
German Studies Association

Newsletter

Volume XXXVII

Number 2

Winter 2012-13

German Studies Association
Main Office:
1200 Academy Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49006-3295
USA
Tel.: (269) 337-7056
Fax: (269) 337-7251
www.thegsa.org
e-mail: director@thegsa.org
Technical Support: helpdesk@thegsa.org

President

Stephen Brockmann (2011-2012)
Carnegie Mellon University

Vice President

Suzanne Marchand (2011-2012)
Louisiana State University

Secretary-Treasurer

Gerald A. Fetz
University of Montana

Executive Director

David E. Barclay
Kalamazoo College

GSA Board:

Kathleen Canning, *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor* (2012)
Louise K. Davidson-Schmich, *University of Miami* (2013)
Geoff Eley, *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor* (2014)
Gerd Gemünden, *Dartmouth College* (2012)
Lutz Koepnick, *Washington University in St. Louis* (2012)
Mary Lindemann, *University of Miami* (2012)
Johannes von Moltke, *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor* (2013)
Leslie Morris, *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities* (2014)
Dorothee Wierling, *Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte, Universität Hamburg*
(2014)
Celia Applegate, *Vanderbilt University, ex officio non-voting* (2012)
Sabine Hake, *University of Texas at Austin, ex officio non-voting*

German Studies Association

Newsletter

Volume XXXVII
Number 2
Winter 2012-13

Table of Contents

Letter from the President3

Letter from the Executive Director7

Reports and Announcements:

Planning for the Next GSA Conference, Denver, Colorado,
October 3-6, 20139

Call for Papers: German Studies Association,
Thirty-Seventh Annual Conference..... 10

Seminars to Be Added to the Next GSA Conference..... 11

2012 GSA/DAAD Prize Winners Announced.....14

2012 Graduate Student Prize Winner Announced.....15

2013 Prize Competitions.....16

Contributions Sought for Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize.....17

GSA Committee Appointments for 2013.....17

Report on Interdisciplinary Committee and Networks.....20

Two New Networks Announced.....24

Patricia Herminhouse: Report on the 2012 Meeting of the
American Council of Learned Societies.....29

Rainer Hering: Aus deutschen Archiven: GSA Archives Committee Report 2012.....	31
GSA Website Recognized.....	42
Grants, Awards, and Related Announcements.....	43
Max Kade Center for Contemporary German Literature at Washington University in St. Louis.....	43
www.linguaelive.ca.....	44
Stiftung Deutsch Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen (SDAW).....	45

Issues and Discussions in German Studies:

In eigener Sache: Roundtable on Our History – From WAGS to GSA, 1980s to 1990s.....	46
Evan B. Bukey.....	46
Patricia Herminhouse.....	50
Konrad H. Jarauschk.....	54
Frank Trommler.....	57

In Memoriam:

Henry (Heinz Egon) Friedlander (1930-2012) (Nathan Stoltzfus and Doris L. Bergen, with contributions from Deborah Agosti, Benton Arnovitz, and Evan B. Bukey).....	61
Dieter H. Sevin (1938-2012) (Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages, Vanderbilt University).....	79

Letter from the President

As I write this, the thirty-sixth annual conference of the German Studies Association is over, and we are already in the midst of planning for the thirty-seventh conference next year in Denver. The Milwaukee conference was one of our four biggest ever, and it featured a vast array of fascinating panels on German politics, history, literature, music, art, and film.

I once again want to thank the Program Committee for the Milwaukee conference—first and foremost Program Director Jared Poley, and then his excellent Program Committee members: Rolf J. Goebel, Ray Canoy, Jesse Spohnholz, Margaret Eleanor Menninger, Randall Halle, Ingeborg Majer-O'Sickey, Dolores Augustine, Jonathan Wiesen, and Jonathan R. Olsen. Jared Poley and his team put together a fantastic conference that I and over a thousand other GSA members enjoyed thoroughly. Of course I also have to thank our extraordinary Executive Director David Barclay, who, year in and year out, does the really heavy lifting of nitty-gritty planning and negotiating with the hotels where we meet, not to mention myriad other feats of organizational and logistical planning that help to make the GSA the successful and smoothly functioning organization that it is. I also want to thank the amazing Charles Fulton, the man behind the GSA's "Help Desk," who carries a lot of the electronic/Internet burden for the association. Meeting on October 4, the GSA Board decided to award a Lifetime Membership to our web guru Terry Pochert, who has managed to bring the GSA into the electronic age, and who has actually managed to do so with grace and good humor; we all owe a huge debt of gratitude to Terry, and we hope he will continue to work with us for many years into the future. Elizabeth Fulton also regularly performs heroic feats at the GSA conference registration desk, and in many other capacities. And Craig Hendrick of ConferenceDirect is also always a beneficial presence with us at the conference, helping to smooth out the interaction between our decidedly academic organization and the conference hotels where we meet, which of course are not academic organizations but rather business operations. The GSA conference thus very much represents a meeting of two very different worlds, and I sometimes wonder whether the hotels and their staffs do not occasionally feel as if a rather different breed of hominids had invaded their territory for a number of days, filling up their conference rooms and coffee shops with discussions—often in a foreign language—of the *Sattelzeit*, Heinrich von Kleist, Die Linke, Günter Grass, and "Defenses of the Aesthetic" rather than with, for instance, marketing pep talks or training workshops. I remember a conference a while back where one rather amazed hotel worker, upon being told that an interlocutor was looking for a German, replied, "Honey, this place is *full* of Germans!" May it always continue to be so! And may the Austrians, the Swiss, and many others from around the world also continue to join us and enrich the annual conference!

Among the conference highlights for me were the special roundtable session on Günter Grass and the controversy surrounding his poem “Was gesagt werden muss,” which featured a remarkably productive and at times very moving conversation between Russell Berman, Jeffrey Herf, Agnes Mueller, Richard Schade, and Stuart Taberner. I was also fascinated by the two special sessions on the GSA’s own history, one with our founding Executive Director Gerald R. Kleinfeld and Marion F. Deshmukh, and the other with GSA veterans Patricia Herminhouse, Evan Bukey, Konrad Jarausch, Frank Trommler, and Katherine Roper. Together with the session “In eigener Sache” from last year in Louisville, these GSA history sessions are beginning to establish the record of the history and development of our organization, which, after all, is part of the story of the development of the humanities in America and the world over the past four decades. I look forward to more such sessions as we gear up to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the German Studies Association in 2016 in San Diego at our old stomping ground, the Town & Country Resort & Conference Center. The biggest problem for me at the Milwaukee conference, as at almost all of our conferences, was that I simply could not attend all the sessions and events I wanted to go to and was forced to pick and choose among extremely tempting choices.

At its annual meeting on Thursday, October 4, the GSA Board met to discuss and decide on a number of significant issues. A year and a half ago I had put together a conference task force chaired by Rolf Goebel and former GSA President Celia Applegate. Our conference has essentially doubled in size over the past decade, and that is a wonderful thing, but it has also brought with it logistical challenges. The assignment of the conference task force was to look at the current state of the German Studies Association conference and explore ways to make the conference even more exciting and successful than it already is so that it can serve the needs of our members even better. The conference task force came up with a number of suggestions and discussion items which the Board addressed at its annual meeting, and one item that achieved almost universal consensus was that most Board members wanted the annual conference to end by sometime in the early afternoon on Sunday, as had been the practice until three years ago, when our conference in Washington, DC in 2009 was so large that we had to introduce Sunday afternoon sessions in order to accommodate all the panels that were accepted. At Milwaukee the Board, after considerable discussion, decided to dial this practice back in order to end the conference by Sunday at 1:45 PM at the latest, giving participants a chance to get out of town and get back home by Sunday evening so that they can get up and go to work again on Monday morning. Obviously, such a decision will likely come at a cost. Specifically, it will probably mean that next year’s Program Committee may not be able to accept all the high-quality paper and session proposals that it receives and may be forced to reject otherwise acceptable paper and/or session proposals. But on balance Board members were convinced that the trade-off would probably be worth it for members and for

the organization. The Board also engaged in a very lively discussion of other items proposed by the conference task force, and in particular it decided to explore the possibility of experimenting with seminar sessions at future GSA conferences. Such seminar sessions would require participants to sign up for and commit to them in advance, and they would also require a certain amount of “homework,” since participants would commit to reading papers in advance of the conference, so that session time could be devoted almost exclusively to discussion rather than to presentation. We will see how this idea works—at first on a relatively small scale next year in Denver—and, if it is successful, the Board may decide to expand it. For the most part, however, the format of the conference will remain unchanged, at least for next year. There is general consensus that this format has been and is serving us extremely well, and that any “tinkering” should be primarily “around the edges” so as not to “mess with a good thing.” Finally, because conference hotel fees and other expenses have been going up over the past few years while the GSA conference fee has remained the same since the Pittsburgh conference in 2006, the Board reluctantly decided to raise next year’s conference registration fee by \$10 for regular members (but not for graduate students or independent scholars, whose conference registration fees will remain unchanged).

On the subject of finances and financing in difficult economic circumstances, please allow me to make a few comments about the GSA’s governance structure and its future financial challenges. The GSA currently has no full-time employees and relies to a large extent on volunteer labor. The chief operating officer of the GSA, the Executive Director, is not actually an employee of the GSA; rather, David Barclay is a Professor of History at Kalamazoo College (and a very distinguished one at that!), and his salary is paid by that institution. In order to offset the burden of the time and work that the GSA takes away from Kalamazoo College, in the form of David’s time and labor, the GSA remits a certain amount of money to Kalamazoo College every year. We are grateful to David and to Kalamazoo College for this arrangement, which so far has been working out well for all sides. David was positively reviewed three years ago, in the summer of 2009, by the Board, which enthusiastically endorsed the extension of David’s original five-year agreement with the GSA by another five years. Another performance review is scheduled for 2014.

So far this arrangement has been working well for us, but we must acknowledge that it relies on the good will of Kalamazoo College and of David Barclay himself. We must also recognize that, increasingly, academic and scholarly organizations of about the same size as the GSA (i.e. with between 1400-2300 members) are being forced, for various reasons, to hire full-time Executive Directors and other paid staff members. There are many reasons for these developments, but the primary ones are: 1) the growth of the organizations themselves; 2) the increasing complexity of the job; and 3) unfortunately, a growing reluctance on the part of colleges and universities to actively cooperate

with and work with scholarly organizations in the way that Kalamazoo College works with the GSA. The American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), which very energetically represents the interests of scholarly organizations like our own, is aware of these issues and does what it can to encourage colleges and universities to support the growth and development of academic life in the United States, in the form of America's key scholarly associations, but in a time of increasing economic stress, that task of persuasion has become every more difficult.

What does this mean for the future of the GSA? It means, concretely, that within the foreseeable future (i.e. within the next four to ten years) we must lay the foundation for an organizational transformation which would likely include a full-time Executive Director. Such an organizational transformation would obviously impose a significant additional financial burden on the German Studies Association, one that the GSA, with its current endowment and dues structure, is not yet capable of bearing. Specifically, in order to pay for a full-time Executive Director the GSA would, at a minimum, have to raise its endowment from the current level of around \$675,000 to well over twice that, i.e., to \$1.5 million. This is a difficult but not impossible challenge for an organization like ours, and it will mean that over the coming years we will have to think about fundraising more intensively, and more creatively, than ever before. This is something that the Board discussed in Milwaukee, and that the Executive Council will also address at its annual meeting in December, and it is something that all of our members should be aware of. We encourage your suggestions and ideas as we seek to position the GSA for a future that will be even more successful than the past.

Finally, as I was getting set to write this, my last presidential letter, the GSA learned of the death on October 17 of one of our most distinguished past presidents, Henry Friedlander, one of the world's greatest experts on the Holocaust [see the joint obituary by Doris Bergen and Nathan Stoltzfus in this issue]. Henry Friedlander was a very strong presence in the German Studies Association for several decades, and it is no exaggeration to say that he helped shape not only his own discipline of Holocaust Studies but also our organization itself. Our condolences go out to Henry Friedlander's family, friends, and colleagues. We will all miss this extraordinary scholar and human being, and I personally find it strange to think that I will no longer see him and feel his energetic, benevolent presence at our annual meetings. Rest in peace, Henry.

Stephen Brockmann
President, GSA

Letter from the Executive Director

Dear members and friends of the GSA,

It is early November 2012, and I'm in Nashville, Tennessee, to attend the annual fall meeting of the Conference of Academic Officers, the organization of executive directors within the American Council of Learned Societies. We meet in a different city each year, combining a business meeting with what is called a "fam" or "familiarization" meeting organized by the local Convention and Visitors Bureau, or CVB. Every CVB likes to "sell" its city to the seventy academic societies represented in the ACLS. In two cases in recent years, we were able to negotiate favorable hotel contracts based on our fam meeting experiences (Kansas City for 2014, and Portland for 2019). At this year's business meeting, we'll be discussing such subjects as records management for academic societies, issues of political advocacy involving academic societies, media relations, open access issues, and what happens when an academic society has to cancel its annual meeting because of natural catastrophes. (This has happened to two academic societies in recent years.)

I mention all this just to emphasize that administering an academic society, even a medium-sized one like the GSA, can be a complicated business, even without the intercession of nature! And running an annual meeting always involves a particularly large number of behind-the-scenes complexities. This year's annual meeting, in Milwaukee, was no exception. It was the third time we had met in Milwaukee, and also was the third largest in our history. With 1202 participants and 317 sessions, the Milwaukee meeting was smaller than Washington in 2009 (1310 participants) and Oakland in 2010 (1254 participants), but slightly larger than Louisville in 2011 (1150 participants).

This year we had participants from 27 countries, including 946 from the United States, 119 from Germany, 50 from Canada, 23 each from Austria and from the United Kingdom, and 8 from Switzerland. We also awarded a record number of GSA travel grants to overseas members; and, as always, we are extremely grateful to the Austrian Cultural Forum New York for the generous assistance that allows scholars in Austrian Studies to attend our meeting. As Professor Stephen Brockmann, GSA President, notes in his letter in this issue, this year's conference included a number of memorable sessions and compelling luncheon and dinner presentations. His own presidential address will appear in a future issue of the *German Studies Review*.

Among those memorable sessions were two on the early history of the GSA and its predecessor, the Western Association for German Studies (WAGS). Professor Marion Deshmukh, herself a member since our early WAGS days, interviewed our legendary founding Executive Director, Professor Gerald R. Kleinfeld; and, in a session chaired by our former President, Professor Katherine

Roper, four more colleagues – Professors Evan Bukey, Patricia Herminhouse, Konrad Jarausch, and Frank Trommler – provided their recollections of the GSA in the 1980s and 1990s. As we near our fortieth anniversary in 2016, we will continue to collect oral and written histories of the GSA, and I would urge any and all of our members to send their recollections to me (director@thegsa.org).

The GSA is also trying to develop an extensive historical archive at our central office in Kalamazoo, Michigan. If you have any correspondence or written materials that might be appropriate for the GSA archive, please contact me!

A complex meeting like ours could never take place without the indefatigable efforts of individuals like Charles Fulton, our redoubtable Operations Manager; Elizabeth Fulton, who works so ably on our registration desk; Craig Hendrick, our wonderful conference planner from ConferenceDirect; and Terry Pochert, our veteran and indispensable webmaster. (In Milwaukee we were pleased to award Terry a lifetime membership in recognition of his many years of service to the GSA.) And of course we could never organize a conference at all were it not for the many hours of hard work put in by the members of our Program Committee, to whom we are so deeply grateful. Our 2012 Program Director, Professor Jared Poley, marvelously coordinated the work of a dedicated committee that included Professors Rolf Goebel (interdisciplinary), Ray Canoy (diachronic), Jesse Spohnholz (pre-1800, all fields), Margaret Menninger (nineteenth century, all fields), Randall Halle (20th- and 21st-century Germanistik), Ingeborg Majer-O'Sickey (20th- and 21st-century Germanistik), Dolores Augustine (20th- and 21st-century history), Jonathan Wiesen (20th- and 21st-century history), and Jonathan Olsen (political science). And special thanks too to the members of the GSA Executive Council: Professors Stephen Brockmann, Suzanne Marchand, Gerald Fetz, Irene Kacandes, Celia Applegate, and Sabine Hake.

We're already working on our conferences for 2013 and 2014. This issue of the newsletter contains our annual Call for Papers for 2013 in Denver and also a description of an exciting initiative involving a number of special seminars in conjunction with the conference. As you can see from the Call for Papers, our Program Committee for 2013, directed by Professor Jason Coy, is already hard at work; our submission deadline will be **15 February 2013**. Our 2014 conference will take place in Kansas City. It will of course take place during the centennial commemoration of World War I, so we will be working in conjunction with the National World War I Museum, close to our conference hotel. In March 2013 I'll be attending a special meeting at the museum to help develop plans for the 2014 conference. Our Working Group on World War I and our newly created interdisciplinary Network on War and Violence will also be involved as we get closer to the conference date. Watch this space and

our e-mails for further details.

Speaking of interdisciplinary Networks, we're pleased to announce the launching of two more Networks to add to our existing group: a Network on Environmental Studies and a Network on Music and Sound Studies. Both are described in greater detail inside, and both will be actively organizing interdisciplinary sessions for 2013.

Finally, we were all deeply saddened to learn of the recent deaths of two longstanding members of the GSA, Professor Henry Friedlander and Professor Dieter Sevin. Tributes to these extraordinary friends and colleagues can be found at the end of this newsletter.

David E. Barclay
Executive Director
German Studies Association

Reports and Announcements

Planning for the Next GSA Conference, Denver, Colorado, October 3-6, 2013

The thirty-seventh annual conference of the GSA will take place October 3-6, 2013, at the Denver Marriott Tech Center, 4900 S. Syracuse Street, Denver, Colorado 80237.

This will be our first meeting in Denver in over a quarter of a century. So we are pleased to be returning to the Rocky Mountains! The hotel is located to the south of downtown Denver, in the Greenwood Village suburb; and, as its name indicates, it is close to a number of high-tech enterprises. The hotel is located adjacent to a Denver light rail station; downtown Denver – including the famous LoDo section – can be reached in twenty to twenty-five minutes. As usual, the deadline for ALL submissions will be **15 FEBRUARY 15 2013**.

Submissions will be accepted online (www.thegsa.org) after 5 January 2013. 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 six related sessions, and it also vigorously supports interdisciplinary sessions, including sessions that are organized in conjunction with our interdisciplinary Networks. Finally, in 2013 we shall also be experimenting with a series of special conference seminars. (See the discussion of GSA Networks and the new seminar series below.)

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

As in the past, all submissions will take place online at the GSA Web site (www.thegsa.org). 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).

Call for Papers

GERMAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The German Studies Association (GSA) will hold its Thirty-Seventh Annual Conference in Denver, Colorado, October 3-6, 2013.

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 and for interdisciplinary presentations are strongly encouraged. Individual paper proposals and offers to serve as session moderators or commentators are also welcome. Programs of past GSA conferences may be viewed at the GSA website (www.thegsa.org).

Please see the GSA website for information about the submission process, which opens on January 5, 2013. ALL proposals must be submitted online; paper forms are not used. The deadline for proposals is February 15, 2013. Please note that presenters must be members of the German Studies Association. Information on membership is available on the GSA website (www.thegsa.org).

For more information, visit the GSA website or contact members of the

2013 Program Committee:

Jason Coy, Program Director, College of Charleston (coyj@cofc.edu)

Ray Canoy, Diachronic, University of Oklahoma (jcanoy@ou.edu)

Maria Makela, Interdisciplinary, California College of the Arts (mmakela@cca.edu)

Heather Morrison, Medieval/Early Modern (All Fields), SUNY New Paltz (morrish@newpaltz.edu)

Marc Lerner, 19th Century (All Fields), University of Mississippi (mlerner@olemiss.edu)

Dolores Augustine, 20th/21st-Century History, St. John's College (augustid@stjohns.edu)

Michael Meng, 20th/21st-Century History, Clemson University (mmeng@clemson.edu)

Sara Hall, 20th/21st-Century Germanistik, University of Illinois, Chicago (sahall@uic.edu)

Todd Heidt, 20th/21st-Century Germanistik, Knox College (theidt@knox.edu)

Carol Hager, Political Science, Bryn Mawr College (chager@brynmawr.edu)

Seminars to Be Added to the Next GSA Conference

The GSA is excited to announce a pilot project adding a small number of seminar modules to the program structure of the GSA Conference in Denver 2013.

Seminars are meant to meet for all three days of the conference during the first morning slot to foster extended discussion, rigorous intellectual exchange, and intensified networking. Seminars should be proposed and led by 2 to 3 organizers and consist of 15 to 20 participants, at least some of whom should be graduate students. In order to reach the goal of extended discussion, seminar organizers and participants are expected to participate in all three installments of the seminar. We assume these participants will submit some form of written communication to the seminar ahead of the conference, which will count as the equivalent of an ordinary paper presentation. That is to say, those who are accepted as seminar participants (or organizers) will be listed in the program as such and will not be allowed to present another paper at the conference. However, any participant or organizer may also serve as moderator or commentator for normal sessions. We envision making it possible for others to sit in on seminars; such persons would not be counted as official participants and therefore could deliver a paper in a different session.

For our pilot program, we will seek proposals for seminars that involve:

1. Pre-circulated papers addressing a defined topic to be exchanged among seminar participants before the conference and discussed intensively on site;
2. In-depth discussion of one or more academic publication(s) or work(s) of art (literature, film, music, theater, the visual arts, etc.). Organizers need both to choose the items to be discussed and to stipulate form of response to the chosen text/object of analysis to be circulated before the conference;
3. Any other workable format the organizers can envision (n.b. include a description not only of the topic but also of format in the proposal).

We believe the seminar format is a viable option for individuals or networks who are considering creating a “thread” of thematic sessions.

Instructions for submitting a proposal for a seminar sequence:

1. Seminar proposers should submit a coordinated 500-word description of the topic, goals, and format of the seminar, as well as their vision of their own role in the actual running of the seminar. A one-page c.v. for each organizer that clearly states her/his rank and institutional affiliation should also be included.
2. Seminar proposers should attach to their proposals a list of five to ten scholars whom they plan to invite to participate in their seminar if the proposal is accepted; please include those individuals’ institutional affiliations and email addresses on the list.

Process of selecting seminars and populating them with participants:

1. Seminar proposers will submit their proposals to the Seminar Working Group no later than 1 January 2013; earlier if possible is encouraged.
2. In consultation with the Executive Director and the Program Director, the Seminar Working Group will give the go-ahead to several well-coordinated and promising proposals by 15 January 2013 and will post a list of approved seminars and their topics on the GSA web site by 18 January 2013.
3. Association members will thereby be invited to submit applications for participation in specific seminars directly to the Seminar Working Group. The application for seminar participation will require a 300-word abstract, stating one’s particular interest in and proposed contribution to the seminar in question and a one-page cv. These applications for participation are due to the Seminar Working Group on or before 1 February. Seminar organizers should note that since they will have already submitted the names of individuals whom they plan to invite to participate, their wishes on this matter will be taken into strong consideration, though no one other than the organizers is

guaranteed participation. Final decisions will be made by the Seminar Working Group in consultation with the Executive Director and the Program Director.

4. The Seminar Working Group will inform seminar organizers and applicants no later than 5 February about the final makeup of the seminars. This will allow time for those who are not accepted as participants to join in the normal process of submitting a paper proposal to the general GSA Program Committee by the deadline of 15 February.
5. We will work together with the Executive Director and the Program Committee to find appropriate rooms for seminars so that individuals who are not official participants but who wish to sit in may do so.

The GSA Seminar Working Group consists of:

Suzanne Marchand, Vice President of the GSA (Louisiana State University),
smarch1@lsu.edu

Irene Kacandes, Vice President Elect of the GSA (Dartmouth College),
irene.kacandes@dartmouth.edu

Lutz Koepnick, Executive Board Member and Member of Conference Task Force (Washington University in St. Louis), koepnick@wustl.edu

Please direct inquiries and proposals to all three of us.

Summary of schedule:

5 November 2012 announcement of seminar pilot project to membership of GSA

1 January 2013 (or earlier) would-be seminar organizers submit proposals to Seminar Working Group

15 January selected (and non-selected) organizers informed; organizers of selected proposals are requested to confirm interest within a day or two of announcement

by 18 January accepted seminar topics posted on GSA website; membership invited to submit proposals to become participants;

by 1 February at latest proposals for participation due

5 February entire seminar slate set and posted

[15 February normal GSA paper/panel proposals due to main GSA Program Committee]

2012 GSA/DAAD Prize Winners Announced

The Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst and the German Studies Association are pleased to announce this year's prize recipients, who were recognized at the GSA's thirty-sixth annual banquet in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on October 5, 2012.

The DAAD and the GSA are proud to announce that **Professor Kader Konuk** (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor) is the winner of this year's DAAD Book Prize for the best book in Germanistik or culture studies during the years 2010 and 2011. Her book, *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey*, was published by Stanford University Press in 2010. The prize committee consisted of Professors Katrin Sieg (chair), Georgetown University; Katharina Gerstenberger, University of Cincinnati; and Stuart Taberner, University of Leeds. The GSA wishes to thank the committee for its hard and outstanding work, and congratulates Professor Konuk for her excellent achievement.

Here is the text of the committee's *laudatio*:

East West Mimesis opens up new dimensions in the study of literature, cultural history, and philosophy by returning us to the encounter of German-Jewish literary studies and Turkish humanism in the 1930s and 1940s. Richly contextualized and beautifully written, Konuk's study places Erich Auerbach and his extraordinary study *Mimesis* (1946) in the center of her analysis of Turkish and German 20th-century history, suggesting a new understanding of exile and its complex relationship to intellectual and creative productivity. Challenging the perception of this seminal work as produced in isolation, Konuk reveals how deeply *Mimesis* was informed by the intellectual climate of Istanbul in the 1940s, and yields insights into Turkey's humanist reform movement as a form of cultural mimesis. The study makes available hitherto unpublished or little known documents while at the same time engaging European intellectual history and the complex influences of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Making wide-ranging connections between different national literatures, Konuk's study offers important insights not just from a historical perspective but also addresses present and on-going concerns about the meanings and representations of East and West. *East West Mimesis* is original, dynamic, and painstaking in its detailed reconstruction of a key moment in intellectual and cultural history. Konuk tells a highly compelling story that deserves our attention.

The DAAD and the GSA are proud to announce that Professor **Edward Dickinson** (University of California, Davis) is the winner of this year's DAAD Article Prize for the best article in history or social sciences published in the *German Studies Review* during the years 2010 and 2011. His article, "Altitude and Whiteness: Germanizing the Alps and Alpinizing the Germans, 1875-1935," appeared in the GSR, volume 33, no. 3 (October 2010). The prize committee consisted of Professors Elizabeth Heineman (chair), University of Iowa; Mark

Clark, University of Virginia at Wise; Devin Pendas, Boston College. The GSA wishes to thank the committee for its hard and outstanding work, and congratulates Professor Dickinson for his excellent achievement.

Here is the text of the committee's *laudatio*:

In this powerfully argued, well-researched article, Professor Dickinson recasts our understanding of the genealogy of German and European racism. Contrary to the historiographic tendency to reduce the history of racist thought to its "scientific" dimensions, Dickinson points to two further dimensions crucial to the history of racism: the role of aesthetics and the influence of environmentalism. Taking the racial reconceptualization of the inhabitants of the Alps as his empirical referent, Dickinson shows how aesthetic judgments rescued a racial understanding of the Älpler at odds with the then extant scientific knowledge. Dickinson's article offers a powerful corrective to an excessive emphasis on the linkages between science and racism, and sets forth new and exciting avenues for research, tracing the role of both aesthetic and environmental thought in the history of European racism. The article is a model of rigorous research and creative reconceptualization.

2012 Graduate Student Prize Winner Announced

The GSA is proud to announce that the winner of this year's Graduate Student Paper Prize for the best paper in German Studies written in 2011-12 is awarded to **Ari Linden** (Cornell University), for his paper "Beyond Repetition: Karl Kraus's 'Absolute Satire'." The prize selection committee was chaired by Professor Kathrin Bower (University of Richmond), and included Professors Jennifer Miller (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville) and Zoe Lang (University of South Florida). Mr. Linden's paper will be published in a future issue of the *German Studies Review*. The GSA congratulates him for his excellent achievement and thanks the selection committee for its outstanding work.

Here is the text of the committee's *laudatio*:

The 2012 GSA Graduate Student Essay Prize committee is pleased to announce the winner of this year's competition: **Ari Linden** (Ph.D. candidate at Cornell University) for his paper "Beyond Repetition: Karl Kraus's 'Absolute Satire'." In his sophisticated and well-argued essay, Mr. Linden contrasts Karl Kraus's dismissal of Heinrich Heine's writing as inauthentic satire with his praise for the work of Johann Nestroy in order to illuminate Kraus's concept of "absolute satire." For Kraus, satire must exceed the historical moment in which it was conceived so as to retain its currency over time, a quality he attributes to Nestroy but not to Heine. Linden then turns to Kraus's *Die letzten Tage der Menschheit* to explore Kraus's own approach to satirical writing. Linden reads *Die letzten Tage* both as a satirical indictment of World War I and as a kind of handbook

on satire as a literary form. He deftly combines a judicious selection of theoretical positions to evaluate Kraus's use of satire as well as the criticisms leveled against him. Linden's paper offers precisely the kind of historically contextualized, theoretically grounded, and critically astute analysis that characterizes the best German Studies scholarship and the committee congratulates Mr. Linden on his excellent work.

2013 Prize Competitions

In 2013 the GSA will again make a number of awards. We hope that as many members as possible will make nominations and submissions. For the membership of the various prize committees for 2013, please see the committee appointments listed below.

In 2013 the **DAAD/GSA Book Prize** will be awarded for the best book in history or social sciences that has been published in 2011 or 2012. Inquiries, nominations, and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Carl Caldwell, Rice University (caldwell@rice.edu), by **15 February 2013**. The other members of the committee are Professors Monica Black (University of Tennessee, Knoxville) and Ben Marschke (Humboldt State University).

The **DAAD Article Prize** will be awarded for the best article in *Germanistik* or culture studies that appeared in the *German Studies Review* in 2011 or 2012. Inquiries, nominations, and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Jennifer Kapczynski, Washington University in St. Louis (jkapczynski@wustl.edu), by 15 February 2013. The other members of the committee are Professors William Collins Donahue (Duke University) and John Pizer (Louisiana State University).

The **Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize** is awarded every other year, and will again be awarded in 2013 for the best book in Holocaust Studies published in 2011 and 2012. Submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Jeffrey Herf, University of Maryland at College Park (jherf@umd.edu), by **15 February 2013**. The other members of the committee are Professors Hilary Earl (Nipissing University) and Bradley Prager, University of Missouri, Columbia.

The prize for the **Best Essay in German Studies by a Graduate Student** will again be awarded in 2013. The deadline for nominations and submissions is **15 March 2013**. 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 Anthony Steinhoff, University of Quebec, Montreal (steinhoff.anthony@uqam.ca). The other members of the committee are Professors Perry Myers (Albion College) and Maiken Umbach (University of Nottingham).

Contributions Sought for Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize

The German Studies Association mourns the loss of Professor Henry Friedlander, GSA president in 2001 and 2002. (Please see the obituaries in this issue of the Newsletter.) Henry Friedlander's contributions to the GSA were legion, but none mattered more to him than the Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize, awarded every two years for the best book in Holocaust and Genocide Studies published in the previous two years, and named after Henry's late wife, herself a pillar of the GSA for many years before her own early and tragically untimely death. Since its establishment more than a decade ago, the Milton Prize has become a touchstone for excellent scholarship in Holocaust and Genocide Studies. Yet it has depended, for its financing, on annual contributions from Henry and, for the most part, from friends of Sybil and Henry. The time has long since come to put the funding of the Milton Prize on a sounder footing, and nothing would honor Henry's memory more than to do so.

Accordingly, the GSA hopes to create a permanent endowment fund of \$20,000 to sustain the Sybil Milton Book Prize in perpetuity. The GSA Board has voted to make a contribution of \$1,000 to the Milton Prize fund, and we strongly encourage as many members as possible to go to the GSA website and click on the homepage link that will enable you to make a tax-deductible, online contribution to this very worthy cause. Or you may go directly to the contribution page by going to this URL: <https://www.thegsa.org/members/contribute>. GSA members should log in using their existing username and password. Alternatively, checks may be sent to Professor Gerald A. Fetz, GSA Secretary/Treasurer, Dean Emeritus, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812.

We know that times are difficult, and that there are many worthy claims on your financial resources. But we hope that you will agree that, by creating a permanent Milton Prize fund, we are paying appropriate tribute to Sybil Milton and Henry Friedlander, without whom the GSA in its modern form would simply be inconceivable.

GSA Committee Appointments for 2013

2013 Program Committee (Denver)

Program Director: Jason Coy, Program Director, College of Charleston

Ray Canoy, Diachronic, University of Oklahoma

Maria Makela, Interdisciplinary, California College of the Arts

Heather Morrison, Medieval/Early Modern (All Fields), SUNY New Paltz

Marc Lerner, 19th Century (All Fields), University of Mississippi

Dolores Augustine, 20th/21st-Century History, St. John's University

Michael Meng, 20th/21st-Century History, Clemson University

Sara Hall, 20th/21st-Century Germanistik, University of Illinois, Chicago
 Todd Heidt, 20th/21st-Century Germanistik, Knox College
 Carol Hager, Political Science, Bryn Mawr College

Nominating Committee

Chair: Celia Applegate, Vanderbilt University
 Sabine von Dirke, University of Pittsburgh
 David Luft, Oregon State University
 Joyce Mushaben, University of Missouri – St. Louis

Archives Committee

Chair: Rainer Hering, Schleswig-Holstein State Archives
 Astrid Eckert, Emory University
 Norman Goda, University of Florida
 Will Gray, Purdue University
 Jennifer Rodgers, University of Pennsylvania
 Gerhard Weinberg, University of North Carolina (emeritus)
 Meike Werner, Vanderbilt University

Prize Committees:

DAAD/GSA book prize (for history/social science):

Chair: Carl Caldwell, Rice University
 Monica Black, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Benjamin Marschke, Humboldt State University

DAAD article prize (for Germanistik/culture studies):

Chair: Jennifer Kapczynski, Washington University in St. Louis
 William Collins Donahue, Duke University
 John Pizer, Louisiana State University

Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize (for best book in Holocaust and Genocide Studies):

Chair: Jeffrey Herf, University of Maryland, College Park
 Hilary Earl, Nipissing University
 Bradley Prager, University of Missouri – Columbia

Graduate Student Prize

Chair: Anthony Steinhoff, University of Quebec, Montreal

Perry Myers, Albion College

Maiken Umbach, University of Nottingham

Interdisciplinary Committee

Co-Chairs: Marc Silberman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2012-15
Janet Ward, University of Oklahoma, 2012-15

Celia Applegate, Vanderbilt University, 2012-15

Drew Bergerson, University of Missouri–Kansas City, 2012-15

Rolf Goebel, University of Alabama, Huntsville, 2010-13

Maria Makela, California College of the Arts, 2010-13

Gavriel Rosenfeld, Fairfield University, 2010-13

Angelika von Wahl, Lafayette College, 2012-15

Silke Maria Weineck, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2012-15

Berlin Program Committee

Greg Eghigian, Pennsylvania State University, 2013-15

Barbara McCloskey, University of Pittsburgh, 2012-14

Joyce M. Mushaben, University of Missouri, St. Louis, 2012-14

Mary-Beth O'Brien, Skidmore College, 2013-15

Helmut Walser Smith, Vanderbilt University, 2011-13

Jonathan Sperber, University of Missouri, Columbia, 2011-13

GSA Representatives to Friends of the German Historical Institute

Celia Applegate, Vanderbilt University, 2012-13

Suzanne Marchand, Louisiana State University, 2013-15

ACLS/GSA delegate

Patricia Herminghouse, University of Rochester, 2012-15

GSA Investment Committee

Chair: Gerald Fetz, University of Montana (statutory)

Celia Applegate, Vanderbilt University (statutory)

David E. Barclay, Kalamazoo College (statutory)

Stephen Brockmann, Carnegie Mellon University (statutory)

Patricia Herminghouse, University of Rochester

Katherine Roper, Saint Mary's College of California

Report on Interdisciplinary Committee and Networks

I. Members of the Interdisciplinary Committee (dates of appointment)

Marc Silberman and Janet Ward, Co-Chairs

As the new co-chairs of the GSA Interdisciplinary Committee, we look forward to the next several years of encouraging interdisciplinary innovations from the general membership of the GSA, and thus benefiting the association as a whole.

The current members of the GSA Interdisciplinary Committee are:

1. Marc Silberman (German / Film Studies, U Wisconsin Madison, co-chair, 2012-2015)
2. Janet Ward (History, U Oklahoma, co-chair, 2012-2015)
3. Celia Applegate (History / Musicology, Vanderbilt U, 2012-2015)
4. Drew Bergerson (History, U Missouri Kansas City, 2012-2015)
5. Rolf Goebel (German, U Alabama Huntsville, 2010-2013)
6. Maria Makela (Visual Studies, CA College of the Arts, 2010-2013)
7. Gavriel Rosenfeld (History, Fairfield U, 2010-2013)
8. Angelika von Wahl (Political Science / International Studies, Lafayette College, 2012-2015)
9. Silke Maria Weineck (German/Comparative Literature, U Michigan, 2012-2015)

We welcome Celia Applegate, Drew Bergerson, Angelika von Wahl, and Silke Maria Weineck to their respective three-year terms as members of the GSA Interdisciplinary Committee.

Original (founding) members of the committee who completed their appointment terms in 2011 are:

Timothy Guinnane
 Nancy Collins
 Roe-Minh Kok
 Jonathan Sheehan
 David Sabean (former chair)

We thank them for their GSA service.

II. A special note of thanks is due to fellow committee member Rolf Goebel, who skillfully served as session coordinator for Interdisciplinary/Diachronic panels for both the 2011 and 2012 conferences (with Jose R. Canoy sharing responsibility for the Diachronic panels at the 2012 meeting). Committee member Maria Makela has graciously accepted to serve as session coordinator for 2013.

III. There are currently 10 defined networks; 7 have organized network sessions at the 2012 conference, and while the newly inaugurated "War and Violence" network has sponsored no session, it is meeting informally to discuss future planning. As anticipated, the committee co-chairs will need to encourage some of the networks to maintain their presence or suggest different leadership for the respective network.

Established interdisciplinary networks include:

- 1) Law and Legal Cultures (4 sessions)
 - Sace Elder (seelder@eu.edu)
 - Timothy Guinnane (timothy.guinnane@yale.edu)
- 2) Religious Culture (currently not active)
 - Christopher Wild (wild@uchicago.edu)
 - John Smith (jh2smith@uwaterloo.ca)
- 3) Trans-regionalism and Transnationalism (2 sessions on intercultural transfer)
 - Thomas Adam (Adam@uta.edu)
 - Deniz Göktürk (dgokturk@berkeley.edu)
- 4) Family and Kinship (2 sessions)
 - Thomas Max Safley (tsafley@upenn.edu)
 - Silke-Maria Weineck (smwei@umich.edu)
- 5) Urban Society and Culture (currently not active)
 - Tanya Kevorkian (tanya.kevorkian@millersville.edu)
 - Chad Ross (Rossch@ecu.edu)
- 6) Visual Culture (5 sessions on spectacle)
 - Deborah Ascher Barnstone (dascher@acm.wsu.edu)
 - Thomas Haakenson (thaakenson@mcad.edu)
- 7) Memory Studies (3 sessions on various topics)
 - Carol Anne Costabile-Heming (costabilec1@nku.edu)
 - Irene Kacandes (irene.kacandes@dartmouth.edu)
 - Gavriel Rosenfeld (grosenfeld@mail.fairfield.edu)

Newly established networks this past year include:

- 8) Alltag (4 sessions on various topics)
 - Andrew S. Bergerson (BergersonA@umkc.edu)
 - Craig Koslofsky (koslof@illinois.edu)
- 9) Swiss Studies (2 sessions on Swiss identity)
 - Peter Meilaender (Peter.Meilaender@houghton.edu)
 - Hans Rindisbacher (hans.rindisbacher@pomona.edu)
- 10) War and Violence (informal meeting to plan for 2013 and 2014)
 - Scott Denham (sdenham@davidson.edu)

Contact information for five of the GSA interdisciplinary networks can be found on the GSA website: <https://www.thegsa.org/resources/networks.html>. We will be encouraging the other networks to join this webpage in the next months. In the coming year, we look forward to the potential addition of another network or two, e.g., on intersections with science and technology.

IV. The co-chairs arranged an Interdisciplinary Committee meeting for Thursday evening at the 2012 GSA conference to discuss future committee “initiatives,” followed by a meeting of committee members with network representatives to discuss expectations, best practices, and future plans. Eight networks were represented at this meeting.

Special Interdisciplinary Report from Rolf Goebel:

At the 2012 GSA Conference, interdisciplinary panels and roundtables were again very well represented. Numerically, interdisciplinary panels now rank third (with 64 sessions) after 20th/21st Century Germanistik (108) and 20th/21st Century History (65). The number of interdisciplinary roundtables is 11. Administratively, it has helped considerably to separate the diachronic panels from the interdisciplinary ones; this separation of tasks should be maintained in future conferences. With some caution, one could argue that the interdisciplinary panels reflect some recent developments in German Studies (and perhaps even in cultural studies generally): While visual culture, especially thanks to the activities of the Visual Culture Network that organized four panels on "Spectacle," maintains a strong presence, music continues to assert itself vigorously, as it did already last year; the most ambitious panel series in this area offers four Wagner sessions on "Jenseits von Bayreuth". Representations of the political (e.g., "Imagining the Arab Spring") and gender themes (e.g., a panel of Queer Methods) are noticeable, but perhaps the most striking change is a strong return to classical writers (e.g., panels on Hölderlin and Fichte), to "Defenses of the Aesthetics" (4 panels), and "Poetic Thinking" (4 panels). The title of yet another panel "Autopoesis: The Re-Entry of Literature" sums up this trajectory rather nicely. It remains to be seen if individual panels and paper advocate a traditionalist credo (re-asserting the hegemony of aesthetics/literature against visual and auditory modes of representations) or seek to define poetic discourses within contemporary media technologies. Size, possible advocacy of specific themes, and methodological range of the interdisciplinary division are categories that should be re-examined in light of the GSA Task Force Recommendations submitted earlier this month.

Membership of Interdisciplinary Committee and List of Established Networks

The current GSA Interdisciplinary Committee members and their terms:

Co-chairs:

Marc Silberman (German /Film Studies, U Wisconsin Madison, 2012-2015)

Janet Ward (History, U Oklahoma, 2012-2015)

Members:

Celia Applegate (History / Musicology, Vanderbilt U, 2012-2015)

Drew Bergerson (History, U Missouri Kansas City, 2012-2015)

Rolf Goebel (German, U Alabama Huntsville, 2010-2013)

Maria Makela (Visual Studies, CA College of the Arts, 2010-2013)

Gavriel Rosenfeld (History, Fairfield U, 2010-2013)

Angelika von Wahl (Political Science /International Studies, Lafayette College, 2012-2015)

Silke Maria Weineck (German/Comp Literature, U Michigan, 2012-2015)

Established interdisciplinary networks:

Law and Legal Cultures

Sace Elder, Eastern Illinois University (seelder@eiu.edu)

Timothy Guinnane, Yale University (timothy.guinnane@yale.edu)

Trans-regionalism and Transnationalism

Thomas Adam, University of Texas – Arlington (adam@uta.edu)

Deniz Göktürk, University of California–Berkeley (dgokturk@berkeley.edu)

Family and Kinship

Thomas Max Safley, University of Pennsylvania (tsafley@upenn.edu)

Silke-Maria Weineck, U of Michigan–Ann Arbor (smwei@umich.edu)

Urban Society and Culture

Jennifer Hosek, Queen's University, Canada (jhosek@queensu.ca)

Michael Meng, Clemson University (mmeng@clemson.edu)

Visual Culture

Deborah Ascher Barnstone, Washington State U (dascher@acm.wsu.edu)

Thomas Haakenson, Minneapolis College of Art and Design

(thaakenson@mcad.edu)

Memory Studies

Carol Anne Costabile-Heming, N Kentucky U (costabilec1@nku.edu)

Irene Kacandes, Dartmouth College (irene.kacandes@dartmouth.edu)

Gavriel Rosenfeld, Fairfield University (grosenfeld@mail.fairfield.edu)

Alltag

Andrew S. Bergerson, U of Missouri–Kansas City (bergersona@umkc.edu)

Craig Koslofsky, University of Illinois, Urbana (koslof@illinois.edu)

Swiss Studies

Peter Meilaender, Houghton College (peter.meilaender@houghton.edu)

Hans Rindisbacher, Pomona College (hans.rindisbacher@pomona.edu)

Music and Sound Studies

Joy Calico, Vanderbilt University (joy.calico@vanderbilt.edu)

David Imhoof, Susquehanna University (imhoof@susqu.edu)

Environmental Studies

Katharina Gerstenberger, U of Utah (katharina.gerstenberger@utah.edu)

Thomas Lekan, University of South Carolina (lekan@mailbox.sc.edu)

War and Violence (not yet active)

Scott Denham, Davidson College (scdenham@davidson.edu)

Religious Culture (not yet active)

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

Two New Networks Announced

The GSA is pleased to announce the establishment of two new interdisciplinary Networks in addition to the established Networks described above: an Environmental Studies Network and a Music and Sound Studies Network.

Environmental Studies Network

1. The Coordinators:

Katharina Gerstenberger is professor of German and chair of Languages and Literature at the University of Utah. She is the author of *Truth to Tell: German Women's Autobiographies and Turn-of-the-Century Culture* (2000) and *Writing the New Berlin: The German Capital in Post-Wall Literature* (2008). She co-edited *German Literature in a New Century: Trends, Traditions, Transformations, Transitions* (2008); and *After the Berlin Wall: Germany and Beyond* (2011). Her articles on topics of 20th and 21st German literary culture have appeared in *Ecozona*, *Gegenwartsliteratur*, *Monatshefte*, *Women in German Yearbook*, *German Politics and Society*, *German Quarterly*, and in several anthologies, including *German Literature in the Age of Globalization* (2004), *Spatial Turns: Space, Place, and Mobility in German Literary and Visual Culture* (2010), and *Generational Shifts in Contemporary German Culture* (2010). From 2007-2010 she was co-editor of *Women in German Yearbook*. Her current project is titled "Disaster Narratives: History and Catastrophe in the German Imagination." Gerstenberger is a member of the Seattle-based Transatlantic Research Network in Environmental Humanities.

Thomas Lekan is associate professor of history and a faculty associate in the Environment and Sustainability program at the University of South Carolina. He is the author of *Imagining the Nation in Nature: Landscape Preservation and German Identity, 1885-1945* (2004) and co-edited *Germany's Nature: Cultural Landscapes and Environmental History* (2005). His articles and essays investigate German, North American, and global themes in landscape, conservation, and environmental history and have appeared in *Environmental History*, *The Journal of Modern History* and *German History* as well as anthologies such as *Naturschutz und Nationalsozialismus* (2003), *The Heimat Abroad: The Boundaries of Germanness* (2005), and *Turning Points in Environmental History* (2010). His current book project, *Saving the Serengeti: Tourism, the Cold War, and the Paradox of German Conservation in Postcolonial Africa*, is scheduled to appear with Oxford University Press in 2014. Lekan is also a member of the Seattle-based Transatlantic Research Network in the Environmental Humanities.

2. Justification:

German-speaking culture has a long and complex relationship with questions pertaining to the natural environment. Scholars of German literature, history, and cultural studies have analyzed the long and rich adoration of “nature” in the German Romantic tradition, while political scientists have produced a voluminous literature on the origins and significance of Germany’s Green Party and the “post-material” values of the post-1968 generation. Germany is also emerging today as one of the leaders in sustainable industrial development. Yet the “environmental humanities” are just beginning to be developed as fields of inquiry within German Studies. The German terms “Umwelt” and “Umweltschutz,” to cite one example, have a different ring to them than their English-language counterparts, “environment” and “environmental protection,” implying a closer relationship with one’s surroundings and seeking to ensure human health and survival within the natural environment.

The Environmental Studies Network seeks to foster dialogue among the different disciplines represented at GSA and beyond to develop a framework for thinking about the environment and its significance in the German-speaking tradition in the broadest sense of the term. The Environmental Studies Network sees itself as an interdisciplinary effort to promote eco-critical, environmental-historical, and environmental-political approaches to environmental issues through literary, historical, sociological, visual, and cultural perspectives. It is also our goal to show the relevance of such investigations to the scientific and political dimensions of these concerns.

3. Call for Papers for the Oct. 3-6, 2013 GSA conference in Denver

Abstract of 200 words are due to both organizers by January 15, 2013; the cfp will be circulated through H-German; H-Soz und Kult; Missouri-List; Women-in German list; H-Environment; the European Society for Environmental History; the Rachel Carson Center for Environment and Society.

Under the broad category of “Nature Writing/Writing Nature,” we propose three interrelated panels that will serve as a foundation for future conversations on these themes:

Nature Writing/Writing Nature (I): Methods

This panel invites presentations from different disciplines on questions concerning the methodologies and critical frameworks of different genres of environmental writing, ranging from literary text to historical studies to visual representations. Papers might examine the epistemologies, political goals, philosophical underpinnings, or aesthetic means that motivate and shape different contributions to the environmental humanities. They might also explore the possibilities and limitations of borrowing concepts and models from related disciplines—especially ecology and geography—for understanding the human-nature interface.

Nature Writing/Writing Nature (II): Contexts

This panel seeks to situate German definitions and assumptions about the environment in a global and transnational framework. Papers might address questions of cross-cultural comparison (e.g., “Umweltschutz” vs. “environment protection”); the migration and adaptation of modes of forestry, tourism, conservation, or urban planning from Germany to other regions and back; speak to German responses to problems such as climate change whose causes and effects are global rather than national; or discuss the significance of national perspectives in global settings for concepts such as the Anthropocene.

Nature Writing/Writing Nature (III): Examples

Notions of nature as beautiful and uplifting to the human spirit continue to shape our thinking about the environment from visual and literary representations to tourist brochures. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, moreover, human progress was often measured by the ability to “tame” and yet simultaneously appreciate nature as a primeval essence, whereas more recent depictions of humans a “rogue mammal” (John McNeill) call into question such divisions between human and nonhuman natures. This panel invites contributions that examine depictions of nature as hostile, vengeful, or perhaps indifferent to the human being that encounters it. Questions to be asked might include the eco-critical relevance of the Sublime in an age of environmental degradation, the political effectiveness of Nature’s Revenge as a literary device, the analysis of nature depictions beyond the beautiful or pastoral, or how nature’s unexpected “agency” blurs the line between anthropocentric and bio-centric narratives of the environmental past.

Music and Sound Studies Network

1. The Coordinators

David Imhoof is associate professor and chair of History at Susquehanna University. He is the author of *Becoming a Nazi Town: Culture and Politics in Interwar Göttingen* (Michigan, 2013). He is editing, with Margaret Menninger and Anthony Steinhoff, the collection “Gesamtkunstwerk: Foundations, Articulations, and Explorations,” which is under review at Berghahn Books, and contributing a piece on musical film. Imhoof’s work on film has appeared in *Why We Fought: America’s Wars in Film and History* (Kentucky, 2008) and *Weimar Culture Revisited* (Palgrave-Macmillan, 2011). He has published articles on sharpshooting and sports in *German History*. His current project, “Recording Germany in the Twentieth Century,” is a broad history of the recording industry in modern Germany. From 2002 to 2007 Imhoof served as editor of the H-German discussion network. He is also a founding member and regular contributor to the Philadelphia-area Modern Germany Workshop.

Joy H. Calico is associate professor of musicology at Vanderbilt University. She is the author of *Brecht at the Opera* (California, 2008), and has published articles in numerous musicology journals as well as interdisciplinary collections

on music in East German cultural politics. Among the most recent are *Wagner and Cinema* (Indiana, 2010), *Art Outside the Lines: New Perspectives on GDR Culture* (Rodopi, 2011), and *Brecht and the GDR: Politics, Culture and Posterity* (Camden, 2011). She has essays forthcoming in *New German Critique* and *The Oxford Handbook of Faust in Music*. The book she is completing is a transnational study of the performance and reception history of Arnold Schoenberg's cantata *A Survivor from Warsaw* in postwar Europe. Her work has been supported by the ACLS, the American Academy in Berlin, the Berlin Program, the DAAD, the Howard Foundation, and the NEH. In January 2013 she will become director of European Studies and the Max Kade Center for European and German Studies at Vanderbilt.

2. Justification

Germany and Austria have each claimed to be a “nation of music” at some point, and with good reason: music from those historical regions has dominated the art-music canon since the nineteenth century. Celia Applegate's pioneering essay “What is German Music?” (1992) helped foster interdisciplinary studies of music's influence in the German-speaking world and of its use and abuse for various ideological agendas. As an object of study, music in this context has helped expand disciplines. Musicologists pay increasing attention to context; historians find new primary sources; and Germanists, including those engaged with silent and sound cinema, discover new texts to analyze. Scholars have likewise widened their scope of analysis to include vernacular, popular, and pop music. And the new field of sound studies has encouraged us to take seriously the meaning of sonic experience, especially in the modern world.

Some twenty years of productive if often informal exchanges between individual historians, musicologists, Germanists, and other scholars suggest that the time is right for the establishment of a Music and Sound Studies Network. The GSA has already served as venue for bringing many of these scholars together. Creating an infrastructure to that end will facilitate deeper engagement among scholars in these disciplines and others (film, philosophy, sociology, political science), including those that are historically underrepresented at the GSA (art and architecture, performance studies, urban studies). By helping various scholars analyze music and sound, this network will thus support the GSA's long-standing promotion of multi-, cross- and interdisciplinary research. This blending of approaches epitomizes the GSA's commitment to German studies.

3. Call for Papers for the 3-6 October 2013 GSA Conference in Denver

Abstracts of 200 words are due to both organizers by 15 January 2013. This call will be circulated broadly on many electronic discussion lists: H-German, H-Soz und Kult; the American Musicological Society (AMS) Listserv, the AMS Cold War and Music Study Group, and other organizations for film studies, art and architecture, and urban studies.

We propose a four-part series of panels, followed by a roundtable discussion (with invited speakers):

1. **Music and Sound Studies: Public**
2. **Music and Sound Studies: Private**
3. **Music and Sound Studies: Politics**
4. **Music and Sound Studies: Consumption**

We welcome proposals on any aspect of music or sound studies in relation to one of these categories. Proposals should indicate the panel for which they are applying. We are particularly interested in scholarship that investigates how musics and/or sounds are determined by, respond to, engage with, and shape the spaces and spheres in which they occur. We also seek papers exploring the purposes for which music and sound are deployed and the processes of experience and consumption. We view these categories (Public, Private, Politics, Consumption) broadly, not prescriptively. “Public,” for example, could include the study of nineteenth-century community bands, the Love Parade, concert programming, or the acoustics of performance spaces; “Private” might mean eighteenth-century aristocratic party music, the philosophy of aurality, or the silence between radio programs; “Politics” could pertain to the function of music/sound as political instrument or a tool of subversion, and is not limited to the realm of high politics; and “Consumption” might involve the analysis of record collection, urban industrial sounds, or television jingles. A roundtable discussion toward the end of the GSA will feature scholars able to comment on the four panels and the larger issues of Music and Sound Studies.

**Report on the 2012 Meeting of the American Council of
Learned Societies
Patricia Herminhouse
University of Rochester**

In May 2012, I participated as GSA's delegate in the Annual Meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), which took place this year in Philadelphia. Even before taking up the more formal agenda of the meeting, attendees had an opportunity to participate in one of two informal sessions devoted to current issues in the profession; "The Future of International Education and Research Collaboration in Challenging Times" or "Learned Societies, Humanities Journals, and Federal Mandates." I chose the latter topic because of widespread concern about what was described as the "risky environment" in which scholarly work is currently accessed and disseminated.

Among the challenges confronted by all participants in the publishing process – the individual scholar, the academic journal publisher, and the scholarly press – are the exploding number of journals (the panelist from Blackwell Wiley pointed out that they now publish some 1500 journals), diminishing university support, declining subscriptions, and increasing demand for content that is free. In one sense, responsibility for the archiving of new knowledge has shifted from the library to publishers as library funding remains flat at best and antipathy towards publishers grows. The expectation that electronic publishing would cut costs has proven illusory, as has the hope that advertisements would cover the costs of distribution. The session ended with the suggestion that the study of knowledge production needs to become part of the foundation of graduate education.

In the formal business meeting of the next day, the most cheering report is almost always that of the Director of Fellowship Programs, Nicole A. Stahlmann. Overall, ACLS was able to award 259 domestic scholars a total of \$14.5 million, as well as another \$1 million to scholars based outside the U.S. Indicative of the attention ACLS has been paying to the so-called "jobless market" are the continuation of the New Faculty Fellows program, which offered 40 two-year appointments in higher education to candidates this year and the even newer Public Fellows Program, which placed 13 recent Ph.D.s in two-year staff positions in various government and non-profit agencies. ACLS also awarded 65 fellowships to scholars at all levels in its traditional central Fellowship Program. Delegates got a taste of the range and quality of work supported by ACLS fellowships in the reports of four scholars, at ranks from senior professor to Ph.D. candidate, on their current research projects. GSA members seeking support for research projects in all fields of humanistic study, broadly understood, are well advised to explore the opportunities available on the ACLS website, www.acls.org. Many deadlines for these competitions are soon approaching. GSA members support the work of ACLS through the dues we pay as a member society, as well as through the service of many of our members on fellowship selection panels.

After a luncheon address by James A. Leach, chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the final session of the conference was a lively forum addressing the question of “How the Humanities Help Us Understand Economic Behavior” chaired by Sewell Chan of the *New York Times*. Economic historian Alexander J. Field opened the discussion by pointing out that, at the macro level, economics affects humanities in general, while at the micro level it relates to how we behave. Historian Jonathan Levy then focused on the categories “risk” and “uncertainty” as characteristics of quantitative and qualitative approaches, respectively. Economists, he claimed, need literature to understand the panoply of human existence. Drawing on the OED definition of “science” as “Wissenschaft,” economist Deirdre McClosky also asserted the need for economists to re-engage with ethical (qualitative) as well as quantitative aspects of their objects of study, offering the term “humanomics” for a discipline that puts language at the center of its enterprise.

The Charles Homer Haskins Prize Lecture was delivered by Professor Emerita of History Joyce Appleby. Her scholarship has been characterized by attention to “how economic developments have changed perceptions about human capacities and convictions” and to the “impact of an expanding world market on people’s understanding of their society and their place in it.” In the light of concern expressed in the afternoon forum on the humanities and economics about the disappearance of economic history in economic degree programs, the presentation of this award to Professor Appleby offered a serendipitously fitting conclusion to the day’s program.

Aus deutschen Archiven GSA Archives Committee Report 2012¹

Gliederung:

- 1.) Internationaler Suchdienst (ITS) Bad Arolsen
- 2.) Offenlegung von Verschlussachen
- 3.) Bundesarchiv- und Informationsfreiheitsgesetz
- 4.) Allgemeine Situation öffentlicher Archive
- 5.) Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln
- 6.) Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach
- 7.) Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv in Weimar
- 8.) UNESCO Erklärung über Archive
- 9.) GSA Archives Committee

1.) 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 wird der ITS vom Internationalen Komitee vom Roten Kreuz (IKRK) geleitet und verwaltet. Finanziert wird die Einrichtung aus dem Haushalt des Bundesinnenministeriums.

Am 9. Dezember 2011 haben die elf Mitgliedsstaaten zwei neue Abkommen über die Aufgaben und die Administration des ITS unterzeichnet. 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 Internationale Komitee des Roten Kreuzes zieht sich Ende 2012 aus der Leitung des ITS zurück. Neuer institutioneller Partner wird das Bundesarchiv. Zugleich wurde mit der amerikanischen Historikerin Prof. Rebecca Boehling (derzeit Direktorin des Dresher Center for the Humanities an der University of Maryland Baltimore County) eine ausgewiesene Expertin für die Holocaust-Forschung, jüdische Studien und die Geschichte des „Dritten Reiches“ als neue Leiterin bestellt.

Das Archiv des Internationalen Suchdienstes in Arolsen (ITS) ist 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. Digitale

¹ The Archives Committee consists of Astrid M. Eckert, Norman Goda, William Gray, Jennifer Rodgers, Gerhard Weinberg, Meike Werner, and Rainer Hering (chair).

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 nun 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 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 Namenskartei 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). Neu übergeben wurden Teilbestände des Kindersuchdienstes und der so genannten Sachdokumente, also nicht personenbezogener Unterlagen, z.B. über die Logistik der Konzentrationslager, medizinische Experimente, den Verein „Lebensborn“ und Gerichtsprozesse der Nachkriegszeit (bisher ca. 2 Millionen Abbildungen). Zusätzlich wurden die ersten 76.000 von drei Millionen Korrespondenzfällen an die sechs Partnerorganisationen ausgehändigt. Die Digitalisierung der Korrespondenzfälle des ITS mit Überlebenden und Familienangehörigen und Behörden wird noch einige Jahre in Anspruch nehmen, da es sich um ca. 60 Millionen Blatt handelt.

Darüber hinaus sind erste Findbücher zu Archivbeständen des ITS im Internet zugänglich und umfassen Teilbereiche, die bislang nicht für die Forschung zugänglich waren. Thematisch geht es um Zwangsarbeit, Todesmärsche aus Konzentrationslagern, den Generalbauinspektor für die Reichshauptstadt und das Verwaltungsamt für innere Restitutionsen, das u. a. für die Rückerstattung von persönlichem Eigentum der Häftlinge aus ehemaligen Konzentrationslagern zu ständig war. Diese knapp 3000 Einheiten sind nach ihrer Herkunft und nach ihrem Inhalt erschlossen.

Im Frühjahr 2012 wurde ein neues Findbuch über die ITS-Bestände zum von der SS getragenen Verein „Lebensborn“ veröffentlicht. Mit 529 Akten befindet sich hier ein Großteil der insgesamt geringen Überlieferung zu dieser Organisation. Dabei handelt es sich um Reste der Vereinsunterlagen, die bei Kriegsende in Oberbayern vor der Vernichtung bewahrt werden konnten. Dazu gehören Akten der Hauptabteilung Gesundheitswesen und die Privatkorrespondenz des Lebensborn-Chefarztes und Heimleiters Gregor Ebner (1892-1974) sowie die von Heinrich Himmler unterzeichnete Vereinssatzung. 22 Akten enthalten ärztliche Statistiken und Unterlagen zum Lebensbornpersonal. Dieser Bestand, der im Sommer 1948 dem ITS vom Berlin Document Center übergeben worden war, ist bislang kaum von der Forschung genutzt worden.

Im Internet ist auch die Effektenliste zugänglich. Diese ca. 2.900 persönlichen Gegenstände, wie Brieftaschen, Fotos, Ausweispapiere und Briefe, waren den Häftlingen damals abgenommen worden. Sie stammen aus Konzentrationslagern (vornehmlich Neuengamme und Dachau sowie der Gestapo Hamburg) und sollen an Überlebende bzw. an Familienangehörige zurückgegeben werden. Im Rahmen eines eigenen Forschungsprojektes konnten 476 Effekten den Namen von ehemaligen Häftlingen zugeordnet werden. Mit der Publikation der Liste sollen der Kontaktaufnahme und die Rückgabe erleichtert werden.

Verstärkt kümmert sich der ITS um den Erhalt seiner Unterlagen: Im Jahr 2012 sollen 300.000 Dokumente aus dem Konzentrationslager Dachau entsäuert werden. Dabei handelt es sich um die zwischen 1934 und 1945 zur Registrierung der Häftlinge erstellten Dokumente (Häftlingspersonalkarten, Effektenkarten, Schreibstubenkarten). Bereits im Vorjahr wurde die Entsäuerung der Häftlingsunterlagen des Konzentrationslagers Buchenwald abgeschlossen. Insgesamt wurden seit dem Jahr 2000 2,7 von 30 Millionen Dokumenten entsäuert, um den Zerfall des säurehaltigen Papiers zu stoppen.

Das ITS wird seit der Öffnung seiner Bestände in steigendem Maße genutzt. Im Jahr 2011 wurden 12.941 Anfragen (2010: 12.981, 2009: 11.768, 2008: 10.251) gestellt. Im ersten Halbjahr 2012 gab es mit 6.889 Anfragen einen Anstieg gegenüber dem Vorjahr mit 6.492. Etwa 85 Prozent kamen von Überlebenden der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft und Familienangehörigen der Opfer, die übrigen stammen von Wissenschaftlern oder Journalisten. Das ITS wird oft von Gruppen besucht. Dafür hat es pädagogische Grundlinien entwickelt, die aufzeigen, was dort pädagogisch angeboten werden kann. Materialien für verschiedenen Jahrgangsstufen und Schulformen sowie für die außerschulische Bildung werden auf dieser Basis erarbeitet. Für alle Interessenkreise sind spezielle Rundgänge, Workshops und Vorträge erarbeitet worden.

Im November 2011 hat der ITS eine neue Gebührenordnung verabschiedet und die bisherigen Beschränkungen bei der Kopienabgabe durch die Gebührenordnung von 2010 an Forscher auch formell aufgehoben. Damit hat der ITS auf Kritik von Seiten der Forschung reagiert.

Erstmals hat der Internationale Suchdienst im Jahr 2012 ein Jahrbuch herausgegeben.² Damit unterstreicht der Suchdienst die durch die Öffnung Ende 2007 deutlich werdende Funktionswandlung von einem reinen Suchdienst für Verfolgte und Opfer des Nationalsozialismus zu einem internationalen Zentrum für Dokumentation, Information und Forschung über Verfolgung, Zwangsarbeit und Holocaust im „Dritten Reich“. Das *Jahrbuch des International Tracing Service* ist in drei Rubriken untergliedert: Im ersten allgemeinen Teil unter der Überschrift „Erkenntnisse“ werden Beiträge unterschiedlicher

² Freilegungen. Auf den Spuren der Todesmärsche. Hrsg. von Jean-Luc Blondel, Susanne Urban, Sebastian Schönemann (Jahrbuch des International Tracing Service 1). Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012. – 382 S., sw. Abb.: € 29, 90.

Autoren verschiedener Institutionen publiziert, die sich mit spezifischen Sammlungen des ITS auseinandersetzen oder diese nutzen, um pädagogische Projekte zu ermöglichen. Der thematische Schwerpunkt eines Bandes wird unter der Überschrift „Freilegungen“ gefasst. Dort wird die laufende inhaltliche Arbeit des ITS auf der Grundlegung seiner Sammlungen deutlich. Die Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler, die dort publizieren, sind Kenner der neu zugänglichen Bestände. Unter dem Titel „Nachrichten aus dem ITS“ wird über laufende Projekte berichtet. Angestrebt wird, die Kompetenzen der Partnerorganisationen zu nutzen und von ihrer Seite Aufsätze abzdrukken. Gerade der internationale Austausch ist von herausragender Bedeutung für den wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisgewinn

Der erste Band setzt sich schwerpunktmäßig mit den Todesmärschen auseinander. Aus den Archivbeständen des ITS ergeben sich neue Perspektiven auf die Todesmärsche. Gegen Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges räumten die Wachmannschaften von Konzentrationslagern ab 1944 in der Nähe der (heranrückenden) Front gelegenen Konzentrationslager und nötigten die Häftlinge zum Transport in Richtung Mitte des Deutschen Reiches. Dieser erfolgte mit der Eisenbahn oder zu Fuß. Nicht transportfähige Lagerinsassen wurden zumeist erschossen. Die oft wochen- oder monatelangen Transporte überlebten nicht alle Häftlinge. Die hier zusammengefassten 17 Aufsätze beruhen auf Vorträgen der Konferenz „Auf den Spuren der Todesmärsche: Verbrechen – Aufklärung – Erinnerung“, die im November 2011 in Bad Arolsen stattfand. Es ist sehr erfreulich, dass sie so zeitnah publiziert werden. Neben dem Forschungsstand werden übergreifende Aspekte, wie humanitäre und rechtliche Motive der alliierten Ermittlungsarbeit zu den Todesmärschen, und die Auflösung konkreter Konzentrationslager sowie die damit verbundenen Todesmärsche, z.B. KZ Flossenbürg, KZ Dachau, KZ Mauthausen, Mittelbau-Lager, KZ Neuengamme, vorgeseht. Angesichts dieses ertragreichen ersten Bandes darf auf die weiteren Jahrbücher sehr gespannt sein.

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

2.) William Gray berichtet über die Offenlegung von Verschlussachen: A New Declassification System Takes Effect

For years, research on the “old” Federal Republic has been hampered by a lack of access to classified government documents. Fortunately, new regulations go into effect as of January 1, 2013, that should allow for a large-scale declassification of West German records dating back to the 1950s, 1960s, and eventually the 1970s. It remains to be seen whether the Bundesarchiv and other relevant German archives are prepared to provide this access right away, however.

Up to the present, German archives have run two parallel registers for government documents. Unclassified materials were subject to a thirty-year deadline and could be requested when that deadline had passed; so, for example, in 2012 it became possible to see official government records from 1981. Most

of the time, the overworked archivists at the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz have not had an opportunity to prepare systematic finding aids concerning such recent material; but individual archivists have typically shown flexibility in working with researchers. Provisional delivery lists (*Abgabelisten*) from the ministries often make it possible to identify and order relevant documents.

A different situation has prevailed with respect to classified volumes (*VS-Bände*, or “*Verschlussachen*”). Documents marked “confidential,” “secret,” or “top secret” were handled in separate registries at the various West German ministries. Over the past few decades, bound volumes of classified material have been deposited at the Bundesarchiv and other relevant sites; yet the registries were kept out of view, and no arrangements were made to declassify these volumes and make them available to the public.

Some initiatives over the past several years have ameliorated this situation. A new Freedom of Information Act (*Informationsfreiheitsgesetz*) went into effect in 2006, making it possible to request small amounts of material independent of the 30-year rule (see the separate report by Astrid M. Eckert). At the Foreign Office, a special team employed by the Institut für Zeitgeschichte has been identifying and publishing several hundred classified documents for each calendar year; volumes of *Akten zur Auswärtigen Politik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* presently cover the years 1949–1953 and 1962–1981. The actual declassification is the responsibility of those ministries that created the records in the first place; since the foreign ministry’s archive is housed in the same location as the Foreign Office itself, the process is reasonably efficient. Even so, this means that other scholars must rely upon the choices made by the IfZ team; and the purview remains limited to foreign relations.

The new regulations fundamentally alter the situation. First, they create a presumption that classified material should, on principle, be declassified and made available to the public when the thirty-year-limit passes. Those agencies or ministries that wish to block the release of individual documents have a right to do so, but they must explain themselves. This leads to a second important innovation: the withdrawing agency must leave behind a record of material withdrawn. No longer will scholars face the bewildering, almost Orwellian sense that they do not know what they do not know. The withdrawal slips should, one hopes, contain enough clues so that researchers will have the ability to lodge targeted declassification requests under the German Freedom of Information Act.

There is a timetable governing the release of the classified West German material. As of 2013, documents through 1959 are to be accessible immediately. Afterwards, with each passing year a further three years’ worth of documents are to become free. This brings us up through 1962 in 2014; 1965 in 2015; 1968 in 2016; and so forth. Down the road, the release schedule will catch up with the year 1994, when all classified government documents were governed for the first time by a routine thirty-year rule.

What should researchers expect as of January 1, 2013? A few archives, such as the Political Archive of the Foreign Office, have prepared finding aids in

advance and should be in a position to open access to newly declassified files right away. Whether material from, say, the Defense Ministry (BMVg) will be this easy to obtain is less clear. A number of agencies do, of course, pose special problems; the Federal Intelligence Service (BND) and the Office for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV) will surely need to guard against revealing the identities of secret informants, even at thirty years' distance. The Interior Ministry, which is the issuing authority for the new regulations, insists that the present opening should not be thought of as a "general release," since the files will still have to be reviewed individually by the ministries before release. Assuming the deadlines are kept, historians can soon look forward to a fresh look at the inner workings of the West German state during its formative years.

For a link to the precise regulations, see:

http://www.verwaltungsvorschriften-im-internet.de/bsvwvbund_31032006_IS46065201.htm

3.) Astrid M. Eckert (Emory University) berichtet über das Bundesarchiv- und das Informationsfreiheitsgesetz:

Applying the German version of FOIA – how to avoid the price tag

Working in state archives, historians of contemporary Germany often probe the limits of accessibility to government records. With some knowledge of the legal technicalities and, above all, with the help of an archivist, researchers can at times gain access to materials that would otherwise remain closed. Access to archival materials is regulated by two main laws in Germany: the Federal Archives Law (*Bundesarchivgesetz*, BArchG) and the German version of FOIA, the Freedom of Information Law (*Informationsfreiheitsgesetz*, IFG). BArchG only covers materials emanating from the federal bureaucracy. Those emanating from state bureaucracies might be covered by IFG, provided the respective state has such a law on the books; but laws may differ from state to state.³

Papers produced by the federal bureaucracy are customarily under a 30-year rule, i.e. in 2012, you are entitled to see papers up to 1981, provided they don't carry a security classification (see William Glenn Gray's contribution in this report). If you want to view federal materials before the 30-year rule, you can file for early access. However, it makes a difference whether you file under BArchG or under IFG. Which law applies is determined by the *Aufbewahrungsfrist* (loosely translated as retention requirement) that federal agencies determine for the records they generate. These retention requirements can range from zero to 30 years. In the year that *Aufbewahrungsfrist* expires, materials move automatically under the purview of BArchG. Federal agencies might divest themselves of files before the end of *Aufbewahrungsfrist* to create space in their

³ For recent developments see Lars von Törne, "Neues Transparenzgesetz. Hamburg öffnet seine Akten, Berlin auch," *Tagesspiegel* 6/13/2012, <http://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/neues-transparenzgesetz-hamburg-oeffnet-seine-akten-berlin-auch/6747322.html>

Lars von Törne, "Hamburger Gesetz als Vorbild. Transparency: Berlin soll alle Akten offenlegen," *Tagesspiegel* 6/15/2012, <http://www.tagesspiegel.de/berlin/hamburger-gesetz-als-vorbild-transparenz-berlin-soll-alle-akten-offenlegen/6752824.html>

ministries etc. In such cases, the files are taken in by Bundesarchiv and stored in an interim facility (*Zwischenarchiv*). Although they are physically held at a Bundesarchiv facility, they are still under the purview of the federal agency's *Aufbewahrungsfrist*, i.e. they are not (yet) treated as Bundesarchiv materials.

Once the *Aufbewahrungsfrist* is over, you can file under BArchG. The archivists at Bundesarchiv will guide you through the process. How long the process will take is somewhat unpredictable since the ministry or agency that once produced these records has a say in your request. It can easily take several months. The important point: there are no fees for the users attached to this procedure.

This is different for petitions under IFG. Materials fall under IFG if they are still covered by the *Aufbewahrungsfrist* determined by the agency that has produced them. Here's the glitch: if you petition to see materials that are governed by IFG, you will be charged with the cost of the document review. How much you have to pay for processing your request is regulated in a schedule of fees (*Gebührenordnung*). You can accrue charges up to Euro 500,-. Ultimately, the fee is a matter of discretion at the institution that you petition for access; it's conceivable that a clerk might take pity on a grad student. Whether you petition under BArchG or IFG, you need to justify your request. This is customarily done with a brief summary of your research project.

As a rule of thumb: filing under BArchG is safe for you. Filing under IFG is somewhat unpredictable and can get expensive. Do the former, avoid the latter.

Further Reading:

Stefan Ittner, "Zugangsregelungen zu Archivgut in den Archivgesetzen des Bundes und der Länder," *Perspektive Bibliothek* 1:1 (2012), 196-215, available online at

<http://blog.gedenkort-t4.eu/files/2012/07/9403-10465-1-SM.pdf>

Stephan Lehnstaedt, Bastian Stemmer: "Akteneinsicht. Das Informationsfreiheitsgesetz und die Historiker," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 60:6 (2012), 493-512.

4.) Nach wie vor wirken sich die knappen Haushaltsmittel gerade in einzelnen Bundesländern negativ auf die Lage der Archive in Staat, Kirchen und Kommunen aus. Dabei bereiten vor allem die Kürzungen im Personalhaushalt den Archiven große Probleme. Archive sind durch den permanenten Zuwachs an Unterlagen Wachstumsverwaltungen, die jährlich mehr Aufgaben erhalten, auch durch die gestiegenen Benutzerzahlen. Zugleich wachsen die Anforderungen, die die Kunden an die Archive stellen. Dem stehen die sinkenden Finanzmittel gegenüber. Als Konsequenz wurde vereinzelt sogar erwogen, die bestehende gesetzliche Grundlage der archivischen Arbeit zu ändern, was die Sicherung der Überlieferung massiv gefährden würde. Insbesondere die kommunale Archivarbeit wird offenbar aus finanziellen Gründen als entbehrlich angesehen. Eine Umsetzung dieser Überlegungen würde für die historische Identität der

Bevölkerung wie für die wissenschaftliche Forschung fatale Konsequenzen haben. Im Bereich der Sicherung kirchlicher Unterlagen verhindern sinkende Kirchensteuereinnahmen einen adäquaten Ausbau des kirchlichen Archivwesens.

5.) Im Historischen Archiv der Stadt Köln gehen die Erschließungs- und Restaurierungsarbeiten kontinuierlich weiter. Derzeit sind 34 Prozent der erhaltenen Unterlagen erfasst worden. Insgesamt wird davon ausgegangen, dass die Arbeiten noch gut vierzig Jahre in Anspruch nehmen werden. Im Januar 2012 wurde der Lesesaal im Restaurierungs- und Digitalisierungszentrum wieder eröffnet. Zugänglich sind Teile der Bibliothek und der Fotosammlung sowie erste, schon restaurierte mittelalterliche Urkunden und Handschriften. Im September 2012 fand in Köln der Deutsche Archivtag statt, der unter dem Rahmenthema „Kulturelles Kapital und ökonomisches Potential - Zukunftskonzepte für Archive“ stand.

6.) 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. Die Bestände sind bis 1998 in Zettelkatalogen und Bestandslisten nachgewiesen, seit 1999 in der Datenbank. Im Museum finden regelmäßig instruktive Ausstellungen statt.

Das Deutsche Literaturarchiv Marbach kümmert sich in jahrzehntelanger Tradition gerade um literarische und intellektuelle Exilnachsätze. Die Erwerbung und Erforschung der Bestände von Emigranten hängt unmittelbar mit der Gründungsgeschichte des Deutschen Literaturarchivs nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg zusammen. Mit Nachlässen und Sammlungen von Hannah Arendt, Siegfried Kracauer, Kurt Pinthus, Kurt Tucholsky, Carl Zuckmayer und vielen anderen verfügt das Deutsche Literaturarchiv Marbach über die weltweit bedeutendsten Bestände zur Exilforschung. Dazu zählen auch die Bestände von Wissenschaftlern, die in die USA auswanderten oder ins Exil getrieben wurden, darunter die bedeutenden Nachlässe von Erich Auerbach, Bernhard Blume, Curt von Faber du Faur, Erich von Kahler, Victor Lange, Wolfgang Paulsen, Heinz Politzer, Arno Schirokauer und Werner Vordtriede. Der Aufbau eines Amerikanischen Freundeskreises, eine Marbacher Tagung zur Geschichte der US-Germanistik und die umgesetzten Empfehlungen

des Wissenschaftsrats 2007 zum Ausbau der internationalen Zusammenarbeit haben 2010 die Anbahnung von fünf wichtigen Erwerbungen aus dem Kontext der US-Emigration vor und nach 1945 ermöglicht.⁴ Die notwendige Sichtung der US-Bestände im April 2011 wird mit Hilfe des Amerikanischen Freundeskreises möglich.

Unter den wissenschaftlichen Vorlässen, die auf diese Weise in Marbach gesichert werden können, befinden sich u. a. die Bestände von Prof. Dr. Egon Schwarz, geb. 1922 in Wien, flüchtete 1938 als Jude mit seinen Eltern über Prag und Paris nach Südamerika, arbeitete als Wanderarbeiter in Bolivien, Chile und Ecuador. Anschließend studierte er Jura, später Germanistik und Romanistik. Er hatte Professuren an der Harvard University und der Washington University inne, sowie Gastprofessuren an Universitäten in Amerika, Europa und Neuseeland. Egon Schwarz ist korrespondierendes Mitglied der Deutschen Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung und Mitglied des P.E.N.-Zentrums deutschsprachiger Autoren im Ausland. Er gilt als einer der wichtigsten Vermittler deutschsprachiger Literatur und Kultur in den Vereinigten Staaten.

Prof. Dr. Walter Sokel, 1917 in Wien geboren, war zu Beginn des Jahres 1938 Student der Romanistik und Kunstgeschichte. Im März 1938 gelang es ihm, über Italien und die Schweiz in die USA zu fliehen. Er verdingte sich zunächst als Laufbursche an der Wall Street, erhielt dann dank eines Empfehlungsschreibens von Thomas Mann ein Stipendium. Er studierte zuerst Philosophie und Geschichte und setzte seine Studien an der Columbia University in Germanistik und Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaften fort. Als international renommierter Kafka-Experte lehrte er schließlich u. a. an der Stanford University. Spät ehrte ihn auch die Republik Österreich mit dem Ehrenkreuz für Wissenschaft und Kunst.

Auf Initiative des Deutschen Literaturarchivs Marbach, des Rosenzweig Minerva Research Center (Jerusalem) und der Universität Bonn wird eine Koordinationsstelle zur Erforschung deutsch-jüdischer Nachlässe in Israel eingerichtet. Sie soll einen wichtigen Beitrag zum Erhalt bedeutender Zeugnisse jüdischer Immigranten deutscher und mitteleuropäischer Herkunft in Israel leisten. Die Einrichtung der Koordinationsstelle wird in einer Pilotphase durch finanzielle Unterstützung des Auswärtigen Amtes ermöglicht.

Die Förderung durch das Auswärtige Amt ist ein weiteres Element der Kooperation mit israelischen Partnern, so etwa mit der Holocaust-Gedenkstätte Yad Vashem auf der Grundlage eines 2012 unterzeichneten Abkommens der Bundesrepublik Deutschland mit dem Staat Israel zur Unterstützung der Arbeit in der Gedenkstätte. Das Deutsche Literaturarchiv Marbach wirkt als Träger der Koordinationsstelle und gewährleistet die Beratung nach internationalen Kriterien.

Gemeinsam mit israelischen Forscherkollegen soll ein Überblick über

⁴ Vgl. den Tagungsbericht von Jürgen Kaube: Berichte aus der Zukunft: die Auslandsgermanistik. In: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung vom 30. Juni 2010.

noch unerschlossene Bestände von jüdischen Autoren, Wissenschaftlern und Intellektuellen aus Mitteleuropa, die während der NS-Zeit nach Israel emigriert sind, gewonnen werden. Schätzungen von Experten gehen von ca. fünfzig in Israel vorhandenen Beständen von zentraler Bedeutung aus, die sich zum Teil in privater Hand und zum Teil in Antiquariaten befinden.

Aufgabe der Forschungsstelle, die zum 1. September 2012 eingerichtet werden soll, ist die sorgfältige Sondierung, die Aufnahme von Gesprächen mit Erben, Sammlern und Forschern sowie die Koordination zwischen den einzelnen Archiven und Forschungsinstitutionen, den bestehenden Kibbuz- und Gemeindearchiven, den Verbänden und Museen. Die Forschungsstelle wird mit Erschließungsmitteln ausgestattet, die nach dem Projektprinzip an bestehende Einrichtungen vergeben werden. Über die Projektlaufzeit hinaus sollen wissenschaftliche, möglichst digitale Benutzbarkeit und konservatorische Standards in den jeweiligen Institutionen gewährleistet werden.

Ziel des Projekts ist es, deutschsprachige Autorenbibliotheken, Sammlungen und Manuskripte, die nach Israel gerettet werden konnten, für die internationale Forschung zugänglich zu machen. Die Literatur- und Ideengeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts, aber auch die Kanonforschung und die Exilforschung dürfen sich davon einzigartige und bislang unbekannte Quellenbestände versprechen.

Die Ergebnisse des Projekts sollen auf einem internationalen Symposium im Deutschen Literaturarchiv Marbach voraussichtlich im Juni 2013 vorgestellt werden.

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>.

7.) Das Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv in Weimar ist nach dreijähriger Sanierungsarbeit in Weimar wieder eröffnet worden. Es ist das älteste Literaturarchiv in Deutschland. Das Archiv verwahrt mehr als 130 Nachlässe von Schriftstellern, Gelehrten, Philosophen, Komponisten und bildenden Künstlern, 14 Archive von Verlagen, Vereinen und literarischen Gesellschaften (u.a. der Goethe-Gesellschaft, des Insel Verlags Leipzig und der Deutschen Schillerstiftung) sowie eine Autographensammlung, in der ca. 3.000 Autoren vertreten sind. Aufgrund seines Bestandsprofils hat das Archiv den Charakter eines zentralen Archivs der deutschsprachigen Literatur des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts. Der Nachlass Goethes wurde 2001 von der UNESCO in das kulturelle Gedächtnis der Menschheit -Fundus Memory of the World aufgenommen. Nähere Informationen unter: <http://www.klassik-stiftung.de/einrichtungen/goethe-und-schiller-archiv/>

8.) Das International Council on Archives hat eine Erklärung über Archive verabschiedet, die von der UNESCO auf ihrer 36. Generalversammlung übernommen worden ist und auch von den deutschsprachigen Archivverbänden vertreten wird:

WELTWEITE ALLGEMEINE ERKLÄRUNG ÜBER ARCHIVE

Archive dokumentieren und bewahren Entscheidungen, Handlungen und Erinnerungen. Archive stellen ein einzigartiges, unersetzliches kulturelles Erbe dar, das von Generation zu Generation weitergegeben wird. Archivgut wird von seiner Entstehung an so verwaltet, dass sein Wert und seine Aussagekraft erhalten bleiben. Als zuverlässige Informationsquelle stärkt Archivgut rechenschaftsfähiges und transparentes Verwaltungshandeln. Die Archive spielen eine wesentliche Rolle für die gesellschaftliche Entwicklung, da sie das individuelle und das kollektive Gedächtnis sichern und unterstützen. Der freie Zugang zu Archiven bereichert unser Wissen über die menschliche Gesellschaft, fördert die Demokratie, schützt die Bürgerrechte und verbessert die Lebensqualität.

Aus diesen Überlegungen heraus bekennen wir uns zu

– **dem einzigartigen Charakter** von Archivgut als zuverlässiger Dokumentation administrativen, kulturellen und intellektuellen Handelns und Spiegel gesellschaftlicher Entwicklungen;

– **der Unersetzlichkeit** von aktuellem und archiviertem Schriftgut für die effektive Abwicklung geschäftlicher Vorgänge, für Rechenschaftsfähigkeit und Transparenz, für den Schutz der Bürgerrechte, die Konstituierung des individuellen und kollektiven Gedächtnisses, die Erforschung der Vergangenheit und die Dokumentation der Gegenwart im Hinblick auf zukünftiges Handeln;

– **der Vielfalt** der Archive, die jede Form menschlicher Betätigung nachvollziehbar macht;

– **der Vielfalt der Archivaliengattungen** in den Archiven, zu denen Dokumente in Papierform, in digitalem oder audiovisuellem Format oder anderen Typs zählen;

– **der Rolle der Archivarinnen und Archive**, die als erfahrene Fachleute mit einschlägiger Ausbildung und kontinuierlicher Fortbildung ihrer Gesellschaft dienen, indem sie bei der Aktenentstehung beraten und Akten bewerten, aufbewahren und der Nutzung zugänglich machen;

– **der kollektiven Verantwortung aller** – der Bürger/innen, der öffentlichen Verwaltungen und Entscheidungsträger/innen, öffentlicher oder privater Archivträger/innen, der Archivar/innen und der Fachkräfte für Information bzw. Informationsdienstleister/innen – für die Verwaltung und Führung von Archiven.

Daher verpflichten wir uns zur Zusammenarbeit, damit:

– angemessene nationale Richtlinien und Gesetze zum Archivwesen verabschiedet und umgesetzt werden;

– die Verwaltung von Archivgut aller privaten und öffentlichen Einrichtungen, die bei der Erledigung ihrer Aufgaben Archive anlegen und nutzen, ihrem Wert entsprechend geschätzt und fachlich kompetent durchgeführt wird;

– die erforderlichen Ressourcen für eine angemessene Verwaltung der Archive, inklusive qualifizierten Personals, bereitgestellt werden;

– Archivgut so verwaltet und erhalten wird, dass seine Authentizität, Vertrauenswürdigkeit, Integrität und Nutzbarkeit gesichert ist;

– Archivgut für jedermann zugänglich ist – unter Beachtung der entsprechenden

Gesetze sowie der Rechte von Einzelpersonen, Urhebern/Urheberinnen, Eigentümern/Eigentümerinnen und Nutzern/Nutzerinnen von Archivgut; _ Archive dazu beitragen, das staatsbürgerliche Verantwortungsbewusstsein zu fördern.

9.) 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)

GSA Website Recognized

The redesign of the GSA website recently won honorable mention in the Website/Association category of the 2012 MarCom awards. The Johns Hopkins University Press Journals Marketing Department submitted the site for the award in this international competition which recognizes outstanding creative achievement by marketing and communication professionals. There were over 6,000 entries from throughout the United States, Canada, and several other countries in the 2012 competition, which featured a number of categories.

Grants, Awards, and Related Announcements

Max Kade Center for Contemporary German Literature at Washington University, St. Louis

I: DLA-Weekend Seminar in Marbach

Fifteen DLA travel grants (up to Euro 1000 each) for advanced U.S. or Canadian graduate students, post docs, and assistant professors participating in the weekend seminar on the topic of “*Neue ostdeutsche Literatur*” from **June 6-8, 2013** in the Deutsche Literaturarchiv (DLA) in Marbach/Germany. The seminar will be taught by **Birgit Dahlke**, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, on books by **Durs Grünbein**, **Lutz Seiler**, **Christoph Hein**, **Angela Krauss**, and **Christa Wolf**. Durs Grünbein and Angela Krauss will do readings during the seminar. Further lecture by the publishing expert **Petra Hardt** (Suhrkamp, Berlin). Room and board during the seminar will be covered by the DLA. The seminar is organized in connection with the Suhrkamp-Forschungskolleg at the DLA and is supported by the State Government of Baden-Württemberg. **Application deadline: 15 March 15 2013**. Email application to: Prof. Paul Michael Lützel, Washington University in St. Louis: jahrbuch@wustl.edu

II: Summer Research Grants

--**Two DAAD Grants (Euro 2500 each, which is about \$3.200 depending on the exchange rate)** for U.S. or Canadian professors of German (all levels) or dissertation candidates working in the field of contemporary German literature to do research in the Contemporary German Literature Collection at Washington University's Olin Library.

--**One Max Kade Grant (\$3500)** for a U.S. or Canadian Ph.D. candidate working on a dissertation in the field of contemporary German literature to do research in the Contemporary German Literature Collection at Washington University's Olin Library.

The application deadline is **15 March 2013**. The grants cover a period of between 4 and 6 weeks and research would have to be done during the time between the middle of May and the middle of August 2013. Please send a CV and a short description of your research project or dissertation topic. Phd. candidates have to add a recommendation from the dissertation adviser. Email all applications to: Prof. Paul Michael Lützel at Washington University in St. Louis: jahrbuch@wustl.edu

www.linguaealive.ca

free student peer-to-peer language tandem website open for all instructors to use

www.LinguaeLive.ca is expanding and has space for more registered users. This web tool was soft-launched as an SSHRC grant-funded, educational service project in September 2011 by Jennifer Ruth Hosek, Associate Professor in Languages, Literatures and Cultures at Queen's University in Ontario.

LinguaeLive.ca allows any instructor to connect with colleagues teaching complementary language classes across the globe. These instructors can then link their students for peer-to-peer communication. LinguaeLive.ca helps students improve their language and cultural skills and make connections abroad.

The self-explanatory website includes introductory, how-to, and case study videos.

The LinguaeLive team that includes web engineer Andy Stevko, Queen's Japanese instructor Mayu Takasaki, Martin Luther Universität English instructor Marjorie Willey, and several student volunteers, hopes that you and your colleagues use LinguaeLive to facilitate peer-to-peer exchange and enrich your students' learning.

In addition to checking out the site, these short videos clarify the project:

Introductory Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MGFaVTiSkQ>

Instructional Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gRpkvuxLwwQ>

Case Study: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y0EC-TIAy9A>

If you have questions, please contact admin@linguaealive.ca or Jennifer Hosek directly at jhosek@queensu.ca

Also, please help spread the word to your colleagues on both sides of language divides. Consider forwarding the relevant texts below. Currently the group is focusing on contacting instructors whose complementary language pairs are German-English, Japanese-English, Spanish-English, and French-English.

We hope that you find LinguaeLive.ca very helpful for your language teaching and learning.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hosek, Mayu Takasaki, Andy Stevko, and the LinguaeLive volunteers

LinguaeLive ist ein kostenloses Web-Tool. Es gibt Lehrenden die Möglichkeit, ihre Lernenden untereinander zu verbinden und ihre Sprachen gegenseitig in Tandems zu üben.

LinguaeLive erlaubt es jedem Lehrenden sich mit seinen Kollegen, die die Komplementsprache unterrichten, über den gesamten Globus zu verbinden. Diese können dann ihre Lerner für Peer-to-Peer-Kommunikation miteinander verlinken. Dank der Förderung der SSHRC ist die Website kostenlos

und offen für alle, die interessiert sind. LinguaeLive.ca kann ihren Lernenden dabei helfen, ihre sprachlichen und kulturellen Fähigkeiten zu verbessern und Kontakte im Ausland zu finden.

Neben dem Besuchen unserer Website können diese Videos Ihnen einen besseren Überblick über das Projekt geben:

Einführung: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MGFaVTiSkQ>

Anleitung: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gRpkvuxLwwQ>

Fallstudie: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y0EC-TIAy9A>

Sollten Sie Fragen haben, können Sie uns unter admin (at) linguaeLive.ca erreichen, oder Jennifer Hosek auf unter jhosek (at) queensu.ca.

Wir hoffen, dass Sie LinguaeLive als sehr hilfreich für Sprachunterricht und Sprachlernen empfinden werden.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

Jennifer Hosek, Mayu Takasaki, Andy Stevko, und Freiwillige des Linguae-Live-Projektes

Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen (SDAW)

The Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen (SDAW) has just issued its “Call for Proposals 2013.” SDAW is prepared to fund research groups composed of German and North American scholars, and, where appropriate, other European scholars, who propose to explore topics of particular relevance to the transatlantic relationship. Research projects may focus on international or domestic topics; comparisons with cases outside the US-European context are welcome, as are proposals that seek to open up new methodological approaches.

Please find our CfP online at http://stiftung.stiferverband.info/t260/sdaw_2013_call_for_proposals.pdf and at <http://www.sdaw.net>.

The closing date for the receipt of proposals is **31 March 2013**.

Issues and Discussions in German Studies

In eigener Sache: Roundtable on Our History – From WAGS to GSA, 1980s and 1990s

[In 2011, on the occasion of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the Western Association for German Studies (WAGS), the predecessor of the German Studies Association, Professor Katherine Roper moderated a special roundtable on the early history of WAGS and its transformation into the GSA in 1982. Several members who were active in those years provided their recollections, which we published in the winter 2011-12 issue. This year, looking toward the fortieth anniversary in 2016, Professor Roper again moderated a roundtable on the history of the GSA, this time focusing on the “middle years from the mid-1980s to the end of the 1990s. We are pleased to publish the recollections of this year’s roundtable participants, Professors Evan Bukey, Patricia Herminghouse, Konrad Jarausch, and Frank Trommler.]

WAGS/GSA in the 1980s and 1990s

Evan B. Bukey

University of Arkansas

When asked to participate in a roundtable discussion of the middle years of the German Studies Association, I was reluctant to accept. There were two reasons: First, in clearing my faculty office upon retirement in 2008, I discarded thirty years of GSA newsletters and a substantial collection of official and unofficial correspondence. Second, while it is true that I served as a member of the Executive Committee between 1988 and 1991, I was much more active as a charter member of the Western Association of German Studies, serving in 1980 as a Session Director for the Wichita convention, in 1981 for the Seattle meeting, and in 1982 as Program Director for one of our more exciting conferences in El Paso. With that in mind, Kathy Roper and Gerry Fetz suggested that I share my personal recollections of WAGS with emphasis on convention details and problems encountered in the transition in 1983 to the German Studies Association. What follows, therefore, is an exercise in memory, supplanted by hard data published in the Winter 2011-12 GSA Newsletter.

In late August 1977, I received a telephone call from a now deceased colleague, Karl Magyar, then teaching Political Science at the American Graduate School of International Management in Glendale, Arizona. Karl asked if I could present a paper at meeting of the newly organized Western Association of German Studies at Arizona State University on 21-22 October. Having just

completed a short essay on the origins and early history of the Nazi party in Linz, Austria, I jumped at the chance. Together with my colleague, Robert Monson, who later escaped Arkansas to head the German desk at the Central Intelligence Agency, I flew from the Ozarks to Phoenix where we met Karl and Gerald R. Kleinfeld, a handsome youngster who bore a striking resemblance to either Salvador Dali or Kaiser Wilhelm II.

What I recall about the inaugural WAGS convention was a tremendous sense of excitement, not least because it occurred within days of the storming of the hijacked Lufthansa 737 in Mogadishu by West German commandos of the Bundesgrenzschutz 9. More fundamentally, however, was the chance to meet and interact with colleagues teaching in remote or far flung institutions west of the Mississippi. Nearly all of us were young, had spent several years studying at German or Austrian universities, but now found ourselves marooned outside the German-speaking world. In an age before the internet our sources of information about Central European affairs were confined largely to the North American edition of *Die Zeit*, the *Österreich Bericht*, or irregular, crackling, short-wave broadcasts of the *Deutsche Welle*. Suddenly, WAGS provided an opportunity to discuss the most recent literature, our own research, and to catch up on current developments in the German states.

My recollections of our first convention do not differ much with those of Ron Smelser, Jerry Fetz, and Chris Browning, as discussed last year and now available in the latest GSA Newsletter. What sticks in my mind is an address by Hans Buchheim predicting German unification within a decade or so. Few took him seriously at the time, but he was right, and we were wrong. I also recall meeting Chris Browning, who graciously introduced himself and presented a fascinating paper on Ribbentrop and the Holocaust. While Chris and I never worked together, I share his view that over the years WAGS and GSA provided a venue where our papers were welcomed and “respectively received.”

To this day I regret missing the fabled convention at Snowbird, but have attended all but a handful of WAGS/GSA meetings for over three decades. The 1979 Stanford conference was masterfully guided by Agnes Peterson, ably assisted by Gordon Craig holding court in an outdoor patio. According to Ron Smelser, there were twenty formal sessions as well as several faculty seminars conducted by Winfried Kudszus and Peter Loewenberg. As for myself, Harry Ritter of Western Washington State University eviscerated a paper I presented on the February 1934 Austrian Civil War. The experience wasn't pleasant, but it was both salutary and indicative that the Western Association of German Studies was developing into a serious academic conference.

Looking back on WAGS, veteran members have called attention to a sense of intimacy and congeniality prevailing at annual meetings as well as the interdisciplinary nature of most of the panels. As Marion Deshmukh writes, “papers were encouraged from *Germanisten*, historians, political scientists, art

historians, musicologists, and philosophers.” What that meant in practice were a series of exciting, syncretic, and occasionally truly odd-ball panels. At the Wichita meeting, for example I found myself struggling to present a coherent commentary in a session that had included one paper on Ludwig Wittgenstein and another on the reception of country and western music in West Germany. While these panels later come under heavy fire from newcomers as slipshod or “non-professional,” there was a solid reason for this “scissors and paste” approach. This was because very few organized panels were submitted to the convention organizers. There were notable exceptions, but for the most part those proposing papers did so on an individual basis, leaving session directors with the challenging task of pasting together often disparate essays. As a consequence, most sessions were perforce interdisciplinary, particularly in the fields of history and literature. These panels also presented commentators with a challenging task of seeking common ground and providing something approaching a global perspective to those present.

To my mind the Western Association of German Studies came of age in 1982 at El Paso. This was because scholars from of all three German states participated with their North American colleagues for the first time in a common forum. There is a mistaken notion that the Austrians were late comers, but they were present at the creation and have sent strong delegations ever since. It is true that prior to the Waldheim affair Viennese academic officials ritualistically claimed they were not German, to which Gerry Kleinfeld responded by asking if a distinctly Austrian language was spoken in the Alpine Republic. There then followed lengthy, though successful “under the table” negotiations with Ferdinand von Trauttmansdorf in the Austrian embassy in Washington or the head of at the Austrian Cultural Institute in New York. As for the West Germans, they supported the organization with great enthusiasm from the outset sending representatives from their Embassy in Washington, the DAAD, and if memory serves me correctly, the Goethe Institute. Here I should also pay tribute to Erich Pohl, a charter member from the University of Heidelberg, who has been a regular participant and attendee since 1977 but for personal reasons cannot be with us today. Among the most prominent German scholars from the Federal Republic present at El Paso were Hans Mommsen and Manfred Messerschmidt, the head of the Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt in Freiburg.

Messerschmidt’s participation was particularly significant because it provided a link to WAGS/GSA that would enable authors and editors of the multi-volume *Das Deutsche Reich und der Zweite Weltkrieg* to present their findings in a non-hostile forum for the next twenty-five years. Messerschmidt’s appearance was also notable because it occurred near Fort Bliss, at that time one of the largest Luftwaffe bases in the world. As my own father had been stationed at Fort Bliss during the Second World War, it was an odd sensation to touch down among so many military aircraft emblazoned with the Cross of Iron. However,

it must have seemed even more bizarre to Hans Schleier and Wolfgang Küttler arriving from the German Democratic Republic. Their appearance had been arranged by Georg Iggers, my dying doctoral advisor, Andreas Dorpalen, and to a lesser extent, by myself as Convention Director. Those attending the session on “Die Geschichtswissenschaft in der DDR” will surely recall a lively discussion, followed by a contentious exchange between Küttler and Michael Kater during which an exasperated Küttler blurted out: “Was Sie machen, Herr Kater, ist immer eine Provokation!” Once the dust had settled, however, the atmosphere became more civil. More importantly, a precedent had been established that enabled East German scholars to participate in WAGS/GSA conferences until the collapse of the GDR.

Before closing, allow me to say a few words as requested about the decision to go national in 1983. My response is that I supported the decision at the time and would do so again. Indeed, some of the most stimulating conferences occurred during the so-called middle years, most notably in 1990 at Buffalo in which Peter Hoffmann interviewed Gräfin von Moltke and two survivors of the White Rose Society including Traute Page Lafrenz, Sophie Scholl’s closest friend. Still, it is indisputable that the transition to the German Studies Association came at a cost of what Jerry Fetz calls a sense of “informality and intimacy” that had characterized meetings between 1977 and 1983. In my own view, however, it was a slow, gradual process that did not really manifest itself until the advent of monster conferences in the past decade. The transition also produced a bifurcation of panels that a number of Germanisten have come to lament. This unintended consequence may be due to the liquidation of ad hoc “scissors and paste” panels as well as to the gradual Balkanization of scholarship that now prevails throughout the academic community. Whatever the reason, the present leaders of the German Studies Association may wish to explore this problem at length and seek ways to correct it. If they succeed, those of us who helped found and organize the Western Association of German Studies will be forever grateful.

The GSA in Its “Middle Years”: Mid-1980s and 1990s

Patricia Herminghouse

University of Rochester

Unlike the old-timers, who experienced – and shaped – the formative years of GSA in its first incarnation as WAGS, my experiences with GSA do not cover even the entire period 1980-2000. My first GSA conference was the 1988 meeting in Philadelphia, where I was immediately struck by the variety and quality of the papers and the difference that having good commentators made in what one got out of the sessions. I had grown somewhat jaded about many of the papers I had been hearing at other conferences, where I often had the feeling that people just threw something together in order to “see and be seen.” But at GSA there was also a real sensation of “die Qual der Wahl” as I found myself dithering between panels more closely related to my own interests and the chance to hear, for example, historians whose work I had only read. For the same reason, I also enjoyed the luncheons and banquet for the way one could simply land at a table of interesting new faces – or catch up with an old friend or two. I was smitten by the human dimension of it all. That was when the conference proudly offered 80 sessions – and now with almost 320 sessions, the human dimension is still cultivated.

By 1989 in Milwaukee – and this was typical of GSA’s way of trying to draw in new people, I think -- I was already serving as moderator of one session and commentator for another on the search for “An American Agenda for German Studies.” GSA had also just published its “Guidelines for German Studies Programs” in 1987, but the sense of crisis in the field that such initiatives sought to address had been ongoing since the 1970s. Enrollments had been dropping precipitously and many German departments were responding by identifying themselves as Departments of German Studies, whether in substance or title only. The term “Germanistik” was coming to represent what many Germanists no longer sought to identify with. Indicative, however, of how shallow the transformation often was is that when GSA members were asked in a mid-90s survey about practices in and attitudes towards “German Studies,” the most popular multiple-choice answer to the question “What do you understand by the term ‘German Studies?’” was “When the German department teaches in English”!

At this point, I also began to sense certain uneasiness on the part of historian members of GSA about being overrun by Germanisten. In fact, when I once asked a GSA officer why it is that hardly any historians ever attend a Germanist session, whereas Germanists are glad for the opportunity to attend history sessions, the reply was “Historians work on important, real material, but

Germanists seem mostly interested in spinning frivolous theory without much connection to ‘reality’.” At that time the interdisciplinary networks of recent years, which seem to have done a better job of integrating the disciplines, did not yet exist, but as Elizabeth Steding documented at this conference in her paper on the GDR as a topic during the thirty-five-year history of the GSA, multi- or interdisciplinary scholarly approaches to the GDR have enjoyed a significant presence in the annual conferences from the very beginning. Probably it was the very strangeness/unfamiliarity of this new territory, with which the U.S. only recognized and established diplomatic relations in 1974, that gave special impetus to interdisciplinary approaches.

The disciplinary disconnect also manifested itself in resistance to the costs of conference AV equipment typically requested by Germanists, who were vigorously branching out into study of the visual and musical arts, especially film. Gerry Kleinfeld took some steps to relieve the stress this situation caused by purchasing a few overhead projectors in order to reduce the budget damage done by rental of this equipment at the hotel; David Barclay subsequently realized the need to expand this equipment by purchasing LCD projectors and designating specific AV rooms at each conference.

Given the February deadline for submitting October conference proposals, the 1989 conference, held here in Milwaukee, was somewhat handicapped in its ability to react to the sudden changes in the political atmosphere leading to the fall of the Berlin wall and, ultimately, to unification. Almost from the very beginning of GSA (the WAGS years), however, there had been a significant component of papers or sessions devoted to the GDR. By the time of the 1990 conference in Buffalo, a large number of sessions featured analyses of the changed, but still roiling political landscape in Germany. It may have just been paranoid on our part, but many participants in these sessions had the distinct impression that planeloads of West German experts had been flown in to be sure we got the correct take on these events and resentments simmered in a few sessions. It was not directed at the presence of German colleagues as such, but at the “belehrender Ton” of some of the “experts.” In fact, part of the great appeal of GSA for North American-based scholars of German-speaking Europe has been the chance to interact with colleagues from abroad – and now not just from Europe – without having to undertake an overseas journey. Their presence was definitely an important aspect of GSA for me.

When I began presenting papers at GSA, I was sometimes puzzled to notice that the session I was presenting in was designated as being sponsored by the Ständiger Ausschuss Deutsch als Fremdsprache (StADaF). We certainly got no stipend and I wondered how we had been selected for this particular distinction. It was only after I was elected to the Executive Committee (now known as the Board) in 1993 that Gerry Kleinfeld explained to me that “sponsoring sessions” was the vehicle by which the German government could lend much-needed

financial support to the conference program. It was not long, however, until the German authorities decided – quite properly in my own opinion – that StADaF should be concentrating its support on the organization that was directly focused on the teaching of German as a foreign language, the AATG, whereas DAAD operated to the benefit of education at the post-secondary level, including, for example, the prizes it annually sponsors for the authors of excellent books and articles and the establishment of visiting scholars at American institutions.

It was not long, however, before Gerry had worked out another unique mechanism to replace the lost StADaF funding and to begin to put GSA on a more secure financial footing. For three years in a row, even though members were no longer presenting in “sponsored” sessions, some conference attendees were surprised to find generous checks in their registration packages, accompanied by a note asking that the recipient please donate, on the spot, at least half of the “award” back to GSA. The funds were granted to GSA as an expression of thanks for post-World War II U.S. support (Marshall Plan) and constituted an important foundation for the long-term health of GSA and its conference. For three years, checks flew back and forth across the registration table and thus was created the core of what is now the GSA Endowment. It was initially used to support travel to GSA by scholars from abroad who could not obtain funding from their home institutions. The travel fund is still maintained, but by now the Endowment is also being grown so that that it can support, at least in part, the eventual need for a more solid foundation for the operations of GSA itself.

My three-year term on the Executive Committee was abruptly cut short after two years, just as Jennifer Michaels of Grinnell College was about to assume office as the first woman president of GSA in 1995. In last year’s panel on the early history of GSA/WAGS, Ron Smelser revealed how the first officers of WAGS came into power: by drawing straws – and indeed that same mechanism was employed once again to remove me from the Executive Committee when it was discovered that by some fluke there was one more Germanist than historian on the committee – another little reminder of the anxiety some seemed to feel about the swelling presence of Germanists in the organization. My exile was short-lived because the events of 1989, alongside factors such as the proliferation of German Departments being renamed Departments of German Studies -- with or without some change in their disciplinary orientation -- made a revision of the 1987 GSA Guidelines for the Curricular Organization of German Programs seem increasingly urgent, and I was tasked with chairing a committee to bring them up to date. This also offered me a delightful taste of what those early WAGS meetings were like: at the end of a hard day’s work around Gerry’s kitchen table, we were dispatched to his backyard to pick limes for our margaritas while he stirred up the salsa.

It was not just the Preamble of the old Guidelines, which spoke confidently of the GDR as “a major industrial power in COMECON and a vital component

of the Warsaw Pact,” that had come to seem outdated. The 1987 document – and in this it accorded with expert opinion at the time – suggested that we would be facing a shortfall of academics to replace the first postwar generation of scholars, who would be retiring in the 1980s. It did, however, correctly predict a concomitant move to a more pragmatic/practical orientation in the study and teaching of things German. Younger scholars in particular had begun voting with their intellectual energies out of the perceived disciplinary isolation of “Germanistik” into programs, such as film studies, gender studies, gay and lesbian studies – fields that tend to locate themselves under the umbrella of cultural studies. But perhaps just as importantly, the revised Guidelines, which were finally published by GSA in 1998 after wide consultation with representatives of all the fields represented in our organization, insisted on an understanding of and respect for the scholarly standards of cognate fields and advocated a model of German Studies that was integrative, not merely additive. I’ve had a hard time, however, judging how influential the new Guidelines have been in shaping the field. It might be that another revision will soon be in order, one that reflects the transnational and international shifts that have since taken place.

In trying to reconstruct these pieces of the history of GSA in the 80s and 90s, I was somewhat handicapped by the fact that I had given all of my GSA files and records to David Barclay when he assumed the position of GSA Executive Director and set out to build a central GSA archive. Jerry Fetz kindly provided me with some data on the period up until my stint on the Executive Committee. As we seek to understand and record our history, I would plead for greater speed in digitizing all of the major documents of our history: not only all program books, but also all newsletters and – importantly – all minutes. They will serve as valuable documents for future scholars seeking to understand the history and development of our fields.

Remarks on the History of the GSA

Konrad H. Jarausch

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

I offer these recollections with a sense of self-irony, since retrospectives are a senior citizen's preserve and I am not yet used to playing that role. But I consider historical memory important as a spur to self-reflection. Academic life has become so fast paced that origins are often forgotten, though they sometimes create a path dependency which cannot be explained otherwise. These remarks are based only on what I most remember rather than on a perusal of correspondence. A more empirically grounded account can be found in the special issue on "Contemporary History as Transatlantic Project: The German Problem, 1960-2010" in Supplement No. 24 of *Historical Social Research*, which contains an academic autobiography.

1. *Personal involvement:* Though I was aware of the founding of the GSA, I was not present at its creation, because I did not feel as cut off as many Western colleagues in small colleges. I heard about the momentous event from David Hackett, a graduate school friend in El Paso, who expressed considerable excitement about the new model of interdisciplinarity, necessary in order to assemble a critical mass of scholars out West. During the first meeting which I attended at Wichita, I was impressed by the lively discussions, the number of German visitors and openness to scholars of all levels, making this a conference of first resort for recent PhDs. Fairly quickly I was drawn into leadership role, since the council searched for historian west of the Mississippi, and my position at the University of Missouri qualified.

2. *Geographic scope:* During the run-up to my presidency the central question for the association was the choice between remaining regional or going national. I was a strong supporter of an extension to the national level, because the German Studies model seemed too important to leave it merely in the West and deprive the rest of the country of that potential interaction. I understood the fears of some colleagues that they might be crowded out by elite scholars from the Ivy League and major state universities in the East, and was therefore in favor of retaining some safeguards. We had heated discussions on the board about this question, but eventually a majority was convinced. In doing so we transcended the example of disciplinary conferences such as French Historical Studies, and come closer to the interdisciplinary British Studies model. I remember the first Eastern conference in Washington, D.C. as a great success, since there was a reception at the embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany and the greater closeness to politics confirmed the correctness of the decision. Nonetheless the *German Studies Review* and

Executive Director Gerry Kleinfeld stayed out West at Arizona State University and the principle of broad access was also maintained. The nationalization of the association made it easier to acquire funding for its initiatives. As a result the GSA conference quickly became the leading meeting place for scholars from Germany and the US as well as for members of different disciplines.

3. *Interdisciplinarity problem:* A second task during the mid-1980s was the attempt to create German Studies guidelines in order to fill the shell of *Deutschlandstudien* with content beyond providing glorified *Landeskunde*. Gerry Kleinfeld played a crucial role through invitations to Tempe with left-over DAAD funds in January – delightful place at that time of year. This was a serious intellectual attempt to discuss different disciplinary approaches and to fashion a new curriculum. We debated the creation of a model of courses combining different disciplines, getting historians to take literature or culture courses and making the literature and theory specialists to overcome their fears of history. On a local level we had some success in implementing these guidelines, for instance at the University of North Carolina, where we created a second track within the German major, and instituted a seminar on post-war history and culture as a capstone course, team-taught by a *Germanist* (Siegfried Mews) and a historian (myself). Attempts to construct integrated sessions by not just to having parallel disciplinary conferences but rather getting representatives from different disciplines onto the same panel were, however, only partly successful. Moreover, efforts to involve social scientists remained rather difficult. Except for specialists in comparative politics and European Studies in political science, most social scientists were rather Anglo-centric or third-world oriented. Because they had little interest in German Studies, they were reluctant to participate in the GSA on a regular level.

4. *Funding and control:* The need for financial support motivated the Executive Director to look to German sources, because the preservation of accessibility prevented the levying of huge registration fees. Moreover editing the journal was costly, and ASU support remained rather limited. While the DAAD was exceedingly helpful, the German Foreign Office in supporting *Auswärtige Kulturpolitik* also wanted some control over the program in exchange. In practice that created a tendency to send CDU and FDP politicians which not all members appreciated. Due to the connections of the Executive Director the party foundations on the conservative side, the Adenauer- and Seidel-Stiftungen were more ready to provide funding which created some tensions in the association over choice of speakers and panels. But in reaction, some more left-leaning members energized the Ebert and Böll Foundations to provide a corrective, leading to a diversification of the offerings. Eventually the board decided that direct financing would be too problematic and hit upon the ingenious device of asking only for project funding for specific themes and conferences. This financial support plus the DFG funding of transatlantic travel facilitated attendance, since members received some

help with travel costs, much of which flowed back to the GSA in the form of donations. Finally, some members like Georg Iggers, Gerry Kleinfeld and I were interested in having East German scholars at the meeting. This was rather helpful in establishing a dialogue across the Iron Curtain, even if their presentations were often propagandistic. At the same time Austrian scholars advocated interpreting the German Studies label more broadly – which was fortunately done, so that German speaking Europe as a whole became the subject.

The general impact of the German Studies model was therefore rather positive, even if the specific disciplinary effect on history remained limited. The journal and the annual meetings offered interesting platforms for intellectual exchange and personal communication. The openness of program access also helped to draw in junior scholars, although the quality of presentations could not always be maintained. The success in involving European colleagues finally helped strengthen transatlantic networking. Some of the problems of size (for instance the expansion to Sunday morning and afternoon), the small attendance at some individual sessions, etc. were really a result of the success of the model.

The creation of the GSA only partly improved the writing of German history in the US. The meeting prevented a specialized historical conference from taking off, but provided an alternative to the AHA meeting, in which German historians played less and less central roles due to shifting methodological approaches and changing subject interests. Some broadening of scope and crossing of disciplinary boundaries in research methods as well as topics was visible when historians for example analyzed the GDR writer's league while *Germanisten* studied public debates within a temporal context. But the deconstruction wave and the rise of Holocaust sensibility pulled both groups in opposite directions, while most political scientists remained (with very few exceptions) in their own universe. This look back, therefore, reveals a mixed picture, which inspires gratitude for all that was accomplished, but also serves as a warning against too much complacency.

From the Mountains to the East Coast: A Larger Organization and No Disaster

Frank Trommler

University of Pennsylvania

When WAGS decided to transform itself into the national organization German Studies Association, not all members were happy. The intimacy of contacts and meetings would disappear. The East Coast would weigh in and assume leadership where the mountains had reigned. Even Gerry Kleinfeld wasn't sure whether the democratic spirit with which the organization had grown would prevail.

When it happened, the democratic spirit prevailed, and Gerry's leadership remained in the place where he wanted it: on the backstage with easy access to the stage. Presidents came and presidents went. Executive boards came and executive boards went. Gerry carried the day, the finances, and the *German Studies Review*. I will direct my remarks first to the changes in the field of *Germanistik*, then to the problems that the national organization had to face in the growth years of the later 1980s and 1990s. Many of the problems and scenarios are still current. Yet there was a defining moment in the late 1980s when Germanists learned to appreciate the particular advantages of interdisciplinarity that brought the cooperation with historians closer to their own endangered curricula. In other words, with the demise of philology as a long-time anchor of *Germanistik* and increasing challenges to the traditional methods of literary criticism, Germanists learned to turn to cultural studies as an invigorating concept.

I speak from my own experience as a Germanist. From the curricular guidelines that a committee under Konrad Jarausch's leadership formulated in 1987, I learned what German departments could do in order to survive by breaking out of their isolation, interconnect with other departments and programs, and create a more comprehensive mission in the encounter with the other language and culture. At this time the directors of the New York DAAD, Manfred Stassen and Wedigo de Vivanco, provided a forum for a larger group of Germanists with a conference under the title, "German Studies in the USA: A Critique of *Germanistik*?" in Scottsdale, Arizona, in January 1989. The meeting, soon to be called "*Wüstenkonferenz*" thanks to the unusual exposure of many "snowbirds" from the Midwest and Northeast to the spring temperatures in mid-winter, gave a strong momentum to further the "Americanization" of the discipline of German which had been shaped by its strong ties to German *Germanistik*. This move was expanded and discussed in a panel with Michael Geyer, Arlene Teraoka,

Patricia Herminghouse, Jeffrey Peck and myself under the heading “Germany as the Other: Towards an American Agenda of German Studies” in Milwaukee in 1989. The GSA made an effort to organize truly interdisciplinary panels at the meetings in Philadelphia (1988), Milwaukee, and Buffalo (1990).

While the “cultural turn” in its particular German studies pattern helped several smaller departments and programs survive in the 1990s when the interest in Germany began to wane again, I need to mention also its problematic side that at the same time threatened German programs, in particular German language programs. Eager to draw on the cultural studies movement that helped reorient English departments from being stalwarts of high culture to becoming mediators of the much-debated multiculturalism, German departments scheduled more and more courses to be conducted in English in order to get more students. German language instruction suffered among a general trend in the mid-1990s to abandon foreign languages and area studies as part of the much oversold peace dividend after 1989/91. In close cooperation with Heidi Byrnes, who in 1995/96 initiated her campaign, “The Future of German in American Education,” several colleagues, among them Gerhard Weiss, Lynne Tatlock, Patricia Herminghouse, and John McCarthy, engaged in making the GSA members aware of the dangers of giving up language instruction as a crucial part of German Studies. Indeed, job seekers who had fully dedicated their work to cultural studies learned to their detriment that departments were often much more interested in hiring candidates with extended experience in German language instruction and a solid knowledge of current SLA methods. The “cultural turn” had to be managed with much care. There was always suspicion whether the freewheeling forays of Germanists into the territory of political and cultural history were tainted by dilettantism.

Back to the earlier years when the Association expanded its reach to the East and the executive committee meetings reflected the move towards a national organization. There was no better event to prove the attractiveness of a larger body of historians, political scientists, cultural historians, and literary scholars than the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent unification of the two German states. It made my stint as president in 1991/92 extremely easy. Everyone was eager to express an opinion about the unification, and the GSA offered a somewhat attentive forum. Many members who had written about the various features of the two German societies were immediately drawn to the difficulties of joining two political and social systems under one roof. As we know, the roof was more or less the western one, which left numerous colleagues who had concentrated on GDR literature and the cultural life of the other Germany in the cold. Methodologically it was a particularly stimulating period as it provided ample justification for an interdisciplinary approach when approaching and explaining the broader implications of the unification.

Historians and political scientists, as far as they included these implications in their reasoning, were interested in getting insights from the intellectual and literary reverberations of this amazing event.

Concerning the problems of the growth into a national organization, the goal to bring different disciplines together required more organizational effort than was needed when conference attendees knew each other and settled on exploratory cross-overs between the fields. Interdisciplinarity required more methodological and institutional reflection, more strategy, and more goodwill. The general appeal to panel organizers did not suffice. The conclusion still rings true: the interdisciplinarity that is not organized does not become reality. It needs constant energy, constant willingness to avoid dilettantism and address history, politics, literature, art, and culture through their scholarly representatives in the academy. Women's Studies cannot be thought without it. It was and remained the number one defining issue for the organization as a creator of synergy at its annual conferences, in its publications and internal discourse.

Of almost equal importance is the continuous renewal of the balance between what we called *elite* and *democracy* in the programming of the annual conferences. On the one hand there is the need of having prominent speakers and certain panels that might offer the experience of topical significance or what is called "hot topics." On the other hand there is the need of providing a forum for younger, lesser known colleagues who wish to present their new research and have fruitful exchanges with a knowledgeable audience that is usually lacking in their home institutions. Sometimes these panels leave a lot to be desired, reflecting badly on the organization. And yet, improvement comes from experience, and most important: without giving a conference talk one usually cannot claim financial support from one's home institutions – *if* it provides moneys for travel and accommodation. The growth of the GSA that is so much a matter of pride is also the result of a somewhat permissive program democracy. The Buffalo meeting in 1990 that started a day after German unification had 85 panels with nine parallel sessions and around 400 participants. At that time we thought we should put a stop on the ever-expanding list of conference proposals in order to keep the conference manageable. This intention has come up every year. Here in Milwaukee David Barclay has to take care of 319 panels with about 1200 participants who can choose between thirty parallel sessions. No wonder that we draw on a rather small audience for our roundtable about GSA history.

Student participation in the annual conference, one of the perennial challenges to the concept of democracy, has generally received positive comments but rather reluctant support by executive boards. Graduate students were only rarely allowed to present papers, doctoral candidates had a better chance. Since the GSA conference does not include a job market like the MLA, the need for a participation that is sponsored by the home institution has grown with

the increasing requirements for job résumés but does not have the compelling urgency of MLA or AHA conventions.

A particular sore point for the Association was the lack of female representation at the top for a long time. After Jennifer Michaels broke the ice as the first woman president of the GSA in 1995/96, it took some time until several women members of the executive boards were elected in an impressive sequence from Patricia Herminhouse (2003) to Katherine Roper, Sara Lennox, Celia Applegate, and, in 2013-14, Suzanne Marchand.

Having Gerry Kleinfeld participate in our roundtable which coincides with his seventy-fifth birthday is a particular pleasure. It dignifies our comments about the history of the organization which cannot be thought without his unflappable loyalty and commitment. People have said that Gerry was married to the GSA. I might add that, as in any marriage, there have been ups and downs, misconceptions, carping, and at times a desire for psychological counseling. I remember learning as a president that this kind of counseling was in addition to the job description and usually took place late at night on the phone since there is a time difference between Arizona and the East Coast. I learned more about Gerry's great talent of talking and narrating, being able to create rather than recreate whole dialogues with stubborn German ambassadors, and in the course of these nightly conversations I learned about threats to the existence of the GSA that I had never envisioned possible. In retrospect it seemed at times that we all barely escaped several disasters. So it is particularly gratifying to be here today in Milwaukee and remember those years in peace and congeniality.

In Memoriam

Henry (Heinz Egon) Friedlander (1930-2012)

Henry Friedlander died in Bangor, Maine on 17 October 2012 at the age of eighty-two. He had been in a series of medical care facilities since suffering a massive stroke in February 2009. Henry was President of the German Studies Association during 2001-2002 and one of its founding and most active members. He was also an influential and enormously engaged scholar and a Holocaust survivor, although he disliked that label because of the way it was commonly used. Survival, he insisted, was a matter of chance. Henry was a person of strong opinions, profound compassion, and absolute integrity. In the many contributions we received to help us prepare this tribute, one word came up again and again: Henry Friedlander was a *mentsch*.

Henry Friedlander's scholarship was at once shaped by and removed from his personal experience. In late 1941, when he was eleven years old, he and his parents were among the first Jews deported from Berlin. Consigned to the Łódź ghetto, the (then) Friedländers managed to stay alive for almost three years only to be sent to Auschwitz-Birkenau in 1944. Henry and his father were subsequently shuffled through other camps and sub-camps – Neuengamme and Ravensbrück – and eventually liberated. In the months before his stroke, Henry had begun to talk more openly about those times and how he had survived. He continued to wonder about the death of his mother, whom he last saw in Auschwitz. In 2001, when he reluctantly accepted the role as Director of the International Commission of Experts on the Reconstruction of the Documentation Center at the Bergen-Belsen Concentration Camp, he mused whether perhaps she “did make it to Bergen-Belsen . . .” It was to her, Ruth Friedländer née Löwenthal, that he dedicated his magnum opus, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution* (University of North Carolina Press, 1995).

Friedlander's book remains a foundational text of modern German history. In lean, powerful prose and on the basis of mountains of sources, many of them judicial records, he tied the so-called euthanasia program – the Nazi killing of people with disabilities – to the Holocaust. He traced the ideological and pragmatic links between eugenics and antisemitism and identified connections in the methods of killing, in particular the use of gas. Based on detailed research he discussed the fate of individual Jews who were victims of Nazi “euthanasia.” Although he found that Bishop August von Galen's 1941 remonstrations from the pulpit had more public impact than any other church protest, it was the regime's concern about unrest and popular opinion, he showed, not von Galen's sermons, that precipitated Hitler's “halt order” of August 1941. The killing continued, he demonstrated, but in ways designed to minimize the provocation of Reich Germans.

With relentless and compelling precision Friedlander laid bare the deadly role of German professionals – doctors, lawyers, social workers, bureaucrats,

and judges – in initiating, planning, carrying out, and covering up the murder of tens of thousands of people. Few expressed as powerfully as Henry Friedlander this underlying mechanism of the Holocaust: the regime learned that there were more than enough people willing to carry out murder. In a 1996 review for H-German, Alan Steinweis praised *The Origins of Nazi Genocide* as “brilliant” and “remarkably well researched,” combining “rich detail with moral force.” At the same time he worried, presciently it turns out, that Friedlander’s path-breaking book would not receive the attention it deserved. Indeed, seventeen years later the implications of Friedlander’s expansive conceptualization of the Holocaust have yet to be incorporated fully into the field.

Henry Friedlander had a keen eye for the ways that genocide drew on familiar motives, from careerism to professional pride to what he called “cya” (cover your ass). One of his archival discoveries was a cache of letters from Dr. Friedrich Mennecke to his wife (“dearest Mummy”). In a letter of 19 November 1941, Mennecke boasted about how quickly he worked and extolled the food and lodging he enjoyed: “I finished at 17.00 and had my supper in the mess: 3 sorts of sausage, butter, bread, beer. I sleep marvelously in my bed.” The following day he informed his wife that “the work speeds along ... an [SS] Scharführer brings in the patients ... The people in Berlin (Jennerwein [Victor Brack used this pseudonym]) simply say we have to do 2,000 – whether or not so many people come under the basic criteria doesn’t bother them.” On 28 November he wrote again, this time from Buchenwald, referring to his “selection” of concentration camp inmates to be killed as “happy hunting.” (J. Noakes and G. Pridham, eds., *Nazism*, III: 436-37).

Henry asked the largest of all questions about the Holocaust – how did it happen? – and he approached that problem with rational analysis and complex historical evidence. But he did not claim to provide big answers and instead admitted the limits of his understanding:

When all is said and done, I am still unable to fathom why seemingly normal men and women were able to commit such extraordinary crimes. Neither ideology nor self-interest is a satisfactory explanation for such behavior. Attempts to replicate their actions in the laboratory must fail, even if experiments seem to show, as did the one by Stanley Milgram, that ordinary men anywhere can commit such crimes. But there is a fundamental difference between the antiseptic experimental setting and the grisly reality of the killing centers, The T-4 killers confronted real human beings as victims and saw their agony, the blood and gore of the killing process. In Milgram’s social science experiment, the subjects might lack the imagination to understand the pain that they could inflict, but the Nazi killers, even if they lacked all imagination, could not avoid knowing what they were doing. They understood the consequences of their deeds. (H. Friedlander, “The T4 Killers: Berlin, Lublin, San Sabba,” in Michael Berenbaum and Abraham J. Peck, eds., *The Holocaust and History*, Indiana University Press in association with

the U. S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, 1998, p. 249)

In an address to the Parliament of Lower Saxony on 26 January 2009, just weeks before his crippling stroke, Henry repeated this perception. “We know a lot today about Auschwitz,” he told his audience. “But in the abstract, it has always been difficult to understand what it all means” (*gedanklich zu erfassen*).

Henry was long concerned about whether and to what extent the law had operated as an instrument to bring about a measure of justice following Nazi crimes. He also analyzed how law had enabled the Nazi dictatorship to commit crime and evade opposition. “To gain support, or at least obtain acquiescence, the regime had to enact its draconian exclusionary policies into law, so that the mass of the population – those not excluded – could continue to believe that the legal system would protect their own security,” he wrote. As for opposition to Nazi mass murder, in his assessment, it was “close relations with potential victims, not ideology that determined whether a sense of ‘moral law’ led to opposition.” (Origins, 171, 89).

Henry was fond of declaring that “like Kennedy,” he could say, “‘Ich bin ein Berliner.’” When asked whether he was German, as his accent suggested, Evan Bukey recalls him replying, “No, I’m Prussian.” In 2009 Henry was honored with the Niedersächsischer Verdienstorden, in gratitude for his service as director of the Bergen-Belsen Commission. The medal came with elaborate instructions, suited to traditional Prussian tastes, about what dress and circumstances were appropriate for donning and bearing the medal. Henry decided that the annual open house party at the residence of Nathan Stoltzfus and his wife Maria Foscarinis in Dupont Circle constituted the right occasion and put off a public wearing until then. Still, during the few days he had between returning from Germany and his stroke on February 13, he often carried the medal of honor with him in its box (together with the instructions). He would bring it out from time to time as when he revealed it to the nurses and staff at his doctor’s office.

Henry was a fierce proponent of research who devoted tremendous time and energy to making archival sources widely accessible. In the 1950s he worked with Gerhard Weinberg on the Captured German Documents Project of the National Archives, and he wrote several of the Guides to German Records Microfilmed at Alexandria, Virginia. With Sybil Milton, his most important historical partner and second wife, he organized the meetings later captured in a remarkable volume, *The Holocaust: Ideology, Bureaucracy, and Genocide: The San Jose Papers* (Kraus International, 1980). This initiative brought together a stellar and diverse cast of scholars: Raul Hilberg, Eugen Weber, Lucjan Dobroszycki, Lawrence Langer, and many others. In that context, Henry later pointed out, he and Sybil had “discovered” Christopher Browning.

Together Henry and Sybil also co-edited the multi-volume series, *Archives of the Holocaust: An International Collection of Selected Documents* (Taylor & Francis). These volumes, published in the 1980s and early 1990s, brought a wealth of primary sources to libraries and college campuses across North America. Doris

Bergen remembers encountering Sybil and Henry for the first time in what was then the Berlin Document Center, where they were reviewing files for this project. Their intensely loving and volatile relationship was on full display as they shouted at one another to “Shut up!” and “Look at this!”

Already in the mid-1980s Evan Bukey recalls, Henry and Sybil were determined that the planned Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. should include coverage of the mass murder of those with physical and mental disabilities and the Roma and Sinti. At Auschwitz-Birkenau, Henry would point out, Gypsies from all over had been murdered. Henry and Sybil faced many opponents on this point but they prevailed, and the expansive definition of the Holocaust reflected in the permanent exhibit and the programming at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum owes much to their meticulously informed and stubborn insistence.

Sybil’s death in October 2000 was a terrible blow to Henry. He often spoke about her and their plan, now dashed, of moving to a house they had purchased in Arizona. Sybil and Henry shared a collection of night shirts, and after her death Henry would occasionally wear her sweaters or jackets. Up until Henry’s stroke, Sybil’s office at their Chevy Chase apartment looked as though she had just stepped out for a moment, her lipstick beside the aging computer monitor, her books untouched. Though no one could take the place of his Sybil, whom he loved and revered, Henry, with his gift for friendship, found other interlocutors and intellectual sparring partners. Joachim Perels developed “a wonderful friendship” with Henry, and they always got together when Henry was in Hanover. Another friend, Gene Tweraser, took Henry to view assisted living homes in the D.C. area on the day before his stroke. “The times I spent with Henry – sharing meals, going to movies, museums, and concerts, taking walks – kept my spirits up and seemed to do the same for him,” she writes. “He always said I cheered him up, even when I teased him unmercifully about his politics, aversion to vegetables and various other quirks.”

In recent years Henry was a regular guest at Nathan and Maria’s house, once arriving four hours ahead of schedule (“you can never know about traffic,” he explained). For hours on the phone he and Nathan gossiped and conversed about German history, although Nathan had to learn to challenge assertions Henry sometimes made in very definite tones. They co-edited what would be Henry’s last publication, *Nazi Crimes and the Law* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), a reminder of the effort Henry expended over the years teaching a course for judges, “When Justice Fails.”

Deborah Agosti, retired Senior Justice for the Supreme Court of Nevada, taught with Henry in that course. He was a personal mentor to her, she recalls, and a brilliant teacher:

Henry taught in a high intellectual style – never compromising on a strong presentation down to the finest detail. He held the attention of the judges he taught, un-intimidated by his audience. Judges, used to holding the floor themselves, like to offer their own views and impres-

sions and so always felt free to interrupt Henry's lectures frequently with questions or observations of their own. Henry handled these moments well; he even seemed to relish the opportunity they presented to correct their impressions or beliefs. He was unafraid to tell the truth and his knowledge was vast. Judges can be *prima donnas*, but there is no question that Henry outranked every one of these impressive students in knowledge, insight and stature. I enjoyed the transformation that inevitably occurred every time the course was taught; These judges, each masters of their own universes, became humble, hungry children, wanting more of Henry's expertise and detailed knowledge.

It is no coincidence that Deborah Agosti reached for a food metaphor when discussing Henry's impact on the judges. Henry talked about food a lot, and many of the contributions we received and our own memories feature his gustatory habits. Nathan remembers Henry's fondness for marzipan; one Christmas he consumed a 300-gram bar of Niederegger on the spot. He was partial to certain dishes at his favorite Bethesda restaurants but usually remembered to insist that the carrots be removed. Even in the Łódź ghetto, Henry once told Doris, he never ate beets. Evan Bukey recalls dining with Henry at a Chicago restaurant. While examining the menu, Henry subjected the waiter to a lengthy interrogation on salad lettuces, dressings, vegetables, and the entrées. He finally decided on thinly sliced duck or veal but did not place his order until satisfied with the dimensions. When the meal arrived, it was adorned with a small garnish. Henry looked up in slight astonishment and asked the waiter, "Is this edible?" As Benton Arnovitz said at the funeral, all those who knew Henry mourn him, "with the possible exception of almost every restaurant waiter who had the misfortune to be called to serve him."

Henry had definite views and not just about food. Yet he was always courteous and friendly and he treated everyone with dignity. Lewis Bateman describes Henry as "reserved in his emotions which were often deep, with a remarkable sense of humor, an inbred sense of duty and dedication, and great courage." "Henry had the capacity to make all of us feel welcome and important," Lew explains: "If you chanced to run into him at the annual meeting of the GSA or AHA, he would break into a smile and engage you in conversation as if this meeting were what was necessary to make his day." Nathan remembers Henry's clarity about the importance of gender inclusion – not for political correctness but because, as Henry put it, men and women brought something qualitatively different, a different presence and perspective, to a discussion.

Henry's warmth and his rare combination of erudition, common sense, and modesty made him an inspiring teacher. "If you didn't know something about history," Lew says, "he would teach you." Henry spent most of his career as a professor of Judaic Studies at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York. Although he had no PhD students there, he played an active role in shaping and encouraging a whole generation of younger historians, many of whom gratefully contributed to this essay. In Lew's words, Henry was a "self-effacing

and an almost invisible presence, striving skillfully and persistently to draw out the best of us.” This quality is not often seen or celebrated in scholarly circles. But it is essential to create the openness necessary for historical inquiry.

Perhaps Henry’s own hard-won education, informal and formal, enhanced his appreciation of learning and understanding for the efforts of others. In the Łódź ghetto, where his father Bernhard “Fritz” Friedländer, was a physician, Henry came to learn and love Yiddish. According to Benton Arnovitz, when Jews were commanded to watch a hanging in the ghetto – Henry was perhaps twelve years old at the time – his mother stood behind him “and placed her hands over his eyes to spare him that traumatic witness.” After the war Henry left Europe on his own, his father having chosen to remain in Germany. He first came to Hamilton in Canada, then in 1947 moved on to the U.S. Initially placed in an eighth-grade class, he received his BA from Temple University in 1953 and his MA and PhD from the University of Pennsylvania in 1954 and 1968. The subject of his dissertation was “The German Revolution of 1918.”

Henry held a series of short-term teaching appointments, including at Louisiana State, McMaster (Canada), and the University of Missouri. One of his first teaching posts was in New Orleans, an experience he revisited in 2001 for participants of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum’s first seminar for faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. At a party in honor of his 75th birthday, Henry was definitely having fun when he put on a feathered mask from New Orleans and poked the air as though to make a point. At least that’s the way it looks in the photograph.

In 2008 the Lessons and Legacies Conference on the Holocaust honored Henry Friedlander’s contribution to the field with a special session titled “Murder of the Disabled: Origins of Nazi Genocide, Victims, and Consequences.” Patricia Heberer, Sheila Faith Weiss, and Dagmar Herzog were slated to present papers, with a response from Henry. Patricia, who had worked closely with Sybil at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and whose research on Hadamar Henry admired and promoted, played a key role in setting up the panel. In the weeks prior to the conference, Henry called her and Doris frequently to check on the details. He also phoned Nathan more than once to ask what had happened to his driver. Why wasn’t he there to take him to the airport? Henry had become confused about time. Apparently he had suffered a lesser stroke in August or early September of 2008, although at the time he knew only that he felt disoriented and was hesitant to drive, especially at night. Still he made it to the conference. When he stepped off the plane in Chicago he had nothing in his hands but a copy of the *German Studies Review*. “I brought this for you,” he told Doris.

With no notes or any other evidence of preparation, Henry gave a cogent and stimulating response to the papers at his session. But his main reason for making the trip was something else: he was determined to speak in public about his time in Auschwitz. “I’m ready,” he told Doris. His opportunity came at the closing banquet, where he addressed some two hundred scholars of the Holocaust assembled there. “Everyone who survived was rescued by someone,” he began.

“To save oneself didn’t happen at all.” Henry’s rescuer was a political prisoner at Birkenau, a kapo. They found each other because both spoke German and then sealed the bond with the discovery that they both came from Berlin’s Wedding district. Sometimes Henry’s protector gave him food. One day Henry learned there was to be a selection. In his recollections black humor mingled with fear and dread: “The Germans were always busy with counting. They always had to count. I hadn’t known that counting was so important, even though I grew up in Berlin. But for them counting was enormously important. One had to always count who was there – as if the people there could leave!”

Caught in a round-up of boys to be sent to the gas, Henry thought he was finished. Then he saw “his kapo” with a group of other privileged prisoners and guards. Henry approached him and said the first words that came to mind: “I don’t belong here.” How absurd, he recounted, as if anyone belonged in that place. The kapo told him to hide in his barracks and not make a sound. Lying on the floor, afraid even to breathe, Henry heard the trucks and then the screams of the boys who had not escaped. “I can tell you, sometimes I still hear those screams today,” he said. “I’m a historian,” Henry added to the scholars in the room. “I know how to write about the Holocaust. But how do I write about that?”

Henry had told a few friends something about his experience in the Holocaust but the Lessons and Legacies conference was the first time he had spoken of it in public. It was not, however, the last. A few months later, in January 2009, Henry addressed the Parliament of Lower Saxony, in conjunction with the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. The evening before, he had confided in Joachim Perels and his wife: “Tomorrow you have to stand by my side. I’m speaking for the first time in Germany about my experiences and survival in Auschwitz.” Henry’s speech, Joachim remembers, was received with a long and reverend silence. Albrecht Pohle, another valued friend in Germany, remembers that the crowd of 500 was deeply moved and pressed around to meet Henry after he finished. Henry also spoke in Berlin, at the great Synagogue on Oranienburger Street, which he had attended as a child. On both occasions Henry’s eldest son Benjamin, a poet and professor of English at the University of Maine, was in the audience. Pohle drove the two Friedlanders to Wolfenbüttel, because Henry wanted to see the memorial there on Justice and the Penal System in Nazi Germany, and to Lüneburg, where Henry at age fifteen had attended school for several months. It turned out to be Henry’s last trip to Germany.

At Henry’s funeral, his daughter Ruth spoke movingly about him as a father. She recalled his weirdly characteristic response when she had told him she was planning to get married: “But I don’t have a suit!” Robert, Henry’s second son, was also present, and Ben reflected on their father as survivor and scholar. Only toward the end of his life, he remarked, did he articulate the connections between these parts of himself. In his contribution to this tribute, Joachim Perels pondered this issue from the perspective of his own family history. Joachim’s father was killed by the SS during the war. His grandfather, the historian Ernst

Perels, was taken into custody soon after and died as a result. In the midst of a discussion with Henry, Joachim recalls, “I asked him whether I was not talking too much about my family.” No, Henry replied: “In his view, personal experiences and life history were extremely significant for one’s scholarly work.”

Until his stroke and subsequent loss of speech, Henry continued his scholarship. He was writing a study of *Kristallnacht*, in which he intended to pay particular attention to theft and plunder, issues he had explored in his GSA presidential address and in a paper at the 2005 GSA meeting in Milwaukee. Also in the works was a smaller project on the Rosenstraße protest. Henry was interested in the Nazi regime’s concern for popular opinion, in a sense the flipside of the complicity he had examined earlier in his career. With Nathan and Evan Bukey he spent hours discussing Christian-Jewish intermarriage and the calculations that led the Nazi authorities, in their quest to destroy all Jews, temporarily to set aside “full” intermarried German Jews. Quite a few members of Henry’s extended family survived due to intermarriage, and he was delighted in recent years to make contact with one of their offspring, the prominent English politician Nicky Gavron.

We remember Henry Friedlander as an incisive, fearless historian and a great and wonderful man. According to Jan Lambertz, he showed signs of “insatiable curiosity” about the past – “that past” – “even in his last year of life, when he had suffered the tragedy of losing his capacity to talk back, to argue, to converse and interrogate.” In the words of his son Ben, right to the end, Henry enjoyed “being in the presence of conversation.” It was during an animated exchange between Ben and Henry’s favorite nurse Belinda that “he passed very gently.”

Nathan Stoltzfus
Florida State University

Doris L. Bergen
University of Toronto

With contributions from Deborah Agosti, Benton Arnovitz, David E. Barclay, Lewis Bateman, Jonathan Bush, Evan Bukey, Patricia Heberer, Dieter Kuntz, Jan Lambertz, Dori Laub, Joachim Perels, Albrecht Poble, Alan Steinweis, Gene Tweraser, and Gerhard Weinberg.

*The full texts of the tributes by Deborah Agosti, Benton Arnovitz, and Evan Bukey follow.

Thoughts of Henry Friedlander, My Mentor and Friend

Henry Friedlander was the backbone of a course sponsored by the National Judicial College in Reno, Nevada, called "When Justice Fails." The one-week course is taught in Washington, DC. and is offered to state trial court judges across the nation. Its purpose is to educate judges about the grave issues that may be at stake in applying laws which may deserve close scrutiny because of their moral consequences. The course focuses on the Holocaust and examines the laws of Nazi Germany and the application of those laws by German Judges. In order to provide context for the societal and political environment in which these German judges worked, it is important to teach so many aspects of German History leading up to the Nazi acquisition of power and then to teach the details of the laws adopted by the Nazi regime as well as the covert programs pursued by the Nazi government. Henry's expertise as a highly respected historian of this terrible era was critical to the success of the course. Henry taught many aspects of the course but he particularly excelled when he taught these American judges the details of the Nazi program of euthanasia of the weak, the impaired and the so-called undesirable members of German society of the 1930's. Children were not spared from this program, in fact they were particularly targeted when birth defects, handicaps or mental impairments rendered them outside the Nazi model of what German children should be.

I met Henry Friedlander when I attended the first presentation of this course in 1997 which at the time was called "Legal History, War Crimes, Crimes against Humanity and Post-war Prosecutions," an indeed unwieldy title. Henry and his wife, Sybil Milton, were faculty for the course. I was at the time a trial court judge in Reno, Nevada, and a student of German history. Since my childhood, I'd been interested and horrified by the Nazi period of German history. I'd taken many classes in college that related to this time period, written many papers for these classes and thought I knew something. Yet, Henry's and Sybil's lectures were a revelation to me. I'd never before been presented with so clear a picture of the German legal and societal context within which the events of this period occurred. It was clear that Henry and Sybil offered me and all the judges in attendance a view with many lessons for our own daily work.

I began to get to know Henry when I returned the next time the course was offered under the new name, "When Justice Fails." This time I attended as a group facilitator, leading group discussions of the materials taught.

The third time the course was offered I returned again, this time as a member of the course faculty, although I never felt that I was on equal footing with such experts as Henry and Sybil. My part in the course was to teach the sections concerning the role of judges in the Nazi courts and also the development of eugenics programs in the United States as well as the application of the various state eugenics statutes in the U.S. I began to get to know Henry.

My memories of Henry are fond, even loving. He was a formal, yet gentle man. He did the lion's share of the teaching and so over the week the course was offered, it was a strenuous exercise for Henry. He was more than equal to

the task. Henry taught in a high intellectual style – never compromising on a strong presentation down to the finest detail. He held the attention of the judges he taught, un-intimidated by his audience. Judges, used to holding the floor themselves, like to offer their own views and impressions and so always felt free to interrupt Henry's lectures frequently with questions or observations of their own. Henry handled these moments well; he even seemed to relish the opportunity they presented to correct their impressions or beliefs. He was unafraid to tell the truth and his knowledge was vast. Judges can be prima donnas, but there is no question that Henry outranked every one of these impressive students in knowledge, insight and stature. I enjoyed the transformation that inevitably occurred every time the course was taught; These judges, each masters of their own universes, became humble, hungry children, wanting more of Henry's expertise and detailed knowledge.

Henry's life was a triumph in every way. But Henry did not behave as a triumphant man. He behaved as an exacting scholar, careful about his facts and brooking no overgeneralizations or mistakes when it came to teaching the details of the Nazi period. I enjoyed listening to Henry and Sybil, two brilliant historians, quibble over details, each certain of their own point of view and each ready to correct the other. And then the disagreements would be put away and they would go off together, very loving and tolerant of the other. Henry once told me a story, in the most indulgent way, of staying at a hotel with Sybil. He was ready to be on his way and she was not. She told him not to wait. He told her he would wait. She insisted he go and she would catch up with him when she was ready. He made to leave and she was astounded. "I thought you said you would wait! It will only be a minute". So, Henry said, he waited, and it was not a minute. It was a great deal of minutes. Henry described how he sat in the hotel room and patiently waited for his wife. He told the story with a wry smile and with great affection. He so clearly loved Sybil and enjoyed his role as the long-suffering, patient husband. I admired their close, caring relationship.

When I began my career as a member of the faculty of "When Justice Fails," I was so cognizant of the high bar set by all the professional members of the faculty. Most of the courses taught by the National Judicial College are based on the principle of Judges teaching Judges. This premise works in courses where the classes are about the laws of evidence, civil procedure, search and seizure and the like. But when a class like "When Justice Fails" is presented, the College relies upon historians and other experts in particular fields. Many members of the faculty were participants in the original events of history, such as the woman who was a prosecutor at Nuremberg – part of the team that prosecuted IG Farben for economic war crimes. It was my rare privilege to be a part of the faculty as a judge who had made herself familiar with the United States historical experiment with eugenics laws in the early twentieth century, and with the activities of the German judges of the 1930s and '40s. Henry made a point of sitting in on my lectures and especially in my first time teaching, he offered me many comments to help me add to my fund of knowledge. He would suggest an article that might be of use and then send me a copy of the

article which, as it turns out, he'd written. His criticisms and comments were always helpful, even essential to my progress as a member of the faculty. When I acquired a copy of Henry's book, I remember being so shy about asking him to sign it. He did, and typical of Henry, it was quite a formal inscription. Henry never presumed to be too chummy unless one first opened the door. He never presumed that believe that his own work-product, his many writings, would be so important to another colleague. On the other hand, he was never shy about offering suggestions to another member of the faculty of the course if he thought they'd either overlooked a point that he thought was important or if he thought the point was inaccurately presented. If Henry praised a colleague, it was high praise indeed, because his standards for himself and others were very high. It remains the best compliment I ever received

for my part in the course that Henry thought, as he once told me, that my contribution was worthwhile.

For many years of teaching "When Justice Fails," Henry never mentioned his own experience as a survivor much less made it a part of his subject matter. Only when I got to know Henry well did I dare to ask him about his own experience in Nazi Germany and his life in the camps. When I finally gained the courage to do so, I found Henry was not reluctant to talk about it and he did so with a detached forthrightness that I admired. He was a boy when he was interred and he described how he'd made himself useful as a sort of courier in the camps. He told me many stories. He did not become emotional when he recalled these events, but his stories were delivered with shadows of sorrow. His was the sorrow of someone who'd been robbed of his childhood, and more, but had found a place for that terrible loss in his life and would not in turn be robbed again by giving it an overwhelming context. Henry defined himself in other terms: he was a historian, a writer, a teacher, an expert, a husband and a father. He was also a friend.

The final two courses that Henry taught were quite special. Sybil had passed away and so the shadows of sorrow that followed Henry, barely discernible, bore new dimensions. I, of course, did not know that Henry was nearing the end of his time of teaching *When Justice Fails*, but I appreciated that he was advancing in years. I asked him if he might share with the class his own history as a survivor. Henry's lectures were always very formal, indicative of the way Henry always presented himself. His bearing was of that old European style; he stood very erect, his language was very precise and he didn't wander into frivolity. Perhaps he thought my suggestion to include a remark or two about his own life was a compromise of his very formal style. In any event, Henry shrugged and opined that it wouldn't be all that interesting for the judges. I disagreed and suggested that he might just bring it up a little bit. He did.

The students were electrified. Henry had transformed the class. His very intellectual presentation had become deeply personal and the judges were now touched by the enormity of Henry's character in spite of the dire adversity he'd faced at an early age. His bona fides as a scholar were already known to the participating judges, but now his lessons had become personal to them. When

the hour struck to end his lecture, the judges crowded around him. The coffee cooled outside the lecture room as the judges remained with Henry. More questions. More comments. More opportunity for these judges to simply be in his presence and listen to what he had to say. Deep reverence and respect was evident in the tone of these men and women who had at first thought only that they were getting a history lesson. No, they were receiving the great gift of a life lesson. Henry the professor had lived through the events that, as the judges listened deeply, had direct implications for the work they did.

The final time Henry taught *When Justice Fails*, he told me he thought it would be his last. He said he was slowing down and it was becoming a chore to recall some details of his lectures, from time to time. I did not believe him when he said it would be his last encounter with the course; in my mind a man like Henry just keeps going. Nevertheless, I stayed close to him throughout the week. An essential element of every offering of “*When Justice Fails*” is a trip to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Henry made the trip with the class on this occasion. We rode together on the bus to the museum and made small talk.

By this time I’d learned that Daniel’s Room, a special exhibition for children at the museum, was designed by Sybil and modeled after Henry’s childhood experience. I’ve visited the museum with the class every time the course was taught but I’d never toured Daniel’s Room. I asked Henry if he would go with me to see this exhibition. Henry agreed and we did walk through Daniel’s Room together. Henry took my arm as we began our visit to Daniel’s Room and guided me through the entire exhibit. He remarked at every point on the exhibit: this part is very accurate, this part is not; this room is smaller than the real room actually was, this room was bigger. His comments, all based on his personal memories, provoked in me a very strong emotional reaction. This was not an exhibit; It was a visualization of Henry’s childhood – a childhood no child should have had to endure. I was in tears by the time we exited Daniel’s room. I was also struck by the fact that Daniel’s Room is a monument, a fitting tribute to Henry’s life. It is a reminder to all who enter that the events, intentionally and deliberately pursued in Germany at the hands of the Nazis, profoundly affected innocent children and families and contain strong and fundamental lessons for society today, now and always.

Henry’s passing was a great loss to the world.

Henry was a great and wonderful man. I have lost a friend and a man I was proud to know. I looked up to Henry for his intellectual force and for his personal strength and uncompromising character. Henry was not only a teacher of judges but a mentor to me and a source of inspiration to the many judges whose lives he touched. The best and final tribute to this important man who contributed so much to so many is that he be remembered. Henry had a distinct, profound impact on every judge who received his lectures. His humanity was an implicit part of his lectures and the judges heard him and learned from him. He touched their lives. Henry mentored these judges who daily perform tasks important to their communities. It is vital that judges carry out the task

of decision-making with integrity, honesty, humanity and always with care for the consequences of their decisions. Those who were fortunate to learn from Henry must remember him as they dispense justice based on imperfect laws in an imperfect world, but with the aspiration to seek a more perfect justice in this country, that those who perished in the Holocaust did not die in vain.

Deborah Agosti

Senior Justice, Supreme Court of Nevada, Retired

Henry Friedlander

With the possible exception of almost every restaurant waiter who had the misfortune to be called to serve our dear friend Henry, all the rest of us, who really *knew* him, are mourning the death and are acclaiming the life of a talented and forceful contrarian who also was one of the finest and most fair-minded of an all-too-quickly passing generation of foundational Holocaust scholars. Henry was, as one might say in Yiddish, a genuine *Kharacter*. And he justifiably reveled in all of those identities.

But the *Kharacter* also had character, an uncompromising integrity that arguably is an increasingly rare commodity among those who practice what we call scholarship and among those who make a career of administering those academics. We know, as well as anyone who was not there with him can know, in what furnace Henry Friedlander's character was forged.

In the course of a normal lifetime, most of G-d's creatures are blessed and fated to meet the fearsome *Malekh ba-Mobves* only once. Our khaver Henry was confronted by that grim eminence many times. And Henry prevailed. We have known Henry's spirit well enough to be confident that he agreed to take the hand of the Angel of Death only when Henry himself was prepared to go. But even then, over several hundred miles and several days now, I think we still can hear the echo of Henry's predictable disgust at the inevitability of it all. You know his trademark judgment: "Zis is CRAP."

Henry had encountered the *Malekh ba-Mobves* before, in Rumkowski's Łódź ghetto, where his father, Bernhard "Fritz" Friedlander, was a physician. When Jews were assembled on a plaza there, commanded to watch a hanging, Henry's mother stood behind him – he was perhaps twelve years old at the time – and placed her hands over his eyes to spare him that traumatic witness.

A year or two later, Henry encountered that angel again every day in Auschwitz-Birkenau., once very dramatically when the teenager's contrarian inclination contributed to saving his life. As I recall what originally was told me in confidence, during a round-up of youngsters in the camp an SS-man pulled his pistol and ordered a fleeing Henry to stop. Henry did not stop and put more distance between himself and his pursuer. Just as the guard was taking aim and about to fire, a group of several Jewish boys fleeing in the opposite direction caught his eye, and he opted instead to turn his clutches to

the potentially larger catch. Henry continued to run to another barracks, out of sight, where a Kapo agreed to hide Henry and a few other fortunate boys who'd made their way to the barracks, until the immediate danger had passed. And after Auschwitz there would be other challenges, in Neuengamme and in Ravensbrück. Life was a highly perishable commodity in those neighborhoods where a maturing young man became sentient, but one day he would come to achieve the only sorts of immortality human beings are afforded – in memory and in the lasting contributions that thoughtful men and women achieve through writing seminal books that continue to inspire when king's palaces and *Führer's* chancelleries are rubble.

Not just a few people who had yet to know Henry were deceived at first by a studied Yekkie-, one might even say Prussian, demeanor. I know that I was. During my first few months at the Museum I still was more or less fresh from the world of New York publishing. And although Henry's wife, Sybil Milton, had been one of the four people who interviewed me, I wondered "Who are those crazy people down the hall who keep shouting 'Shut-up! Shut-up! Shut-up! At each other?'," yet who somehow clearly showed a bond of deep mutual respect and love.

But Henry had written a piece for another Museum department's catalogue, and he wandered into my office one day, justifiably proud of what he had wrought. "You're an editor," he said, "read it," and he sat himself down. After the first few seconds I had to reply, "You know, Henry, there's no such thing as the 'British Channel'; it's the 'English Channel.'" He looked stunned for a moment and then declared that six people already had approved the piece. But in another few moments he nevertheless seemed very grateful for that tiniest of services, and he gave me the sense that I'd a new-found friend for life.

For all his cultivated Yekkiness (and Henry often insisted that he didn't speak with an accent) Henry was in many respects more like a Sabra, a native Israeli: prickly on the outside until you'd earned his confidence, and then he'd dare disclose the softer, more vulnerable inside, with a delicious and even mischievous sense of humor and, as almost all of us have if we are honest, an occasional appetite for a bit of *Schadenfreude*.

Henry was a real friend of many of the senior scholars in the Holocaust Kingdom, including several whom you will recognize here to honor his work and his personal memory today. Yet over the past decade or so I've allowed myself to *shep a bissel nakhus* by making a *shidduch* of sorts. Henry and Raul Hilberg had known each other for a very, very long time, of course. Both of them were native German-speaking Jews who'd come to America at a relatively young age from the same nasty part of the world, they worked some of the same subject turf, and I can attest that both of them wrote lean, muscular prose; each understood that words are not to be wasted, that they have meanings, and are to be used with surgical precision. But in their natural reserve Henry and Raul seemed a bit more like professional acquaintances than buddies. I'd been Raul's editor in my pre-Museum commercial life, and both he and Henry shared an abiding fascination with the inner workings of the publishing industry. I would

be their sounding board for the indignities, both the real and the perceived, that publishers visited upon authors, and those notions would branch into the indignities that various scholarly keepers of the Holocaust studies discipline would inflict upon each other. Neither Henry nor Raul suffered fools gladly, and both knew posturing and self-aggrandizement when they saw it. In their last years they occasionally came to share with each other the same sorts of hours-long confidences I'd been privileged that they shared with me.

A confession and I've still not decided if it should be a regret. I misled Henry, though it was unintentional. Henry kept my phone number on the emergency card in his wallet. The police and hospital used it once when he flipped over his car. And they used it again about a year later when he had what we now know to have been a stroke. When I got to the ICU it was clear that some sort of serious damage probably had been done, but no one knew how serious, and we didn't know that the hemorrhaging had not yet progressed as far as it would just a little later. Henry still was able to speak coherently for a couple of hours, and he complained that he really didn't need whatever this new infirmity was. I assured him that he was in the best place, with the best care, that the worst already was over, and that there would be only improvement from then on. Well....

Before I close there a couple of more things that want to be said, and in these Henry is only one of the actors. As you know, he spent about two years in a rehabilitation facility here in Arlington. Lots of people, including many in this room, visited Henry, some rather regularly, but one person, I'm sure, has assured his own place in heaven with an utterly selfless dedication to Henry and his welfare. Bob Arons more than merits that recognition this side of the great divide.

And after Arlington, Henry was moved to a new facility in Bangor, Maine. I don't know all of the aspects of the visitation and care that Henry received there, but we do know that the fifth commandment was fully and faithfully observed by Benjamin.

Among his legacies, Henry leaves a model all too rare these days. He did not dissemble. He did not waste words; neither did he mince them. What he spoke and what he wrote are the distillations of informed thought and of an informed heart, and not a substitute for them. That alone, I think, places him high among the newest immigrants to *Jener Welt*. And, in the Yiddish he came to learn and love in the Łódź ghetto, it confirms him in an epitaph each of us might covet: *Er iz g'ven a ebrlicher un a emessdikker mentsch*. This is the time that the Dahyan ha-Emess, the *Riboyni shel Oylam*, renders His judgment, and if you cup your hand at your ear and listen hard just now in this place, I think you will hear the verdict. "*Gut g'zogt un gut g'makht, mein tyere Chaim ben Benjamin. Yahsber Koyakh.*"

Benton Arnovitz

Anecdotal Memories of Heinz Egon Friedländer (1930-2012)

In 1982 the Western Association of German Studies held its annual meeting in El Paso, Texas. As convention director, I was responsible for inviting East German colleagues, Wolfgang Küttler and Hans Schleier, to what was then a rare public forum involving historians from both German states. Georg Iggers had done most of the highly complex and difficult legwork, but it was incumbent on me to extend a formal welcome to our colleagues from the GDR. When I approached Küttler and Schleier, they were engaged in a lively, occasionally heated, German-language conversation with a small, good-looking colleague I'd never met and whose accent struck me as odd. After the discussion, I asked "Sind Sie Deutscher?" The response was "Nein. Ich bin Preuße." That was my introduction to Henry with his wry, slightly sarcastic, self-effacing sense of humor. Later that day, Henry introduced me to Sybil at a small gathering in the home of a West German officer. I noticed a fossil fish mounted on the wall, remarking on the basis of three semesters of geology (!) that the fossil was probably Silurian. Sybil fired back that it came from the Green River shale and that I didn't know what I was talking about. There followed an intense disputation that left me in shambles. No matter. Sybil and I had bonded, probably because we both liked to argue.

Over the course of the next several years, I got to know Henry and Sybil better, mostly through chit-chat at various conventions. At the GSA Minneapolis meeting I learned from Jay Baird that Henry had been deported in 1941 from Berlin to Łódź and in 1944 to Auschwitz. Thereafter, Sybil let me know that Henry hated the term "survivor" and would say little about his time in Auschwitz. However, he was always keen to comment on aspects of films involving the Holocaust; for example, he considered *Sophie's Choice* a dreadful movie, but thought the depiction of the selection process at Auschwitz astonishingly accurate. He and Sybil both approved of the Höss figure. Here I should mention that after Sybil's death Henry and I talked to each other on the telephone about all kinds of subjects, including movies. He disliked *Schindler's List* as sentimental and politically correct. We both agreed that the best Holocaust film was *Judgment at Nuremberg*, primarily because it followed Aristotle's rules on tragedy.

Looking back, I think our three-way friendship congealed in 1985 in the midst of a ten month sabbatical in Vienna. Sometime in the Spring Henry and Sybil turned up at the Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstandes, where I was researching popular sentiment in Austria during the Anschluss era. Henry was gathering documents and conducting interviews for his T4 euthanasia project. Like Michael Kater, whom he greatly admired, Henry insisted in including incorporated Austria as an integral part of comprehensive studies of Hitler's Greater German Reich. To this day, incidentally, historical scholarship tends to examine the "Altreich" and "Ostmark" as separate entities, which between 1938 and 1945 was simply not the case. As for Sybil, she was in the initial stages of finding documents to be used in preparing her script for

the future USHMM. She appears to have had some Austrian background and knew a great deal about the Anschluss years. Both she and Henry talked about making the museum more inclusive by devoted attention to the mass murder of the physically and mentally handicapped as well as the Roma and Sinti.

Between 1988 and 1991 Henry and I served together on the GSA executive committee. Along with Frank Trommler we normally sat at the end of the table, chuckling to see Gerry Kleinfeld wear down putative reformers by means of clever, convoluted arguments and Bolshevik-like Sitzfleisch. Henry made it quite clear that he did not like the West German “establishment.” Given the horrors of his childhood, Henry’s motives were no doubt complex, but it was Bonn’s pomposity that aroused his ire. I well recall him leaving a patronizing diplomat nearly speechless after grilling him on Kohl’s proposed Centers of Excellence. Henry was not too keen on the *Spiegel* or *Die Zeit*. You can imagine his views on *Die Welt*, but he seemed to admire Axel Springer as a respectable conservative and friend of Israel.

In late 1994 I returned from Cambridge to finish my manuscript on Hitler’s Austria. Both Henry and Sybil expressed considerable interest in the project and helped in many ways to bring it to fruition. Indeed, Henry read the completed manuscript and with Sybil persuaded Lew Bateman to publish it for the University of North Carolina Press. During that period Sybil once called me out of the blue to apologize for having voted for Clinton.

Shortly before Christmas 1999 I was diagnosed with an exceptionally rare form of abdominal cancer. A surgeon at M.D. Anderson proposed palliative surgery that would extend my life three to five years. A physician friend in Boston then suggested consulting Dr. Paul Sugarbaker in Washington, D.C., an oncologist well known for his radical surgical procedures. After a very grim consultation with Dr. Sugarbaker, Sybil and Henry invited my wife and me to dinner at their favorite Italian restaurant. Upon arrival Sybil ordered a magnum of champagne, assuring my shell-shocked wife and me that all would be well. To this day Anita remain grateful for that most extraordinary evening. On the flight home Anita remarked, “Now I know why you like them.”

During the run-up to my surgery (January-May 2000) Henry would call to ask if he could be of assistance in the weeks following what would be a risky, life and death procedure. True to form, Henry visited me three or four times during my six week stay at Washington Hospital Center. After returning home to recover for a second operation in October, Sybil was diagnosed with lymphoma. She was quite angry, but initially optimistic. After she unexpectedly took a turn for the worse and slipped into a coma at the NIH, Henry continued to ring me up. And after the second operation in Washington, he made two hospital visits including one on the very day Sybil died.

Some months later, Henry and I began to chat on a regular basis on the telephone. He related stories about life in the American Zone after the war, worrying whether his hair would grow back and trying to re-learn German after having spoken Yiddish before liberation. Once back on his feet, he received regular visits from the Palestine committee urging him to emigrate. At various

times in 1947, Eric Kohler told me, there were meetings with members of Henry's extensive family, all of whom had survived the Holocaust in mixed marriages. In fact, Henry's mother appears to have been the only close relative to have been murdered by the Nazis. At one of these family gatherings, a decision was made to have Henry emigrate to Philadelphia. After arriving in the City of Brotherly Love, Henry, then 17 years old, returned to the schoolroom by enrolling in the eighth grade. He made rapid progress and within a few years received his degrees – I think – from the University of Pennsylvania. Thereafter he moved to Washington to work with Gerhard Weinberg microfilming captured German documents for the AHA.

In the course of many telephone conversations in 2002 Henry suggested that I investigate the fate of intermarried couples in Nazi Vienna. He was particularly interested in the issue of divorce, believing that more Gentile wives tended to initiate proceedings than non-Jewish husbands. After several research trips spent in the Wiener Stadt-und Landesarchiv, Henry arranged for me to present my preliminary conclusions at a roundtable discussion with other colleagues, which he managed to organize and moderate at the 2005 GSA meeting in Milwaukee. In retrospect, I think Henry's health was beginning to fail, though he presided over our session with enormous verve and energy. It was also here that he introduced me to Nathan Stoltzfus, who subsequently helped me immensely in completing my study *Jews and Intermarriage in Nazi Austria*.

Between Sybil's death and his crippling stroke three years ago Henry telephoned more and more frequently. He tried to remain cheerful, but increasingly felt lonely and down in the dumps. However, he always cheered up when reporting on visits by Lew Bateman, Gerhard Weinberg, and Frank Nicosia. He also felt enormously comforted by the growing attention provided by Nathan Stoltzfus and his wife, of whom he became exceptionally fond.

Those of us who knew and loved Henry will always remember his many eccentricities, including his strong opinions, interminable likes and dislikes, and occasionally maddening behavior. Dining out always seemed to accentuate these, as his son, Benjamin, reminded me with considerable embarrassment some months ago. In January 2003 Anita and I shared several meals with Henry and others at the AHA convention in Chicago. One chilly evening, our dinner group decided on an up-scale restaurant near the Palmer House. While examining the menu, Henry subjected the waiter to a lengthy interrogation on salad lettuces, dressings, vegetables, and the main entrées. He finally decided on thinly sliced duck or veal, but did not place his order until satisfied with the proper dimensions. When the meal arrived, it was adorned with a small garnish. Henry looked up in slight astonishment, asking the waiter: "Is this edible?"

In preparing these remarks I decided to let others discuss Henry's outstanding historical scholarship, which to my mind was penetrating, based on original documents, and fair-minded. He will certainly be remembered for his convincing views on the evolution of the Holocaust. That said, Henry invariably wrestled with multiple identities, though not in his publications. He was exceptionally

proud to be an American citizen, though clearly sympathetic to Israel. He took enormous pride in being Jewish, though made no secret of his disdain for the Hebrew Bible or religion in general. He relished his status as a “Yekke,” but never looked down Eastern Jews. In his heart of hearts, I think he considered himself first and foremost a Berliner. There is no way to prove this notion. Even so, Henry always spoke fondly of life in Berlin, even under the Nazis. He told me many times that once compelled to wear the Yellow Star, passersby would stop him on the street to apologize. And as we now know, it was a Berlin Communist who saved his life in Auschwitz. Thanks to that unknown inmate Henry survived to contribute to our understanding of many aspects of German history including the revolutionary upheavals of 1918-19 and Hitler’s persecution of the Jews. Above all, Henry enriched the lives of countless friends throughout the world.

Evan B. Bukey
University of Arkansas

Dieter H. Sevin (1938-2012)

Dr. Dieter Sevin, former chair of the Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages at Vanderbilt University, died of pancreatic cancer on July 29, 2012, at his home in Brentwood, Tennessee. He was 73. A specialist in language pedagogy and the literature of the former East Germany, Dr. Sevin published extensively and taught German language and literature for over 44 years.

Born on November 5, 1938, near Wittenberg, Germany, Dr. Sevin decided to follow his dream when emigrating by boat from Bremerhaven to New York. With little money to his name, his enterprising spirit and work ethic enabled him to finance his undergraduate studies at San Jose State College. After getting married in 1963, he and his wife moved to Seattle to pursue graduate studies at the University of Washington. He received his Ph.D. in German and History in 1968 and then accepted a position at Vanderbilt University. In 1969, Dr. Sevin was instrumental in launching the Vanderbilt-in-Germany program with Regensburg University. In subsequent years, he served as the program’s director and helped establish a summer exchange program with the Free University of Berlin. Convinced that travel, studies, and/or work in different countries widens perspectives and enriches lives, he saw himself as somewhat of a cultural mediator between the United States and Germany and worked enthusiastically to enable others to participate in intercultural exchange. He also was active in Nashville’s Sister City partnership with Magdeburg, Germany, and the German-American Chamber of Commerce.

In 2007, he was awarded the Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany (*Bundesverdienstkreuz*), the only order awarded by the president of that nation. When presenting the medal, Dr. Lutz H. Görgens, the Atlanta-based Consul General of the Federal Republic of Germany, remarked, “Dieter Sevin is a beacon of German language teaching in the U.S. His entire career has been dedicated to promoting the knowledge of German language, literature and culture in the United States.” He was the recipient of awards and fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Philosophical Society, the German Academic Exchange Service and the Vanderbilt University Research Council, and he served as associate director of the Vanderbilt European Studies Center and as a member of the Modern Language Association delegate assembly. His widely used German college text, *Wie geht’s?: An Introductory German Course*, co-authored with his wife Ingrid Sevin, is now in its ninth edition.

To those who knew him, Dieter Sevin was a unique human being, always positive and willing to help. Quick with a laugh and sound advice, he was always ready to listen, mentor, and inspire. He loved his work, his colleagues and students, enjoyed traveling, reading, music and the arts, but most of all, he cherished spending time with family and friends. He was a devoted husband to his wife of 49 years, Ingrid Sevin; a dedicated father to his daughters, Sonja Sevin and Karen Bryan, as well as to his son-in-law, Charlie Bryan; and a loving grandfather to Caroline and Anna Bryan. He will also be very much missed by his brother Dr. Bernd-Uwe Sevin and his family, as well as the family of his sister Uta DeBoer. A celebration of his life was held in Vanderbilt University’s Benton Chapel on Monday, October 1, at 4:00 PM.

Memorial donations may be made to: The Dieter and Ingrid Sevin Undergraduate Research Fund, Vanderbilt University, Gift Processing Office PMB 407727, 2301 Vanderbilt Place, Nashville TN 37240-7727. Contributions will enable students to pursue various kinds of international study, an experience close to Dieter Sevin’s heart.

*Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages
Vanderbilt University*