstruktur und der allgemeinen Stichwortsuche auch die Suche z.B. nach dem Entscheidungsdatum oder dem berichterstattenden Bundesverfassungsrichter.

Direktlink zum Bestand B 237 Bundesverfassungsgericht:

<https://invenio.bundesarchiv.de/basys2-invenio/direktlink/fc071736-d5b4-4172-8fd8-edb8ab1b1be0/>

Zum Weiterlesen:

Sebastian Gehrig: Recht im Kalten Krieg. Das Bundesverfassungsgericht, die deutsche Teilung und die politische Kultur der frühen Bundesrepublik, in: Historische Zeitschrift 303 (2016), S. 64-97.

Florian Meinel / Benjamin Kram: Das Bundesverfassungsgericht als Gegenstand historischer Forschung. Leitfragen, Quellenzugang und Perspektiven nach der Reform des § 35b BVerfGG, in: Juristenzeitung 69 (2014), S. 913-921.

4.) Literaturarchive bieten nicht nur für die Germanistik, sondern gerade auch für die Geschichtswissenschaft wichtige Quellen.

Herausragend ist das 1955 gegründete Deutsche Literaturarchiv in Marbach am Neckar. Finanziert wird es von der Bundesregierung und dem Land Baden-Württemberg sowie von den Städten Stuttgart, Ludwigsburg und Marbach sowie dem Landkreis Ludwigsburg. Mit rund 1.200 Nach- und [Vorlässen](#) von namhaften Schriftstellern, Schriftstellerinnen und Gelehrten gehört die Marbacher Handschriftensammlung international zu den führenden Sammlungen ihrer Art. Sie erwirbt, erschließt und archiviert Manuskripte, Briefe und Lebensdokumente vom 18. Jahrhundert bis in die Gegenwart. Der Zugang zu den Sammlungen steht allen offen, die Quellen für ihre Arbeit brauchen. Darüber hinaus finden sich hier auch *Redaktionsarchive literarischer Zeitschriften*, wie Merkur, Neue Deutsche Hefte, Text + Kritik, Texte und Zeichen, Die Wandlung, und Verlagsarchive, wie z.B. Cotta, Insel, Luchterhand, MÄRZ, R. Piper, S. Fischer und Suhrkamp. Die Bestände sind bis 1998 in Zettelkatalogen und Bestandslisten nachgewiesen, seit 1999 in der Datenbank.

Neu übernommen wurden u.a. folgende Bestände:

- Einzelne Briefe und kleinere Postkartenkonvolute, u.a. acht Briefe an die Mutter von Erich Kästner und ein Brief von Gustav Freytag,
- Der Vorlass von Eva Zeller (*1923),
- der Nachlass des Schriftstellers Dieter Kühn (†2015), der das Mittelalter mit Musils Möglichkeitssinn beleuchtet hat,
- Materialien zu Paul Celan (Sammlung Marlies Janz),

- Nachtrag zum Nachlass von Ralph Giordano,
- Nachlass von Johannes Gross,
- Nachtrag zum Vorlass von Durs Grünbein,
- Nachtrag zum Nachlass von Ricarda Huch,
- Nachtrag zum Vorlass von Günter Kunert,
- Nachlass von Eberhard Lämmert,
- Nachtrag zum Nachlass von Karl Löwith,
- erster Teil des Vorlasses von Christian Meier,
- Vorlass von Jochen Missfeldt,
- Vorlass von Klaus Oehler,
- Nachtrag zum Nachlass von Fritz J. Raddatz,
- Nachtrag zum Nachlass von Gabriele Wohmann,
- Redaktionsunterlagen zu *Text+Kritik* (Nachlass Heinz-Ludwig Arnold),
- eine Sammlung zum frühverstorbenen, schillernden Doppeltalent Eugen Gottlob Winkler (1912-1936). Die Sammlung enthält neben Briefen aus den bedeutenden Jahren ab 1931 eine Originalradierung des Dichters und Essayisten.
- Die Bibliothek hat fünf seltene Titel von Harro Harring, erschienen zwischen 1827 und 1836, 35 außerhalb des Buchhandels erschienene literarische Akzidenz-Erstdrucke, die aus einer Lesereihe am Hamburger Gymnasium Klosterschule entstanden sind, 13 Kolportage- und Abenteuerromane aus dem Zeitraum 1860-1900, Provenienzexemplare aus dem Besitz von Carl Schmitt erworben.
- 2016 wurden im Wert von 5.000 Euro von Barbara Stamer, Tochter der Scherenschneiderin Hedwig Goller (1920-2015), fünf Scherenschnitte erworben. Es handelt sich dabei in der Mehrheit um Illustrationen zu Texten Eduard Mörikes. In Verbindung mit diesem Ankauf übergab Barbara Stamer dem DLA Marbach zahlreiche weitere Scherenschnitte und Erinnerungsstücke. Damit besitzt das DLA Marbach eine noch größere Scherenschnitt-Sammlung, die – begonnen bei Luise Duttenhofer über Luise Walther bis hin zu Hedwig Goller – Porträts und Illustrationen von der Zeit um 1800 bis in die Gegenwart umfasst und zu komparatistischen Studien einlädt.

Eine genaue Übersicht findet sich im Jahrbuch der Deutschen Schillergesellschaft 2016
 Adresse: Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, Schillerhöhe 8-10, 71672 Marbach am Neckar,
 Telefon +49 7144 848-0, Telefax +49 7144 848-299, <http://www.dla-marbach.de/startseite/index.html>.

5.) 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. Sofern Mitglieder Erfahrungen mit der Anwendung der Informationsfreiheitsgesetze in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland haben, wird um Rückmeldung gebeten.

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

The GSA Interdisciplinary Networks, 2017-18

Established some years ago, the GSA Networks are platforms tasked with focusing sustained interdisciplinary attention on topics of interest to the GSA membership by distributing calls for papers and forming panel series for the annual conference on a regular basis. Networks also have maintained list-serves, blog sites, and webpages, and have developed publications (journal issues and book volumes) derived from their panel activities.

GSA networks are formed in consultation with the GSA's standing Interdisciplinary Network Committee, comprising all network coordinators, and its co-chairs. Network coordinators are nominated by the IC co-chairs and confirmed by the GSA President and Executive Director for three-year terms.

Interdisciplinary Committee Co-Chairs

[Pamela Potter](#), University of Wisconsin, Madison (2015-2018)

[Winson Chu](#), University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee (2018-2020)

1. Emotion Studies

[Derek Hillard](#), Kansas State University (2014-2017)

[Heikki Lempa](#), Moravian College (2014-2017)

[Tiffany Florvil](#), Arizona State University (2017-2019)

2. Environmental Studies

[Sabine Mödersheim](#), University of Wisconsin-Madison (2015-2018)

[Christina Gerhardt](#), University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (2017-2019)

[Timothy Scott Brown](#), Northeastern University (2018-2020)

3. Family and Kinship

[Margareth Lanzinger](#), University of Vienna (2017-2019)

[Eleanor ter Horst](#), University of South Alabama (2017-2019)

[Sarah Vandegrift Eldridge](#), University of Tennessee (2017-2019)

4. GDR Studies and German Socialisms

[April Eisman](#), Iowa State University (2018-2020)

[Sonja Klocke](#), University of Wisconsin at Madison (2018-2020)

5. Law and Legal Cultures

[Barnet Hartston](#), Eckerd College (2016-2018)

[Todd Herzog](#), University of Cincinnati (2016-2019)

6. Memory Studies

[Jenny Wustenberg](#), York University (2017-2019)

[Ben Nienass](#), California State University at San Marcos (2017-2019)
[Katja Wezel](#), University of Pittsburgh (2017-2019)

7. Music and Sound Studies

[Kira Thurman](#), University of Michigan (2016-2018)
[David Imhoof](#), Susquehanna University (2015-2018)
[Amy Wlodarski](#), Dickinson College (2018-2020)

8. Religious Cultures

[William Collins Donahue](#), Notre Dame (2015-2018)
[C.J. Jones](#), Notre Dame (2017-2019)
[Ralph Keen](#), University of Illinois - Chicago (2017-2019)

9. Swiss Studies

[Peter Meilaender](#), Houghton College (2016-2019)
[Hans Rindisbacher](#), Pomona College (2016-2019)

10. Visual Culture

[Heather Mathews](#), Pacific Lutheran University (2015-2018)
[Daniel Magilow](#), University of Tennessee (2017-2019)

11. War and Violence

[Katherine Aaslestad](#), West Virginia University (2018-2020)
[Kathrin Maurer](#), University of Southern Denmark (2018-2020)

12. Black Diaspora Studies

[Andrew Zimmerman](#), George Washington University (2016-2018)
[Sara Lennox](#), University of Massachusetts (2016-2018)
[Tiffany Florvil](#), University of New Mexico (2016-2018)

13. Digital Humanities | [Website](#)

[Kurt Fendt](#), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2017-2019)
[Shelley E. Rose](#), Cleveland State University (2017-2019)
[Anke Finger](#), University of Connecticut (2017-2019)

14. Asian German Studies

[Douglas McGetchin](#), Florida Atlantic University (2017-2019)
[Joanne Miyang Cho](#), William Paterson University (2017-2019)

GSA Committee Assignments, 2017-18

Program Committee

Program Director: [Benjamin Marschke](#), Humboldt State University
 Pre-1800, all fields: [Rita Krueger](#), Temple University
 19th Century, all fields: [Martha Helfer](#), Rutgers University
 20th/21st-century History: [Andrew Donson](#), University of Massachusetts-Amherst
 20th/21st-century History: [Joe Perry](#), Georgia State University
 20th/21st-century Germanistik: [Christine Rinne](#), University of South Alabama
 20th/21st-century Germanistik: [Qinna Shen](#), Bryn Mawr College
 Contemporary Politics, Economics, and Society: [Sarah Wiliarty](#), Wesleyan University
 Contemporary Politics, Economics, and Society: [Pamela Swett](#), McMaster University
 Interdisciplinary/Diachronic: [Benita Blessing](#), Oregon State University
 Interdisciplinary/Diachronic: [Martin Nedbal](#), University of Kansas
 Single Papers (all fields): [Katherine Aaslestad](#), West Virginia University
 Single Papers (all fields): [Deborah Janson](#), West Virginia University

Seminars

Chair: [Margaret Menninger](#), Texas State University
[Faye Stewart](#), Georgia State University
[Maria Mitchell](#), Franklin & Marshall College

Nominating Committee

Chair: Thomas Kuehne, (History; Clark University) tkuehne@clarku.edu
 Marc Lerner (History; University of Mississippi) mlerner@olemiss.edu
 Meike Werner (Germanistik; Vanderbilt University) meike.werner@vanderbilt.edu

DAAD/GSA Article Prize History, Social Science

Chair: Yair Mintzker (History, Princeton University) mintzker@princeton.edu
 Harry Liebersohn (History, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana) hliebers@illinois.edu
 Laurie Marhoefer (History, University of Washington) marl@uw.edu

DAAD/GSA Book Prize Germanistik, Cultural Studies

Chair: Mara Wade (German, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana) mwade@illinois.edu
 Vance Byrd (German, Grinnell College) byrdvl@grinnell.edu
 Deniz Göktürk (German, University of California, Berkeley) dgokturk@berkeley.edu

Graduate Student Essay Prize

Chair: Margaret Lewis (History; University of Tennessee, Martin) mlewis47@utm.edu
 Holly Yanacek (German, James Madison University) hyanack@gmail.com
 Peter Yoder (History, Independent Scholar) peter.yoder@gmail.com

[The Forty-First Annual Conference of the German Studies Association included a number of sessions, topics, and special programs that commemorated the quincentenary of the Reformation. A special highlight was the banquet address by Professor Hartmut Lehmann on Friday, 6 October. The author of many important books and articles, Professor Lehmann taught at the University of Kiel, served as founding director of the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C., and directed the Max Planck Institute for History in Göttingen. Here is the text of his banquet address:]

Hartmut Lehmann, “Luther Decade and Reformation Commemoration: A First Assessment”⁵

Less than two weeks from now, back home in Germany, the big quincentenary party will be over. The main commemorative service already took place in May. The main art exhibitions mounted in Berlin, on the Wartburg, and in Wittenberg will soon close. So it may be time to look at what we have experienced since the proclamation of the Luther decade in the fall of 2008, and what we may have learned since the opening one year ago of the festivities that marked the five hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Protestant Reformation.

In 2008, the leaders of German Protestantism decided to place Martin Luther, once again, at the very center of all commemorative activities. As a result, the greater part of all scholarly and popular publications, as well as most exhibitions, focused on Luther. Consequently, most of my remarks also will refer to him.

Let me assure you, however, that what I will offer is not another celebratory address praising the achievements of Protestantism in general, and of Lutheranism in particular. It will not be another variation on Protestant triumphalism. Nor will I amusingly ridicule the absurd, inevitable Luther kitsch and Luther folklore inspired by the quincentenary. And certainly I will not attempt to explain the inexplicable, namely the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Rather, as we are assembled here as scholars, I plan to address some of the issues that most irritated me as I read recent publications on Luther and the Reformation – issues that may concern scholars as they look back at such a major historical event as the Protestant Reformation. I will briefly discuss the following four topics:

First: The distortion of fact through inattention to details.
 Second: The danger of producing anachronisms.
 Third: The challenge of proper contextualization.
 Fourth and last: The importance of making fair judgments.

5 Address delivered at the forty-first banquet of the German Studies Association in Atlanta, October 6, 2017. Footnotes were added.

With regard to the importance of details, I will give you some examples. First, Luther at Worms: In most works he is called „the simple monk“, *der einfache Mönch*. Those who depict him as „the simple monk“ forget that by 1521 Luther had achieved a spectacular career. Within his order, the Augustinians, he had become a well-respected superior, and within the university of Wittenberg he had become a celebrity. In 1512, at age 29, he had been appointed full professor of theology. In 1517, when he formulated the 95 theses, he served as dean. By 1521, four years later, he filled his position as professor with impressive authority. Don't we all know what full professors in their late 30s are like: scholars, who have held their position for almost ten years and who are on their way up, in the middle of their academic careers? This is the Luther who was interrogated at Worms. This is the man who, as we know, was so clever and self-confident in answering the questions put to him. Forget: *der einfache Mönch* (the simple monk).

More about Luther at Worms: In all works about this event we read that he had to appear before the emperor and the representatives of the empire, *vor Kaiser und Reich*. Again, not accurate. Luther did not appear before a court made up of representatives of the emperor and the diet (the *Reichsstände*). The superior judicial power within the empire belonged to the emperor alone, and to no one else. Accordingly, Luther was interrogated not at the townhall of Worms, the place where the imperial diet met, but at the palace of the bishop of Worms, the place where the emperor resided. Certainly, before emperor Charles V signed the edict outlawing Luther, he had some contact with the leading princes of the empire. But the members of the imperial diet attended the court proceedings only as curious spectators, not as judges taking part in the deliberations. Please note: *Luther erschien nicht vor Kaiser und Reich* (he was interrogated by representatives of the emperor but not by representatives of the empire).

Details matter also with regard to Luther's journey from Wittenberg to Worms, a trip with a guarantee of safe passage granted by the emperor. Some of the authors commenting on this arrangement credit the diplomatic skills of Luther's prince, elector Frederick the Wise; others refer to the diplomatic cleverness of Charles V. To my knowledge, no author describing this episode seems to remember that the emperor was obliged to follow the capitulation of election (*Wahlkapitulation*) that he had signed two years earlier, and that he had many good reasons for doing so. The emperor hoped that the *Reichsstände* would grant financial as well as military help. In relation to these matters the Luther story was only of secondary importance.. With regard to the Luther case the *Wahlkapitulationen* stipulated two important matters: namely that no subject of the German Empire should be brought to trial outside the empire (for fear that Charles might use Spanish courts), and secondly, that no one banned by the pope should be declared an outlaw without trial (for fear that pope and emperor could conspire against the princes of the empire). Both stipulations were applied to Luther's case in the spring of 1521. Put differently: The situation of Luther en route to Worms was completely different from the situation of Johann Hus one hundred years earlier.

Now to my second point, the danger of falling into the *Reichsstände* would grant financial as well as military help. In relation to these matters the Luther story was only of secondary importance.. With regard to the Luther case the *Wahlkapitulationen* stipulated two important matters: namely that no subject of the German Empire should be brought to trial outside the empire (for fear that Charles might use Spanish courts), and secondly, that no one banned by the pope should be declared an outlaw without trial (for fear that pope and emperor could conspire against the princes of the empire). Both stipulations were applied to Luther's case in the spring of 1521. Put differently: The situation of Luther en route to Worms was completely different from the situation of Johann Hus one hundred years earlier.

Now to my second point, the danger of falling into the trap of drawing anachronistic conclusions. My first example: *Luther und die Freiheit des Gewissens* (Luther and the freedom of conscience). With very few exceptions, most authors treating this subject make the same mistake. They use the modern meaning of the term *Gewissen* and do not seem to know that the term had a different meaning in Luther's time. Around the year 1500, *Gewissen* stood for the sum of knowledge, or the expert knowledge, that a person had acquired. Just as *Gebirge*, meaning a mountain range, is the sum of all the mountains, all the *Berge* of that range, so *Gewissen* referred to the sum of all the expert knowledge, the *Expertenwissen* a person possessed⁶. Take Luther as he was interrogated at Worms. When he explained in his closing statement that he could not act against his *Gewissen* and that his *Gewissen* was bound to the content of the Holy Scriptures, he was referring to the knowledge – the intellectual expertise - he had acquired as professor of theology, interpreting and teaching the books of the Bible since 1512. By contrast, the modern notion of *Gewissen* that originated in the late eighteenth century means something quite different. It is something like an existential category that implies, to put it simply, the ability to make ultimate ethical decisions based solely on one's own heart, intuition and soul. Luther made no such claim, and we should not salute him as the one to whom we owe the modern meaning of *Gewissen*, and *Gewissensfreiheit* (of conscience and the freedom of conscience).

Another widespread anachronism credits Luther with the idea of freedom of religion, of *Religionsfreiheit*. True, in his „Address to the Christian Nobility“ Luther propagated the notion of the priesthood of all believers. True, shortly afterwards he translated the New Testament, thus putting the authority to interpret this part of the Bible into the hands of the laity. But let us not forget. When some of his followers went forward with reforming the church while he was on the Wartburg, he rushed back to Wittenberg and stopped them, calling the reformers enthusiasts (*Schwärmer*). Nor should we forget that as early as 1526 Luther initiated strict visitations of all pastors and congregations, thus creating an instrument for church and state to control pastors in their parishes and members of the congregations as well. As the *Visitationsberichte*, the visitation reports, show, these controls were strict, and they worked.

6 There are dozens of similar words in German. For example: Gebälk = viele Balken; Gebüsch = viele Büsche; Gefieder = viele Federn; Gehölz = viel Holz, viele Bäume; Gelächter = viel Lachen; Gestein = viele Steine; Gewässer = viel Wasser; etc.

Those who believed that only adults should be baptized were accused of radical thinking and punished. Within a few decades, all supporters of Anabaptism were expelled from Central Europe. Thus, the idea of *Religionsfreiheit*, of freedom of religion, within the Protestant Reformation was short-lived. And what applies to *Religionsfreiheit* and *Gewissensfreiheit* also applies to topics like *Rechtsstaat*, *Toleranz*, *Demokratie*. All of that, important as it is today, came much later. Even on the occasion of a jubilee, credit for the political values of the Western world should not be given to Luther. Luther lived in a different world. After the medieval church broke apart, that world was characterized by an extraordinary number of conflicts, an appalling degree of violence, and an endless series of wars, including in fact, some of the bloodiest wars of the modern era. The modern ideas of *Religionsfreiheit*, *Toleranz* and *Gewissensfreiheit* emerged in the 18th, not in the 16th century.

My third point: The need for proper historical contextualization, including questions of periodization and generalization. Should we consider the year 1517 as a major historical caesura? How should we relate the events in Wittenberg to the religious and political transformations in the rest of the Empire, and, even more importantly, in other countries of Europe? If I am not mistaken, most American historians would agree with Tom Brady's view that there was not one Reformation but many Reformations. See his path-breaking book *German Histories in the Age of Reformations, 1400 – 1650*, published in 2009⁷. And there is, if I am not mistaken, an even broader consensus among American historians of the early modern period: that we should consider the Wittenberg movement as part of a much longer period of political, cultural, religious and economic transformations in Europe, reaching roughly from 1400 to 1600. Carlos Eire called his most recent book, published in 2016, *Reformations. The Early Modern World, 1450 to 1650*⁸. Eire traces strands of the Protestant Reformation in a tapestry of transformations of the late middle ages: humanism, various forerunners of the Catholic Reformation, and changes within the Catholic world as Rome confronted the challenge from North of the Alps.

By contrast, up until now, for most German authors commemorating the Reformation, the story begins with Luther in Wittenberg, and from there it develops and expands in all directions, first within the empire, and then beyond. These German authors consider the year 1517 an absolute turning-point, as if Luther had single-handedly reinvented the world. Theologians may be reminded here of the parable of the mustard seed. From the smallest of all seeds, the largest of all trees grew. And in its branches all the birds of heaven found shelter. In other words: From Wittenberg, one of the the smallest towns within the empire, came the largest of all reform movements to change the world and resurrect humankind. This interpretation, with its distinct national coloration, is far from the grand panorama painted by Carlos Eire.

With my fourth point, concerning fair historical judgment, I return to Luther. This is perhaps more difficult than the matters I have discussed so far because historians dealing with Luther's

7 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2009.

8 New Haven and London: Yale University Press 2016.

life and work face essential decisions. They must choose whether they want to present mainly the impressive writings and spectacular actions of the so-called „early Luther“, that is Luther up to 1522, or whether they want to examine also the Luther of the following years. That is the Luther who denounced the peasants, who distanced himself from Erasmus, who condemned people believing in adult baptism, the Luther for whom the Turks were companions of the devil and the Jews doomed by God. Having looked at several dozen publications that came out with 2017 in view, I have the impression that for most authors the young Luther is the real Luther, the Luther worth remembering and celebrating, while the the writings and actions of the older Luther leave them uneasy.

Let me illustrate this dilemma with the most troubling example of all: Luther's view of the Jews. In 1522 Luther, that is Luther in the early years of his career, invited the Jews to convert and to join his movement. He did so in a treatise of less than twenty pages. By contrast, in the last ten years of his life Luther spent countless hours writing several books against the Jews, more than a thousand pages in all, using the harshest language imaginable. In the book „The Jews and Their Lies“, published in 1543, for example, he laid down concrete, practical directions on how Jews should be treated: Synagogues should be destroyed, Luther argued, their holy books burned, and much more.

If we look at the later course of German history, we see that Luther's plea to the Jews of 1522 had little effect. *Judenmission* never was much of a success. By contrast, Luther's antisemitism sank deep into the DNA of German Protestantism. His anti-Jewish writings have drawn much attention, especially since the 1880s, after German Protestants discovered the notion of *Volk* as an ethnic identity. After 1933, Nazi leaders like Julius Streicher praised Luther as the greatest antisemite of all times. For many Nazis and for their collaborators, the German Christians, Luther became a crown witness in the persecution of Jews. As they celebrated Luther's birthday on November 10, 1938, all over Germany the synagogues were burning. In my view, of all the exhibitions shown in Germany in the past few months, at least for historians of German history, the one in Berlin on *Luther im Nationalsozialismus* is the most important one⁹.

In 1983, on the occasion of Luthers 500th birthday, with preparations already underway for the establishment of the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, American Lutherans distanced themselves from Luther's antisemitic diatribes. In 1983, in both East and West Germany, by contrast, we find no remarks on this topic. By 2017, finally, this changed. In preparing for 2017, the members of the synod of the *Evangelische Kirche* issued a statement very clearly distancing themselves from Luther's vitriolic writings against the Jews. Recently, however, some Protestant theologians have dared to complain that the topic „Luther and the Jews“ begins to overshadow other, more important themes. Be that as it may. I am still waiting for someone to explain to me how the two most important cultures of remembrance

9 Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, ed., „Überall Luthers Worte ...“. *Martin Luther im Nationalsozialismus*. Bönen: Kettler 2017.

(*Erinnerungskulturen*) in Germany today, remembering Martin Luther and remembering the Holocaust, can be reconciled.

Let me conclude. The literary production generated by the commemoration of the Protestant Reformation has been called a harvest. It is tempting, then, to compare the harvest of 2017 to the harvest of 1983. In terms of large exhibitions, in my view, 2017 takes first place. I am not so sure, however, about the scholarly works. In 1983, within the English-speaking world Heiko Oberman and Bob Scribner produced works of remarkable insight, and the same is true in Germany if we remember the writings of Bernd Moeller and Martin Brecht, to mention just a few of many names that come to mind. As for 2017, Lyndal Roper's biography is a superb piece of scholarship¹⁰, and so are Thomas Kaufmann's book on Luther and the Jews and the Jews¹¹ and Volker Reinhardt's book on the Luther story as seen by his Catholic contemporaries¹². Nevertheless, to me some deficits are still obvious. In particular many German Protestant authors have yet to understand that 1517 was only one landmark in a much longer period of transformations, not less, but not more, and that beyond Wittenberg lay a vibrant world animated by ambitious explorers and self-confident merchants, and full of religious traditionalists and religious reformers, with ideas and aims of their own, and with their own measures of success and failure. Luther's message reached some of them, but by no means all, just as he became aware only of some of the transformations, but not all, taking place in some other parts of this teeming world.

One last remark. Like earlier commemorations of Luther and the Reformation, 2017 is a mirror of the religious, cultural and political conditions and of the scholarly insights of our own time. Future generations will have the chance to find out and describe how our age understood and related to the events of a time 500 years earlier. I would not be surprised if they are amused as they record our prejudices and our failures. I only wish I could read what they will have to tell.

10 Martin Luther. Renegade and Prophet. London: Bodley Head/Penguin Random House 2016. In German: Der Mensch Martin Luther. Die Biographie. Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer 2016.

11 Luthers Juden. Stuttgart: Reclam 2015. In English: Luther's Jews: A Journey into Anti-Semitism. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2017.

12 Luther der Ketzer. Rom und die Reformation. München: C.H. Beck 2016.