

sich nicht durchsetzen konnten. Dafür macht er den Vorrang der Politik gegenüber der Theologie mit den Mitteln der Diplomatie, repräsentiert durch Pacelli, verantwortlich. Die abwägende Argumentation führt aber auch dazu, was Dominik Burkard wörtlich nicht tut, sich an die Spannung zwischen Gesinnungs- und Verantwortungsethik Max Webers zu erinnern.

Sieht man vom nicht zutreffenden Titel „Häresie und Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts“ ab, so ist abschließend zu loben, dass Dominik Burkard eine nicht minder gründliche als lehrreiche Untersuchung über Strukturen, Prozesse, Form, Inhalt, Folgen und nicht zuletzt Personen bei der Entscheidungsfindung der Kurie über das zentrale Thema des Verhältnisses von Politik und Religion im Falle des Nationalsozialismus vorgelegt hat.

*Dieterszell*      *Claus-Ekkehard Bärsch*

*Dramm, Sabine: V-Mann Gottes und der Abwehr? Dietrich Bonhoeffer und der Widerstand. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlags-haus, 2005, 303 S., Geb., 3-579-07117-3.*

Bonhoeffer's path into the resistance tends to be viewed either as the logical culmination of his theological course through the Kirchenkampf or as a politically grounded decision that contradicted his early theology. At least some of those who studied under him in the early 1930s and the Finkenwald period didn't know what to make of Bonhoeffer's resistance activities or his prison writings. In the context of the Kirchenkampf, of course, Bonhoeffer's resistance stands in stark contrast to most of his Protestant colleagues, and is read back into his early writings and actions, giving them a greater political clarity and significance than they may have actually had. In the popular literature, as well as most films on Bonhoeffer, his resistance provides the dramatic frame that has led all too often to a kind of mythology that portrays him as a central figure in the German resistance. As Dramm notes, the role of Bonhoeffer's friend and biographer Eberhard Bethge has decisively shaped our understanding of Bonhoeffer the resistance figure, giving Bonhoeffer a centrality in this story (particularly in the portrayals of ecumenical and resistance circles) that is not always borne out by the historical literature. In his later writings and lectures, Bethge was actually more circumspect about Bonhoeffer's role.

In this book Sabine Dramm explores "the story behind the story": what did Bonhoeffer actually do in the resistance, and what does this mean for our understanding of Bonhoeffer, theologically and historically? Dramm has read

and incorporated most of the pertinent literature in the field, drawing both on Bonhoeffer's own writings from the 17-volume *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Werke* and on newer research, including the works by Klemens von Klemperer, Marikje Smid, Christine-Ruth Müller, and Winfried Meyer, as well as earlier publications by Bonhoeffer's contemporaries, such as Jørgen Glenthøj and Josef Müller. Much of the book is simply a recapitulation of the relevant material from these various sources – a useful and very readable synopsis of Bonhoeffer's resistance activities.

The concluding chapter, in which Dramm identifies ten main issues that deserve further study and research, is actually the strongest section of the book, and one wishes that she had focused more on developing each of these points throughout the narrative. Here, Dramm's conclusions offer some provocative but very legitimate points for further discussion. There may be some truth to her conclusion that Bonhoeffer's entry into the resistance was essentially a ploy developed by Hans von Dohnanyi to keep his brother-in-law out of military service, yet surely the central involvement of other family members in the conspiracy (not just Dohnanyi, but Bonhoeffer's brother Klaus and his other brother-in-law Rüdiger Schleicher), was also a factor. This, as well as Bonhoeffer's own wartime writings, would suggest a more deliberate decision to participate in the conspiracy. Regarding his resistance activities, Dramm correctly notes that while Bonhoeffer was indeed involved in the "Operation 7" rescue of 14 "non-Aryans" to Switzerland, his actual role was peripheral. The July 20 resistance circles in which he moved were indeed largely "national conservative" and tend to be treated more critically by historians of the period than by the theologically-trained Bonhoeffer scholars, and I would also concur with her that these conservative tendencies inform many of the passages in Bonhoeffer's *Ethics*. Given this latter fact, Dramm is intrigued by the way in which his theological legacy has shaped progressive and liberation movements in the Christian world. As she notes, the political consequences drawn by the Protestant left after 1945 differ considerably from the worldview of many of Bonhoeffer's fellow resisters. Dramm also notes the critique by Holocaust scholars of Bonhoeffer's theological writings on the Jews and argues that here, too, the significance of his resistance activity deserves a more critical and contextual analysis.

Dramm concludes that Dietrich Bonhoeffer was not "the theologian of the resistance" but a "theologian in resistance" – that his importance ultimately rests more in what he said

(and wrote) throughout the resistance years, and less in what he actually did. I would concur, even as I would argue that this is precisely what opens the way for a reading of Bonhoeffer's texts from that era as a critique, not affirmation, of the "national conservative" circles in which he moved. His role in the actual resistance may have been minor, and his colleagues in that resistance may have been nationalists and monarchists. But his theological reflections on the challenges that confronted Christians under Nazism, including his reflections on the role of the Church in an ideological dictatorship and the consequences this has for the Church's very identity, are powerful reminders to all Christians of the dangers of an alliance between Christianity, state authority, and ideology. As a "theologian in resistance", Bonhoeffer ended his life imprisoned and pondering the very viability of religious faith in an ideological age.

There are a number of interesting comments and insights throughout this work; Dramm is an observant reader of Bonhoeffer and the historical literature, and in addition to her closing chapter, she offers good suggestions for deeper analysis or new avenues to pursue in the endnotes. Given her earlier comparative study of Camus and Bonhoeffer (1998), it would have been interesting had she incorporated some of that analysis or pondered Bonhoeffer's thought in the larger context of European intellectual resistance. She suggests, but offers no real analysis of the larger issues: how his resistance affected his theology, how this history fits in (or does not) in German Protestantism. Another aspect would be to ponder the compromises and delays made by the July 20 resistance – by all accounts a source of real anguish to Hans von Dohnanyi – and what influence this had upon Bonhoeffer's prison writings as well as the *Ethics*.

This is a good synopsis of Bonhoeffer's role in the resistance, however, and a very readable book for both general audiences and students interested in learning the details of this history – and Dramm's concluding questions are certainly worthy of further study and examination.

Washington

Victoria J. Barnett

Kaiser, Jochen-Christoph (Hrsg.): *Zwangsarbeit in Diakonie und Kirche 1939–45*. (Konfession und Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Zeitgeschichte; 32), Stuttgart (W. Kohlhammer Verlag) 2005, 464 S., kt., ISBN: 3-17-018347-8.

Als Band 32 der seit knapp zwei Jahrzehnten erscheinenden Reihe „Konfession und Gesellschaft“ erscheint der diakonie- und zeithistorisch gut informierende Sammelband über das in der Forschung lange vernachlässigte Thema Zwangsarbeit in Diakonie und Kirche während des 2. Weltkrieges. J.-Chr. Kaiser, Professor für kirchliche Zeitgeschichte in Marburg, Mitbegründer und geschäftsführender Herausgeber der Reihe, der den vorliegenden Band editorisch verantwortet und instruktiv in ihn einführt (Zur Einführung: 13–25), ist mit zahlreichen Publikationen zu zeitgeschichtlichen Themen des Sozialprotestantismus wie der Diakoniegeschichte monographisch seit den 1980er Jahren hervorgetreten. Auch in dem „Marburger Forschungsprojekt“, das einem Auftrag der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland und des Diakonischen Werkes aus dem Jahre 2000 entsprach, war er initiativ und leitend verankert. Dabei wurde das Marburger Team von eigenständigen Projekten einzelner Landeskirchen und Diakonischer Werke unterstützt, die auch selbst kompetente wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiter zur Erforschung der Zwangsarbeit in ihren Regionen einstellten. Hervorzuheben ist, dass sich eine enge „Kooperation aller an diesen Projekten Beteiligten nicht nur im protestantischen Raum, sondern auch in Bezug auf die katholischen Parallelunternehmungen“ (21) ergab, wobei die gegenseitige Orientierung über die zumeist diffizile Quellenlage bei Begegnungen der Forschungsteams im Mittelpunkt stand. Die territorial begrenzten Forschungen des Marburger Projekts konnten durch Ergebnisse aus weiteren Landeskirchen und einzelnen großen Einrichtungen der Diakonie in den Sammelband integriert werden, so dass der überwiegende Teil der Landeskirchen und größeren diakonischen Werke monographisch aufgearbeitet werden konnte. Bisherige Forschungsliteratur wurde berücksichtigt. Die Anmerkungen orientieren präzise über entsprechende Einzelstudien. Auch auf sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen ist Bezug genommen. Die Ergebnisse der jeweiligen Beiträge des Bandes lassen auch die kirchenpolitische Situation während des Krieges und vorher erkennen und enthalten auch widerstandsgeschichtliche Erwägungen, soweit sie für den kirchlichen Umkreis im NS-Regime von Bedeutung sind. Über historiographische Anfänge dieses Forschungsfeldes, das umfassend erst durch die bundesdeutsche Entschädigungsdebatte seit den 1980er Jahren ins Bewusstsein gehoben und nach und nach in Angriff genommen wurde, wie über Ergebnisse der umfangreichen Recherchen orientiert instruktiv die Einführung des Herausgebers. Im Geleitwort (5–7) des Ratsvorsitzenden der