

gendered, whether implicitly or explicitly; this is especially the case because her study makes it clear how these categories for analysing mobile and sedentary populations came to be understood in racial and ethnic terms. Like many scholars, Hahn concludes that attention to gender in migration studies first emerged from studies of migrant women by North American scholars and was adopted more slowly in other national schools of scholarship. Why this should have been the case remains to be explained by a thoroughly gendered analysis of national histories of scholarly practice.

Silvia Hahn's fascinating discussion of how the study and policing of cities and urban populations worked to create 'foreigners' as categories of governance, and scholarly study provides a firm foundation for understanding the gendered labour migrations and the working-class populations that she analyses in the final section of the book. The ways in which scholars define the dimensions of any regional economy or distinguish analytically between long-distance and short-distance moves are very much influenced by state decisions about the relationship of birthplace, political rights and official, state definitions of civic 'belonging'. The distinction between the 'foreign' and the 'native' shapes almost all data collection on human movement and, thus, it also inevitably shapes scholarly understanding of the past based on statistical data. Any change in how the boundary is drawn between the two can fundamentally alter the way in which scholars define mobile and sedentary populations. Precisely because Hahn is able to show how occupations were gendered as male or female and how these occupations came to be associated with 'native' or foreign workers, with 'long-distance' or 'short-distance' movements (that were also gendered differently), it would have been desirable for her rich discussion of the history of early policing of mobile people to have attended as closely to gendered dynamics and associations as her discussion of the scholarly field within which she works and to which this book contributes so much.

*Donna R. Gabaccia, Minneapolis*

Angelika Schaser and Stefanie Schüler-Springorum eds., **Liberalismus und Emanzipation. In- und Exklusionsprozesse im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik** (= Stiftung Bundespräsident-Theodor-Heuss-Haus, Wissenschaftliche Reihe 10), Franz Steiner Verlag: Stuttgart 2010, 224 pp., EUR 29,-, ISBN 978-3-515-09319-4.

European liberalism has always been fraught by the contradictions between its emancipatory claims and exclusionary practices toward groups deemed "incapable" of fully participating in the political process. This edited volume is interested in exploring these contradictions, primarily in respect to gender (women) and ethnicity (Jews), although questions of class, confession, and education come up throughout. The volume also discusses the tension, raised in a number of studies of German and European liberalism, between promoting individual freedom on a universalist basis and fully recognis-

ing group identities, be they sexual, religious, or ethnic in nature. The eleven essays are organised into sections, “Liberalism and Emancipation”, “Liberalism in Regional and Local Praxis”, and “Emancipation Between Individual and Group Rights”, which provide a number of interesting comparisons between women and Jews in three overlapping contexts.

The tensions between universalist inclusion and ethno-sexual exclusion, individual emancipation and minority oppression become immediately apparent in Reinhard Rürup’s opening essay on “Liberalism and the Emancipation of the Jews”. Nevertheless, the inconsistency between liberal rhetoric and political reality that Rürup describes was less stark in regard to German Jews than it was in regard to women. Indeed, despite the tragic history of German Jewry during the Third Reich, the decades before the Nazi seizure of power represented a period of rapid “acculturation and assimilation”, producing one of the “greatest epochs in Jewish history, not only in Germany but also in Europe and elsewhere” (38). In examining the infamous “Berlin Antisemitism Controversy”, however, Uffa Jensen finds greater liberal preoccupation with Jewish religious and, at times, racial difference. The two opponents in the controversy, Theodor Mommsen and Heinrich von Treitschke, may have disagreed about the likelihood of Jewish assimilation, but neither liberal was especially tolerant of Jewish ethno-religious particularities.

In Part II, Ulrich Baumann and Stefanie Schüler-Springorum introduce two interesting case studies of local anti-Semitism, the first in Baden, the westernmost province in the Reich, the second in Königsberg, Imperial Germany’s easternmost metropolis. Both case studies confirm the findings of Peter Pulzer and others who argue that latent anti-Semitism (and support for left-wing liberalism) waxed and waned in strong correlation to economic conditions, but there are important regional distinctions. In Baden, for example, intermittent local tensions between Catholic supporters of the Center Party and Jewish National Liberals seem to have been based more on concrete differences in political and economic interest than grassroots anti-Semitism. In Königsberg, where clearer “limits to (Jewish) integration” existed, economic uncertainty after 1918 appears to have had a more extreme and deleterious affect on both Jewish-gentile relations and liberal success at the polls. According to Christian Schölzel, who contributes the first essay of Part III, the brilliant Jewish industrialist, politician, and intellectual Walther Rathenau was motivated more by the specific issue of Jewish emancipation than liberal principles *per se*, even if the former generally put him on the side of the latter. Finally, in her examination of Eva Reichmann, a member of the liberal and assimilationist-inclined Central Association of Germans of Jewish Confessions, Kirsten Heinsohn finds that gentile liberals were uncomfortable recognising Jews as a distinct ethno-religious group. In his contribution to Part III, Manfred Hettling observes that German liberalism, despite its universalist preoccupations with creating an inclusive bourgeois civil society (*Verbürgerlichung*), often favoured less inclusive concepts of community (*Ver-gemeinschaftung*) like nation, religion, or race.

Nevertheless, as Karin Hausen indicates in her excellent essay on liberalism and women's emancipation, liberal attitudes toward women were probably even more ambivalent than they were toward Jews. Few liberals questioned the "capacity" of Jews to participate in German political or social life. The inconsistency in liberal attitudes toward Jewish emancipation had more to do with a combination of latent prejudice and genuine fear of Jewish dominance. On the contrary, in regard to women, the old question of women's "natural" mental and emotional inferiority, stemming from "anti-feminist" Enlightenment thinkers like Rousseau, profoundly influenced liberal attitudes. Unlike Jews, women were also not a small minority, but represented half the German population. Moreover, Jewish men who wanted equal rights could simply leave the ghetto and embrace assimilation, while women who sought emancipation first had to break out from under the domestic authority of their husbands or fathers. Lastly, German liberals were hampered in their support for women's emancipation by their constituencies' own inherently conservative values, which continued to view women as "naturally" predisposed to marriage and reproduction.

According to Ute Planert, French liberals, the true heirs to Rousseau, were more ideologically anti-feminist than their British and German counterparts, generally opposing female suffrage. But the record of British and German liberals, if hardly "anti-feminist", was mixed, vacillating between support for female suffrage in a pragmatic attempt to regain liberal majorities, and an underlying antipathy to liberal women's demands for political and social equality. Turning from a broad European comparison to a case study of liberal women's integration in the German capital of Berlin, Angelika Schaser's own contribution in Part II illustrates the considerable strides in political representation, social standing, and employment opportunities that liberal women achieved in the Weimar Republic. Schaser nonetheless reminds us of the glass ceiling faced by even the most talented liberal women, whether in politics or the workplace. In the last contribution to Part III, Barbara Vogel agrees that German liberals had difficulty overcoming a widespread scepticism toward women's emancipation. This attitude had something to do with liberal fears regarding women's capacity to participate in the political process, but it also reflected the conservative values of their bourgeois constituencies.

To be sure, most contributors recognise that political prejudices and socioeconomic conjunctures endemic to much of Europe played an important role in explaining the inconsistencies in German liberal attitudes toward Jews and women. But some contributors, especially those dealing with the Jewish Question, resort to explanations that still suggest German liberal peculiarity. While convincing in places, these arguments would be stronger with a greater sense of comparative context and theoretical depth. One might expect, for example, that a volume addressing the relationship between Jews and liberalism would deal more explicitly with the copious historiography on German (liberal) nationalism, anti-Semitism, and minority policy in the Wilhelmine and Weimar period, particularly that published in English. The same might be said of the equally extensive English-language research on nineteenth and early twentieth century

German feminism. Nevertheless, most of the findings here complement Anglo-American research quite well, reminding us of the many complexities of class, religion, ethnicity, and place in defining the relationship between liberal theory and practice. These rich contributions provide both a useful summary of existing views and, in some cases, effective models for future research on German liberalism.

*Eric Kurlander, DeLand/Florida*

Regina Mühlhäuser, **Eroberungen. Sexuelle Gewalttaten und intime Beziehungen deutscher Soldaten in der Sowjetunion 1941–1945**, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition 2010, 416 S., EUR 32,-, ISBN 978-3-86854-220-2.

Regina Mühlhäuser stellt in ihrer Publikation – der überarbeiteten Fassung ihrer Dissertation an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Köln – die Frage nach den heterosexuellen Begegnungen männlicher Angehöriger der Wehrmacht, SS und zivilen Besatzungsbehörden mit einheimischen Frauen in den besetzten Gebieten der Sowjetunion. Dabei handelt es sich um ein wichtiges und wenig beforschtes Thema, bei dem es um die Interdependenzen von Sexualität, Krieg, Gewalt und Geschlecht geht. Sie wählt dafür den aus dem Englischen entlehnten offenen und sinnvoll erscheinenden Begriff *sexual encounters*/sexuelle Zusammentreffen. Dabei wird von ihr die Bandbreite heterosexueller Kontakte, von sexueller Gewalt bis zu einvernehmlichen Beziehungen in den Blick genommen und in den Kontext von zeitgenössischen Männlichkeits- und Weiblichkeitskonzeptionen, nationalsozialistisch-rassistischen und militärischen Geschlechterdiskursen gestellt, was ihr gut gelingt. Sie thematisiert ein sehr weites Spektrum geschlechtsspezifischer heterosexueller Praxen in Kriegen – von Vergewaltigung, Gewalt, Erniedrigung, Folter, vom Besuch ‚geheimer‘ Prostituerter und von Militärbordellen über den freiwilligen Austausch Sex gegen Nahrungsmittel oder Schutz bis hin zu einvernehmlichen Beziehungen –, die in Ehen und dem Zeugen von Kindern münden konnten. Sie stützt sich dabei vorrangig auf Foucaults theoretischen Ansatz, der sexuelle Vorstellungen und Praktiken als nichts natürlich Gegebenes, Festes, Biologisch-Invariables begreift, sondern als Formen von Macht/Wissen darstellt, die von den ProtagonistInnen immer wieder neu hergestellt werden.

Regina Mühlhäuser gliedert ihre Publikation in fünf große Abschnitte: „Ausgangspunkte“, „Sexuelle Gewalt“, „Sexuelle Tauschgeschäfte“, „Einvernehmliche Verhältnisse“ und „Besatzungskinder“. Dazwischen schiebt sie zwei kleine Bildteile mit privaten Fotografien von Wehrmachtssoldaten ein, die zwar sehr interessant sind, aber – bis auf eine Ausnahme – nicht weiter interpretiert werden und daher etwas unverbunden neben den anderen Kapiteln stehen.

Die Quellen, auf denen Regina Mühlhäusers Untersuchung basiert, sind divergent und von sehr unterschiedlicher Aussagekraft: zeitgenössische Selbstzeugnisse und später