

and where a university diploma could boost a career. While military officers had a very hard time finding a position in the U.S. before the outbreak of the Civil War, a number of officers and soldiers of the Hungarian Army were integrated into the Ottoman forces and fought against the Russians during the Crimean War, interpreting it as a continuation of the earlier struggles for freedom. The last two chapters discuss the significance of networks and local supporters of the political emigrants, such as Boston native Mary Lowell Putnam, who published articles on Hungarian history and used her influence among the elites of New England to support Hungarian 48ers.

ÁRPÁD VON KLIMÓ  
*The Catholic University of America*

STEFAN MANZ. *Constructing a German Diaspora: The "Greater German Empire," 1871–1914*. (Routledge Studies in Modern European History, no. 24.) New York: Routledge, 2014. Pp. xvi, 360. \$140.00.

Stefan Manz's work on the German diaspora between the founding of the nation-state and the outbreak of the First World War takes readers on a whirlwind tour of locations as diverse as Shanghai, Samoa, New Zealand, the U.S., Haiti, Spain, Russia, and Egypt. Using above all Robin Cohen's definition of "diaspora," Manz convincingly argues that pockets of Germanness across the globe demonstrated "collective commitment to the safety and prosperity of the homeland, including the self-perception of contributing actively to its trade or colonial ambitions; a strong consciousness of belonging to the same distinct ethnic group; and a sense of empathy and solidarity with co-ethnics living in other countries of settlement" (99).

Manz focuses on transnational cultural entanglements to explain the dissemination of German diasporic identity; he investigates global organizations, means of communication and transportation, an ethnic press, and the "migrants themselves" (4). His emphasis on the mid-nineteenth century onward establishes a clear connection between globalization and an increased movement of Germans abroad. Nevertheless, Manz argues that the primary turning point in establishing a diasporic German identity was the founding of the German nation in 1871, followed by German global ambitions and mobilization on the part of migrant groups themselves (89).

This study thus reestablishes the "national" as a category worth considering in German history alongside the recently more popular options of the regional (following the works of Celia Applegate and Alon Confino, for example) or transnational (see, for instance, the works of Sebastian Conrad and Jürgen Osterhammel). Manz considers nationalism as something transcending Berlin's jingoistic propaganda, which was actually internalized and practiced by various diasporic communities around the globe who still identified with German politics, culture, and language. The author goes to great lengths to localize the formation of this identity in three main areas: "politics" (specifically, the politics of the navy clubs), religion, and language (including the language of instruction in

schools). Significantly, he does this by focusing as much as possible on what is traditionally considered the "periphery," the diaspora communities themselves.

At the same time, Manz does not take this nationalism for granted, but considers the tension between representativeness and actual experience, claiming that "[b]oth national as well as diasporic memberships were certainly fluid and contested" (4). To examine this tension, or to test the limits of diaspora formation, is a highly worthwhile enterprise. Indeed, Manz finds that in Germany and Russia "[t]he vast majority of migrants . . . assimilated quietly or, alternatively, kept their language and religion without defining themselves as part of an all-encompassing German diaspora" (167).

The scale of the project is both an advantage and a disadvantage. The structure, for example, seems to be centered on the three areas of identity formation mentioned earlier, which comprise chapters 3, 5 and 6, but these thematic chapters are interrupted by a separate chapter presenting case studies on Russia and the U.S., the two main destinations for German migrants during the period in question. Although the more comprehensive view of the study demonstrates how diverse German diasporic communities could be, it still leaves the reader wondering whether these communities can be compared at all or if a tighter focus would have worked better. Are there not just too many regional variables? How did migrants from the diaspora define themselves not only vis-à-vis the homeland but also vis-à-vis their new surroundings? Interestingly, Manz chooses to analyze both colonial and non-colonial communities in the same analytical framework, including, for example, a discussion of navy clubs in Spain and Britain as well as an analysis of the Protestant Church in German Southwest Africa. But is there not a fundamental difference between the colonial and the diasporic? How do the particularities of the colonial situation, for example power structures based on race, influence the self-identification of the diaspora community? These are intriguing issues that may have been addressed in more detail.

Nevertheless, this is already an extremely thorough study and a very timely one, bringing together issues of identity, belonging, and nationhood in a truly global context. It resonates strongly with other transnational studies of German communities abroad, including Sebastian Conrad's and Jürgen Osterhammel's *Das Kaiserreich Transnational: Deutschland in der Welt, 1871–1914* (2004), Krista O'Donnell et al.'s *The Heimat Abroad: The Boundaries of Germanness* (2005), Daniel Walther's *Creating Germans Abroad: Cultural Policies and National Identity in Namibia* (2002), and Mathias Schulze et al.'s *German Diasporic Experiences: Identity, Migration, and Loss* (2008). The book's objective to provide a comparative aspect within a single volume is ambitious and still offers a very useful perspective for historians of Germany.

For scholars of German colonialism in particular, many of the discourses Manz addresses will seem familiar: the desire to cultivate Germanness as a superior cultural force abroad (54); a reconstructed sense of *Heimat* through dress, traditions, and architecture (57); and an-

nual political rituals such as the celebration of the Kaiser's birthday (198–200), all implemented to create a unique sense of ethnic community. Indeed, Manz argues that “the world was mentally mapped through the filter of German migrants and their colonising potential,” with “colonies” forming anywhere there was a significant settlement of Germans, not just within political territories (61). One way of interpreting this relationship between the colonial and the diasporic is that the concepts of the “colonial” and the “imperial” were applied by contemporaries to a wide range of formal and informal constellations, and that historians may well need to widen their conceptualization of the term accordingly (e.g., Uta Poiger, “Imperialism and Empire in Twentieth-Century Germany,” *History and Memory* 17, no. 1/2 [spring/summer 2005]: 117–143). Another way, suggested implicitly by Manz's study, is to consider the concept of diaspora as a much more appropriate and significant aspect of German history than has heretofore been acknowledged.

BRITTA SCHILLING  
*Utrecht University*

MICHAEL FLEMING. *Auschwitz, the Allies and Censorship of the Holocaust*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. ix, 406. \$125.00.

Ever since the war ended and the Nazi camps were liberated, the debate on Allied knowledge of the camps has continued. Within Anglo-American scholarship, the gathering, dissemination, and publishing of news about the Holocaust—in short, the Allies' responses to the Holocaust—has been the most prominent and heated line of inquiry. The latest addition to this scholarship is Michael Fleming's painstaking study of how the British and Americans obtained the information about the extermination of Jews in Auschwitz. His major aim is to track “Polish and other reports about the camp from their source, through intermediaries, to their final dissemination to Western governmental agencies/departments, the pages of newspapers and the airwaves” (9).

Fleming offers a well-rounded discussion and critique of previous scholarship pertaining to the topic. So what sets his study apart from the previous scholarship that has established that the news about the extermination of Jews was by and large censored and obfuscated by the British and American governmental agencies? In five main chapters, Fleming chases “the lives” of forty-five key reports that detailed the extermination of European Jewry. Chapters 2 and 3 provide background information by detailing how the Allies' self-censorship operated in practice and the political and cultural landscape in which the Polish Government in Exile worked in London. The next two chapters, which form the nexus of the book, explain how the news about Auschwitz flowed to the West. The final chapter reassesses the significance of the Vrba-Wetzler report and argues that the true function of Auschwitz was known in the West before this report appeared.

By closely scrutinizing these documents, Fleming reveals in detail how knowledge of the Holocaust became

available in the West: who drafted the documents and transmitted them to Britain and, more importantly, how the Allies treated these materials. While it is generally accepted that the Allies could have done more to help the Jews, the Polish Government in Exile has often been seen as the main culprit for censoring and suppressing the news about the extermination of the Jews. Fleming's main contribution to the scholarship lies in his careful reconsideration of the Polish-British relationship. What becomes clear is that it was precisely the Western Allies who worked as the gatekeepers of knowledge about the Holocaust, not the Polish underground or the Polish Government in Exile. As Fleming writes regarding one such document, “given that the Polish government distributed the report widely, swiftly and with some energy, this absence [from Western archives] is distinctly odd” (205).

In terms of the Allies' responses to the Holocaust, Fleming has pushed the standard further by bridging the gap in our understanding of the life-span of these important documents. Starting with the issue of source reliability, Fleming debunks the idea (as advocated by Yehuda Bauer, for example) that the British censored news from Auschwitz because they distrusted the Polish sources. As Fleming shows, the reports came from the same sources as military and strategic information that the British intelligence community found reliable. In fact, the same reliability was attributed to reports on the Holocaust. However, other factors, such as the difficulty to entrench the fate of European Jewry in an overarching narrative about the war and the fear of creating more domestic antisemitism, shaped British and American attitudes and led to hesitant treatment and distribution of the documents.

Apart from meticulously tracking down these documents (which are also neatly summarized in an appendix), Fleming's investigations of the press's reaction to news about Auschwitz is illuminating. Typically, scholarship on the press's response to the Holocaust has explained that the news hardly appeared on the front pages or in editorials, which has left readers to wonder what was more newsworthy at the time? Fleming notes one such case: while the Hungarian Jews were being deported to Auschwitz in the summer of 1944, the British press (and Parliament) was much more interested in the Polish Army's alleged antisemitism. The former news hardly figured on the front, while the latter attracted front-page interest. Another revealing statement by the author places the responses of the British press in the larger context. Fleming notes that the circulation of the news about Auschwitz in the Swiss press in the summer of 1944 far exceeded “the number of articles published about the Holocaust during the entire war in *The Times*, the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Manchester Guardian* and the whole of the British popular press” (233).

While the field of Holocaust studies continues to grow, with an understandable tendency to concentrate on issues such as Holocaust memories, remembrance, and twenty-first-century representations, Fleming's work serves as a great reminder of the fact that a lot of new material remains and that arguments grounded in empirical