

hat sich Konstanz etwas entgegen lassen: die Konstruktion eines überraschend komplexen photographischen „kollektiven Gedächtnisses“ in der DDR der achtziger Jahre. Erfreulicherweise spart der trotzdem überbeuerte Band nicht mit Abbildungen. Edgar Lersch gelingt in seinen unter dem Motto „Aus der Zone für die Zone“ daherkommenden „Streiflichtern zum Kalten Krieg im Hörfunk der beiden deutschen Staaten 1945–1970“ die wünschenswerte Balance zwischen detailreicher, konkreter Anschaulichkeit und theoretischer Grundierung, was keineswegs über die Mehrzahl der anderen Beiträge gesagt werden kann und von einem solchen Tagungsband auch kaum zu erwarten ist. Die Beiträge zur Pressegeschichte, über das Fotoarchiv und den Rundfunk, also über „die anderen Medien“ wirken eher wie zur belehrenden Horizonterweiterung der versammelten Bibliothekare bestimmte Farbtupfer ohne systematischen Anspruch.

Das gilt auch für den Einleitungsaufsatz Wolfgang Marienfelds mit dem Titel „Kalter Krieg und Deutsche Frage im Spiegel der politischen Karikatur“, der zugleich für die Gesamtkonstruktion des Bandes eine tragende Rolle spielt. Nicht weniger als 31 Karikaturen ziehen den Leser auf die einfachste Weise in die Bilderwelt des Kalten Krieges hinein und bilden ein Tableau, das in die Lektüre des gesamten Buches einstimmt, zudem entsteht so gemeinsam mit dem vorletzten Beitrag über die Fotothek eine Art bebildeter Rahmen, also ein hübsches Buch. Danach kommt als würdiger Abschluss noch eine Coda von Karlheinz Blaschke über „Die Stellung des Archivwesens im Herrschaftssystem der DDR“, ein Beitrag, den jeder die Quellenbasis reflektierender DDR-Forscher gelesen ha-

ben sollte. Er beobachtet abschließend wie die Übergabe ihrer Archive das Ende der SED-Herrschaft bedeutete und symbolisierte: „Sic transit gloria mundi.“

Anmerkungen:

- 1 Vgl. dazu bisher nur: M. Lehmstedt u. a. (Hrsg.), Das Loch in der Mauer. Der innerdeutsche Literaturtausch. Wiesbaden 1997; R. Berbig (Hrsg.), Stille Post. Inoffizielle Schriftstellerkontakte zwischen West und Ost, Berlin 2005.
- 2 E. Carlebach, Zensur ohne Schere. Die Gründerjahre der „Frankfurter Rundschau“ 1945/47. Frankfurt a. M. 1985.

**Gabriela Ann Eakin-Thimme,
Geschichte im Exil. Deutschsprachige
Historiker nach 1933, München:
Martin Meidenbauer Verlag 2005,
352 Seiten.**

Rezensiert von
Edoardo Tortarolo, Turin

In her work Gabriela Ann Eakin-Thimme has focused predominantly on the impact émigré (or, from the American perspective, refugee) German historians had on the American historical profession in the 1950s and 1960s. To do so, she has listed and investigated 98 historians who left the German-speaking countries in the 1930s, after having completed their studies in the historical sciences at a German university. The first chapter is therefore a useful if somewhat uninspiring list of biographical accounts of all those who graduated in history and left Germany and Austria for political or racial reasons. The author

then follows these historians in their effort to gain a foothold in the academic labor market in the USA and to adapt to the new social and intellectual environment. This is the most engaging part of the book, as it draws on some archival materials to sketch the variety of reactions and approaches: those who were dismissed from their teaching posts or were forced to leave Germany in 1933 and afterwards acted very differently in the face of the Nazi government. While some young historians became aware very soon that the Nazis were there to stay, others, like Kantorowicz and Rothfels postponed their departure until the very end: Kantorowicz made his final decision in November 1938, Rothfels did so, very reluctantly, in July 1940. The author stresses rightly that the diversity of outlook and education was apparent in the way they entered the American academic system through the agencies that supported the attempts of the émigré scholars. The author combines biography and sociology of knowledge. This methodological move allows her to reconstruct the strategic steps taken by the German historians to place their research at the center of the debate and attract financial resources in the very competitive American market. The sessions at the annual conferences of the American Historical Association were the stage for the émigré historians to show their skills and have a chance to be hired by colleges; in doing so they had to come to terms with the prevailing interests in America, which in many cases were not the same as in Weimar Germany. The sessions of the American Historical Association also showed that cooperation among German émigré was very difficult and sometimes impossible. A revision of the narrative of

German history was therefore a common wish but was not to be the outcome of a collaborative effort. The focus of the whole book is on early modern and modern history. While this is reasonable considering that many of the most prominent émigré German historians had been Meinecke's pupils, it seems to misrepresent the reality of a historical culture that was imbued with classical antiquity to a very high degree. And quite a few German émigré had an undeniable impact on the research and teaching of the classics in the USA (and in England too). Besides, sociology of knowledge is a viable approach but is likely to disregard the internal development of history as a discipline, which is the case in Eakin-Thimme's research.

Accordingly, out of 98 historians Eakin-Thimme singles out the most outstanding figures who gained recognition in the American academic world. Hajo Holborn and Felix Gilbert, both from the "Meinecke Schule", are the most conspicuous examples of a successful integration, which is made clear not only by their academic reputation but also by their use of English as their first language in personal correspondence. In 1961 Holborn warned Masur in English: "I hope you have been able to decide whether or not to accept the offers from Berlin and Tübingen. Certainly it is a decision not easy to make. As far as I am concerned, I would wish that you would stay on this side of the Atlantic" (p. 271). Masur followed his advice and rejected Rothfels' offer (who wrote to Masur in German).¹ Language was indeed an issue: shifting from German to English in scholarly communication required a reformulation of problems and narratives that should be investigated as a research topic

in its own right. It may come as a surprise that a prominent role in Eakin-Thimme's book is played by Hans Baron. He was not particularly successful in being accepted by the American historians: only after a long struggle did he get a permanent position as a librarian. He persisted in his scholarly interests, concentrating on the Italian Humanism, despite the hostility of the leading American historians of the late Middle Ages and early modern period. His insistence on the exemplary nature of the 15th-century Italian history as a playground for the jarring forces of liberty and despotism marks him as particularly influenced by the political and spiritual climate of the 1930s (what is aptly called his "passionierte Intensität", p. 232). Baron's scholarly passion was the driving force behind his enduring impact on the Anglo-American historical studies in the 1960s and beyond. It is surprising, therefore, that Eakin-Thimme has not devoted a paragraph to the discussion on republicanism in early modern Europe as especially John Pocock has been inspired by Baron in writing his Machiavellian Moment. Baron may have been an exception (p. 245), but a terribly important one in his own field. It is unfortunate that the author's general statement on the success of the "refugee historians" in the American academic system is hidden in a footnote (42, p. 258): her scepticism seems to be correct. It would sound more persuasive if argued in the text and, possibly, within the framework of an extended comparative history of the exiled historians from other European countries, especially Russia.

Annotation:

- 1 There is an inconsistency in the letters quoted by Eakin-Thimme: Rothfels' letter to Masur, ac-

knowledging his rejection to accept the chair in Tuebingen, is dated January 25, 1961, while Holborn's letter, apparently written before Masur's decision, is dated March 9, 1961 (footnote 74-75, p. 271). Among some minor factual mistakes, it should be noted that in his speech of 1949 Gilbert must have meant the 19th-century Italian historian Francesco De Sanctis, not the the 20th-century filologist Gaetano De Sanctis (p. 229).

Michael Borgolte (Hrsg.), *Stiftungen in Christentum, Judentum und Islam vor der Moderne. Auf der Suche nach ihren Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschieden in religiösen Grundlagen, praktischen Zwecken und historischen Transformationen.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005. 297 Seiten.

Rezensiert von
Thomas Adam, Arlington

Nach wie vor erfreut sich das Thema der Stiftungen im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staat, Individuum, Öffentlichkeit und Religion einer regen Aufmerksamkeit unter Historikern aus den verschiedensten Fachrichtungen. Der hier zu besprechende Sammelband erweitert den vorhandenen Kenntnisstand auf mehreren Ebenen und trägt insbesondere zu der intensiven theoretisch-terminologischen Debatte um die Definition dessen, was unter Stiften zu verstehen sei, sowie zur vergleichenden Erforschung des Phänomens der Stiftung bei.

Oftmals erscheint ein Phänomen dann klarer und fassbarer, wenn man es aus seinem Kontext herauslöst und mit ähnlichen Phä-