

Strote's emphasis on a cohort of intellectuals, born between 1890 and 1910, who began their careers in the Weimar period, emigrated or were sidelined during the Third Reich, and eventually shaped West Germany's emerging political center, is welcome. Aside from questioning narratives of American-led modernization it serves as a useful corrective to the by now conventional dichotomy between an "uncompromising generation" (Michael Wildt), born around 1900, which radicalized after the First World War and later self-nazified, and the "45ers" (Dirk Moses), ranging from Jürgen Habermas to Helmut Kohl, who experienced German defeat as teenagers and later bolstered the Federal Republic's democratic transformation. That intellectuals born around 1900 played an equally crucial part in this transformation is a point that the author briefly scores (11–12, 221) but could have made more of. Instead, he treads on thinner ice when aiming to reinterpret the "creation of post-Nazi Germany" as a whole, based on an inevitably limited sample and kicking in an open door inasmuch as the value of "Americanization" as a historiographical concept has long been in doubt. Strote's heroes are well known and have garnered much academic attention in Germany. He does bring out some neglected aspects of their thinking, namely, regarding the importance of Christianity, but the claim on the dust cover that his book "draws from never-before-seen material" seems rather far-fetched. Demonstrating these intellectuals' cohesion as a group by way of a bold thesis is no small achievement, although precise synthetic and interpretative passages would have been more effective in bringing it home than an inclination to overgeneralize and overcontextualize. Despite these weaknesses in execution, *Lions and Lambs* convinces in its overarching thrust. And I happily join him in raising a cheer for those Germans whose experience and conviction led them to become political moderates.

MORITZ FÖLLMER

University of Amsterdam

The Rise and Fall of Comradship: Hitler's Soldiers, Male Bonding, and Mass Violence in the Twentieth Century. By *Thomas Kühne*.

New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. viii+304. \$99.99 (cloth); \$29.99 (paper); \$24.00 (Adobe eBook Reader).

The War in Their Minds: German Soldiers and Their Violent Pasts in West Germany. By *Svenja Goltermann*. Translated by *Philip Schmitz*. Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany. Edited by *Kathleen Canning*.

Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017. Pp. viii+428. \$80.00 (cloth); \$65.00 (EPUB or PDF).

The question is one with which most historians of twentieth-century Europe are well acquainted. How did the experience of war relate to the fascisms that dominated the political stage of the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s? Addressing it is especially crucial for historians of modern and contemporary Germany. One can hardly discuss the history of twentieth-century Germany without outlining some narrative arc about the relationship between the world wars and National Socialism. And so, most of us have come to light upon some more or less familiar, and invariably disheartening, story.

As Kristian Mennen and Wim van Meurs have partly reconstructed it ("Editorial Introduction: War Veterans and Fascism," *Fascism: Journal of Comparative Fascist Studies* 6 [2017]: 1–11), that narrative often goes something like this. World War I was a formative experience in which the military, state, and society projected onto young men the values of

heroism, self-sacrifice, and violence in the name of the nation. For German veterans, losing the war was experienced as something so unexpected, so disenchanting that frustrated veterans never fully integrated back into civilian society. In the interwar years, they nostalgically idealized the Great War—as well as war in general—and became politicized and armed with highly misogynistic worldviews inflected by social resentments and dreams of revenge. This ultimately translated into sympathy and support for National Socialism, which in turn embodied the ideals of the veterans. The ground had been set. When world war came a second time, veterans and their sons proved willing to be even more ruthless and more lethal than the first time around.

The image of the brutalized and brutalizing soldier and veteran has been a powerful heuristic device. To be sure, there is a great deal of truth in the plot sketched above. But in examining new sources and revisiting widely known ones, the books by Svenja Goltermann and Thomas Kühne reveal neglected and often surprising dimensions to the experiences of German soldiers and veterans of the twentieth century.

Kühne's book focuses on the ideal of comradeship and how it played a role in the lives of German soldiers. He excels in capturing the ambiguities inherent in both the meaning of the notion and its realizations in practice. As he puts it, "It radiates uncertainty—and contingency" (30). In Kühne's view, comradeship was a form of appropriation of the notion of fraternity, one that allowed soldiers and veterans to see themselves as independent of women but allowing them to embrace values of toughness and tenderness all at once.

Kühne targets two influential perspectives on German soldierly solidarity for reconsideration. On the one hand, there is the classical sociological argument of Edward Shils and Morris Janowitz about cohesion in the ranks of the Wehrmacht that stresses so-called primary group relations, that is, the relative strength of interpersonal bonds forged and maintained between infantrymen. On the other hand, there is the famous psychoanalytical take put forward by Klaus Theweleit, stressing the idea that a violent repudiation of all things feminine stamped the imaginations and life-worlds of veterans after World War I. Kühne grants that each of these lines of argument has something to offer, but he finds them in need of refinement. Primary group relations, he notes, are hardly stable and thus must be historicized. And when looking at how men have historically discussed comradeship practices, it is clear that their sensibilities cannot be reduced to simply the excision of the feminine.

Relying especially on diaries and memoirs, Kühne presents a heterogeneous picture of German warriors. In the Weimar Republic, for instance, most stayed away from veteran organizations, while other notable figures did not. Viewed during the war as a kind of segregated intimacy—sometimes mixed with a dose of homoeroticism—the squad took on the status of a family. In so doing, after the war, comradeship could be called on to provide a way for many men to envision a more socially level political community, the *Volksgemeinschaft*. Nazi Germany, of course, would mobilize this ideal in the service of xenophobia, racism, and war. And while some soldiers in the Second World War found it possible to build a new kind of comradeship around sadism, gallows humor, rage, and sexual assault, others fell back on flying "under the radar," apathy, or a resigned fatalism.

Though there is some overlap between the two, Goltermann's book in a fashion carries Kühne's narrative forward, exploring how World War II veterans looked on their wartime experiences and, in turn, how others regarded them in West Germany. She argues that postwar Germans were well aware of the carnage associated with the war, but that conversation about wartime memories was largely squelched in public discussions for some time afterward. What she calls the "dark side of memories of the war" (231) instead found its expression in the unsettled private lives and interpersonal relations of

men. Ingeniously consulting psychiatric records from the time, Goltermann finds that many men after the war were beset by self-doubt, their personal lives disrupted by domestic crises.

Psychiatry, it turns out, not only helped serve as a vent for these problems, it also played a key role in providing the means for bringing these experiences to public attention. In one of the most intriguing sections of the book, Goltermann shows how mental health specialists were key actors in the process of recognizing and denying war-casualty status for distressed veterans, particularly for returning POWs from the USSR. German psychiatrists and neurologists of the 1950s and 1960s struggled mightily with the idea that the kinds of memory problems, anxiety, anger, and depression some veterans were manifesting could be attributed to the war. Following decades of precedent, clinical evaluators assumed human beings to be eminently resilient in the face of adversity—so much so, that they considered most men asking for welfare compensation to be either craven or outright frauds.

These clinical assumptions were increasingly challenged on two fronts. First, family members of ailing veterans—mostly wives and parents—pressed the issue, pointing to domestic problems and changes in the personality of their loved ones as evidence of war-casualty status. By the late fifties they had succeeded in getting some influential clinicians to recognize that veterans could become victims of what was eventually dubbed “summation trauma.”

Victims of Nazi persecution and their advocates also proved successful in criticizing the traditional assumptions of the mental health professions. By the second half of the 1960s, both inside and outside Germany, welfare administrations and clinicians widely held the view that, when it came to survivors of Nazi atrocity and abuse, entitlement to reparations should be considered the rule, not the exception. Ironically, this had a negative impact on German war veteran claimants. For as the trials of Adolf Eichmann and former staff at Auschwitz drew extraordinary publicity, they contributed to an emerging consensus that German veterans were categorically perpetrators. They could never be deserving of the label of victim.

In the end, these are imaginative and resourceful works, ones that bring an appreciation of subtlety and a judicious sense of nuance to the historical study of gender and war. Above all else, Kühne and Goltermann uncover a chronic vulnerability that these men faced and often carried with them throughout their lives. In this regard, one is reminded of the recent documentary by Jennifer Siebel Newsom, *The Mask You Live In* (2015). Under the gaze of these two discerning historians, masculinity is shown to be not only equivocal and fluid—despite cultural efforts to naturalize and stabilize it—but also profoundly precarious.

GREG EGHIGIAN

Pennsylvania State University

Sweden after Nazism: Politics and Culture in the Wake of the Second World War.

By *Johan Östling*. Translated by *Peter Graves*.

New York: Berghahn Books, 2016. Pp. xii+346. \$130.00.

Since 1945, few European nations have avoided debating the rise and fall of Nazism and Hitlerism’s particular impact on their nation and society, whether they were occupied during the war or not. Some societies have achieved a meaningful level of reflection; others have clung to the belief that such debates were best understood as a political exercise