

Transforming Occupation in the Western Zones of Germany

Politics, Everyday Life and Social Interactions, 1945-55

Edited by Camilo Erlichman & Christopher Knowles



Transforming Occupation in the Western Zones of Germany



An American armoured car attracts a crowd of young Germans in Berlin, 1946 (Getty Images).

Transforming Occupation in the Western Zones of Germany

Politics, Everyday Life and Social
Interactions, 1945–55

Edited by
Camilo Erlichman and Christopher Knowles

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK

BLOOMSBURY, BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC and the Diana logo are trademarks of
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2018

Copyright © Camilo Erlichman, Christopher Knowles and Contributors, 2018

Camilo Erlichman and Christopher Knowles have asserted their right under the Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Editors of this work.

For legal purposes the Acknowledgements on p. ix constitute an extension of this
copyright page.

Cover image: Germany Under Allied Occupation (© War Archive / Alamy Stock Photo)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or
transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical,
including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval
system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc does not have any control over, or responsibility for,
any third-party websites referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given
in this book were correct at the time of going to press. The author and publisher
regret any inconvenience caused if addresses have changed or sites have ceased
to exist, but can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-3500-4922-2
ePDF: 978-1-3500-4923-9
eBook: 978-1-3500-4924-6

Typeset by Newgen KnowledgeWorks Pvt. Ltd., Chennai, India

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com
and sign up for our newsletters.

Contents

List of Illustrations	vii
Notes on Contributors	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
List of Abbreviations	x
Part 1 Contextualizing Occupation	
1 Introduction: Reframing Occupation as a System of Rule <i>Camilo Erlichman and Christopher Knowles</i>	3
2 Preoccupied: Wartime Training for Post-War Occupation in the United States, 1940–5 <i>Susan L. Carruthers</i>	25
3 Benign Occupations: The Allied Occupation of Germany and the International Law of Occupation <i>Peter M. R. Stirk</i>	43
Part 2 The Past in the Present: Transitional Justice and Managing the Nazi Legacy	
4 Transitional Justice? Denazification in the US Zone of Occupied Germany <i>Rebecca Boehling</i>	63
5 The Allied Internment of German Civilians in Occupied Germany: Cooperation and Conflict in the Western Zones, 1945–9 <i>Andrew H. Beattie</i>	81
6 What Do You Do with a Dead Nazi? Allied Policy on the Execution and Disposal of War Criminals, 1945–55 <i>Caroline Sharples</i>	97
Part 3 Doing Occupation: Image and Reality	
7 ‘My Home, Your Castle’: British Requisitioning of German Homes in Westphalia <i>Bettina Blum</i>	115
8 Game Plan for Democracy: Sport and Youth in Occupied West Germany <i>Heather L. Dichter</i>	133

9	Occupying the Environment: German Hunters and the American Occupation <i>Douglas Bell</i>	151
Part 4 Experiencing Occupation: Daily Life and Personal Relationships		
10	The Sexualized Landscape of Post-War Germany and the Politics of Cross-Racial Intimacy in the US Zone <i>Nadja Klopprogge</i>	171
11	Shared Spaces: Social Encounters between French and Germans in Occupied Freiburg, 1945–55 <i>Ann-Kristin Glöckner</i>	191
12	‘Gosh ... I Think I’m in a Dream!!’: Subjective Experiences and Daily Life in the British Zone <i>Daniel Cowling</i>	211
Part 5 Mediating Occupation: Interactions, Intermediaries and Legacies		
13	‘We Are Glad They Are Here, But We Are Not Rejoicing!’: The Catholic Clergy under French and American Occupation <i>Johannes Kuber</i>	233
14	From Denazification to Renazification? West German Government Officials after 1945 <i>Dominik Rigoll</i>	251
15	The Value of Knowledge: Western Intelligence Agencies and Former Members of the SS, Gestapo and Wehrmacht during the Early Cold War <i>Michael Wala</i>	271
	Select Bibliography	283
	Index	293

Illustrations

Frontispiece	An American armoured car attracts a crowd of young Germans in Berlin, 1946	ii
1.1	A denazification tribunal meeting in Berlin, 1946	12
2.1	John Hersey, author of <i>A Bell for Adano</i> , driving a jeep	36
8.1	German youth being instructed by US soldiers in badminton, January 1947	138
8.2	Group shot of the British (white shirt and black shorts) and German teams at the Brentano sports field in Frankfurt, 26 April 1950	142
8.3	John G. Dixon, Chief Sports Officer for the British Zone, at the Deutsche Sporthochschule	145
10.1	<i>Ebony</i> magazine reporting on black GIs in Germany	178
10.2	Nuremberg in Allied hands, 1945	181
12.1	Edna Wearmouth with German friends, ca. 1947	220
12.2	Edna Wearmouth with friends during a trip to Fulda, July 1947	221
13.1	Archbishop Conrad Gröber in Walldürn, 1947	234
13.2	An Allied soldier contemplates a ruined church in Cologne, 1945	240
14.1	Organizational chart of the Federal Ministry of the Interior, 1950	257
14.2	Gustav Heinemann helping with restoration work as mayor of Essen, 1946–9	258
14.3	Hans Ritter von Lex at the tenth anniversary parade of the <i>Bundesgrenzschutz</i> , 1961	262

Contributors

Andrew H. Beattie is Senior Lecturer in European Studies and German at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

Douglas Bell is a doctoral candidate at Texas A&M University, USA.

Bettina Blum completed her PhD at the University of Münster. She is now responsible for the research and exhibition project ‘The British in Westphalia’ at the City of Paderborn, Germany.

Rebecca Boehling is Professor of History; Director, Global Studies Program; and Director, Judaic Studies Program at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC), USA.

Susan L. Carruthers is Professor in American History at the University of Warwick, UK.

Daniel Cowling is a doctoral candidate at the University of Cambridge, UK.

Heather L. Dichter is Associate Professor in the Leicester Castle Business School and International Centre for Sports History and Culture at De Montfort University, UK.

Camilo Erlichman is Assistant Professor in the Institute of History, Leiden University, The Netherlands.

Ann-Kristin Glöckner is a doctoral candidate at the University of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany.

Nadja Klopprogge is a doctoral candidate at the John F. Kennedy Institute's Graduate School of North American Studies at the Freie Universität, Berlin.

Christopher Knowles is a visiting research fellow at King's College London and Archives By-Fellow at Churchill College, Cambridge, UK.

Johannes Kuber is a doctoral candidate at RWTH Aachen University, Germany.

Dominik Rigoll is a research fellow at the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung, Potsdam, Germany.

Caroline Sharples is Senior Lecturer in European History at the University of Roehampton, London, UK.

Peter M. R. Stirk is Senior Lecturer in the School of Government and International Affairs, and Director of the Centre for the History of Political Thought at Durham University, UK.

Michael Wala is Professor of North American History at Ruhr University Bochum, Germany.

Acknowledgements

The idea for this book originated at a conference on ‘The Allied Occupation of Germany Revisited: New Research on the Western Zones of Occupation’, held in September 2016 at the German Historical Institute, London. We would like to thank the German Historical Institute, the German History Society, the Society for the Study of French History, the Royal Historical Society and the Beyond Enemy Lines project at King’s College London, funded by the European Research Council, for supporting the conference. We are grateful to all those who participated in and gave papers at the conference for stimulating discussions on a new framework for research on the post-war occupation of Germany, and for contributing ideas on the significance of the occupation period within the broader history of post-war Europe. We are particularly indebted to Andreas Gestrich and Michael Schaich, director and deputy director, respectively, of the German Historical Institute, for their support, as well as to Felix Römer and Bernd Weisbrod for chairing two of the sessions. We are also grateful to the three anonymous peer reviewers of this book for their helpful comments and suggestions. Finally, we should like to thank Alexandra Paulin-Booth for compiling the index with much attention to detail. What follows is intended as a novel exploration of a subject that is now in need of urgent rediscovery by historians, but we owe a large intellectual debt to earlier generations of scholars who have worked on the occupation period. We hope that the approaches presented here will contribute towards a more comprehensive and contextualized understanding of the post-war occupation of Germany, and that this book will act as a stimulus to others seeking novel ways of engaging with the period.

Abbreviations

ACC	Allied Control Council
AMGOT	Allied Military Government of Occupied Territories (in Italy)
BAOR	British Army of the Rhine
BJV	<i>Bayerischer Jagdschutz & Jägerverband</i> (Bavarian Hunting Organization)
BND	<i>Bundesnachrichtendienst</i> (German federal intelligence agency)
BVP	<i>Bayerische Volkspartei</i> (Bavarian People's Party)
CCG (BE)	Control Commission for Germany (British Element)
CDU	<i>Christlich Demokratische Union</i> (Christian Democratic Union)
FRG	Federal Republic of (West) Germany
GDR	German Democratic Republic
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IMT	International Military Tribunal (at Nuremberg)
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff (USA)
KRO	Kreis Resident Officer
MCC	Ministerial Collecting Center
NAACP	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
NAAFI	Navy, Army and Air Forces Institutes
NSDAP	Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (National Socialist German Workers' Party, the official name of the Nazi Party)
OMGUS	Office of Military Government, United States
OSS	Office of Strategic Services (USA)
PMGO	Provost Marshal General's Office (USA)
POW	prisoner of war
SA	<i>Sturmabteilung</i> (Nazi stormtroopers)
SD	<i>Sicherheitsdienst</i> (an intelligence arm of the SS)
SHAEF	Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force
SLRU	Special Legal Research Unit (UK)
SMG	School of Military Government (USA)
SPD	<i>Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands</i> (Social Democratic Party of Germany)
SS	<i>Schutzstaffel</i> (a Nazi internal security and paramilitary organization)
UNRRA	United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency
USFET	(Headquarters of the) United States Forces in the European Theater
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association

Part One

Contextualizing Occupation

Introduction: Reframing Occupation as a System of Rule

Camilo Erlichman and Christopher Knowles

In 2003, amidst blurry TV images of the night-time bombing of Baghdad, the Allied occupation of Germany after the Second World War experienced a remarkable comeback. In its search for justifications for the invasion of Iraq, the Bush administration issued various statements that sought to legitimize the military interventions of the present by reference to the successes of 'democratization' through occupation in the past. In a speech in March 2003, President Bush proclaimed that 'there was a time when many said that the cultures of Japan and Germany were incapable of sustaining democratic values. They were wrong. Some say the same of Iraq today. They, too, are mistaken.'¹

Bush's statement was just one of many similar pronouncements made at the time. Leading members of his administration had been floating such comparisons for a while, making frequent declarations that established a range of analogies between post-war Germany and contemporary Iraq. If post-war reconstruction had turned Western Germany from a country in ruins into a prosperous market economy and liberal democracy, they proclaimed, American post-war efforts in Iraq would surely turn the country from a 'failed state' into a beacon of political and economic stability in the region. Intellectual ammunition for such arguments was provided by think tanks close to the US government, who produced various studies using the fashionable label of 'nation building', drawing up catalogues with 'lessons' from the successful occupations of Germany and Japan for the present-day occupations in the Middle East. One such publication by the RAND Corporation, tellingly entitled *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq*, contained a glowing endorsement by Paul Bremer, the top civilian administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq. For Bremer, the RAND publication that traced America's history of 'nation building' since 1945 represented 'a marvellous "how to" manual for post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction.'²

Professional historians, particularly in the United States, were quick to protest at such historical simplifications. Writing in the *Los Angeles Times*, Atina Grossmann and Mary Nolan, two leading US experts on German history, accused the US administration of 'ransack[ing] history for successful precedents', using 'facile historical comparisons'

that 'distort the postwar situation and blind Americans to the challenges ahead in Iraq'.³ Other scholarly interventions were quick to follow, most of which highlighted that there were many more differences than similarities between the cases of Germany and Iraq.⁴ Meanwhile, historians of the American occupation of Japan expressed similar despair, emphasizing how the occupation of Iraq lacked legitimacy, not only among the victors but most importantly among the local population.⁵ But if historians were quick to call into question the irresponsible use of the 'good occupations'⁶ of Germany and Japan as a blueprint for future military operations designed to achieve 'regime change' and 'nation building', the analytical question of how the occupation of Germany by the Western Allies fits within a broader historical framework remains essentially unresolved.

The occupation of Germany, it would seem, is still generally understood by historians as a unique and exceptional case, with most scholars regarding the subject as a story of post-war transition internal to German history, with passing reference to the national history of the four occupiers.⁷ Alternatively, historians have focused on how the division of Germany into four zones of occupation exacerbated tensions between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union, thereby contributing to the emergence of a Cold War Europe divided between East and West, and the integration of the Federal Republic of Germany within the Western Alliance.⁸ A third historiographical strand has explored the occupation as part of a broad 'post-war' narrative that analyses the challenges faced by people across Europe after the mass violence, death and destruction following the Second World War and the legacies of the Third Reich and the Holocaust, with some approaching the immediate post-war history of Germany as a story of post-conflict reconstruction.⁹ None of these approaches, however, discuss military occupation as a subject in its own right, or engage with the question of how the ruling strategies of the three Western Allies, together with the outcomes and legacies of occupation, can best be placed within a broader transnational or comparative framework.¹⁰ The present volume is conceived as a response to this gap in the historiographies of post-war Germany and Europe.

The title of this book, *Transforming Occupation in the Western Zones of Germany*, seeks to capture a three-fold approach to the subject. First, it contributes to an evaluation of the impact of the occupation upon German society, exploring the extent to which daily life, politics, society and culture were transformed during the occupation period. Our conception of transformation, however, does not seek to suggest that the experience of occupation changed everything in German society.¹¹ It rather follows the recent suggestion by Simon Jackson and A. Dirk Moses that the most productive analytical question for historians of occupation is to explore the specific "usages and practices" through which occupation *transforms*.¹² To use a musical analogy, one might regard transformation as a process of modulation, a change from one key into another that contains elements of both. Second, *Transforming Occupation* reflects and follows an increased focus by historians on studying ruling techniques, social interactions and everyday life. These subjects have transformed historical approaches to the history of the mid-twentieth century, but are still marginal to the historiography of the post-war occupation of Germany.¹³ Third, the present volume aims to transform our understanding of the place of the occupation period within German and European

history, arguing that the occupation needs to be understood and studied as a distinct period in modern German history that can be explored using similar approaches to those adopted to analyse other cases of military occupation.

Military occupation as a dynamic power relationship

In addressing these questions, this volume starts from the assumption that military occupation is a discrete *system of rule*,¹⁴ in which the power relationships between rulers and ruled are different from those in other modern hierarchical societies, such as parliamentary or presidential democracies, absolute or constitutional monarchies, dictatorships or other forms of authoritarian government. The defining feature of military occupation is the combination of *foreign* rule with the dependence, in the last resort, on the use of threat or force. Most rulers, even domestic military dictators, can draw on various forms of legitimacy derived from their pre-existing relationship with the local population and are in that sense rooted within local society and its current values.¹⁵ Military occupation, on the other hand, normally begins life without intrinsic legitimacy, though the severity of the problem of legitimacy always depends on the historical context, and in particular on whether the occupation is perceived by the population as liberation from oppression, as conquest or subjugation following defeat in war by a foreign enemy, or as an illegitimate form of more long-term foreign control. In practice, this means that most occupation regimes need to find ways of legitimizing their hold on power and so induce the population to accept their authority, at least if they wish to stabilize their rule and achieve their political objectives.¹⁶ This quest for legitimacy and stability prompts occupiers to develop and apply a number of ruling techniques that seek to preserve their authority and power, making the most efficient use of the resources available to them and, if possible, circumventing the need to apply violent forms of coercion.¹⁷

The fundamental concept underlying this volume is therefore that the occupation of the western zones of Germany, as a system of rule, can best be understood as a dynamic power relationship between the three Western Allies and the local German population. The unequal and ever-changing balance of power between occupiers and occupied affected all aspects of society and operated at different levels, including the structure of national, regional and local government; the relative status and influence of social, economic, political and generational groups; and the everyday life and personal relationships of individuals. Occupation affected people in different ways depending on their citizenship, social class, gender, ethnicity, geographical location, previous history and personal beliefs.

The following chapters demonstrate the complexity and diversity of occupation, providing examples of how the Western Allies planned for occupation and how they attempted to manage the legacy of war and the crimes committed during the Third Reich. Some of the chapters explore aspects of everyday life under occupation, with case studies on the application of occupation policies on the ground, on social encounters, on personal relationships and on the legacies of occupation. The Soviet Zone, however, has not been included in this volume. This is not intended to deter future comparative

evaluations, but it seemed necessary to gain a greater understanding of similarities and differences within and between the western zones before extending the comparisons to include the Soviet Zone. If this is not done first, it can be all too easy to revert to a simplistic binary divide between East and West, in which the Cold War functions as the *deus ex machina* that persuaded the Western Allies, and the United States in particular, to promote German rehabilitation, while ignoring significant differences between policies, ruling strategies and conditions in the western zones.

Collectively, the case studies presented in this volume illustrate the dynamic and shifting reality of power relations under occupation rule. Although the Allies had won the war with the total defeat of the Third Reich, occupied the entire country and faced hardly any resistance that seriously challenged their rule, in the case of occupied Germany their power was never absolute. This led to complex processes of conflict and cooperation with the local population, to the application of diverse strategies of rule that sought to take into account local interests and expectations, to discussions and debates between occupiers and occupied over specific policies, and to a wide range of social encounters and personal relationships that ranged from street brawls and rape to friendship and marriage. To be sure, the balance of power was always unequivocally tilted towards the side of the occupiers who held the monopoly of force and could always resort to repressing threats to their authority with harsh measures, which in the initial phase of the occupation they often did. Power relations, however, changed subtly over time, as the occupiers devolved responsibility progressively to German officials and newly created German administrations, and the role of the occupiers changed from maintaining order, deterring any possible resistance and managing the legacy of the Nazi past, to promoting economic reconstruction, political renewal and personal reconciliation.¹⁸

The changing dynamics of power affected both the ability of the Western Allies, at all levels of the occupation hierarchy, to realize their objectives and the nature of the German response. While the occupation lasted, the power of the Allies penetrated many spheres of everyday life, impacting on the life of Germans across all strata of society and altering social relations. In doing so, military occupation functioned as a highly disruptive force within daily life, breaking up daily routines and habits and imposing severe material pressures and privations. The occupation may in that sense be regarded as a 'state of emergency', an extraordinary moment that produced novel forms of behaviour among a population that needed to adapt or find new strategies to survive.¹⁹ At the same time, it confronted the population not only with the question of how to cope with extraordinary social and political circumstances, but also with the vexed problem of how to respond to the presence of a foreign ruler. As a result, it forced individuals as well as larger social groups to make difficult choices about how they should relate to the occupiers, producing a range of often highly ambiguous attitudes that fell somewhere between the two extremes of collaboration and resistance. Echoing the work of Michel de Certeau and James C. Scott who have conceptualized daily life as a sphere in which populations can counteract the demands of those in power, studying everyday life then becomes an investigation of the strategies and practices chosen by those facing occupation to respond to a changing power framework that was not of their own making, but which they were able to mould through their own attitudes and

responses.²⁰ Exploring social interactions on the ground is therefore also part of an attempt to restore a degree of agency to all those affected by the occupation, instead of treating them as mere recipients of policies dictated from above.

From high politics to social interactions: Historiography

Placing the question of how occupation *functions* in practice at the heart of this volume implies a redirection of attention away from the high politics of the occupation. With the gradual declassification of archival sources on the occupation period in the 1970s and 1980s, historians started producing an impressive body of scholarship that broadly conceived the occupation as a diplomatic wrestling match between the three Western Allies and the Soviet Union, in which geopolitical rivalries were fought out within the increasingly conflictual framework of the early Cold War. The actors in this story were often the policy makers at the top of the Allies' foreign policy establishments who interacted with German political leaders, an approach most successfully demonstrated in Hans-Peter Schwarz's classic, meticulously researched and still unsurpassed study of the politics of the occupation, *Vom Reich zur Bundesrepublik*.²¹ Here, and in other political histories of the period that focused on either international relations or on internal German politics, the occupation gained its broader historical significance from the fact that it served as a point of crystallization for the pursuit of major diplomatic and economic interests by the Allies, the development of German political structures and institutions, and ultimately as a mirror of the broader ideological battles of the period.²²

One legacy of this extensive body of work is that the Cold War still features prominently as a major paradigm within more recent general interpretations of the era.²³ As a result, many historians have tended to assign to it explanatory centrality for understanding the policies of the occupiers, while side-stepping a deeper engagement with relations between the occupiers and the occupied. Similarly, seeking to explain the long-term partition of Germany into two separate states in 1949, many historians tended to approach the occupation primarily as part of the 'pre-history' of the two Germanies, and thus as a period that put in place the institutional and political structures that prefigured the shape of the two subsequent states.²⁴ As such, the legacies of the occupation period were not thought to be found by exploring the sociopolitical changes wrought by the occupation upon German society, but rather traced at the level of constitutional structures and the formal political process.

At the same time, with a growing specialization and compartmentalization of historical research on the period since the late 1980s and 1990s, an extensive historiography emerged that examined and reassessed the implementation of big Allied reform projects such as the Potsdam 'four Ds', including democratization (and its twin concept of 're-education'), denazification, decartelization and demilitarization.²⁵ Again, while much of this work has increased our understanding of the various occupiers' objectives and interests in Germany, it tended to concentrate on *policies* rather than on ruling strategies and social interactions between the occupiers and the occupied, often tracing in detail the rationalities behind the occupiers' decision-making

process, but ignoring the German responses. Some pioneering steps towards a study of interactions under occupation were, however, made at an early stage. This included, most notably, John Gimbel's path-breaking 1961 study of the city of Marburg under American occupation, which explored the sociopolitical impact of the occupation, though it could only draw on a highly limited number of archival documents as most of the primary sources remained classified at the time.²⁶ In the last three decades, other major contributions that provide granular analyses of interactions at the local level have been published, including Rebecca Boehling's seminal study of three cities under US occupation, Adam Seipp's highly innovative micro-history of the transformation of a rural community during the occupation, as well as the monumental history of the American occupation in 1945 by Klaus-Dietmar Henke.²⁷

So far, however, this effort has mostly concentrated on the US Zone, while there have been few comparable bottom-up approaches for the French and British Zones.²⁸ This is particularly evident in the way historians have approached the history of social relations, gender and race under occupation. While scholars such as Petra Goedde, Elizabeth Heineman, Maria Höhn, Atina Grossmann, Heide Fehrenbach and Timothy Schroer have contributed to the emergence of a rich historiography on the US Zone that pays attention to interactions between Germans and Americans on the ground, no similarly extensive and sophisticated work exists for the other zones of occupation.²⁹ This lack of balance and the concomitant privileging of work on the US Zone, however, is characteristic for the historiography of the occupation of Western Germany as a whole. The literature is shaped by a clear emphasis on what happened in the US Zone, with developments in the other western zones often treated as mere addenda to US policies, or as insignificant within the broader story of post-war Germany. Very often, there is an implicit assumption that American policies were simply carried out in the other zones as well, neglecting in the process zonal differences in ruling strategies and local experiences, as well as the wider consequences of the three occupiers' different approaches for relations between occupiers and occupied on the ground. The result is a marginalization of the diversity of the experience of occupation in the western zones, which are often mistakenly treated as a monolithic bloc. That might be regarded as one of the more durable intellectual legacies of the Cold War, the most unfortunate consequence of which is the current lack of archival studies on the occupation that engage in inter-zonal comparisons.³⁰

The privileging of the US Zone in writing on the occupation is also connected to the more general problem of how historians assess the broader significance and legacies of the period. A heated debate took place in the 1970s, encouraged by the emergence of a new critical generation of left-wing historians who, motivated largely by concerns at a supposed lack of democracy in the Federal Republic, questioned the degree to which the Allied occupation had produced real change in Western Germany. Rather than identifying occupation as the precursor to a successful process of democratization, as postulated by both the Western Allies and the German government, these historians emphasized the 'restoration' of authoritarian attitudes and practices within government and society, and the extent to which political, social and economic structures prevalent in both Nazi Germany and the Weimar Republic had been re-established in the post-war period. Calling into question the widespread notion of a *Stunde Null* (zero

hour) and a fundamental break with the past after the end of National Socialism, they emphasized continuities with the preceding decades and stressed the fundamental role the Western Allies had played in re-establishing a capitalist system in Germany, while suppressing what in their view was a general desire among the population for wide-ranging social, political and economic reforms.³¹ In this interpretation, the Western Allies emerged as the oppressors of German grassroots movements that advocated revolutionary change, such as the anti-fascist (*Antifa*) committees that had emerged in the immediate aftermath of the war. According to this narrative, it was, therefore, the Allies, led by the United States, the anti-Communist superpower, who were responsible for blocking any fundamental transformation of German society.³²

These were in many respects highly politicized debates, and in the more recent historiography, the juxtaposition of the two binaries of 'new start or restoration' (*Neuanfang oder Restauration*) no longer determines the shape of historical writing on the occupation period, with most scholars sharing the rather unspectacular view that, as with most historical periods of transition, the immediate post-war era contained elements of both continuity and renewal.³³ This historiographical consensus, however, leaves the question open as to what were the most significant outcomes of the occupation period, and what forms of change did take place in the post-war era. As a response to this problem, an influential literature has emerged which locates the legacies of the occupation mainly in the gradual *Americanization* of Germany, emphasizing the impact of the US presence upon German businesses, culture, gender relations, media, consumption patterns and broader sociopolitical attitudes.³⁴ A related but somewhat more inclusive interpretation that gives more credit to the contribution of other western states has been articulated around the notion of *Westernization*, which emphasizes the circulation of ideas and values in the first three post-war decades and the transformation of Germany as a result of the adoption of sociopolitical ideas and economic practices from both the United States and Britain.³⁵ In this interpretation, however, the transformation of Germany is not related primarily to the effects of occupation rule in itself, but rather to the broader transfer and interchange of liberal democracy, capitalism and anti-Communist attitudes in the Western Bloc and within the general framework of the Cold War. Once more, the durable sociopolitical legacies of the three western zones of occupation remain elusive.

While this volume draws on the growing and diverse literature on the occupation, it seeks to depart from existing approaches in several important respects. In particular, the following chapters approach occupation as a system of rule by exploring power relations on the ground through case studies of ruling techniques, social interactions and daily life. The history of everyday life under occupation during the mid-twentieth century has only in recent years moved to the centre of historiographical attention, reflecting a growing awareness among historians that occupations often had major social, material, political and cultural repercussions amidst 'ordinary people', away from the major corridors of power.³⁶ In the case of occupied Germany, however, studies of daily life have so far remained limited. In exploring this relatively novel field, this volume builds upon the pioneering work of Lutz Niethammer on the social history of the immediate post-war period.³⁷ By interpreting Allied rule as a 'liberal occupation dictatorship' (*liberale Besatzungsdiktatur*), Niethammer approached the occupation as

a power framework that was top-down in nature, but encouraged various forms of interaction with the occupied population and in doing so had significant repercussions on the texture of German society.³⁸ As his work on daily life also suggests, tracing interactions between the occupiers and the occupied should not be regarded as an ultimately futile exercise in recounting anecdotes of exotic encounters, but should rather be seen as a crucial component in any wider attempt to understand how the occupation affected life among both the occupiers and the occupied, allowing one 'to grasp the multiplicity of experience and individuals' attempts to order and make sense of their everyday lives'.³⁹

Five perspectives on the occupation of the western zones

This volume is structured around a conceptual framework that places the occupation of the western zones of Germany firmly within the context of the study of military occupation generally, rather than treating the subject either as a unique and exceptional 'interregnum period' in the history of post-war Germany, or as part of an equally exceptional phase in the history of post-war Europe. The key elements of the framework are fourfold. First, they include an examination of the origins and longer-term lineages that contributed to military occupation as the eventual outcome. These causal factors will vary from case to case, but will always have to be managed and will strongly influence the aims and policies of the occupiers and the responses of the occupied. Second, they entail a detailed analysis of how the occupation functioned as a system of rule, including the various techniques applied by the occupiers to maintain their power and authority, the response of the occupied and the diverse ways in which occupation affected everyday lives. Third, they involve an exploration of the nature of interactions between occupiers and occupied at many different levels, from official contacts in town and city administrations to violent disputes and protests, intimate encounters and personal friendships. Finally, the framework includes an assessment of the diverse legacies of occupation, of its impact upon the future political, social, economic and cultural structures of the occupied territory, and, in particular, of how the occupation affected the long-term social position and power of those individuals and groups that acted as social intermediaries between the occupiers and the occupied.

Transforming Occupation in the Western Zones of Germany is divided into five parts that provide different perspectives structured in accordance with this conceptual approach. Part One seeks to place the occupation of Western Germany within a wider historical context, demonstrating how the occupiers' policies and ruling techniques were shaped by their previous experiences of occupation, and how the challenges they faced in Germany in turn influenced the subsequent international law and practice of occupation. In her chapter on American planning for the post-war occupation of Germany, Susan Carruthers shows how previous occupations undertaken by the United States were discursively ignored or disregarded, following the widely accepted but incorrect view that the United States, as a presumably anti-imperialist power, did

not engage in military occupation. Yet at the same time, US experiences of the 'Yankee' occupation of the confederate states after the American Civil War and of the short-lived US participation in the occupation of Rhineland after the First World War, as well as more recent US experiences in ruling Italy, all influenced both the training of occupation personnel at the School of Military Government in Charlottesville and subsequent policy and practice in occupied Germany.

Echoing the theme of diversity in how occupation was defined and interpreted in different contexts, Peter Stirk describes in his chapter how the British and Americans claimed that their presence in Germany was not actually an occupation at all or, alternatively, that it was a special *sui generis* case and therefore not subject to the international rules of war agreed in the Hague Regulations of 1899/1907. At the Geneva Convention of 1949, however, all the participants, including those from the United States, Britain and France, had recent experiences of occupation very much in mind as they debated proposed clauses on issues such as the obligation of an occupier to feed the defeated enemy, a practice that was subsequently translated into international law, albeit in a highly qualified form. As Stirk demonstrates, however, the practice of 'regime transformation' and the occupiers' ability to change the laws of an occupied country, as the Western Allies had done in Germany, did not find full expression in international law and remains controversial today.

Part Two takes these threads contextualizing the occupation of Germany further, but applies them to the ruling techniques of the occupiers on the ground and, in particular, to their attempts at managing the political, social, mental as well as physical and symbolic legacies of National Socialism in the immediate post-war period. This can be seen as a story that has an obvious specificity and internal relevance to the history of mid-twentieth-century Germany. However, while the occupation of Germany had distinct antecedents in that it followed the Nazi dictatorship, the Holocaust and a total war that unleashed extraordinary levels of destruction, it is also possible to use it as a case study that allows one to obtain insights that apply to occupation, the aftermath of war and 'regime change' more generally.

In her contribution, Rebecca Boehling uses the comparative lens of transitional justice to analyse denazification policies in the US Zone of Germany, examining how the occupiers established special courts and tribunals to judge actions that individuals had performed earlier under a legal, social and political system that was entirely shaped by the Nazi government. The questions of what legal framework should be used in such instances, what sanctions and punishments should be applied, who should police and enforce them and what compensation should be offered to the victims, especially during the transitional period before a new legal system is established, remain contested issues. More broadly, those involved in processes of transitional justice in post-conflict situations tend to operate within a difficult tension between, on the one hand, the desire to produce deep sociopolitical change and transform broader societal perceptions, prejudices and beliefs that may have led to the murder of millions and, on the other hand, the more pragmatic need to create order and get things running again in a devastated country. As her chapter demonstrates, in the German case that tension was often resolved to the benefit of technocratic figures who were appointed by the Allies to influential positions despite their activities during the Third Reich, leading to



Figure 1.1 A denazification tribunal meeting in Berlin, 1946 (Getty Images).

a protracted process in which the demands of victims for truth were muted and their suffering took many decades to reach recognition among broader society.

Similarly, Andrew Beattie's discussion of extrajudicial internment as a means of undertaking a political purge and securing regime change raises issues about the use of nonjudicial measures that are by no means unique to post-war Germany. Beattie's inter-zonal analysis of internment questions widespread narratives that present the western powers as primarily benevolent occupiers, emphasizing instead the highly coercive strategies of rule utilized by the three occupiers to enforce their security interests. By demonstrating the durability of internment, Beattie is able to show that the familiar assumption that the Cold War produced a sudden abandonment of punitive policies in Germany requires substantial revision. More generally, however, his analysis highlights how a ruling strategy such as internment produced interactions between the occupiers and the occupied, leading to a range of responses among different German groups, some of whom chose to cooperate with the occupiers, while others criticized the policy and, in doing so, called into question the legitimacy of occupation rule.

Caroline Sharples, in the third chapter in Part Two, explores the porous boundaries between public and private rights, duties and obligations, in the specific case of the disposal of the bodies of Nazi war criminals condemned to death and executed. Is a punishment complete when a person is executed, or does it extend to the treatment of the dead body? For the three Western Allies, the issue presented a great challenge, prompting extensive debates about the best course of action, taking into account the broader symbolism of the matter, social and cultural norms prevalent among the

population, and the intricate problem of how to deal with the threat posed by right-wing groups using the real or imaginary burial sites for their own political purposes. Most significantly perhaps, Sharples's chapter raises important questions about the temporality of the occupation and its long-term legacies, as the incarceration of war criminals in Allied prisons continued well after the Federal Republic became a sovereign state in 1955, with Allied debates about the disposal of the Nazi corpse lingering on until the demise of the last imprisoned war criminal in 1987, and speculation within German society about the location of Nazi graves persisting well after the formal end of occupation.

Part Three explores the manifold contradictions that emerged when specific occupation policies were applied on the ground. The three cases presented here illustrate a significant gulf between the self-image of the various occupiers as benevolent rulers and the actual perception of their activities by the German population. That clash between image and reality was often the result of the occupiers' bold self-confidence about the superiority of the model of democracy practiced in their own countries and the advantages of their broader sociocultural values, leading to numerous instances of incomprehension, miscommunication and indeed outright conflict between the occupiers and the occupied.

As Bettina Blum demonstrates in her analysis of British requisitioning policies in Westphalia, the occupiers' policy of requisitioning German homes to accommodate British officers, and in particular their ongoing refusal to return empty German properties to their previous owners, produced a highly emotional response among the local German population, who, in a manner that the British often found entirely stupefying, saw themselves as the innocent victims of the war, disregarding any links between their current plight and the war of aggression launched by Germany, while ignoring the suffering of people elsewhere in Europe. Conflicts between the occupiers and the occupied gravitating around material issues often resulted in proxy debates about much larger issues, in which Germans articulated notions of victimhood and attempted to regain the moral high ground by accusing the occupiers of not living up to their own democratic standards. Such discourses culminated in the recurring accusation that the British were behaving in the manner of colonial rulers and treated Germans like 'natives'. At the same time, however, such conflicts also bore the potential for a rapprochement between German and British people, with the occupiers seeking to involve German officials to resolve the housing problem and find joint solutions.

Heather Dichter shows how the occupiers dissolved the national youth and sports organizations created by the Nazis and replaced them with others operating on supposedly more 'democratic' principles, often with input from 'experts' recruited from Britain, the United States or France. Quite what 'democracy' – that omnipresent concept of the immediate post-war period – meant in such contexts remained highly ambiguous, with the occupiers alluding to a vague set of principles around fair play, teamwork, sportsmanship and opportunities based on meritocracy, while implementing institutional reforms that sought to root out the Nazi leadership principle and make internal decision-making structures more democratic. Of equal, if not greater, importance, however, was their broader attempt to reshape German society through a top-down emphasis on transforming the attitudes and behaviour of

German 'youth leaders' through designated leadership schools and programmes, and creating exchange and travel programmes so that these future elites would adopt the occupiers' respective model of democracy as well as embrace related conceptions of engaged 'good citizenship' by observing such practices in action. Here and elsewhere, for the three Western Allies, 'doing occupation' often meant working through social, political and economic elites and trying to influence Germans more widely by interfering selectively at the higher levels of society.

Elite cooperation, however, did not always proceed as smoothly as the occupiers might have wished. Such clashes between the occupiers and social elites are the theme of Douglas Bell's analysis of American policies vis-à-vis hunting, a sphere in which more long-term German and American understandings of nature as well as concomitant notions of how to relate to the environment collided. Bell shows how the American occupation of the environment, and in particular the indiscriminate and highly destructive shooting of game by American personnel, produced significant unrest among Bavarian groups that thought that long-standing German approaches towards wildlife and the environment were threatened. For many American officials, by contrast, German hunters as a social group as well as German hunting laws more specifically represented vestiges of authoritarianism and Nazism that required fundamental change. Even such seemingly specialized debates about the right approach towards nature and the adoption of novel hunting laws were always part of broader negotiations between the occupiers and the occupied, gravitating around competing conceptions of sovereignty and contrasting sociocultural attitudes. As Bell suggests, such discussions ultimately contributed to the re-emergence of civil society in Germany, as German groups acquired a novel space to voice and debate their views and concerns.

Part Four explores everyday life during the occupation through examining social encounters and personal relationships between occupiers and occupied. Each of the chapters in this section focuses on life as experienced by a particular social group or selected individuals in one of the three western zones, highlighting the complexity and ambivalence of the relations between occupiers and occupied from different analytical perspectives. Despite the fraternization ban imposed by the Commanders-in-Chief in the US and British Zones at the start of the occupation, personal encounters between occupiers and occupied were widespread. Some encounters occurred through people acting in an official capacity, such as between Allied and German officials responsible for the administration of towns and local districts. Many other encounters were unofficial, ranging from street brawls, unprovoked attacks and conflicts over living accommodation, to more friendly encounters, such as joint trips to the countryside, sightseeing or walking holidays and personal friendships. Personal and intimate encounters between men and women ranged across a wide spectrum, from instances of rape and violent assault to more friendly encounters and longer-term consensual partnerships, including marriage.

In her chapter on the politics of cross-racial sexual relationships in the US Zone, Nadja Klopprogge adopts a spatial approach to explore what she terms the 'intimate landscape' of post-war Germany, highlighting how personal relationships between African American GIs and white German women in three historically significant spaces in post-war Germany were interpreted by individual soldiers and the black

press in the United States to create their own image of Germany as a venue for the struggle for social justice at home in the United States.

Similarly, Ann-Kristin Glöckner also adopts a spatial approach, together with concepts from gender studies, to examine a wide range of interactions between occupiers and occupied in the French Zone. In doing so, she explores how the balance of power shifted subtly from place to place and over time. Everyday interactions were part of a broader power struggle that encompassed gender, race and nationality. As Glöckner's examples indicate, the field of interpersonal relations was a power framework in which the occupiers, despite their presumed monopoly of force, were not always in the stronger position.

The impact of occupation on the occupier is also explored in Daniel Cowling's chapter on the everyday subjective experiences of two British women, as related in personal letters and photographs sent home from Germany. Such 'ego-documents' on the life of members of the occupation authorities in the British Zone contrast markedly with more familiar images of misery, destruction and desolation in post-war Europe. In these narratives, the occupation emerges as a life-enhancing and fulfilling experience that provided manifold personal opportunities and a sense of individual freedom, new friendships, adventures that had been unthinkable at home, and long-lasting memories.

The final section, Part Five, looks to the diverse legacies of the post-war occupation of the western zones of Germany, including studies of social groups that acted as intermediaries between occupiers and occupied. It shows how certain German groups emerged as beneficiaries of the occupation, playing a significant part in the subsequent history of the Federal Republic and thereby shaping the more durable legacy of occupation. In his study of Catholic priests in the archdiocese of Freiburg, Johannes Kuber discusses the local parish clergy's response to occupation based on hundreds of contemporary reports submitted by Catholic priests to the Archbishop. The archdiocese covered parts of both the US and French Zones, and the reports reveal significant differences in how the priests perceived two Allied occupying forces. Kuber highlights the various functions the priests took up at local level, filling a gap that had been opened following the collapse of the central German government. Their roles ranged from peace negotiators and temporary informal advisors to the occupying forces, to advocates for the civilian population, mediators and self-appointed protectors of the interests of their parishioners and their local communities. He concludes that the situation of change and uncertainty enabled the Catholic parish priests to temporarily pause a long-term trend of decreasing social significance and ensure that their influence, at least in rural parishes, remained significant well into the 1960s.

Perhaps most remarkable, however, were the successful efforts of a few highly influential German government officials recruited by the Allies and given senior roles in the new political and administrative structures established after 1945, despite their having worked in similarly responsible positions throughout the Third Reich. This is the theme of Dominik Rigoll's chapter exploring the diverse career trajectories of functional elites who subsequently took over key positions as government administrators in the Federal Republic of Germany. While this continuity of personnel, facilitated by the Western Allies, did not signify a simple 'restoration' of the old regime, it did contribute

to a particular kind of authoritarian democracy established in the western zones that typified the early years of the Federal Republic.

A similar, though more extreme process is described by Michael Wala in his chapter on former members of the SS, SA and *Wehrmacht* who worked in close collaboration with western intelligence agencies during the early Cold War. Using their supposed knowledge of Soviet intelligence activities acquired during the Second World War, former members of the SS and Gestapo were able to not only avoid prosecution but also obtain, often with Allied support, positions in the emerging security and intelligence services of the newly formed Federal Republic. They subsequently worked closely with US, British and French secret services and, though only ever half-trusted by their new allies, were accepted by and fully embedded within the western Cold War intelligence community, thereby contributing to the Adenauer government's goal of becoming an integral part of the Western Alliance. The legacies of occupation lasted long after its formal end in 1955.

A comparative approach to the study of military occupation

With hindsight, the creation of the Federal Republic in 1949 and its subsequent development over the next four decades into a remarkably stable, capitalist, liberal democracy might appear to have been an almost inevitable consequence of occupation and defeat in war, as economic and political structures and institutions prevalent in the United States, Britain and France were adopted in Germany. This, however, was not a foregone conclusion in 1945. National Socialism was discredited after the war, but many Germans believed that liberal democracy and the particular model of capitalism that had prevailed during the Weimar Republic had failed them as well. The German central state had collapsed and suffered a tremendous loss of legitimacy, having failed to protect its citizens from physical and economic hardships. There was a severe lack of the most basic resources, including food, living accommodation and fuel, affecting the daily lives of those who had survived the war and causing great uncertainty as to how, or even where, they would live, work and rebuild their future lives. The reconstruction of the German state after twelve years of Nazi dictatorship and the return of sociopolitical stability after the uncertainties of both the Nazi and Weimar periods were, however, achieved remarkably quickly. Exploring the making of that post-war stability and the specific dynamics that shaped it, both in Germany and elsewhere in Europe, amidst a broader context of social and political uncertainty, therefore deserves further historical investigation.⁴⁰

When viewed from the perspective of the Allies, a favourable outcome seemed equally unlikely at the end of the war. For at least the first year of the occupation, the British, Americans and French disagreed profoundly over various aspects of their policies towards Germany. The French vetoed the formation of central administrations that could have enabled the four zones to be administered as a single entity, while promoting economic separation of the Rhineland and Ruhr. The British and Americans disagreed over many issues, including economic policy, the level of industry discussions

in late 1945 and early 1946, the 'socialization' of industry, and the devolution of power to regional German administrations in the US Zone, which the British considered recklessly premature.⁴¹ Moving the lens from these matters of high politics to focus on issues of ruling strategies, social interactions and everyday life under occupation, as has been attempted in this volume, reveals similarities as well as differences in approach between the three Western Allies in areas such as internment policies and practice, youth and sports programmes, and the willingness of American, British and French occupation officials to work together with German administrators, initially at local and regional levels, and then with federal politicians and senior civil servants. Several of the case studies presented here include suggestions of how the diverse experiences of occupation in the three western zones helped to shape the social and political texture of the Federal Republic.

Wherever possible, issues have been examined across more than one of the zones, although this was necessarily limited by the current state of research, which has generally treated developments in each of the zones separately. As the chapters in this volume demonstrate, internal power dynamics within the western zones encouraged cooperation, discussion and debate between occupiers and occupied. Compromises were found over contentious issues such as requisitioning, or over particular behaviour by Allied soldiers that antagonized the local population. Influential individuals and members of social and political elites on both sides, such as the clergy, senior civil servants, local officials, the intelligence services and, to some extent, even the military, identified a common interest and were willing to cooperate to maintain and indeed often solidify aspects of the pre-existing social order, such as the privileged position of certain elites within society, the protection of property rights, adherence to a set of sociocultural norms and modes of behaviour, as well as the continuity of the state bureaucracy. More generally, strategic considerations around how to run an occupation efficiently were similar among the three Western Allies, all of whom worked in conjunction with German social intermediaries, recognized that German interests would have to be taken into consideration to avert significant conflict with the local population, and developed increasingly determined policies to block the rise of Communism. These shared policies converged to produce what one historian of the occupation has aptly described as pragmatic *Stabilisierungsbündnisse* – tacitly understood pacts between the occupiers and the occupied based on a shared recognition of the need for sociopolitical stability in a period of political and social upheaval.⁴²

From a historical perspective, if the post-war occupation of Germany was unique or *sui generis* in some ways, it is also clearly recognizable as a distinct case of military occupation. This is evident from the legal arguments made to justify the authority of the Allies, the language used in proclamations, ordinances and laws, and the more general power structures established nationally and locally, comprising Military Governors (later rebranded as High Commissioners), resident officers and district officials. Power was now in the hands of foreign rulers, and this reality structured social relations on the ground. Everyday life in the western zones of Germany under Allied rule was evidently not subject to the same risk of indiscriminate imprisonment, torture, deportation, forced labour, collective reprisals, mass murder and genocide that

characterized, for example, much of German-occupied eastern Europe during the war, but many aspects of daily life were still affected by the presence of the occupiers.

A better historical understanding of the history of the western zones of Germany needs to be framed, in our view, not only as the aftermath of the war, the Holocaust and Nazi dictatorship, or as the prehistory of the Federal Republic, or even as a response to the emerging Cold War between the new global superpowers, but as a distinct period of military occupation. The conceptual framework used in this volume highlights the complexity of occupation, how people tried to manage the legacy of a violent and disruptive past, the diverse ruling strategies of the occupiers, the responses of the occupied, the role of social intermediaries, conflict and cooperation, everyday life and personal relationships, and the diverse legacies of occupation. Above all, it emphasizes the need to place any one case of military occupation within the broader context of the longer-term lineage of foreign rule. The framework used in this volume is, however, not the only possible model. Extending the field of enquiry through exploring comparatively different cases of military occupation would allow one to situate the case of the occupation of Germany within a broader history of foreign rule and so trace apparently contradictory factors that are common across different instances of occupation, such as continuity and change, cooperation and conflict, reconciliation and justice, privilege and deprivation, winners and losers, rhetoric and substance, perception and reality, 'doing occupation' through direct action or ruling indirectly through intermediaries, managing the past and preparing for the future.⁴³

Military occupation always involves at least two countries. In the case of post-war Germany, it involved many more. Studying the subject of occupation takes us beyond a traditional framework for studying national history and leads us towards embracing transnational and comparative approaches. All occupations are different. Some were oppressive and based on the application of brute force; others were less violent, generally benevolent and constructive. Some were short and some much longer. Some were very limited in scope and aspirations; others affected all aspects of economic, social, political and personal life. Occupation and rule by a former enemy, after military defeat, is an emotive subject, and different conclusions have been drawn in different countries from their experience of occupation. One may, of course, question if it is possible to make valid comparisons between different occupations and if, for example, the oppressive German occupations of France, Denmark or Norway, let alone the extremely violent German occupations in eastern Europe during the Second World War, shared any common features with the relatively benign post-war occupations of Germany by the Western Allies.⁴⁴ On the other hand, it could be argued that broader comparisons should be made, for example, between occupation and imperial rule, following the observation that imperial experiences had a major impact on the Western Allies' practice of occupation in Germany.⁴⁵ Yet as these examples show, whatever view one takes on a specific case, military occupation is always a transnational phenomenon. This volume has proposed some issues that were significant for the history of post-war Germany and Europe, but which, in our view, also need to be addressed in any other comparative study of military occupation and foreign rule.

Military intervention and occupation is back on the agenda, though under different names, such as regime change or nation building. Occupation, often invoked under the more agreeable label of liberation, has been presented and legitimized in public discourse as contributing to internal stability, as essential for maintaining national security or even survival, or as necessary for protecting threatened minorities and spreading democracy globally. Yet at the same time, recent experiments with occupation have been abject failures in bringing about the type of change, democratization and stability that policy makers often refer to when they advocate military intervention. In the UK, the Chilcot Enquiry, after years of collecting evidence, castigated the government for ‘wholly inadequate’ preparations for the aftermath of war and occupation of Iraq.⁴⁶ This volume aims to show that historical research can provide an important corrective to simplistic understandings of what the experience of occupation may entail, by demonstrating some of the paradoxes and intricacies inherent in occupation and highlighting the ambiguities that policies of stabilization and top-down democratization often carry with them. Revisiting what is often seen as the model, benevolent and successful occupation of Germany by the Western Allies after the war is important in its own right, in helping us understand the transition from war to peace in Germany and in post-war Europe generally. But it is also part of the process of gaining a better understanding of occupation generally and is now more relevant than ever.

Notes

- 1 President’s radio address, 1 March 2003. Available online: <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/03/text/20030301.html> (accessed 28 October 2017).
- 2 See Bremer’s endorsement on the back cover of James Dobbins, John G. McGinn, Keith Crane, Seth G. Jones, Rollie Lal, Andrew Rathmell, Rachel Swanger and Anga Timilsina, *America’s Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2003). The fascination with discovering a golden formula that accounts for success in military occupation, with Germany as a pre-eminent example, has also percolated into political science writing. See, for example, David M. Edelstein, *Occupational Hazards: Success and Failure in Military Occupation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010).
- 3 Atina Grossmann and Mary Nolan, ‘Germany Is No Model for Iraq’, *Los Angeles Times*, 16 April 2003. Available online: <http://articles.latimes.com/2003/apr/16/news/war-oegross16> (accessed 28 October 2017).
- 4 In November 2003, for example, the German Historical Institute Washington and the Friedrich Ebert Foundation organized a conference to discuss the recent invocations of the occupation by the Bush administration. See Robert Gerald Livingston, ‘How Valid Are Comparisons? The American Occupation of Germany Revisited’, *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 34 (2004): 205–7. A follow-up panel was convened at the GSA annual conference in September 2005: Rebecca Boehling, ‘American Occupations: Germany 1945–1949, Iraq 2003–2005’, *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 38 (2006): 153–5. For a British response, see Christopher Knowles, ‘The British

- Occupation of Germany, 1945–49: A Case Study in Post-Conflict Reconstruction', *RUSI Journal* 158, no. 6 (December 2013): 78–85; Christopher Knowles, 'Germany 1945–1949: A Case Study in Post-Conflict Reconstruction', *History & Policy* (January 2014). Available online: www.historyandpolicy.org/policy-papers/papers/germany-1945-1949-a-case-study-in-post-conflict-reconstruction (accessed 30 October 2017).
- 5 John Dower, 'A Warning from History: Don't Expect Democracy in Iraq', *Boston Review* (February/March 2003). Available online: <http://bostonreview.net/world/john-w-dower-warning-history> (accessed 28 Oct 2017); John Dower, 'Don't Expect Democracy This Time: Japan and Iraq', *History and Policy* (1 April 2003). Available online: www.historyandpolicy.org/policy-papers/papers/dont-expect-democracy-this-time-japan-and-iraq (accessed 28 October 2017).
 - 6 See Susan L. Carruthers, *The Good Occupation: American Soldiers and the Hazards of Peace* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), and her chapter in this volume.
 - 7 Konrad H. Jarausch, *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans, 1945–1995* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Richard Bessel, *Germany 1945: From War to Peace* (London: Simon & Schuster, 2009); Ulrich Herbert (ed.), *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland: Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung 1945–1980* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2002).
 - 8 A typical example of this approach is the appropriately titled work by Noel Annan, *Changing Enemies: The Defeat and Regeneration of Germany* (London: Harper Collins, 1995). For a revisionist slant questioning the 'old orthodoxy' that it was the Soviets who forced partition, see Carolyn Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line: The American Decision to Divide Germany, 1944–1949* (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
 - 9 Notable examples include three influential survey histories of post-war Europe: Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes* (London: Abacus, 1995); Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945* (London: William Heinemann, 2005); Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (London: Allen Lane, 1998). See also Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann (eds), *Life after Death: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe during the 1940s and 1950s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Frank Biess and Robert G. Moeller (eds), *Histories of the Aftermath: The Legacies of the Second World War in Europe* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2010); Mark Mazower, Jessica Reinisch and David Feldman (eds), *Post-War Reconstruction in Europe: International Perspectives, 1945–1949* (Past and Present Supplement 6) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
 - 10 The comparative work of Peter Stirk is a welcome exception: *The Politics of Military Occupation* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012).
 - 11 For a recent exploration of the related concept of 'transformative occupation', see Simon Jackson and A. Dirk Moses, 'Transformative Occupations in the Modern Middle East', *Humanity* 8, no. 2 (2017): 231–46. An extensive literature has emerged around the normative question of whether the international law of occupation allows occupiers to make significant transformations to the constitution, politics, society and economy of an occupied country. From the many contributions in this debate, see, for example, Eyal Benvenisti, *The International Law of Occupation*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) and Gregory H. Fox, 'The Occupation of Iraq', *Georgetown Journal of International Law* 36, no. 2 (2005): 195–297. Peter Stirk's chapter in this volume explores the issue in more detail.
 - 12 Jackson and Moses, 'Transformative Occupations', 234 (emphasis in original).

- 13 Influential examples of this literature include Detlev J. K. Peukert, *Inside Nazi Germany: Conformity, Opposition, and Racism in Everyday Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); R. J. B. Bosworth, *Mussolini's Italy: Life under the Fascist Dictatorship, 1915–1945* (New York: Penguin, 2007). See also, more recently, Nicholas Stargardt, *The German War: A Nation under Arms, 1939–45* (London: Vintage, 2016).
- 14 This approach to occupation is developed more extensively in Camilo Erlichman, 'Strategies of Rule: Cooperation and Conflict in the British Zone of Germany, 1945–1949' (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2015), esp. 32–36.
- 15 This understanding of legitimacy owes much to Martin Conway and Peter Romijn (eds), *The War for Legitimacy in Politics and Culture 1936–1946* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2008), esp. 1–27, as well as to the work of David Beetham, *The Legitimation of Power*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 3–41.
- 16 On the problem of legitimacy and foreign rule, see Michael Hechter, *Alien Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- 17 For a broader theory of occupation rule and its variations, see Cornelis J. Lammers, 'Occupation Regimes Alike and Unlike. British, Dutch and French Patterns of Inter-Organizational Control of Foreign Territories', *Organization Studies* 24, no. 9 (2003): 1379–403, esp. 1379–86, and Cornelis J. Lammers, 'Levels of Collaboration. A Comparative Study of German Occupation Regimes during the Second World War', *Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences* 31 (1995): 3–31.
- 18 Christopher Knowles, *Winning the Peace: The British in Occupied Germany, 1945–1948* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017), 179–88.
- 19 Robert Gildea and the team, 'Introduction', in *Surviving Hitler and Mussolini: Daily Life in Occupied Europe*, ed. Robert Gildea, Olivier Wieviorka and Anette Warring (Oxford: Berg, 2006), 1–15, esp. 6–9.
- 20 Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985).
- 21 Hans-Peter Schwarz, *Vom Reich zur Bundesrepublik: Deutschland im Widerstreit der außenpolitischen Konzeptionen in den Jahren der Besatzungsherrschaft 1945–1949*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980). There is still no scholarly interzonal survey of the occupation period available in English.
- 22 Hermann Graml, *Die Alliierten und die Teilung Deutschlands: Konflikte und Entscheidungen, 1941–1948* (Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1988); Josef Foscaphoth (ed.), *Kalter Krieg und deutsche Frage: Deutschland im Widerstreit der Mächte 1945–1952* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985). For a diplomatic history from a British perspective, see Anne Deighton, *The Impossible Peace: Britain, the Division of Germany and the Origins of the Cold War* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990). For the French Zone, see Dietmar Hüser, *Frankreichs 'doppelte Deutschlandpolitik': Dynamik aus der Defensive – Planen, Entscheiden, Umsetzen in gesellschaftlichen und wirtschaftlichen, innen- und außenpolitischen Krisenzeiten, 1944–1950* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1996); Geneviève Maelstaf, *Que faire de l'Allemagne? Les responsables français, le statut international de l'Allemagne et le problème de l'unité allemande (1945–1955)* (Paris: Direction des Archives Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, 1999).
- 23 For a broader critique of the heuristic value and limits of writing post-war history through the lens of the Cold War, see Holger Nehring, 'What Was the Cold War?', *English Historical Review* 127, no. 527 (2012): 921–49. Martin Conway, 'The Rise and

- Fall of Western Europe's Democratic Age, 1945–1973', *Contemporary European History* 13, no. 1 (2004): 67–88, suggests how one might write the history of post-war Europe without pressing the period into the explanatory 'straightjacket' of the Cold War.
- 24 Theodor Eschenburg, *Jahre der Besatzung: 1945–1949* (Mannheim: Dt. Verlagsanst; Brockhaus, 1983); Christoph Kleßmann, *Die doppelte Staatsgründung: Deutsche Geschichte, 1945–1955*, 5th ed. (Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 1991). See also the many publications by Wolfgang Benz: for example, Wolfgang Benz, *Auftrag Demokratie: Die Gründungsgeschichte der Bundesrepublik und die Entstehung der DDR 1945–1949* (Berlin: Metropol, 2009).
 - 25 Influential works include James F. Tent, *Mission on the Rhine: Reeducation and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982); Nicholas Pronay and Keith M. Wilson (eds.), *The Political Re-education of Germany and Her Allies after World War II* (London: Croom Helm, 1985); Clemens Vollnhals (ed.), *Entnazifizierung: Politische Säuberung und Rehabilitierung in den vier Besatzungszonen 1945–1949* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1991).
 - 26 John Gimbel, *A German Community under American Occupation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961).
 - 27 Rebecca L. Boehling, *A Question of Priorities: Democratic Reforms and Recovery in Postwar Germany* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 1996); Adam R. Seipp, *Strangers in the Wild Place: Refugees, Americans, and a German Town, 1945–1952* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013); Klaus-Dietmar Henke, *Die amerikanische Besetzung Deutschlands*, 2nd ed. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1996).
 - 28 The best academic survey on the British Zone is still Ian D. Turner (ed.), *Reconstruction in Post-War Germany: British Occupation Policy and the Western Zones 1945–55* (Oxford, New York and Munich: Berg; St. Martin's Press, 1989), but this contains relatively little on everyday life. See however the work on Hamburg: Michael Ahrens, *Die Briten in Hamburg: Besatzerleben 1945–58*, 2nd ed. (Munich: Dölling und Galitz Verlag, 2011); Frances A. Rosenfeld, 'The Anglo-German Encounter in Occupied Hamburg, 1945–1950' (PhD thesis, Columbia University, 2006). Historians of the French Zone have only recently started to discover the subject. See, for example, the ongoing research project by Karen H. Adler (University of Nottingham) on the social and cultural history of the French Zone, and her article 'Selling France to the French. The French Zone of Occupation in Western Germany, 1945–c.1955', *Contemporary European History* 21, no. 4 (2012): 575–95.
 - 29 Petra Goedde, *GIs and Germans: Culture, Gender, and Foreign Relations: 1945–1949* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003); Elizabeth D. Heineman, *What Difference Does a Husband Make? Women and Marital Status in Nazi and Postwar Germany* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1999); Maria Höhn, *GIs and Fräuleins: The German-American Encounter in 1950s West Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Atina Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies: Close Encounters in Occupied Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); Heide Fehrenbach, *Race after Hitler: Black Occupation Children in Postwar Germany and America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); Timothy L. Schroer, *Recasting Race after World War II: Germans and African Americans in American-Occupied Germany* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2007). For a more impressionistic account, see Werner Sollors, *The Temptation of Despair: Tales of the 1940s* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014).