

H-Net Reviews

in the Humanities & Social Sciences



German Studies Association Conference 2003 Session 135: German Intellectuals between Renewal and Restoration, 1945-1970. German Studies Association.

Reviewed by Diethelm Prowe (Department of History, Carleton College)

Published on H-German (October, 2003)

This session was centrally concerned with the evolution of German political culture after 1945 in view of the ultimate democratization of German politics and society. All presenters focused primarily on the role of intellectuals in this process. Sean Forner, who is writing his Ph.D.-dissertation under the guidance of Michael Geyer at the University of Chicago, discussed the “imagined generational community” of “radical democrats” committed to a fundamental, thorough democratization of Germany in the first post-World-War years. Forner included a broad spectrum of Marxist-left to center-left writers in this group, including Alfred Andersch, Franz-Josef Bantz, Ernst Bloch, Willi Bredel, Walter Dirks, Azel Eggebrecht, Alfred Doeblin, Wolfgang Harich, Karl Jaspers, Erich Kaestner, Alfred Kantorowicz, Marie-Luise Kaschnitz, Eugen Kogon, Werner Krauss, Rudolf Leonhard, Horst Lommer, Friedrich Luft, Georg Lukács, Burkart Lutz, Hans Mayer, Alexander Mitscherlich, Joachim Moras, Clemens Muenster, Pauline Nardi, Ernst Niekisch, Hans Paeschke, Theo Pirker, Bruno Reifenberg, Hans Werner Richter, Herbert Sandberg, Maximilian Scheer, Karl Schnog, Max Schroeder, Dolf Sternberger, Alfred Weber, Guenter Weisenborn, and Wolfgang Weyrauch, as well as the journals *Ende und Anfang*, *Die Gegenwart*, *Das goldene Tor*, *Merkur*, *Der Ruf*, *Heute und Morgen*, *Ulenspiegel*. Typically for the postwar years, these writers sought a democracy or “democratic socialism” that was different from and “purer” than the “Western” or American and the Soviet communist versions. In this search for a German “third way,” as it is usually termed, Forner argued that these intellectuals emphasized the “spontaneous, creative, and participatory agency of people

self-consciously giving form to structures that shape all spheres of their collective existence.” He found the characteristic postwar search for synthesis of fundamental social principles, such as of freedom and order, individualism and collectivism/socialism, economic production and consumer needs (*Bedarfs*- or *Gemeinwirtschaft*) spirituality and pragmatic action, Christianity and Marxism-all under the guise of economic democracy or a humanist socialism, in contrast to intolerant ideologies. Once this analysis is put in the context of (1) the related and in some important respects identical discourse that took place in conservative circles at the same time, (2) the related economic-democracy discussions in the Weimar Republic, and even (3) the *Volksgemeinschaft* slogan used so effectively by the Nazis and clearly still lingering in German heads after 1945, this thorough and comprehensive review will be a valuable contribution to postwar German history. A. Dirk Moses, Assistant Professor of History at the University of Sydney, presented a remarkably original and persuasive model for understanding the democratization of (West) Germany. In contrast to the traditional rival explanations of a (1) gradual conservative integration under the guidance of the Adenauer Government with critical backing of the U.S. and (2) the defeat of an early postwar democratic movement by a U.S.-backed conservative restoration yet finally overcome by the rebellion of the 68ers and a “second foundation” of the Federal Republic, Moses described the democratization as a “discursive” process. He identified two “rival languages of republicanism,” linked to the two traditional theses: a “redemptive” or cathartic language associated with the French and American Revolutions and with the second explanation above, and an essentially liberal-conservative “integrationist” model

of democratization or “republicanism.” Neither was by itself able to solve the fundamental problem of legitimacy the Federal Republic confronted at its outset. It was the discourse between the two languages over the first quarter-century of the new, post-totalitarian Germany that ultimately solved the problem of legitimization. Thus Moses saw this discourse as the <cite>post-factum</cite> equivalent of the French and American Revolutions. At least in the case of the French Revolution, one might object that it took post-revolutionary France most of a century of such discourse to solve its legitimacy problem internally. But France did not enjoy the advantage of the powerful external pressure that Germans felt, primarily from America, to conform to the “Western” standard of democracy during the Cold War. Still, even without mention of this critical American influence, Moses’ model for understanding the internal German democratization process in and of itself will be, in the view of this reviewer and commentator, a seminal contribution in the field of post-World-War-II German history and beyond. <p> Christina von Hodenberg, Visiting DAAD Associate Professor of History at the University of California, Berkeley, presented a summary of the main theses of her <cite>Habilitationsschrift</cite>, which is slated to be published as a book in Germany. Hodenberg reported that in the press democratization came more slowly than has generally been argued and

was achieved only with the change in generations. Even though the German postwar press, which held the special attention of the Western Allies and was reformed more quickly and effectively than most other institutions, there was no “zero hour” in the literal sense of replacement of all or most personnel. After quite a radical reform by the Allied occupation, which replaced all print and broadcasting media with a newly licensed press, reporters who had served in the Nazi years quickly returned to outnumber the often very young writers and editors appointed by the military governments. Thus, with the exception of the new <cite>Spiegel</cite> magazine, a “consensus journalism” dominated in the fifties, which was easily steered by the Federal Press Office of the Adenauer Government. Starting in 1956, a new generation of more critical journalists began to make its appearance first at the radio stations. By the early sixties the younger generation, now in charge, were provoking political scandals with investigative reports. Like Moses, Hodenberg saw ultimately both generations contributing to the democratization process, since Germans were new to democracy and needed to be guided gently toward mature citizenship. <p> For a complete listing of all sessions at the 2003 German Studies Association Conference, please visit <http://www.g-s-a.org>. <p>

If there is additional discussion of this review, you may access it through the network, at:

<https://networks.h-net.org/h-german>

Citation: Diethelm Prowe. Review of , *German Studies Association Conference 2003 Session 135: German Intellectuals between Renewal and Restoration, 1945-1970*. H-German, H-Net Reviews. October, 2003.

URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=15245>

Copyright © 2003 by H-Net, all rights reserved. H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, originating list, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online. For any other proposed use, contact the Reviews editorial staff at hbooks@mail.h-net.org.