Introduction

Why do soldiers fight? Why did German soldiers follow orders throughout a seemingly endless war from 1914 to 1918? Did German soldiers really believe that they were waging a ‘war of defence’ while occupying foreign soil and populations? Were German soldiers atavistic nationalists or bitter pacifists? In other words, were these men perpetrators or victims? What was the postwar legacy of these soldiers’ experiences for the dark events to come? Every major study of German soldiers in the First World War (and ninety-plus years have produced a vast library) attempts to tackle most, sometimes all, of these questions. This book is no exception. I posit partial answers to all of these queries through my analysis of German soldier newspapers, printed at or near the front, by and for soldiers. I will show that this incredibly popular medium, bought and read by millions, provided ‘ordinary soldiers’ with a language of manly justification for the aggressive and occupational practices of the German army. The soldier newspapers largely bypassed the popular nationalist discourse, a troublesome category in the still young Germany with its many ethnic divisions and decentralised mass culture, and instead focused upon the ideal of comradeship. This comradeship involved both that among fellow soldiers, with its associated concepts of what it meant to be a ‘man’, and the idea of the German comrade, an honest, good gentleman, as a participant in an occupying, or ‘colonising’, force. The editors and authors of the soldier newspapers provided this language, and on the basis of the popularity of this textual source we can surmise that this discourse, that of manly justification, was crucial to the identity and understanding of a significant portion of German soldiers of all ranks during the Great War.

The soldier newspapers represent only one (albeit substantial) discursive voice among the multitude of soldier languages that have been brought to light in recent scholarship. The last twenty years have seen a significant surge in research surrounding the questions posited above. This is largely a result of a shift in focus, in both social and cultural history, to the life-world of ordinary soldiers. In Germany the 1980s saw the rise in interest of the history of everyday life (Alltagsgeschichte), and a
concomitant curiosity about the lives of soldiers. Initially, the interest was in the soldiers of the Second World War. In fact, the unearthing of anti-Semitism and criminal behaviour on the part of ‘ordinary men’ in the Wehrmacht has led to a substantial re-thinking of the history of the eastern front in that greatest of conflagrations. By the late 1980s, German dissertations began to appear that investigated the language of soldiers’ letters in the First World War, and in most of these studies, the men portrayed were quite the opposite of the Second World War soldiers receiving such bad press.

Thus, in this recent historiography, the first discursive voices of German soldiers of 1914–18 were the soldiers’ letters analysed in 1990s publications, and they were largely the words of resistance, bitterness, pacifism and indeed sometimes revolution. The voices of soldiers’ letters had earlier appeared during the war itself, selectively published to provide the language of patriotism. Now we were hearing something very different. However, the language of soldiers’ letters was admittedly dissonant, with contradictory pro- and anti-war statements appearing in
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the very same texts. Yet, for the most part, these first works pushed a discourse of soldiers as victims. These initial voices were then disturbed through the comparative work of Aribert Reimann and Klaus Latzel.6 Through the analysis of the language of German soldiers’ letters and German home front newspapers, both of which were then compared with British letters and newspapers, Reimann located a plethora of examples of the language of nationalism and patriotism in the discursive world of German soldiers. Further, although Latzel found many moments of resistance in First World War soldiers’ letters, his comparison of the language in both First and Second World War soldiers’ letters uncovered, again, many instances of soldier belief and language in 1914–18 which did not correspond so neatly with a (largely) unproblematic signifying practice of resistance. In other words, the scholarship of the last twenty years has made clear the impossibility of identifying ‘the’ voice, or opinion, of ‘ordinary soldiers’ in the First World War. No one set of sources can convey the point of view or outlook of an army of 10 million men. All of these sources, however, provide us with a language, an overall German soldier discourse of 1914–18, with many of its contradictions and Justifications, with all of its ready mix of terms and ideas useful to any and all soldiers for their own strategic uses, their own ways of understanding (and justifying) their individual roles in a massive and confusing landscape of total war. The discourse and discursive strategies provided by the German soldier newspapers must be added to this universe in order for us to have a fuller picture of the life-world of German soldiers in the First World War.

This study attempts to do two things: first, to define a specialised medium and its usefulness, and second, to use this source to help us further understand what German soldiers experienced in the First World War and thereby provide greater understanding as to why at least some of them fought for so long without rebellion. Soldier newspapers have been dismissed as perhaps the clumsiest form of propaganda, depicting only the ideas of their authors and the propaganda messages it seemed their duty to disseminate.7 This assumes that soldier newspapers are ‘newspapers’, that is, that they are merely a subset of the larger medium

of home front or civilian newspapers, and should be analysed and judged on those terms, falling roughly into the category of either 'propaganda' or 'free press'. While soldier newspapers contain both elements to a degree, they are very different from civilian newspapers. Soldier newspapers were written by members of a club, a very large club: the soldiers of the German army. The authors were members of this same club, and wrote in the belief that they were writing both about themselves and for the millions of soldiers who eagerly bought and read these newspapers. Each small group of authors wrote a 'club newsletter' for an audience ranging from a mere 100 to a rather substantial 130,000. In contrast to the diversity of traditional 'newspaper' readers, this audience was all male, all soldiers, all severely limited in their freedom of action; almost all lived in occupied territory; most missed their mothers, their wives, their girlfriends, and many (perhaps most) were either engaged in relationships with local, occupied women, or wished they were, or visited brothels. All were trained to kill and many of them were already killers, most wished the war was over, most wanted to be at home, and virtually all looked for a mixture of justification and escapism. This last element, the provision of justification and escapism, was what the medium of soldier newspapers was created to provide. Unlike home front newspapers, with their diverse readerships and the requirement for various themes that applied to only some of their readers some of the time, soldier newspapers were an attempt by some soldiers to 'self-represent' all soldiers, to tell their stories to each other and provide something for future generations, a testament to what soldiers believed at the time and why they thought they fought the good fight. Formal censorship certainly existed for the soldier newspapers of the French, British and German armies, and indeed the German army attempted more vigorously than its counterparts to control the various messages in its newspapers. But at the same time, the network and number of German soldier newspapers dwarfed those of the Allies, and any attempt to control the content of these texts completely was bound to fail. For these reasons, soldier newspapers deserve examination beyond their use by the High Command to convey a certain point of view. It is important also to examine how the authors depicted soldiers, citizens, occupied peoples and the enemy in a medium and a manner that appealed to millions of 'ordinary'

8 For helpful comments on this and other points, I would like to thank Professor Bernd Sösemann of the Arbeitsstelle für Kommunikationsgeschichte und interkulturelle Publizistik at the Free University of Berlin.

9 At its peak, the newspaper of the 6th German Army, the *Liller Kriegszeitung*, was being distributed to a unit that numbered at least 130,000. John Ellis and Michael Cox, *The World War I Databook: The Essential Facts and Figures for All the Combatants* (London: Aurum Press, 1993), pp. 180, 232.
soldiers. The former approach, the top-down study of these sources, provides evidence of the political and propagandistic history of the war; the latter investigation, analysing appeal, goes some way to filling out the rich cultural history of the soldiers of the First World War.

I explain that a theme of manly justification pervaded the popular German soldier newspapers of the First World War and provided the readership with a set of images and explanations, both for Germany’s aggressive ‘defence’, and for its occupation of foreign lands and peoples. Thanks to the sheer number and distribution of the soldier newspapers and the organisational support for them, this source played a far larger role in the constitutive social reality of life at the German front than did the trench journals of either the French or the British army. Although the studies of the French and British soldier newspapers have been widely hailed as crucial in helping us to understand the morale, daily life, attitudes and beliefs of ordinary soldiers, German soldier newspapers have surprisingly not been the subject of systematic analysis as a way into the representations of the war that soldiers themselves constructed and exchanged. Some important studies have exploited these sources to illustrate their use by the High Command as an instrument of propaganda.

While this approach has produced informed, enlightened and useful research, it has left unexplored the ways in which these sources disclose more broadly based attitudes that originated within the army and within German society as a whole.

The reasons for the neglect of this source are twofold. First, the idea that ‘ordinary’ Wehrmacht soldiers in the Second World War were also active agents or ‘perpetrators’ (Täter) has only recently found a prominent place in the scholarship of that conflict. It has taken even longer for German historians to explore the degree to which most participants in the First World War were likewise active perpetrators in a war of foreign occupation. Second, and more fundamentally, certain approaches to history have limited the possibility of using the soldier newspapers in interesting

---


and hermeneutic ways. Some practitioners of the Sonderweg approach to the First World War posited an elitist cabal controlling Germany (and printing its newspapers) in a manner out of touch with reality (and ‘modernity’ for that matter) and preparing to foist the ‘myth’ of the ‘stab in the back’ upon a ‘surprised’ and ‘shocked’ German populace. Certain historians locate this story in preparation for the structurally determined final ascent of the ‘radical nationalists’ to power in January 1933. Therefore, in the first study of the German soldier newspapers to appear since 1937, Anne Lipp depicts ‘bourgeois’ editors working closely with the High Command, from 1916 at the latest, to create a discourse of an ungrateful home front, slowly but surely capitulating, and disloyally betraying the ‘undefeated’ army. This approach does not exploit the newspapers as a source for examining what the lower ranks were thinking because, according to Lipp, most of what appeared in these popular journals was often not what the average soldier believed. Lipp is quite correct that the High Command attempted to use the newspapers in such a way, and her well-researched monograph provides a thorough and illuminating study of the manner in which members of the High Command successfully forced many of these messages into the pages of the soldier newspapers. Her detailed study, however, leaves little room for an analysis of the way in which the images used, and the arguments made, reflect broader currents of opinion about Germany, the war and the occupied territories. Finally, Lipp’s work, as valuable as it is, needs to be supplemented by a discussion of how the themes, and tone, of the newspapers might reveal beliefs and prejudices among soldiers of all classes. While she does hint at the possibilities of reading this source ‘against the grain’, the direction of her main argument forces such explorations into the margins.

As noted above, one of the main sources analysed by historians of the ‘war of the common man’ (‘Krieg des kleinen Mannes’) has been

13 Although Sonderweg historians attacked the view of historians like Eyck and Röhl that Wilhelmine Germany was run by a small cabal (‘das persönliche Regiment’), the ‘special path’ approach often remains very narrow and elitist in its allocation of historical agency. The legend of the ‘stab in the back’, or Dolchstoßlegende, was that Jews and socialists on the home front had been disloyal during the war and undermined the efforts of the soldiers in the field. They thus became the scapegoats for Germany’s defeat.
14 Lipp, Meinungslenkung, pp. 14 ff., 287.
15 It is noteworthy that in her two earlier published articles, Lipp was more interested in how one could use the newspapers to decipher what the soldiers believed, their ‘war experience’ (Kriegserlebnis), than in discussing the experience of the officers. However, in her book she has shifted her focus from what the soldier newspapers might tell us about the lower ranks to how they mainly represent élite discourse. Lipp, ‘Friedenssehnsucht’, p. 280; Lipp, ‘Heimatwahrnehmung’, pp. 225–6; Lipp, Meinungslenkung, pp. 15–16.
soldiers’ letters. However, because of the private and non-military audience of these letters, such studies tend to focus upon the non-aggressive, non-chauvinistic, complaining aspects of soldiers’ lives. Not only does such an approach leave major aspects of the soldiers’ daily life largely unanalysed, but the letters rarely discussed how soldiers communicated their roles to each other, within their own ranks and community. The letters’ audience was civilian and uninitiated, and was rarely forced to deal with the very real moral questions of aggressive occupation.17

However, as noted above, two recent works have employed the new methodologies of cultural history to uncover both the resistance and the participation of soldiers in aggression. In the words of Jay Winter and Blaine Baggett, ‘Cultural History is the story of the way [the soldiers] made sense of the war and its consequences.’18 Further, according to Barrington Moore, ‘what is or appears to human beings unavoidable must also somehow be made just’.19 Thus historians such as Aribert Reimann and Klaus Latzel attempt to understand the ways in which an overarching discourse of ‘war nationalism’ or the ‘socialisation of power’ permeated the language of both the officers and the lower ranks of the German army in the First World War.20 By distilling the shared terminology of a larger semantic universe at the front, one is able to illuminate further the answers to such questions as the following. Why did morale remain intact for so long in the German army? To what degree were the images of the enemy negotiated? What was the nature of the connection between front and home front? How were the local populations of the occupied West and East viewed by the soldiers? In what ways did the soldiers manage to actually ‘enjoy’ themselves while behind the lines? What were the larger frames of reference for the war that made it so easy for many German soldiers to participate in the myth of the ‘stab in the back’?21

The key to success for both Reimann and Latzel is found in their resorting to the comparative mode of history. While First World War German soldier newspapers provide the material of cultural history – ‘cultural phenomena, encoded with rich and complex images, language

17 See Ziemann, War Experiences, and Ulrich, Die Augenzeugen. See also the collection of letters compiled by these two historians working together, at an earlier stage: Ulrich and Ziemann (eds.), Frontalltag.
20 Reimann, Große Krieg; Latzel, Deutsche Soldaten.
and cultural forms’ – it is ultimately through a comparison of this material with elements of both the British and French soldier newspapers that the international similarities as well as the idiosyncrasies of the experiences of the German soldiers become most apparent. To be sure, we must be cautious when comparing one national source with another. Ultimately, the German soldier newspapers comprise a set of data so much larger than the British and French trench newspapers combined, and represent material so much more present in the daily lives of German soldiers and the consciousness and planning of the High Command, that this study should be seen as a close analysis of the German soldier newspapers, at every stage compared with what I found in my thorough reading of the closest comparable source in the two main Allied armies. I thus attempt to avoid ‘the distorting effects of a narrowly national approach’. We are fortunate to have two subtle and powerful studies of the French and British soldier newspapers.

The most striking difference between the soldier newspapers of the Allies and those of the Germans is the emphasis upon the rhetoric of justification and occupation in the latter. This is hardly surprising given the position of the rival armies, but there is more to the distinction than that. The French were located upon, and defending, French soil. The British, however, were living on Belgian and northern French land and among Belgian and French civilians. Yet the British newspapers revealed virtually no interest in the countryside and Volk around them (aside from the rather carnal attention paid to the local female population) and spent no time trying to justify the digging-up of Belgian farmland or the shelling of Belgian villages. It is clear from the tone of the British soldier newspapers, and even more so from the French, that the Allies felt little need to prove to themselves that they were fighting a defensive and just war.

22 Winter and Baggett, 1914–18, p. 11.
24 Audoin-Rouzeau, Men at War; Fuller, Troop Morale. Throughout this book, I have drawn material directly from the British and French soldier newspapers I consulted, for which direct footnote references are provided. When these sources were cited originally by John Fuller or Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, the authors of excellent studies on the British and French soldier newspapers respectively, their use here is indicated by the phrase ‘cited in’.
The text and imagery of the German soldier newspapers were strikingly different. These journals exhibited a deep interest in their foreign surroundings and were replete with descriptions and sketches of the occupied. Moreover, the difference between the language appearing in the German soldier newspapers in the West and that of the eastern front is crucial to our understanding of the place of the First World War in the evolution of German perceptions of its role in Europe. Although in some articles the French were seen to be a somewhat ‘womanly’ and disloyal people when compared with Germans, the Landser were nevertheless depicted happily learning the French language while proudly boasting about their French girlfriends. The story was very different in the pages of the eastern front newspapers. There the local Slavs were portrayed as deeply dependent, lazy, dirty and primitive. The soldiers showed no inclination to learn Slavic languages or cultures, and they were very rarely described as having any kind of relationship with Slavic women.

In stark contrast to the depictions of occupied populations, the German soldier newspapers on both fronts emphasised the masculine ‘comradeship’ of all Germans. Unlike the local, occupied civilians, German soldiers were depicted as loyal, hard-working and honest Kameraden, as were the German women waiting and working stoically at home, the Kameradinnen, such as the powerful, almost ‘manly’, mother figure seen watching a soldier march off to war (see Figure 4.3). This theme, which I term ‘manly justification’, was repeated continuously, from the moment when occupation became a daily part of life at the front, definitely by 1915, through to the end of the conflict, for the newspapers were forever reminding themselves and their readers that this was still a ‘war of defence’. Anne Lipp’s interpretation has its merits, but my reading of these sources offers another point of view, one in which German soldier newspapers were not intent on constructing or disseminating notions of a split between the front and home. Rather, and especially when compared with the newspapers of the Allied armies, the notion of Burgfrieden, a deeply rooted community of hard-working, loyal comrades both fighting at the front in the trenches and at home ploughing the fields and working in factories, was the central and repeated message circulated in the German newspapers. Just as the Allied newspapers displayed anger and contempt for shirkers and strikers on the home front, to a significant degree the accusations of betrayal in the German journals in reaction to the strikes of January 1918 reflected not only the attitude of the High Command but, more importantly, a deep sense of anger and frustration among the lower ranks as well. When a small trench newspaper lambasted the ‘little boys’ back home in an article entitled ‘Treason or Childishness’, the proposal to turn the machine guns around
to give strikers a taste of what they were missing expressed a resentment beyond any central propagandistic control.26

I contend that a negotiated discourse of nationalistic, defensive ‘manliness’, found in the pages of the popular and widely dispersed German soldier newspapers of the First World War, provided an important set of ideas and explanations that helped many soldiers of all ranks to understand and justify their ‘holding out’ against the Allies, as well as their occupation of foreign lands and peoples. Additionally, the constant invocation of the concept of comradeship, both at the front and on the national level, was intended to assure soldiers that they were strongly supported by a large community and that they were fulfilling their manly duty by holding off the intruders at the gate and protecting their families. While comradeship was an aspect of the wartime discourse on the Allied side, in my reading of all the British and French soldier newspapers this theme was virtually never discussed.27

It is not my intention to substitute an approach which ignores the High Command and its uses of these newspapers for one in which those manipulations are taken to be the primary significance of this body of sources. A more balanced approach has many merits. To be sure, the language and imagery of the German soldier newspapers most clearly represented the German ‘national culture’ as understood and perpetuated by the bourgeois intellectual class. As Wolfgang Mommsen points out, in the final decade of the Kaisereich, the artists and authors of the middle class broke away from their politically liberal roots in constitutional liberalism, becoming ‘apolitical’ as they promoted their belief that German culture was superior to all others. This Kultur included not only the heights of Goethe and Schiller, but also all the trappings of a secular Protestantism that praised hard work, efficiency, literacy, education, discipline, hygiene and social welfare. Thus when the war began, it was not a difficult step for this class to support their Kaiser and the war machine with the infamous ‘Appeal to the World of Culture’.28

This document, signed by ninety-three of Germany’s leading academics and artists, gave clear evidence that the prejudices of the authors who


27 See Chapter 3.