

INTRODUCTION

Journalists and Freedom of Expression in the Twentieth Century

JOURNALISTS BETWEEN HITLER AND ADENAUER is, in its broadest perspective, a study of the situation of journalism and its practitioners as they grappled in the twentieth century, and are grappling to this day, with the age-old question of the freedom of expression and, more particularly, their own freedom to report on current events and articulate their views in editorials and op-ed pieces of their media outlets. However, when conceptualizing this book I did not have in mind a philosophical study of the perennially precarious position in which the freedom of opinion has found itself ever since the arrival of the Gutenberg press and all the way down to modern times. I obviously needed to achieve a clear focus and to anchor my analysis in tangible empirical material.

Accordingly, I chose what to my mind was a particularly intriguing and crucial case in point and decided to write a history of German journalism and journalists from the late Weimar Republic and the Hitler dictatorship up to developments in the West German press in the early postwar decades. As this was in itself still a huge field of inquiry, I took a further step: instead of writing a more general analysis of journalism in this period, I turned to biography and determined to look at the life and work of a few very prominent journalists: Paul Sethe, its “grand old man,” who worked for *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (FAZ) and later for Axel Springer’s *Die Welt* before finishing his long career at *Die Zeit* and *Der Stern*; Marion Countess Dönhoff of *Die Zeit*, widely deemed to have been the “doyenne” of the West German quality press; and finally Hans Zehrer, a particularly fascinating and controversial figure during the Weimar period, who became the editor in chief of *Die Welt* and the intellectual mentor

of Axel Springer, West Germany's powerful press mogul of the postwar media metropolis Hamburg.

The period at the core of this book, from 1932 to the mid-1960s, thus provides the time frame of an effort to investigate three key questions: how, to begin with, did these three Hamburgian journalists live, work, and survive under the Nazi dictatorship, and how did they interpret the end of the Third Reich in 1945? Secondly, what kinds of ideas and visions did they develop for the reconstruction of a defeated and devastated German society? Yet, while much of this book is about their experiences under Hitler and later during the era of Federal Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, as well as the insights they gained into contemporary developments and transmitted to their readers, this is also a study of the intellectual and political history of postwar Germany and its major media empires. It is this third and more expansive theme that finally provides the setting for some concluding considerations of the recent evolution of journalism and freedom of expression in the age of mass communication and social media.

What the three journalists had in common was that they had been adults and *anti-Nazis* in the Weimar Republic who had been enjoying liberal press freedoms under Article 118 of the Constitution. According to this article, "every German" had "the right, within the limits of general laws, to express his opinions freely, by word of mouth, writing, printed matter, or picture, or in any other manner. This right must not be affected by any conditions of his work or appointment, and no-one is permitted to injure him on account of his making use of such rights." It continued: "No censorship shall be enforced, but restrictive regulations may be introduced by law in reference to cinematographic entertainment. Legal measures are also admissible for the purpose of combatting bad and obscene literature, as well as for the protection of youth in public exhibitions and performances." Since none of the three worked for papers promoting such entertainment, they were primarily dependent on their employers, the proprietors who had the ultimate legal right to hire as well as to dismiss them if they did not follow the owners' political and cultural preferences. However, their freedom became threatened when from 1930 onward they witnessed the rise of Nazism and then Hitler's seizure of power in January 1933. Sethe, Zehrer, and Dönhoff (though she was not yet a journalist) continued to keep their distance from the regime thereafter. Unlike millions of other Germans, they never became members of the Nazi Party, nor did they emigrate or join the early underground resistance, most of whose members had by 1935 been caught by the Gestapo and sent to concentration camps or

condemned to death and executed. Instead “my” three journalists went into “inner emigration,” a concept that I define a bit later.

However, this is not the end of their story. Having lived, often quite dangerously, under the Hitler dictatorship to the bitter end, after 1945 they began to wrestle with the question of what kind of society they wanted to see emerge from the rubble of World War II and how, as journalists and public intellectuals, they intended to explain their experiences and insights to their West German readers. What makes the cases of Sethe, Dönhoff, and Zehrer so intriguing, though, is that they were not so much concerned with the rebuilding of a war-torn economy and with *material* recovery; nor were they primarily focused on political reconstruction in a narrow sense of the word, that is, of building a viable and stable parliamentary-constitutional democracy. Realizing that an abjectly criminal regime, responsible for the murder of millions of innocent men, women, and children, had destroyed literally all ethical and moral norms and values, these three journalists saw the task in front of them as much more fundamental. They wanted to restore precisely those moral and ethical axioms that Hitler had so totally demolished. To them, these axioms were the foundation without which a new West Germany would be built on sand, foundations that the Germans must never abandon again.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no similar study in the English language that raises and closely examines the difficult questions of the impact of the Hitler dictatorship on journalists before 1945 and then extends the analysis to the revival of journalism in the Western zones of occupation and, from 1949, the Federal Republic, thereby also dealing with the problem of continuity and discontinuity in modern German history and with societal change and learning. What encouraged me to undertake this research was not only that it proved to be an underdeveloped field of intellectual and media history in the English language, but also that my interest in the life and work of those three journalists became keen after I was given access to largely untapped archival sources. No historian can resist such an opportunity. First, I was fortunate that Dönhoff’s voluminous papers had just been catalogued and were made available to me by her executor. In the case of Paul Sethe’s papers, I encountered a similar stroke of good luck: Sethe’s daughter had a treasure trove of letters at her apartment in Munich that had never been evaluated. The Zehrer papers, though they had been deposited by his family at the Federal Archives in Koblenz and accessible to researchers for some time, also contained much original material. In addition, there were two volumes of diaries that Zehrer had kept during his final years at *Die Welt* and that his heirs gave me permission to consult.

As this is a book about journalism and journalists, I had the additional advantage that the many articles and books that Sethe, Dönhoff, and Zehrer published were accessible online or through Interlibrary Loan, making it possible for me to trace their intellectual journeys through their private papers as well as their published writings. Finally, I was able to rely on a number of studies in German. As far as Marion Dönhoff is concerned, there are no fewer than three biographies, by Alice Schwarzer, Klaus Harpprecht, and Haug von Kuenheim.¹ Several anthologies on the history of *Die Zeit* have also helped me to formulate my approach.² There is nothing biographical on Paul Sethe, not even in the German language, apart from a number of obituaries and references relating to him in histories of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* (FZ), FAZ, and *Die Welt*. Sethe had started his career as editor in chief of a local paper in Solingen, in the Ruhr industrial region, in the 1920s, and after an agonizing journey through subsequent decades spent the happiest years of his life in the 1960s when he was welcomed and esteemed by Gerd Bucerius, the publisher of *Die Zeit* and *Der Stern*. Before joining the Bucerius media empire, Sethe had been a political editor at *Die Welt*, the daily that Axel Springer had bought from the British occupation authorities in 1953. It had been Hans Zehrer, the editor in chief of *Die Welt*, who had recruited Sethe in 1955 after he had fallen out with Chancellor Adenauer, his colleagues on the FAZ board, and the financiers and owners of the paper. On Zehrer, there is at least Ebbo Demant's book of 1971, as well as a string of articles and references in books on his Weimar journalism; but there was, as I found, more to be said on his life and his strange intellectual trajectory from Weimar Berlin to postwar Hamburg and finally back to Berlin.³

After the discovery of these fresh sources, it was but a small step to develop a plan for a study that was basically biographical, but not in the traditional sense. Rather than writing full biographies I decided to limit myself to several crucial issues that Sethe, Dönhoff, and Zehrer had been wrestling with as members of a particular generation. What intrigued me was that they were all born before 1914 and experienced the Weimar Republic as adults and opponents of Hitler before they were suddenly, in 1933, confronted with the huge quandary of how to react to the brutal dictatorship that the Nazis succeeded in establishing in Germany and later throughout Continental Europe so amazingly swiftly.

Of course the expansion of my project into a generational one raised the question of representativeness. How could I make claims about those three journalists as part of a generational cohort without a much larger sample, even

if this cohort was limited to a relatively small group of public intellectuals? However, as I immersed myself in the careers of Sethe, Dönhoff, and Zehrer, I discovered that, although their lives diverged in many other respects, there were a number of tangible commonalities in their lives as journalists. These, I decided, would allow me to draw some larger conclusions relating to their quest, encapsulated in their writings and political positions, for what I call the “moral reconstruction” of post-Nazi Germany. This perspective, reflected in the book’s title, also explains why it essentially ends in the late 1960s. I chose this terminal point partly because by that time the postwar reconstruction effort in which the three had become so deeply involved could be said to have largely succeeded. A further consideration was that Zehrer and Sethe died in 1966 and 1967, respectively. In the case of Dönhoff, who lived until 2002, I decided go beyond the 1960s time frame because it would enable me to highlight certain biographical continuities that had existed before but became distinctly more visible in the 1990s toward the end of her life. It would also allow me to discuss how Dönhoff responded to fresh threats to the moral foundations she began to see and then wrote about, enabling me to offer in the conclusion some larger considerations about journalists and the media at the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first.

Admittedly, my generational approach to capturing the lives and work of three individuals is peculiar in that it diverges from received notions of generational analysis in terms of cohorts and subcohorts born into a particular period. If I have called this particular generation the “Generation of ’32,” it is not because they were born in 1932. Rather I see the three journalists as members of a group that was defined and shaped by their adult experience of the Weimar Republic and the rise of the Nazi dictatorship. Together with many other Germans, this then confronted them, as mature individuals, with the existential question of how to react to the new post-1933 circumstances. Their response was to go into “inner emigration”—a concept with which I hope to open up a field of research that has not received as much attention as other alternative reactions to the Hitler dictatorship, such as forced emigration abroad, underground resistance, or collaboration with the Nazi regime. The decision not to leave, to go underground, or to join the Nazi movement but to stay in Germany and to become “inner emigrants” is, I postulate, best viewed as a spectrum along which they moved from a limited involvement with the regime to survive economically while continuing to reject Nazism, at the one end, to increasingly passive resistance and ultimately active participation in anti-Nazi movements, at the other end.

As far as I can see, our knowledge about inner emigrants and their dilemmas remains scant. To be sure, compared with those who joined the Nazi regime, they represented a small minority, and yet it seems worthwhile to take a closer look at their experiences and responses. After all, they knew that their position was very precarious and that a wrong move or angry outburst against the regime could have dire consequences, involving, in the extreme, torture and execution. Because these threats were hanging over them, their words and actions provide insights into life under the Hitler dictatorship, but also into the lessons they learned and applied after 1945. The question that is therefore ultimately at stake is that of what one could do if one was living in a parliamentary-democratic system that suddenly became an autocracy or even a dictatorship. So, apart from the generational concept that I deploy to shape the biographical narrative of the next three chapters, there is also the concept of inner emigration through which I approach the lives and work Sethe, Dönhoff, and Zehrer.

Clarifying the “Generation of ’32”

Analyzing societies in terms of generations and generational conflict has been a field that many historians and social scientists have viewed as a promising avenue toward understanding socioeconomic and cultural change, and Karl Mannheim was among the very first to think more systematically about the concept in his seminal essay of 1928.⁴ Accordingly, researchers, journalists, and politicians in mostly Western countries have identified and discussed divergent generations and their interactions, usually in comparison with their predecessors but also with later generations. There are many examples of the application of this approach to modern American society, the most recent being the study of the “millennial” generation. Yet nowhere else have scholars been more preoccupied with the concept and its problems than in Germany. To a considerable degree this is probably due to the huge upheavals and dislocations that German society experienced in the twentieth century. This, in turn, stimulated efforts to refine Mannheim’s work and also to provide empirical backup for fresh lines of argument. Researchers began to disentangle the broad early hypotheses that had been put forward, adapting them to more specific circumstances and moving away from the original notion that a generation spanned a period of some thirty years.

Social scientists and social historians now deal with shorter periods when taking up Mannheim’s proposition that traumatic events, such as wars or economic depressions, can telescope a generation into ten or fifteen years. No

less important has been the hypothesis that, in very general terms, all human beings are part of a particular generation that they cannot relinquish, as they might decide spontaneously to give up their membership in a sports association or private club. In this respect, generational belonging is said to be similar to being part of a socioeconomic class into which an individual has been socialized from birth and within which he or she has been shaped. And yet, however much individuals perceive themselves to be part of a specific generation, they do not form a clearly identifiable community with all others from their generation.

Accordingly, generations have been broken down into cohorts or even subcohorts.⁵ The advantage of this kind of approach has been that it has facilitated a better understanding of group consciousness in psychosociological terms. Researchers have also discovered subgroups that are marked by a retrospective longing and the wish to reconstitute a lost age. At the same time, there have been cohorts and subcohorts that have been driven by a desire to build an allegedly better future upon the ruins not only of a bygone era but also of the currently existing socioeconomic and cultural order.⁶ A considerable amount of more recent work in this field has also been devoted to examining intergenerational negotiation and conflict that can even escalate into physical violence, even if it has not been easy to determine which cohort in fact triggered the escalation of civilized intellectual exchange into violent confrontation.⁷

In Germany, Ulrike Jureit has been at the forefront of recent attempts to conceptualize these problems.⁸ In “New Perspectives on Generational Research,” Kirsten Gerland, Benjamin Möckel, and Daniel Ristau have argued that generations can be taken as projects, as loci of longing, or as periods in which intergenerational negotiation takes place.⁹ They see these efforts as characterized by memory, experience, and expectations. However, according to the three authors, generations can also be differentiated by perceived obligations (*Verpflichtungen*) arising from the past and to be implemented in the future. It is this latter perspective that—as we shall see—is particularly helpful in understanding the life and work of “my” three journalists of the “Generation of ’32.”

It is also helpful to what follows that scholarship has been quite rich with respect to the “Generation of ’45” and the “Generation of ’68.” Dirk Moses was among the first to wrestle with the “45ers,” as he called them.¹⁰ He focused on those born between 1922 and 1932. This was a cohort that was deeply influenced by the experience and memory of the Nazi youth organizations and their ideological indoctrination. They had reached the age of 17 or 18 by 1944 and at

the end of World War II were then recruited into the armed forces, where they saw brutal fighting and more indoctrination. It was the West German sociologist Helmut Schelsky who called this cohort, who had lived through the momentous rupture of 1945 and the years of chaos and dislocation in the late 1940s, the “Skeptical Generation.”¹¹ Other researchers have spoken more pointedly of the “Flakhelfer” or even the “Auschwitz” generation. They were the ones who, in 1945, felt betrayed by the Nazi regime and later embarked on the search for a new moral and constitutional order.¹² It is important to mention them here, as the journalists among them will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4. What differentiated the 45ers from the 32ers was that they wanted not only to restabilize society on moral foundations but also to reform it, though not revolutionize it.

A new generation emerged in the 1960s, the 68ers, who set out to challenge the 45ers.¹³ They criticized their predecessors for having, as adults, treated the Nazi past and the members of the generation who had lived and worked under Nazism too sympathetically, for having failed to vigorously confront their elders about their role in the Third Reich. Instead—thus the reproach—the 45ers had remained silent, allowing the older generation to resume many of the positions that they had lost during the Allied occupation.¹⁴ The 68ers claimed to want to correct this earlier failure by refusing to remain silent about compromised individuals and about the authoritarian mentalities and practices that had been carried over into the Federal Republic, resulting in Adenauer’s autocratic “chancellor democracy.”¹⁵ Ironically, this reproach was misdirected with regard to Sethe, Dönhoff, and Zehrer, whose criticism of Adenauer’s policies and style of government will be examined in the next three chapters.

This is why mention must finally be made of Christina von Hodenberg’s book that concentrated on the 45ers in the media.¹⁶ She is interested in the socialization and professional ethos of this particular generational subgroup. Devoting much of her research to their ideological positions and activities in the 1950s and 1960s as well as their contributions to the reconstruction and stabilization of West Germany, von Hodenberg finds that many journalists among the 45ers, like others of their generation, had tolerated the return of elder colleagues. To be sure, they had no sympathy for former dyed-in-the-wool Nazi ideologues among them, many of whom had a record of brutality to boot. It was a different matter with those elders who had been opportunists and had contributed to the regime with their pens, though not as leaders of Nazi organizations or even perpetrators of massive crimes.

It is against this background that my book proposes to encourage the study of the allegedly silent Generation of '32. By this I mean journalists who were born from around the turn of the twentieth century to 1914. The question is how this particular generation of journalists experienced the end of the Weimar Republic and how they responded when they were suddenly confronted in 1933 with a dictatorship that, with breathtaking speed and brutality, was turning the country into a one-party state that many of them—not knowing the future—believed could not possibly last. I realized, of course, from the start that I could not possibly provide a study of the 32ers that was statistically representative. But in order to make a start, I decided to examine the trajectories of three journalists who became “inner emigrants” after 1933 and emerged as influential voices after 1945, interacting with the 45ers and to some extent becoming their role models. However, since the reactions of this cohort were immensely variegated, the best way to start was to approach it biographically in an effort to begin to capture the complexities of journalism under the Nazis as well as after 1945.

Defining “Inner Emigration”

This leaves me with the difficult problem of defining “inner emigration,” which requires a preliminary note. Teaching in Britain and the United States for many decades, I was struck by how firmly undergraduates tended to be set in a conventional black-and-white mental frame when it came to “the Germans.” They knew that a few had actively resisted the Nazi regime and, when caught, had been tried, imprisoned, or even executed. And they knew that others, especially German Jews, had to flee in order to survive. As for the rest, they supposed that all joined the Nazi movement, collaborated, and sustained a criminal regime to the bitter end.¹⁷ These students had never heard of inner emigrants. Those who fell into this particular category are best illustrated by reference to Zehrer. Having opposed Hitler's seizure of power and having lost his job as a journalist, he, with good reason, to be discussed in chapter 3, began to fear for his life. Encouraged by friends and colleagues, he left Berlin and ultimately moved to a hovel on the remote North Sea island of Sylt near the Danish border, where he survived on a meager budget until 1945.

In other words, there were Germans who either fell completely silent or became associated with the regime in some more remote professional capacity, while finding covert ways to oppose it, until some of them, such as Sethe and Dönhoff, became involved in forms of active resistance. Others in this category, while still refusing to join the National Socialist German Workers' Party

(NSDAP) and its affiliates, found it too difficult to join the active resistance because of family or other responsibilities that they believed they could not jeopardize. Simple fear was also a significant factor. After all, it was generally known what it meant to be arrested and put on trial or to be sent into the legal black hole of a concentration camp. However, after 1945 a number of scholars and intellectuals began to write about these “refuseniks,” among them Friedrich Krause and Karl O. Paetel, who had found refuge in the United States.¹⁸

The motivation for this book is echoed in Krause’s preface, in which he argued against “the fairy tale” that “all Germans had been Nazis and [are] hence culpable.”¹⁹ He added: “We were sitting in safety [in New York] and were not exposed to the enormous pressure of a God-less party machinery.” In his contribution Paetel focused on Germans who participated in an “inner-German resistance.”²⁰ The conditions of open terror, he added, had led many anti-Nazis to remain mum. Still, their decision to refuse collaboration was an “expression of their resistance.”²¹ They decided to resort to metaphors and historical parallels that were “indirect, and yet they were clear enough for anyone who was prepared to hear the intermediate tones.” In short, inner emigration was “the common code of the entire anti-Hitler movement.” It was, Paetel concluded, “more far-reaching, but [hence] also less sharply contoured” when compared to the codes of the “old anti-fascist underground movement.” However, it was “closer to reality, precisely for this reason.”

There were, third, those described in an extract from Frank Thiess’s writings as “inner-German emigrants” who could rely on an “inner space that Hitler, however hard he tried, was never able to conquer.”²² Many of them were completely isolated and suffered economically. But their predicament “gave them a treasure trove of insights and experiences” that could be “of the highest value for their future work.” It was, Thiess asserted, a richer experience than “if I had witnessed the German tragedy from the boxes or the parquet of a foreign country.” He hastened to add that he had no wish to criticize those who had left the country, as for most of them it had been a “life-or-death” decision. Accordingly, he ended on a conciliatory note, hoping for a trans-Atlantic alliance and taking the admonitions and “angry greetings from beyond the ocean” as a “sign of a deep inner bond between the two camps of emigrants.” He did not “expect to be rewarded for not having left Germany. For us it was natural that we stayed.”

Another writer to take up the question of inner emigration was the journalist and professor of political science at West Berlin’s Free University Richard Löwenthal.²³ He had become interested in concepts of nonconformism and

resistance and viewed inner emigration as a form of *Widerständigkeit*, that is, as an expression of “a will to societal refusal” due to “ideological dissidence.” To him its significance lay in the quest “to salvage the cultural traditions of the earlier Germany from the years of terror by affecting the consciousness of important minorities.” With this broad understanding of resistance, he proposed to “integrate a variety of forms of *Widerständigkeit*” into his concept “of refusal that involves a withdrawal of loyalty,” whether individual or institutional. Peter Steinbach, as a scholar of the anti-Nazi resistance, was more skeptical.²⁴ According to him, dissidence was “unspectacular” and a “precondition of resistance” that lies in an individual’s “intellectual independence, an intact morality and humanity, in faith and being a Christian, in enlightenment and reason, in decency and responsibility,” upon which “all resistance is ethically and morally founded.”

It might therefore be argued, also with reference to the journalists at the center of my study, that those who saw themselves as inner emigrants operated within a spectrum that extended from grudging cooperation to passive resistance that could become more active as the war unfolded. Postulating the existence of such a spectrum facilitates placing a person at a particular point along it and studying his or her back-and-forth movements over time, either in the direction of greater compliance or toward the opposite end of passive or even active resistance. Still, trying to define “inner emigration” within this spectrum of what might be called a “gray zone” rather than a black or white one, is fraught with many difficulties, and the rest of this introduction is designed to demonstrate this by examining the cases of three other journalists and asking how far they fit into this gray zone or whether they should be put outside the spectrum of inner emigration.²⁵ In other words, it is an attempt to grapple with the difficulties of this term before the life and work of Sethe, Dönhoff, and Zehrer are examined in greater detail.

Three “Inner Emigrants”?: Ernst Jünger, Margret Boveri, and Henri Nannen

Paetel’s essay referred to a separate volume in the Krause series titled “Ernst Jünger, the Metamorphosis of a German Writer and Patriot,” and later he reprinted an extract from Jünger’s memorandum “Der Friede” (The peace).²⁶ The mention of Jünger in the volume raises the question of where to put him along the spectrum of inner emigration and to use his case, together with two

others, to test whether there were limits to including an individual on the inner emigration spectrum.

Jünger's reputation was that of an arch-militarist whose writings in the Weimar years had had a hugely negative impact on the life of the Republic. Born in 1895, after a brief spell in the French Foreign Legion as a 17-year-old, he had fought on the Western Front. He was wounded several times and awarded not only the Iron Cross, First and Second Class, but also the highest Prussian army decoration, the Pour le Mérite, for his bravery. He wrote about his very personal experiences in a best-seller titled *In Stahlgewittern* (*Storms of Steel*).²⁷ The popularity that this book gained him enticed him to write *Der Kampf als Inneres Erlebnis* (*Combat as an Inner Experience*), a more general study of the face of modern war.²⁸ In it he declared that war was "the father of all things" and described how World War I had "hammered, chiseled and hardened" the combatants into men. It was the glorification of war in this particular piece and his many other essays that literally influenced millions of mainly right-wing veterans in the Weimar Republic, enabling them to view their wartime sacrifices as having been worthwhile and for a just cause.²⁹ No less important, it confirmed their belief that the parliamentary-democratic Constitution had to be replaced by an authoritarian regime that would overthrow the "shameful" Versailles peace settlement. In the late 1920s Jünger placed his hopes for a "state of the front soldiers" temporarily in Hitler's hands. But once the Nazis had come to power in 1933 and were showing their real face, Jünger, after returning to a military career, began to change his mind. A novel that he published in 1939 under the title of *Auf den Marmor klippen* (*On the Marble Cliffs*) was taken by many of his readers as a veiled anti-Hitler statement.³⁰

After the invasion of France in 1940 Jünger kept a diary containing such a mishmash of entries that it has been difficult for scholars to fathom his thoughts about war and the Nazi occupation. Some have viewed him as an arrogant Wehrmacht captain who had no qualms about the occupation and enjoyed life in Paris. A Francophile, Jünger sat in cafés, met with fascist and accommodationist French intellectuals and artists, and had a number of love affairs. However, his diaries also contain references to the brutal aspects of life in occupied Paris. He learned of the execution of hostages and the recruitment of forced labor. He saw Jews wearing the Star of David and heard about their deportations. Because he was responsible for censorship and liaison with Parisian producers of culture, one of his sources of information was Otto von Stülpnagel, the commander of the Occupied Zone, who, having resorted to draconian repression, came close to a nervous breakdown and had to be

relieved by his cousin, Heinrich von Stülpnagel. But Jünger was apparently never quite at ease, either, and, surrounded by so much violence, began to suffer from insomnia.³¹

From the summer of 1941, after the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, he began to hear rumors about brutal warfare and mass murder in the East. Apparently in an effort to gain firsthand knowledge, he undertook a longer trip to the Caucasus in 1942–43 that seems to have changed him from a *bon vivant* to an opponent of Hitler, whom he disdainfully nicknamed “Kniébolo” (not translatable; possibly a play on “Diabolo”). Hannes Heer, having scrutinized the relevant documents of Jünger’s trip to the East, came to the conclusion that Jünger had experienced a “crisis” after talking to Wehrmacht officers and members of the SS Security Services (SD) who had witnessed the mass murders that were being perpetrated in the region.³² To Heer, the experience remained no more than an “episode,” so a “possible switch to another path,” namely that of outright resistance, never occurred.

Jünger’s story seems to be more complicated, though. While he did not join the active military resistance to remove Hitler and believed that the Nazi regime had to suffer total defeat to avoid the rise of another legend of the *Stab in the Back* (based on the post-1918 right-wing charge that the Imperial army had not been defeated but had allegedly been betrayed by the Left and Jewish profiteers at the home front.³³ In fact it was an anti-socialist and anti-Semitic lie that helped undermine the Weimar Republic. Having returned from the East to Paris, Jünger was in touch with a number of high-ranking officers who had committed themselves to the assassination of Hitler and the overthrow of his regime. One of them was Cäsar von Hofacker, a cousin of Claus von Stauffenberg, the man at the center of the conspiracy. He tried to win Jünger for the cause, though apparently without intending to recruit him directly; rather he hoped to rely on him after a successful coup as a celebrated writer who would speak up to justify the assassination of Hitler.

It may be that Hofacker had learned through Hans Speidel, the chief of the general staff to General Heinrich von Stülpnagel in Paris and later to Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, the commander of the Atlantic defense district, that Speidel had encouraged Jünger to compose a memorandum to be published after the overthrow of Hitler.³⁴ Titled “Der Friede” (The Peace), it was not found after the failure of the 20 July 1944 plot, in the wake of which Speidel was arrested. Meanwhile, Heinrich von Stülpnagel, thinking that the coup in Berlin had succeeded, had summarily interned hundreds of SS and SD officers, including their chief, Carl Oberg, as well as Otto Abetz, the German

ambassador. When this news reached his superiors, he was ordered to Berlin for report. Knowing that he would be arrested as a traitor, he tried to commit suicide but survived, losing his eyesight in the process. Shortly after his arrival in Berlin, he was hanged with the blood-soaked dressing still around his head.

Speidel, having covered his tracks better than his superior, was interrogated, but was released unharmed. Nor did Jünger have his belongings searched, among which were his peace memorandum and diaries. He survived and published "Der Friede" in April 1945 as an appeal for renewal.³⁵ The document was more straightforward than many others but contained one illusion: that Germany would emerge as a third power between the United States and the Soviet Union. No less significant, he dedicated the document to the memory of his "dear son" Ernstel, who had resisted tyranny and "languished in its prisons," from which his father succeeded in freeing him.³⁶ Ernstel was subsequently recruited into the army at age 18 and sent to the Marble Mountains of Carrara, where he fell on 29 November 1944. Although Jünger's position on the 1944 plot remained opaque, I would nevertheless argue that Jünger had become part of the "inner emigration" and by 1943 had, in fact, moved to a position that could have cost him his life if "Der Friede" and his diaries had been discovered. After all, as he put it, by that time "the play of hide-and-seek" had become "more difficult and over large stretches knowledge about one another" was "very precise."³⁷ In other words, "the air has become tougher, but also more transparent and this means that the yardsticks have become more clearly discernible." It seems that this was an opaque way of discussing the dilemma of his situation at the end of the Hitler regime.

However, neither this observation nor the publication of his peace memorandum was of much help to Jünger after 1945. Memories of his books and essays of the 1920s were still very much alive among Social Democrats and others who had fought his militarism and anti-Republican politics. He was vigorously attacked as being one of the gravediggers of Weimar Germany, and neither his *On the Marble Cliffs* nor the publication of his diaries counted for much in the balance. Like many other Germans with an inner emigration past, he resented having to undergo de-Nazification, a response that was reinforced by his latent anti-Americanism. He retreated to Wilfingen, near Sigmaringen in the Southwest, and refused to follow the advice of Armin Mohler, his rightist private secretary, to participate in the reconstruction of Germany and Europe in a spirit of conservatism that we shall encounter again in Zehrer.³⁸ Instead he tended his garden and wrote several rather esoteric novels.³⁹ He met with his mainly Southwest German Francophile friends, among whom were Theodor

Heuss, the first president of the Federal Republic, Hans Speidel, and Carlo Schmid, the Francophile intellectual in the Social Democratic Party (SPD). But he was also in touch with Carl Schmitt, the Nazi jurist. Jünger kept up a voluminous correspondence with his many German and French friends and acquaintances. Toward the end of his life, he accepted an invitation from Chancellor Helmut Kohl to attend a Franco-German commemoration of the First World War on the battlefields of northern France. He died in 2001 at age 103. His was a life with incredible twists and turns, reflecting the tumultuous course of the twentieth century. He has been called an *Einzelgänger* (loner) and therefore continues to pose a great challenge to a biographer. This explains why so much has been written on him by historians and also by Germanists who have scrutinized the strange journey of this soldier and intellectual.⁴⁰

The case of Jünger provides a good example of the complexities of conditions inside Germany during the Nazi period. Unlike some academics who successfully kept silent about their involvement in the regime, Jünger had a past that was too well known for it to remain hidden after 1945. He tried to defend himself, but when this proved futile he concentrated on writing allegorical novels. As Daniel Morat has shown,⁴¹ his correspondents included Schmitt and the philosopher Martin Heidegger, who, while also keeping silent in public, continued to exchange views about the past that showed how little they had learned from it. Judging from his wartime record, Jünger's trajectory is less clear. He remained close to his brother Georg Friedrich, whose transformation from a militaristic nationalist to an anti-Nazi was in many ways similar to Ernst's. As early as the mid-1930s Georg published a long poem that he titled "The Poppy."⁴² In it he took a strong anti-war position and, referring in the mid-1930s to Hitler's preparations for war, spoke of "the mourning dead" resting in a "silver fountain of peace" where they can no longer hear the noise of battle and "the infantile song of glory-less intoxication."⁴³

Next is the case of the journalist Margret Boveri, who also made an explicit attempt to grapple with a definition of "inner emigration." She claimed to have heard of the concept from Theodor Heuss.⁴⁴ Before the Nazi seizure of power he had been teaching at the Hochschule für Politik (HfP) in Berlin, where Boveri was one of his students. After voting for Hitler's Enabling Act in March 1933, Heuss, who had been a member of the Reichstag for the pro-Republican Deutsche Demokratische Partei (DDP), considered himself an "inner émigré" but did not fall completely silent. Instead he wrote reviews and articles on cultural themes for Joseph Goebbels's highbrow paper *Das Reich*. After 1945 Heuss encountered considerable difficulties when the American occupation

authorities discovered this. They deemed him a collaborator whose application to become the co-publisher of the *Rhein-Neckar-Zeitung* they rejected at first. It was approved only after some slightly devious string-pulling by more lenient American officers.⁴⁵

Writing in 1965, Boveri defended Heuss's posture in the Third Reich.⁴⁶ She thought it was perfectly understandable, so long as he had assumed that the regime would not last and that, following its early collapse, the refugees who had gone abroad would come back and unite with the "inner émigrés" and the active resistance to rebuild the country. She added, no doubt correctly, that this stance became more and more unrealistic when Hitler succeeded in consolidating his power and ruled with an iron fist for the next twelve years, only to be defeated in World War II by the Allies. What men like Heuss had badly underestimated was the enormous dynamism of the Nazi movement and Hitler's policies. By 1940 they found themselves swept away by the rapid political and socioeconomic changes around them, many of which were so piecemeal that they were grasped only when it was too late. After the conquest of Poland and most of western and northern Europe by 1940, even non-Nazi conservatives like the famous historian Friedrich Meinecke were swept off their feet by the "splendid victories" of the Wehrmacht.⁴⁷ These military successes were the context in which many educated Germans, believing that the regime was now here to stay, very mistakenly came to believe that it needed to be given more intellectual substance during its quest to "reorder" Europe.⁴⁸

Boveri next went beyond the prevalence of such impulses to discuss the shifting attitudes toward the Nazi regime when pressures on and risks to anti-Nazis grew exponentially from the mid-1930s onward and even more when a defeat of Nazi Germany appeared on the horizon from 1941–42 onward. Therefore, she mentioned the constant and increasing danger of being denounced by fellow-citizens or of stumbling into a Gestapo trap by coincidence. As she put it, the dividing line between inner emigration and collaboration was never sharply drawn for Germans who continued to be critical of Nazism after 1933. As sanctions against all kinds of "subversive" behaviors proliferated and became more draconian, "mere unenthusiastic standing aside," she wrote, could end "in a prison sentence or concentration camp internment."

Boveri's biography, like Jünger's, is thus another test case for gauging how far her attempt to specify inner emigration, which she claimed for herself during the Nazi period, in fact applied to her. As we will see, her case is raised here because it highlights the historian's dilemmas when operating in this peculiar territory. Dealing with Nazi ideologues and enthusiastic followers

or, alternatively, with members of the active resistance and with rescuers of Jews and, third, with men like Jünger, is challenging enough but is still relatively easy in comparison to assessing Boveri's behavior. Indeed the question must be asked whether she in fact qualifies as an inner emigrant in light of her puzzling movements along the cooperation-resistance spectrum. Fortunately, we have an excellent biography of her by Heike Görtemaker on which the following analysis relies quite heavily.⁴⁹

Born on 14 August 1900, Boveri fits neatly into the Generation of '32's temporal framework. Her father was an internationally renowned zoologist who held a chair at the University of Würzburg; her mother, Marcella Isabella O'Grady, had been born in the United States into a well-to-do family.⁵⁰ O'Grady attended Vassar College as an undergraduate and subsequently obtained her graduate training at MIT and Harvard. The couple were married in Boston and subsequently moved to Germany. Their daughter Margret grew up in a privileged bourgeois household but from early on had problems accepting her hyphenated German-American identity. She never warmed to her mother's elite education, though in a complex way she probably took her mother as a role model. Margret began her studies close to home, at Würzburg University, registering for a range of humanities and science subjects and believing that it was possible to build a bridge between what C. P. Snow called the Two Cultures. At the same time, she had come under the influence of the German Youth Movement and its romanticism while keeping her distance from American pragmatism and rationalism, as well as her mother's support of the traditions of constitutional democracy. She witnessed her father's close friendship with Wilhelm Röntgen, the inventor of the X-ray machine, and imbibed the two men's deep conviction that German culture was superior to all others.

By 1926 Margret decided that she was German rather than German-American. For a while she thought of a career in teaching, but she had developed a strong interest in international affairs.⁵¹ Relocating to Berlin, she began to take courses at the university and the newly established HfP, where she studied with Heuss and Arnold Wolfers. Her teachers at Berlin University were the historians Otto Hoetzsch and Hermann Oncken. The latter eventually accepted her proposal to write her doctoral dissertation on pre-1914 British foreign policy. In domestic politics she disdained the narrow petty-bourgeois ideology and activism of the Nazis. When in 1933 the latter forced the closure of the HfP, Arnold Wolfers quickly found a position at Yale University and apparently urged Boveri to emigrate to the United States. But she refused to take a dim view of Germany's future under Hitler and tried to take advantage

of the vacancies that Nazi anti-Semitism created in the media. She placed an ad in which she highlighted not only her doctorate but also her status as an “Aryan” and hoped to be taken on by the prestigious FZ.

While some of Margret’s work was accepted for publication, it did not result in a permanent staff appointment. Although life was difficult, she was sufficiently well-heeled through her family to undertake a tour of North Africa by car. It may have been an escape from what she saw happening in Germany during the violent early months of the regime. By May 1933 she wrote to Emil Dovivat, the director of the German Institute of Journalism, that she felt depressed by the “many sad individual lives” around her and feared that something that had existed whole until now would become completely splintered. To Wolfers at Yale she confessed that every day had become torture to her. And yet she insisted that things could change only if those who did not allow themselves to be “synchronized” (*gleichgeschaltet*) by the regime stayed on and bore “this entire bitterness.” In short, Boveri was not prepared to leave the country. In December 1933 she joined the synchronized Reichsverband Deutscher Schriftsteller (Reich Association of German Writers).⁵²

By January 1934 Boveri took the view that whoever wanted to continue to live in Germany without closing their eyes and ears and, for that matter, all their senses (at which, she added, “most people are now becoming virtuosi”), would have to be clear about his or her attitude.⁵³ She felt that she could not join the Nazi Party or the opposition, adding, somewhat puzzlingly, that she had remained a “liberal” and that the system of government was hence irrelevant to her. Although the era of individualism was over in Boveri’s view, she had remained an individual. By contrast, her friends and mentors, such as Heuss and the feminist Gertrud Bäumer, had grown “somehow old” and were merely interested in salvaging their vocation and inheritance in the face of the Nazi onslaught.

While Rudolf Kircher, the editor in chief of FZ, procrastinated about employing her, Boveri was finally picked up by Paul Scheffer, the editor in chief of the formerly Jewish-owned and liberal *Berliner Tageblatt* (BT).⁵⁴ There she developed a close professional relationship with Karl Korn, to whom she felt a special intellectual affinity. Like the FZ, the BT was a paper that Joseph Goebbels and his press watchdogs were prepared to keep on a long leash. The FZ continued to cover international news and was also widely read abroad as an organ that helped foreigners to read the tea leaves of Hitler’s diplomacy and military strategy in the 1930s. Meanwhile, the BT targeted an educated readership in the German capital. Still, given the repressive political environment

of the Third Reich, the paper's position and that of its editors remained precarious. In June 1935 Boveri was arrested out of the blue and her apartment searched.⁵⁵ She was interrogated and spent a frightening twenty-four hours in solitary confinement before she was released without being charged.

In previous months she had resolved that she would not allow herself to be thrown off balance like some of her colleagues, who, she learned, lived in a constant state of nervous anxiety. But after her experience in a Gestapo cellar she was, as she confessed later, also terrified. Of course it was known in general terms what happened to people who were arrested and not released shortly after. She appreciated that she had constantly done things that she should have kept away from, even if none of her activities amounted to serious crimes. Fortunately, not only was Boveri discharged, but also her books and papers that the Gestapo had carted off were returned to her, leaving her to wonder what the police had been hoping to find out. It seems they merely wanted to scare her, as dictatorships also tend to do.

After a longer trip abroad, Boveri returned to Berlin in July 1938 and found the political climate depressing.⁵⁶ Nor can she have missed the stepped-up persecution of the Jews during that year, culminating in the November Pogrom. Observing all this, she wanted to retreat to her parents' home away from the cauldron of Berlin to finish a book about her recent travels. When the BT was closed down in 1939, Boveri took the train to Frankfurt at the end of August to explore a more permanent position with FZ.⁵⁷ She spoke with Dolf Sternberger and Paul Sethe and was finally received by Erich Welter, the deputy editor in chief. In the end she was made the FZ correspondent for Scandinavia and moved to Stockholm. Her experience of living among the Swedes was not a good one. She heard and read a lot of criticism of her country, with which she still strongly identified. Her reporting therefore poses a further puzzle for the historian. How is one to interpret her intellectual transformations when war was looming and finally started in September 1939? While many of her colleagues had become increasingly critical and moved toward more firmly oppositional positions, Boveri became more collaborationist.

If she had been skeptical of Hitler's foreign policy in earlier years, by 1939 she had come to admire how he had, she believed, outmaneuvered the British in August 1939.⁵⁸ When the war broke out and the Wehrmacht destroyed Poland within a few weeks and in 1940 swiftly defeated France, Belgium, and the Netherlands after conquering Denmark and Norway, she was swept away by the more general wave of blind patriotism. In a letter of 31 December 1939 to her colleague Herbert Küsel, with whom she had had disagreements before,

she rejected his criticisms of her political attitudes.⁵⁹ If one joins some cause, she wrote, one cannot exclude oneself. Otherwise one forfeited, if nothing else, the right to condemn those who are obliged to do things that are unsupportable. As far as morals were concerned, Boveri argued, she could take up critical positions, even if she might not be happy with everything she did or wrote.

In the view of her biographer, she was walking a very narrow mountain path with a precipice on either side that left Boveri uncertain about what to do. She was now being wooed by *Das Reich*, a paper increasingly under Goebbels's heel, but hesitated to sign up, preferring to keep FZ as her journalistic base.⁶⁰ Perhaps it was to get away from these political pressures that she accepted an appointment as the FZ correspondent in the United States. Still strongly pro-German, she decided to travel to the United States via Moscow and Japan. On her long journey by train, she registered the many Jewish refugees passing through Moscow.⁶¹ When she took the boat across the Pacific, the American fellow-passengers with whom she shared her meals took her to task about Germany's inhuman policies toward Jews and about the conclusion of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Apparently Boveri remained unmoved, so the table conversations eventually turned to other, less controversial, topics. Such encounters continued once she had settled in New York and began to report on developments in America. The basic thrust of her articles was to counter local criticisms of Nazi Germany with pieces on racism in the American South and the country's homogenized culture, which to her was so inferior to that of Europe.⁶² If in her youth she had refused to identify with the society in which her mother had grown up, this rejection now surfaced with renewed vigor.

After the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and Hitler's declaration of war against the United States, Boveri was briefly interned as an enemy alien but later allowed to return to Berlin via Lisbon.⁶³ However, her political stubbornness continued, even as she witnessed and experienced the deteriorating situation and the increasingly terroristic policies of the Hitler dictatorship. When, on Hitler's orders, the FZ was shut down in 1943, she lost her job and was ordered to join the Nazi *Völkischer Beobachter* (VB). At the same time she met with the diplomat Adam Trott zu Solz, though she did not know of his connections to the conservative resistance that was planning to kill Hitler.⁶⁴ She also spoke with armaments minister Albert Speer about the overall situation, as German cities were increasingly reduced to rubble by Allied carpet bombing. She was vexed by self-doubts as to whether she should continue to write, but her patriotism remained firm. After a short spell as a correspondent on the Iberian Peninsula, she returned once again to Berlin.

On a visit to Switzerland, Boveri heard what she still refused to believe: that Germany was losing the war. She was also exposed to the hatred of Germany in Switzerland, where rumors that had begun in the spring of 1944 about the deportation and murder of the Hungarian Jews circulated.⁶⁵ With the FZ no longer in existence, she wrote for *Das Reich*, by then an organ of Goebbels's propaganda campaigns of total war. Back in Berlin, she spent the weekends at her *dacha* on Lake Teplitz but was back in her city apartment during the week. When it suffered bomb damage, she organized the repairs and reproached colleagues who had decided to leave the city to avoid the constant air raids. She came to believe that the roofs of Berlin were good platforms from which to observe the nightly duels and fireworks between Allied planes and German anti-aircraft guns. Apparently without emotion, she looked at the dark skies, like Ernst Jünger had done from the roofs of occupied Paris when the Allies had gained air superiority.

There was no shift, like Jünger's, in Boveri's views toward more active resistance as the Third Reich fell apart. She now expected defeat, but her attitudes at this time raise the question of the credibility of her claim that she had spent the Third Reich in inner emigration. Her career in Nazi Germany certainly fits into the spectrum of collaboration and resistance that I outlined earlier. Yet, while some fellow-journalists fell completely silent or moved more closely toward the active resistance end of the spectrum, we have to place Boveri more toward the opposite end. She continued to defend her country and remained detached from the misery around her, refusing to confront the injustices and crimes committed before her eyes. Ultimately she presents an enigmatic case, probably exacerbated by difficulties to connect with others at a more personal level. The journalist Günther Gillessen, who knew her, called her "*menschenscheu*" (diffident).⁶⁶ Her case not only allows us to study the intellectual trajectory of a prominent journalist of the Generation of '32 but also helps locate the point at which to place inner emigrants along the spectrum of cooperation and resistance. Boveri, too, lived in the previously mentioned gray zone, but at the collaborationist end of the spectrum.

This leaves one last test case that shows how thin was the line that separated members of the Generation of '32 from outright collaboration. It is that of Henri Nannen, who after World War II became the editor in chief of the magazine *Der Stern* and whose postwar journalism will be discussed in chapter 4. How is one to assess his life and work before 1945?

Born on 25 December 1913, he grew up in a lower-middle-class family in the East Frisian town of Emden.⁶⁷ His father rose to the position of police

commissar and, having entered the SPD after 1918, also served on the town council for a while. Although he left the Party in 1931 and claimed to have voted for the Nazi Party in the early 1930s, the Nazis dismissed him in 1934, together with some of his “unreliable” colleagues, under the terms of the Law for the Restitution of the Civil Service, as the Nazis cynically called it. It was the same law that also led to the unceremonious termination of many Jewish academics and Republican civil servants. It is also relevant that in the 1920s Henri fell in love with Cäcelie (Cilly) Windmüller, who hailed from a Jewish family. They remained inseparable until Henri, having passed his *Abitur*, moved to Munich in 1933 to study art and art history. He stayed in touch with Cilly until 1937, when she, increasingly terrified by Nazi persecution, moved to Palestine, where she stayed for the rest of her life. Her father, Adolf, who was a patriotic German, and his wife stayed in Emden and were deported to Łódź in Poland in 1940. It is not known where they eventually perished.

Nannen was at least once beaten up by Nazi hoodlums, apparently for his continued friendship with Cilly, and also had run-ins with the authorities. But, with the regime firmly in the saddle, he began to think of his future more opportunistically.⁶⁸ He wanted to write on art and eventually became an editor of an art magazine published by F. Bruckmann in Munich, to which he contributed some really terrible, fawning articles on Nazi art, but—as an admirer of Emil Nolde, Paul Klee, Max Beckmann, and Käthe Kollwitz who protested the removal of “degenerate” artists from museums—he joined the long lines of visitors to view the infamous “Degenerate Art” exhibition in Munich. All the while, the local Nazi organization in Emden kept an eye on him, and more than once did he get into trouble with the authorities. Consequently, he faced the dilemma of many Germans in the 1930s who did not want to “belong” and kept away from Party membership. But he also did not want to be an outsider, leave the country, or join the underground. As he put it after the war: “I was no resistance fighter, no hero,” but also no Nazi.⁶⁹ To have at least some Nazi affiliations to show, he joined one or two cultural associations and also began to write a few radio features. He even thought of a career in film after he had met Leni Riefenstahl, who took an interest in this very tall and attractive young man. Hooked on air travel, he finally became a member of the Luftsportverband, which opened a door for him at the beginning of the war. In 1939 he was drafted into the Third Company of the Airforce News Regiment 3 to write articles for the Luftwaffe’s propaganda arm. An energetic and experienced journalist, he was promoted quite fast and began to dream of a career as an air force officer.

By July 1940 Nannen was attached as a “technical writer” to a dive-bomber squadron, where he also trained as a gunner before he was sent to the Soviet Front for the next two years.⁷⁰ It was a dangerous life. He survived a crash landing and gained several decorations, including the Iron Cross 2nd Class and the “Crimea Shield.” By the end of January 1944 he found himself on the Italian Front as part of an “active propaganda” detachment of the Army High Command 10.⁷¹ With the German defenses against the Allies and Italian partisans crumbling, his unit retreated into the Alps, where, by the end of the war, he finally reached Oberfischbach in Bavaria, where his family had found refuge in a small farmhouse. Much more important than his movements during those final years and the people he worked with in psychological warfare is, in the current context, how he behaved as a war propagandist producing—as his biographer put it—“annihilation prose from the country of silence”⁷² and how he coped with the mass murder that he saw or heard about, just as Jünger had done during his travels in the Caucasus. His anti-Nazism became stronger, but he did not turn into a resister in the face of the atrocities that he witnessed.

In November 1941 Nannen wrote a long letter to a friend that, if caught by the censors, would have gotten him into serious trouble. In it he describes the plight of Soviet POWs, who were being marched to the rear areas, totally starved and without even the ability to forage the bark from trees because it was frozen.⁷³ When these soldiers collapsed from exhaustion, they were shot on the spot and left lying at distances of a few meters between them. Nannen wrote that he was glad not to be with the infantry, whose soldiers saw such scenes all the time. Next he wrote about the behavior of the White Russian police in Minsk and Borisov, who had evacuated the ghettos. They had forced Jewish men, women, and children to dig their own graves. The Jews had to line up alongside their graves and, shot in rows, fell into the ditches. If one of them had not been killed, the next victim would tumble on top of him. Nannen wrote: “One officer told me of such a mass murder during which one Jew had gotten up again shouting: ‘Dear Sir, please, good Sir, shoot me dead!’ This is what happens to thousands, in Minsk alone it is supposed to have been seven thousand.” He concluded with a sentence that reflected his total disorientation and the continuing search for scapegoats, in this case not the Jews as portrayed in Nazi propaganda, but Perfidious Albion: “Small wonder that even the oldest pilots are longing for the day when they can again fly against England.” Referring to the many German graves that he had also seen, he hoped that he would not have to die in this way. To him it was a terrifying thought, as his death would come too soon and end a life that was still unshaped (*unfertig*). Indeed,

he wrote, he had even been able to put some order into it. So, while Henri Nannen did survive, his earlier dissidence had evaporated, and it is doubtful that he can be placed inside the spectrum of inner emigration. At the same time, he never forgot what he had seen and heard in the East. What he could do after 1945 was to apply the lessons he had learned from his meandering life in the 1930s and early 1940s to his work as a journalist after the ordeal was finally over.

The Structure of *Journalists between Hitler and Adenauer*

Moving beyond the broad definitions of the Generation of '32 and inner resistance, which have now been explored more specifically with respect to Jünger, Boveri, and Nannen, the rest of this book deals with different journalists, who responded to the events in Germany differently than those just discussed. Chapter 1 deals with the life of Paul Sethe, born in 1901, from the time of his early journalism for a local paper in the Rhenish city of Solingen all the way to that of his work for major national newspapers in Frankfurt and Hamburg. The second chapter looks at the intellectual and political journey that Marion Countess Dönhoff, born in 1909, took from growing up on an East Prussian noble estate to becoming the revered editor in chief of *Die Zeit*. Chapter 3 provides a fresh analysis of Hans Zehrer, born in 1899, examining his journalism and politics at the end of the Weimar Republic. Ousted after the Nazi seizure of power, he “emigrated internally” to Sylt. He left the island after 1945, first as the editor in chief of *Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt*, founded by Bishop Hanns Lilje in Hanover, and later of *Die Welt* in Hamburg.

The fourth chapter then moves beyond the biographical and analyzes the broader context of the three journalists’ work in Hamburg as one of several media centers in West Germany. But no less importantly and in line with the title of this study, I also explore the question of press freedom during the Adenauer years and of how far journalists were able to enjoy it. After all, the West German Basic Law guaranteed the freedom to write and speak, within the limits of the law, without fear of being arrested and imprisoned. The Nazi era, when these freedoms had been suppressed, was over. Yet there was another constraint: after the war the Federal Republic, having abolished Nazi regimentation of the press, adopted a capitalist economy. This meant that the ultimate freedom to publish rested with the publishers and owners of a particular paper. If the latter did not like a journalist’s opinions, this employee either had to follow the owner’s editorial and ideological-political guidelines or leave his or her job to express opinions in another paper sympathetic to, or tolerant

of, these views. This is the legal background of the emergence of a free press in West Germany. Many journalists who had experienced “un-freedom” and brutal censorship during the Nazi period now found themselves in the era of the Cold War, with its new conformist pressures, which were personified by Chancellor Adenauer, for he in many ways embodied the autocratic style that continued to pervade post-1945 West German political culture. Accordingly, journalists were locked in another, though nonlethal, confrontation with both government and proprietors.

The problem that they faced was put into a nutshell when Sethe left *Die Welt* after disagreements with Axel Springer about the paper’s politics. Press freedom, he averred, was in effect the freedom of some two hundred wealthy people who owned the country’s press. He added bitterly that this was being expressed not by Karl Marx, but by Paul Sethe. Earlier on, as one of the editors of FAZ, he had also experienced the party-political pressures that Adenauer had exerted on the paper’s owners. Bucerius, the publisher of *Die Zeit*, was different in this respect. He attended editorial meetings and argued with his editors about the layout and contents of a particular issue without insisting that his views must prevail. Not surprisingly, Sethe had finally found a place for his journalism, which he had not been able to practice since 1933. This is why the conclusion will raise some big and topical issues about the media and the evolution of contemporary society.