THE TRANSNATIONALIZATION OF STRUGGLES FOR RECOGNITION
AN INTRODUCTION TO A MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD OF RESEARCH

Dieter Gosewinkel

Prelude: Historical Context and Issues

The twentieth century was a century of extremes.[1] This is true in global terms, but it is particularly so of Europe, the starting point for two world wars and the main theatre of the Cold War that followed. There are sound reasons for describing Europe in the twentieth century as a 'black continent' (Mazower 1998). The radical polarization of political camps and the intensification of ideological conflicts, including new, thoroughly organized forms of mass violence, bear witness to this. The particularly radical form that confrontation took was the product of dictatorships and the political movements that backed them, which provoked a 'European civil war' (Nolte 1989). Characteristic was an insistence on existential differences between key political currents; the rejection of the elementary equality of human beings as a mistaken universalistic principle in the face of demands for civil, political and social equality; the consistent rejection of the principle of reciprocity in elementary social relations based on equality; and ultimately, the forced homogenization of social communities or even the destruction of the Other. This intensified confrontation of demands for inequality or equality is not only a hallmark of the sharp antinomies prevailing in an extremely violent century. It also marks the key political positions from which and against which the struggles for recognition were fought out on the national and transnational levels.

The rejection on principle of the universality of equality also affirmed difference as an expression of 'natural' hierarchy. The fundamental insistence on differences, such as race, class and gender, served to justify hierarchical value gradations and the associated differences in the way the various groups were treated. The double coding of equality in the sense of forced homogeneity and of difference in the sense of value gradation was based on the fixed ascription of properties regarded as essential, such as race, nation or class. Classification, for example as 'Jew', as 'non-proletarian', and as 'woman', led to considerable political, social and cultural discrimination – including extermination as enemies of the nation or class – precisely because such classification was seen as evident, and its consequences as 'natural' and hence legitimate. These ideas proved enormously attractive. Under authoritarian and dictatorial regimes, they developed a material force that was to shape European history far beyond the end of the 'short twentieth century'. For certain periods and in certain regions of Europe, the use of force gave them hegemony.

But this hegemony was challenged by a counter-model of social order that it could never completely displace or eradicate. The counter-model had developed before the democracies and dictatorships of the twentieth century; it had resisted dictatorial approaches and allied itself in the course of the twentieth century – albeit it not systematically – with democracy in Europe. The social model stood for the elementary equality of human beings as individuals, and for the development of their freedom on the basis of a moral order of human dignity (Margalit 1996), which took the social norms of equal respect as its core.

The political point of departure was the struggle for self-determination. It was chiefly concerned with individual and collective protection against violation of equal respect. In this political struggle for equal respect lay the basis for what was later to be expressed analytically by the theoretical concept of the struggle for recognition. Discrimination, that is to say the failure to respect elementary precepts of equality – whether codified or merely aspired to – sparked off protest by individuals and associations against discrimination and the underlying legitimation system. Basically, this sort of fundamental protest against the violation of equal respect is the archetypical resistance, timeless in its elementary motivation, against societal conditions perceived as unjust (Moore 1978). From a historical point of view, however, rebellion against injurious discrimination in the double Atlantic revolution in North America and France at the turn of the nineteenth century displayed a new political quality and weight. The achievement of equal respect by the American colonists against the British colonial regime and by the Third Estate against the Ancien Régime realized a demand for equality that shattered politicosocial

systems based on hierarchy, providing a future point of reference for farther-reaching demands for equality and equal respect. The struggle of the bourgeoisie for emancipation from the hierarchical bounds of the feudal order signalled the beginning of a political movement that also wished to entrench its achievements in a universally binding constitutional order. There are many examples from the broad spectrum of political movements that unfolded in the nineteenth century: the struggles of the early workers' organizations and the labour movement against the disrespectful treatment of their labour as a commodity and the political discrimination of workers; the striving of religious groups and minorities for tolerance and equal respect; the struggles of women against exclusion from public political and cultural life and for equal rights that at the same time did not ignore the cultural and biological distinctions between the sexes; and finally, the early movements that protested against the elementary, essential rejection of equality in the system of European colonialism (Osterhammel 2009: 113f., 196f., 584f., 722f.). It was above all in the form of associations that these movements constituted crystallization points for the up-and-coming bourgeois society.[2] They represent an excerpt from a range of societal movements that, on the threshold of the twentieth century, found their political impetus and pathos in the lack of equal respect and the resulting violation of a fundamental norm for a just social order.

Whereas the organizational form of this rebellion was often the association or party, its medium was the law. The legitimacy and importance in setting standards of justice of the law as a means for demarcating and distributing spheres of freedom, satisfying elementary needs, and regulating political participation was greatly enhanced. The major codifications of civil law gave emerging bourgeois society a basis on which to develop standards for solving practical conflicts about justice. The amount and density of legal regulation in all areas of social life, especially in working and economic life, and the provision of social and public services at all levels of the community including private and family life,[3] increased rapidly towards the end of the nineteenth century. The constitutionalization of political life, that is to say the increasing submission of the political authorities to superordinate legal rules, led increasingly to struggles for justice conducted in the forms and procedures of the law. This 'juridification'[4] of social life and social conflict did not mean that the existing legal order was felt – in itself and overall – to be just. Many struggles were directed rather towards changing the existing legal system and asserting new rights. Not infrequently, therefore, the law, too, was used not as a value in itself but as a tool for enforcing sectional interests, not excluding revolutionary objectives (Böckenförde

1967; Schultz 1972; Wesel 2010: 552). Nevertheless, the law established itself as a major mode[5] of articulating and enforcing demands for equal respect and the protection of autonomous spheres of freedom. The extension of constitutionally guaranteed basic rights in the European constitutions of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the system of minority protection grounded in international law after the First World War, amply demonstrate this. While law played an essential role in establishing and formalizing fundamental standards of freedom and equality, mass media came to be another major mode of articulating and instigating protest and rebellion. Protest groups need the mass media to win as big an audience as possible for the diffusion of their claims. As for the media, they profit from reporting on protest events, thus contributing to their legitimation. Although it would be simplistic to see a symbiotic relationship between mass media and protest groups, while most cases are characterized by a deep asymmetry of power, the media and social movements have a considerable common interest in performing and publicizing social protest (Fahlenbrach, Sivertsen and Werenskjold 2014; Rucht 2014; for an example, see Clifford 2005). Protest and social movements' struggles for recognition have gained much of their relevance and credibility from resonance in newspapers, journals, radio, television and, finally, the internet.

A lengthy and dominant current of protest against the violation of elementary standards of equal respect was concerned with social conditions and the sometimes extremely hierarchically structured living and working conditions among the lower classes. The European labour movement, strongly organized and politically effective in comparison to other movements, championed demands arising from the experience of social injustice for the fundamental redistribution of goods and property. The outcomes of these struggles were social rights, the granting of legally binding claims for the abolition or at least reduction of the socially unequal distribution of opportunities for employment and property ownership (Marshall 2009), and the introduction of minimum standards of social security. The attainment and codification of social rights, as well as the institutional transformation of European countries into welfare states, are hallmarks of the twentieth century. The call for solidarity as a tool for diminishing blatant disparities and discrimination under unbridled capitalist working conditions was to become an integral element in the political programmes of socioeconomically motivated movements – in so far as they did not aspire to the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois-capitalist society itself to give hegemonic power to the oppressed classes in a classless society.

The historical processes described here, which extended from the nineteenth into the twentieth century, have in common that they were borne by actors who joined forces in groups and movements, often fixed organizations, in order to express their protest against existing societal conditions and criticize the disregard of legitimate demands for equality. Often – but by no means invariably – they based their demands on moral principles, general or generalizable, going beyond the concrete occasion and immediate personal interests to call for the change, restoration or establishment of a just social order as a whole.[6] These demands did not presuppose basic agreement and understanding with the addressees but accepted conflicts and struggles, which not infrequently proved to be violent.[7] Characteristic of developments from the end of the nineteenth century onwards was that these demands and movements were organized across the borders of single countries. In a first wave of globalization, set off by worldwide European colonization, not only the exchange of goods and commercial contacts proliferated (Hoerder 2002; Torp 2005; Osterhammel 2008, 2009). Broad migration flows and intellectual contacts across national borders, facilitated by new modes of transport and means of communication, meant that experience gained in social struggles for equality and against discrimination crossed territorial boundaries in communication spaces – that is to say, they became transnational.

This binary sketch of developments from the nineteenth to the twentieth century contains certain simplifications. It confronts political systems and movements that are authoritarian and liberal, that seek homogenization or plurality. But social movements struggling for equal respect were not limited to liberal-democratic systems; they were often particularly effective where they addressed the transformation of the political system in order to attain their goals. Vice versa, twentieth-century democracies, too, revealed an authoritarian aspect of forced homogenization to suppress the free association of opposing plural interests – for example, the organization of national minority interests (Mann 2007).[8] What is more, the struggle for equal respect did not necessarily arise from a minority position; especially under democracy, it could also be propagated from the position of the majority. Finally, struggles for equal respect could also be substantively ambivalent, and not systematically espouse inclusive and universalistic principles. The struggles of national movements, for example, could, from a liberal position, serve to secure national minority rights; but from the position of the majority they could display an excluding and aggressive side that seeks equal respect for their own national entity to promote its superiority.[9]

The studies presented in this volume argue historically on the basis of the extreme political opposites of the twentieth century in Europe,

with the aim to understand the movements for self-determination, equal respect, and emancipation against authoritarian oppression and forced homogenization in terms of their historical conditions, success and degeneration; and, on this basis, with the further aim to analyse current development trends. The studies have emerged from a research project entitled 'The Transnationalization of Struggles for Recognition – Women and Jews in France, Germany and Poland in the 20th Century'. Since 2007, historians and social scientists have been addressing the categorization, development and impact of struggles for equal respect on the basis of empirical investigations. The underlying project ran from 2007 to 2012 and involved Polish, French and German scholars, focusing on the empirical analysis of Jewish and women's groups and movements during the twentieth century.[10] The point of departure in European history is examined in comparative studies on Poland, Germany and France. They are supplemented by studies that add a comparative perspective by including other objectives in the struggles for recognition (e.g. the peace movement) and non-European as well as global struggles for recognition.

The empirical studies share two fundamental theoretical assumptions: first, that the societal conflicts described here as struggles for equal respect can be precisely captured historically and analytically by the theory of the '*struggle for recognition*'. Second, that *transnationalization* of the struggles for recognition is an essential factor determining the development of struggles for recognition, their reach, and their effectiveness.

This volume thus poses the following *core question*: Why and how did struggles for recognition by women and Jews in the twentieth century go beyond the national context, and how did this transnationalization affect both the national and the transnational level?

With regard to transnationalization, this means: What specific conditions of development favoured or hampered transnationalization processes? When and why were there phases of and trends towards (re-)nationalization? Did, as is often assumed, transnationalization weaken national conflicts? Is there a secular trend towards transnationalization?

On questions of *comparison*: What does national comparison have to say about the conditions for the transnationalization of struggles for recognition? Do differences in the institutional preconditions for struggles for recognition mean differences in opportunities for transnational mobilization – or, conversely, that transnational mobilization balances out national deficits? Finally, does the comparative perspective confirm the existence of a gap between West and East with regard to institutional opportunities and the effectiveness of national and transnational struggles for recognition?

Research Topic and Concepts

On the basis of these questions, we now take a closer look at the topics and concepts of the research presented.

Women and Jews

The choice of the two groups – women and Jews – as the main topics of investigation is based on a number of assumptions and objectives that provide, firstly, clear common ground, and secondly, the greatest possible diversity. In the first place, groups and associations were to be examined that were nationally and geographically widespread and thus comparable across national borders. Secondly, the groups and associations to be investigated were to have the highest possible degree of transnational 'organizedness'; in comparison between countries this was the case for women's and for Jewish organizations (Geyer and Paulmann 2001). Thirdly, the two groups share historically a long struggle against discrimination and marginalization in public life, and in exclusion from fundamental rights (e.g. access to certain occupations; full participation in political life), which obliged them to particularly urgently turn to the law as a medium of dispute.

On the other hand, women, who almost everywhere in the societies under study constituted more than half the population, were, unlike Jews, not a minority group. Their struggles for equal respect range thematically from social struggles for equal access to employment and political participation to recognition of a specific female identity. Jewish groups all living in the diaspora define themselves, in contrast to the social (biological) group 'women', as a cultural entity and determine their cohesion primarily via the cultural spheres of religion, Jewish history, and tradition. Finally, the type and degree of discrimination and violation of equal respect vary. Whereas women were continuously excluded from the full exercise of fundamental rights, albeit it to a decreasing degree, Jews experienced the extremes and extreme violence of the twentieth century – on the one hand complete legal equality, and on the other physical extermination.

Transnationalization

This volume aims to compare societal struggles for equal treatment, not as confined to national, isolated public spheres. The research focuses rather

on territorial and cultural border-crossing. In this sense, *transnationality* is understood as a status or quality of an action, a social movement, or an institution that consciously or unconsciously goes beyond the territorial or institutional framework of a nation-state. We set out from a number of assumptions, which will be looked at in detail. First, in the course of the twentieth century, struggles for equal treatment were only exceptionally limited to the national context. Second, regardless of considerable fluctuations over time, processes of transnationalization decidedly enhanced the effectiveness of struggles. Third, no historical continuum of purposeful development from national to transnational struggles can be assumed. Differences in the historical development of these struggles between the poles of 'national' and 'transnational' have to be taken into consideration without assuming a clear and irreversible trend from national to transnational.

Struggles for Recognition

The struggles that we present as a major current of the twentieth century address many motives, political objectives, forms of organization, and groupings that can only provisionally be covered by the term 'equal respect'. Keeping in mind the conflictual situation, the bipolarity of goals between equality and diversity, and the range of motives from socioeconomic to cultural, what these struggles have in common is the political endeavour to assert the value of the protagonists' articulations of their lives and needs in the demand for 'equal respect'. The demand for 'respect', which directly addresses intersubjective relationships, can be summed up by a category developed by social theory: '*recognition*'. This is an analytical category, not a concept that plays a role in the historical sources or statements of actors. It involves two key assumptions, which we shall be considering in detail. First, the 'struggle for recognition' seeks not only to attain respect and the right to one's own cultural practices and the like, but also includes genuinely socioeconomically motivated struggles for redistribution.[11] Second, the analytical category 'recognition' is not understood ahistorically, but rather in its development into and assertion as a lead category in current societal theory.

Comparison

The studies in this volume focus on *France, Germany and Poland*. The three countries are compared and the history of their relations reconstructed.

From a historical point of view, particularly in the twentieth century, the three countries were enmeshed in conflictual, singularly violent relations, so that we can speak of the *entanglement* of their national histories, leaving no room for any notion of separate national paths in struggles for recognition. Secondly, the three countries stand for various models of nation-state formation and structures of government:[12] the centralist French state with its long historical tradition and, since the nineteenth century, a vibrant republican tradition; the so-called 'belated nation-state' Germany with markedly federal structures and at times strong emphasis on ethnic and cultural homogeneity; and a Poland marked particularly in the twentieth century by territorial and governmental fragility, which experienced not only the birth of new states but also long phases of foreign rule and dictatorship. This mixture of entanglement and similarity on the one hand, and autonomy and difference on the other, justifies assuming that a comparison of the three countries could prove particularly instructive. Women and Jews are groups chosen not for reasons of comparison but because they have essential features in common concerning both the aspects of struggles for recognition and the transnationalization of these struggles. Both groups were systematically deprived of their rights over a long period of nineteenth- and twentieth-century European history: women were the group most discriminated against in quantitative terms in view of their size, Jews in qualitative terms in view of violent anti-Semitism and the Holocaust. Finally, both women and Jews have been particularly active in transnational networking and thus in the transnationalization of their struggles for recognition.

The categories 'struggles for recognition' and 'transnationalization' are concepts that have come to play a greater role in international research in the humanities and social sciences since the 1990s. When using the concept of transnationalization 'we refer to the growing role played by diverse forms of interactions between domestic and external actors in defining the direction and the content of the evolution of domestic institutions and policies' (Bruszt and Holzacker 2009: 3). We contrast transnationalization in this sense with 'internationalization', which, by our definition, denotes transboundary processes and networks promoted by state agencies, and not civil society actors.[13]

Regardless of differences in analytical explanatory level, consideration of the origins and reception of the two concepts 'struggles for recognition' and 'transnationalization' is necessary for understanding their specific force in the present discussion. To avoid succumbing to the plausibility of current developments, we historicize the two categories 'struggles for recognition' and 'transnationalization', that is to say, with regard to their intellectual genesis and certain key representatives and positions in the

course of their interpretative history. This is in keeping with a double aim of this volume: firstly, the key categories are to serve as analytical categories in explaining societal change; secondly, they are to be examined themselves in the course of the study as to their analytical viability and explanatory power. Such an attempt to reflect critically on theoretical categories while applying them in research means that the categories in question are not taken as absolute from either an analytical or a temporal point of view. There are therefore contributions that take a critical look at the adequacy of the categories as such, and at how they are traditionally interpreted. Furthermore, we adopt a *historically critical approach* in two regards. First, struggles for recognition and the forms taken by transnationalization are traced as historically determined processes through the history of the twentieth century. Second, we take a step back and assume that not only the empirical phenomena under study but also the categories under study are subject to time, and can change.

A historically critical study therefore begins by considering the historicity of the categories used '(struggles for) recognition' and 'transnationalization': What do they mean in present-day scientific parlance? Where do they come from; that is, when and why were they formulated? And how has their meaning changed?

Struggles for Recognition

At the turn of the twenty-first century, 'recognition' had become a central category of (Western)[14] international societal theory and moral philosophy. It addresses the normative basis of political demands for difference and identity in the awareness that 'only a category that makes individual autonomy dependent on intersubjective consent can capture the moral interests of many current conflicts' (Fraser and Honneth 2003: 7). Recognition is accordingly a philosophical category applicable (to begin with) in everyday practice, which focuses on modernity's promise of autonomy – the aspiration to happiness and freedom – to provide a normative measure for the widely ranging violations of autonomy. In essence, the theory of recognition is concerned with the theoretical assessment of experience with social injustice. In the broad version represented by critical theorist Axel Honneth, recognition theory addresses 'the withdrawal of social respect …, phenomena … of humiliation and disrespect that constitute the core of all experience of injustice' (ibid.: 158; Brink and Owen 2007). The theory of recognition tackles the categorical assessment of many forms of the rape, deprivation of rights, and debasement of human beings, violating their positive

understanding of themselves. The underlying assumption is that there is an 'indissoluble link between the inviolability and integrity of the human being and the consent of Others'. The focal point of a theory of recognition is therefore its reference to the fundamental intersubjectivity and reciprocity of successful social relations, 'the embracement of individualization and recognition from which that special violability of the human being arises' (Honneth 1992: 12).

If we take as our basis the Axel Honneth (1992) and Charles Taylor (1993a) version of recognition theory, which has the greatest influence in German (and West European) social theory, there are three 'basic patterns', 'love, law, solidarity', that constitute intersubjective recognition. These basic forms of recognition are graduated, with the 'degree of positive relationship of the person to himself increasing step by step' (Honneth 1992: 150).[15] Love is understood as the 'primary relationship', 'consisting of strong emotional ties between few persons on the pattern of erotic couple relationships, friendships, and parent–child relationships'. 'Law' or 'legal recognition' assumes that 'every human subject can be considered the subject of some rights or others if he is societally recognized as a member of a community' (ibid.: 153, 176). The effect of law as a mode of recognition is based on the key principle of equality, which represents legitimation and a driving force for every demand for the steady 'extension of both the material content and the social reach of the status of legal person' (ibid.: 191).

Finally, social recognition or 'solidarity', the third pattern of recognition, refers to relations of intersubjective esteem that lie beyond intimate emotional relationships and social relations regulated by the law. What is described in everyday speech as the 'social prestige' and 'self-esteem' of the individual goes back to the process of individualization in the transition to modernity. It was only when notions of estate-based collective honour were replaced by a form of esteem grounded in individual achievement that the conditions for 'solidarity' – and the need for solidarity – developed, in general terms: 'social relations of symmetrical esteem between individualized (and autonomous) subjects […] to esteem one another symmetrically means to view one another in light of values that allow the abilities and traits of the other to appear significant for shared praxis'. By 'symmetrical' is meant that 'every subject obtains the opportunity without collective gradation to experience himself in his own achievements and abilities as valuable for society' (Honneth 1992: 201, 209f). The violation of this claim to social recognition or solidarity, disrespect, covers – in a broad version of the recognition theory (Fraser and Honneth 2003a)[16] – not only matters of social and cultural degradation but also 'economic

disputes'. Under this interpretation, the sociocultural and economic aspects of degradation have to do with recognition theory and have the same origins in an asymmetrical denial of esteem, in violation of reciprocity, for the individual particularity of a human being (Honneth 1992: 206, 210).

We draw on the current theory of recognition in its broadest and most strongly differentiated form because it makes the most comprehensive interpretative claim. It addresses non-verbalized everyday experience as well as elaborated discourses of social disrespect; it covers the sufferings of isolated individuals and highly organized social movements; struggles for equality and for the recognition of difference; the violation of culturally grounded demands for identity and socioeconomic redistribution.

In view of the wide interpretative scope of recognition theory as a critical social theory, there is a certain internal logic that two of its internationally most influential proponents, Charles Taylor and Axel Honneth, have drawn on the social theory of G.W.F. Hegel.[17] At his time, Hegel experienced the very phenomena of fundamental societal upheaval that provide the point of departure for current recognition theory. Hegel's theory is an astute and forceful diagnosis of the threshold period at the turn of the nineteenth century: the disintegration of estate-based hierarchical social relations; the advance of a bourgeois value system and work ethic; the individualization of thought and of labour relations; the breakthrough to a bourgeois-capitalist social and economic order with new, intense social tensions and struggles.

In Hegel's early work, the *Jenaer Schriften zur Realphilosophie* (1805–1806), which is to be seen in the context of his treatment of the late Enlightenment and which historically coincides with the fall of the Holy Roman Empire, the old European estate-based feudal order, he developed the outlines of a social theory of the emerging bourgeois society. Amidst abundant, complex, conceptual abstraction, three elements in particular of this social theory appear to have favoured their continued reception and development over two centuries.

The first concerns the temporal context, the historical turning point in the light of which Hegel was arguing. With the French Revolution[18] in mind, and the popular movements that found political expression therein, Hegel outlined an intersubjectivist theory of recognition that addressed not only the struggle of bourgeois society against the persistent inequalities of estate-based society, but also the struggles for recognition against new inequalities within bourgeois society.

Secondly, Hegel captured in the concept of 'Kampf/struggle' (Honneth 1992: 68, 74) the profoundly conflictual nature of the disputes, which

were far from unpremeditated, being the work of rebellious subjects brought to awareness by their dignity and injuries. On the other hand, unlike Hobbes in his premise of a state of nature as 'war of all against all', he understands 'struggle' not as a struggle for physical 'self-assertion' but as a struggle for 'recognition'. This recognition is, however, not directed at counter-destruction as a reaction to destruction but at 'regaining the attention of the Other' (ibid.: 75), who understands the intersubjective dimension of his action through the resistance of the injured party, and thus his dependence on the party denied recognition. An initially individual educational process develops not from rendering the Other harmless but from realization of mutual dependence on recognition, a process that can also have a positive impact on the constitution of life in society (ibid.: 83).

Thirdly, such a process that relies on the stabilization of the social order through conflict requires underpinning and consolidation by a normative order. For Hegel it is the law, the relationship of 'law per se', which he equates with the 'recognizing relationship' (Hegel 1969: 206). Hegel thus returns to the point of departure, the unfolding process of bourgeois society that was taking place in his time. The normatively consolidated recognition of the Other contained in the law is immanent not only in bourgeois society; it produces it as an institutional structure.[19] The theory of recognition establishes a social model that understands profound conflicts even within bourgeois-capitalist society as soluble – without the extermination of the Other or the abolition of his freedom – that is to say, it is the functional model of a liberal society.[20] These solutions are based on legally formulated norms that understand the individual as universally worthy of recognition and protection, and as agent in an educational process.

The social theory model of the 'struggle for recognition' that Hegel outlined at that decisive historical turning point in European societal order has never been lost and has left its mark throughout the history of social philosophy. However, reception was long, selective, modified, and failed to affirm the entire theory. Marx limited 'recognition' to self-realization in work, and 'struggle' to the socially insoluble conflict between classes as collective actors that uphold fundamentally irreconcilable values. The adversaries in such an agonal struggle cannot find common ground even in Hegel's powerful notion of a universalizing law.[21] George Sorel, turning to Marx at the end of the nineteenth century, takes recourse to Hegel's conflict model by ascribing model function to the affective experience of the oppressed classes in their struggles for recognition. At the same time, however, his concept of law remains particular, so marked by class-specific needs as to be completely relativized, thus reducing it to a power

technique without moral substance (Honneth 1992: 246f). Finally, more than half a century after Marx and Sorel, one of the chief representatives of existential philosophy, Jean-Paul Sartre, saw social conflict as the consequence of a disturbed recognition relationship – as did Hegel – that in a historicizing approach related increasingly to social groups. Taking the example of the 'Jewish question' ('Réflections sur la question juive', 1945) in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War and in light of colonialism, Sartre diagnosed 'asymmetrical interaction patterns' between social groups, which, however, he considered in principle to be surmountable. Like Marx and Sorel, Sartre saw in the formal demand for equality of the bourgeois legal order no clear moral gain that would stabilize struggles for recognition and produce a solution.[22]

Sartre's social philosophy brings us to the second half of the twentieth century, when various developments, historicopolitical and immanent to science, come together to prepare the ground for a new reception and the further development of the theory of recognition. Major impetus was given by George H. Mead's theory of American Pragmatism, which in the 1930s took Hegel's intersubjectivity theory a step further with the means of empirical social psychology, placing strong emphasis on the law for the individual education process (Honneth 1992: 114–47).

Changes in global political conditions also played a role. The age of totalitarianism and dictatorship in Europe gave impetus to counter-movements intent on liberation from disrespect and oppression. The worldwide anti-colonial movement, which came to a climax after 1945, turned under the influence of Sartre's existentialist approach to Hegel, taking him in the writings of Frantz Fanon as a political beacon against the centuries of racist disrespect and discrimination of the colonized. In his chapter 'Le Nègre et la Reconnaissance. B. Le nègre et Hegel', Fanon takes Hegel up directly: 'C'est de cet autre, c'est de la reconnaissance par cet autre, que dépendent sa valeur et sa réalité humaines. C'est dans cet autre que se condense le sens de sa vie … en tant que je lutte pour la naissance d'un monde humain, c'est-à-dire d'un monde de reconnaissances réciproques'. At the same time he gives Hegel an existentialist twist[23] when he radically stresses the difference, the 'breach', between 'negroes' and 'whites', and calls for the inescapable life-and-death struggle in which the 'negro' raises himself to mastership over the 'whites', thus establishing the precondition for recognition in reciprocity (Fanon 1952: 176–80).

Similar in thrust to the struggles of the colonized for recognition, three other intellectual currents, feeding on (new) political and social movements, gave momentum to the recognition paradigm: the renaissance of human rights after the Second World War and their global

triumph, particularly from the beginning of the 1970s, symbolized by the growing influence of 'transnational advocacy networks' (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Madsen 2013: 89–91; Risse, Ropp and Sikking 2014; Eckel 2014: 207–59); feminism, which calls into question male-dominated, gender-specific disrespect as opposed to indifferent social models; and social theories of multiculturalism and multiethnicity, which seek to take account of the increasing friction and tensions in modern, complex and highly mobile societies.[24]

The political ground for a new wave of now worldwide reception of the theory of recognition was prepared by the political turn of 1989 in Europe. The end of ideological confrontation between the blocs largely removed the power-political and conceptual basis for the agonal struggle described by Marxist societal theory to overcome the Other, the class enemy. The model of liberal democracy under the rule of law had been introduced into the new constitutional states of Central and Eastern Europe, partly in theory only, partly in practice. The constitutional protection of the bourgeois rule of law imposed itself for the first time since its breakthrough as principle during the period of the French Revolution throughout Europe.[25] The role of the law as the medium of recognition of the Other, on which Hegel had placed the focus at the beginning of the nineteenth century, found in the liberal constitutional orders of European states at the turn of the twenty-first century a new institutional basis. Rights of citizenship, the core of individual rights in constitutional orders, became effective points of departure for social struggles aimed, often successfully, at eliminating legal and social inequality. The assertion and constitutional protection of citizenship rights covered in a broad spectrum of civil, political and social rights the spheres of recognition, family, civil society, and the state, with which theoreticians since Hegel have been concerned. Even if citizenship rights as legal guarantees do not over and beyond the sphere of the law guarantee love and solidarity, and thus all stages of recognition, they do establish an essential precondition for achieving them. The rights of citizenship that emerged in the course of the twentieth century from social struggles were the institutional expression of successful struggles for recognition. The theory of citizenship rights elaborated by the English sociologist T.H. Marshall (2009; Gosewinkel 2016) therefore describes – without mentioning 'recognition' – the historical practice of societal change through social struggles and their legal specification. For Marshall as for Hegel, however, 'struggles' are not agonal conflicts. They have to do with progress in development that finds expression in a willingness for mutual recognition and legal specification. This approach, based on the amenability of social conflicts to resolution under the principle of reciprocity – consequently a socially harmonious approach – is the key

to the current success of a comprehensive theory of recognition that understands itself as a 'critical theory', but explicitly leaves any elements of Marxist theory behind (Honneth 2003: 137).

One of two interpretation disputes currently preoccupying the societal theory of recognition is based on this dissociation from socioeconomic strictures. Nancy Fraser objects that Axel Honneth's broad concept of recognition, which she describes as distorted beyond recognition, requires supplementation by a category 'redistribution'. She argues in favour of a separate category of 'redistribution' in keeping with the postulate of social justice, whereas 'recognition' refers to cultural identity conflicts; the two categories should then be integrated under the superordinate goal of justice. Honneth, by contrast, pleads for a comprehensive 'normative monism of recognition' whose pattern of love, law and solidarity incorporates the problem of redistribution (Fraser and Honneth 2003b: 9, 135).[26] Secondly, one variant of the dispute is concerned with whether the demand for the recognition of difference and different 'identity' constitutes a separate category of recognition (Fraser) or is systematically covered by the guiding principle of equality in recognition (Honneth) (Honneth 2003: 180–82). Fraser's moral philosophical interpretation of recognition theory, explicitly addressing the 'socialist vision' (Fraser 2003: 128) and the force for change of old and new social movements, comes up against an approach that takes up the early Hegel before his reception and critique by Marx, making it into a comprehensive conceptual basis for capturing all sorts of experience of injustice as humiliation and disrespect – whether involving individuals or groups, or whether concerned with the recognition of equality or of difference (Honneth 2003: 157–58).

This volume sets out from a *comprehensive concept of recognition* such as that elaborated by Axel Honneth in more recent critical theory. No distinction is drawn between socioeconomic and cultural experiences of disrespect or between the establishment of equality and difference as the objective of struggles for recognition. Experiences of disrespect – rape, deprivation of rights, degradation – are examined rather as the starting point of struggles for recognition. In investigating the empirical subject matter itself, associations of women and Jews, the distinction between socioeconomic and identity motives, and between the goals of equality and difference, comes to bear. Whether recognition struggles are involved is not an initial criterion.[27]

A final reason for the renaissance of the recognition theorem in current societal theory is the global interlinkage of struggles for recognition. Redistribution struggles, for example, are increasingly taking place on a global scale. They are being measured more and more strongly against

a universal legal benchmark – human rights (Moyn 2010; Hoffmann 2010, 2011; Iriye, Goedde and Hitchcock 2012). This finding is seen in transcultural terms, even though processed at the level of the specific culture. At the same time, worldwide migration flows contribute to the frequent coincidence of socioeconomic and identity discrimination. This, too, suggests that a comprehensive concept of struggles for recognition should be taken, and closely associated with transnationalization.[28]

Transnationalization

Transnationality and transnationalization are as old as nations and nation-states. There never was a closed nation-state. There have always been flows of communication, migration, commerce, industry and culture across national borders; such openness was necessary, for it was in the interest of the given nation-states, their striving for information, innovation, and population control. Less trivial is the question of when and why these transnational links gained factual importance and the attention of scholars. In brief, the following can be said on the subject.

If we take the nineteenth century as the age in which the European nation-state attained its strongest form, political force, and legitimacy, this (nevertheless) coincides with the first wave of *globalization*. It began shortly after mid-century and lasted until the First World War. It consisted above all in an explosive increase in cross-border transfers of goods and capital (Torp 2005), which produced innovative institutions designed to ensure legal security and provide the protection of international law (Peterson 2009). What is more, a particularly mobile sort of commodity was added, intellectual property, which soon gained worldwide importance and legal protection (Löhr 2010). Nation-states and national economies that permitted and often promoted these transnational exchanges did not hermetically seal their populations off from one another. On the contrary, continental and transcontinental migration flows developed on a scale that was not reached again, even in the twentieth century.[29] The result was that ideas, ways of pursuing economic affairs, and linguistic peculiarities were abundantly transferred from country to country. Countries that permitted, caused, or even promoted these population movements could not stop transnational political communication in the form of the circulation of political publications and ideas. Open borders for goods in a nation-state, which was often a liberal trading nation, also meant open borders for mobile individuals and groupings, who often crossed the borders of their country of origin with a critical attitude and an intent to establish political links and initiate political activities abroad,

which they expected would give them additional support from outside in their struggle against political conditions at home. The supposedly closed nation-state in Europe was thus at the apogee of its political and economic power, open enough to enable transnational mobility with political and critical intent. The high mobility of intellectual property (Löhr 2010: 14, 25f.) and its international protection helped to transport critical thought, even across the borders of authoritarian states such as Tsarist Russia (Siegrist 2006: 65f.). Scholars were late in addressing this radical process of material globalization and transnationalization. Concerned contemporaries and commentators reflected on these epoch-making developments,[30] but historians and social scientists provided no analyses of the processes (Osterhammel 2001: 283). Possibly under the impression of the reaction, renationalization, and insulation of economic and migration areas that set in with the First World War, signalling a worldwide crisis of liberal regimes, the scholarly treatment of these processes remained inadequate. The continuing ideological confrontation between the blocs in Europe after 1945, with massive efforts to prevent and control the mobility of goods, people and ideas, also contributed, directing scholarly attention to earlier perforations of national borders and territories. And even if, due especially to worldwide means of communication, the politically desired insulation of communication spaces did not succeed, it was not by chance that the breakthrough to a drastic change in perspective in historiography and the social sciences did not take place until after 1989. Amidst a second wave of globalization, at the end of the confrontation between blocs and European colonial rule, analysts almost necessarily cast a more attentive eye on the historical precursors of this development.[31]

Since the beginning of the 1990s, theoretical and empirical attention has increasingly concentrated, in history and in the systematic social sciences, on the theory and practice of transnationality and transnationalization.[32] The rise of global history (Mazlish and Iriye 2005; Osterhammel 2008; Osterhammel and Petersson 2012) at the beginning of the twenty-first century is closely associated with the growth in the number of empirical studies on transnational history (Pernau 2011).[33]

Scholars have demanded that the twentieth century and, indeed, the whole age of globalization should be researched from a transnational perspective (Maier 2000). Political, social and cultural history can no longer be explained solely within a national framework. Rather, the focus should be on transfer, the hybrid-like character of modern culture, and the international aspects of politics. Transnational history, defined as processes, structures and events that transcend national borders, must then be studied in close international cooperation. It has been shown that

a transnational perspective can contribute fruitfully to an established field of research (e.g. Conrad and Osterhammel 2004). Recent comparative work and the new paradigm of *histoire croisée* investigating the cultural transfers and the interdependencies between national communities have further underlined the importance of a transnational approach to the history of Western and Central Europe (Espagne 1999).[34] Research on the Communist period has also become more transnational, producing a number of studies which involve comparisons of the GDR and Communist Poland (Ther 1998; Connelly 2000; Rittersporn, Rolf and Behrends 2003; Behrends 2004; Mazurek 2005.)

In the methodological debate on the choice between a *comparative and a transnational approach* to historiography,[35] we, like some comparative contributions in this volume, take a middle position (Kocka 2003; Kocka and Haupt 2009). Comparative history is not rendered obsolete by the transnational perspective: it is to be seen as a precondition and complement. Only this methodological point of departure allows us in this volume to raise the key question of a comparison between differing national conditions of transnationalization.

The systematic social sciences have developed various models on the theory and workings of transnationalization processes. Ludger Pries understands by this a 'dynamic of societalization as something processual'; that is to say, 'a spreading and intensifying process in the context of increasing international movements of goods, people, and information of forming relatively lasting and dense pluri-local and cross-border relations of social practices, symbolic systems, and artefacts' (Pries 2008: 44).[36]

Among the multitude of conditions and factors influencing processes of transnationalization,[37] we concentrate in this volume on specific actors: groups and associations that form political networks (NGOs, protest campaigns, social movements, etc.) across national borders, thus opening up a new transnational arena over and beyond the national theatre for their political struggles. Studies on this category of transnational political struggles can be roughly divided into three types.

The first category of publication consists of general writings on transnational structures, the activities of political actors, and the alleged emergence of a 'global civil society'. Much of this literature was motivated by political hopes that benign non-governmental actors would contribute to the creation of 'another world' (e.g. Falk 1994; Chatterjee and Finger 1994; Willetts 1996; O'Brien 2000). Usually, the transnational and morally sound character of such initiatives is taken for granted, so that the main question is how to influence international policy making (Anand 1999; Evans 2000). Even if it contains a great deal of material on transnationalization processes, this literature is not very useful for research purposes.

The second category of publication embodies comprehensive or comparative studies with a more analytical perspective on transnationalization. Some of these studies focus on the historical evolution of transnational activities (Boli and Thomas 1999, Bauerkämper 2004; Keck and Sikkink 1998. Others concentrate more on recent and contemporary activities, often with a focus on what has come to be called 'global justice movements' (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink 2002; Rucht 2014; Andretta et al. 2003; Della Porta and Tarrow 2005).[38] These studies provide us with some theoretical tools, and basic information on the structures, preconditions, problems and impacts of transnational mobilization. Some of this work makes explicit comparison across time and across countries.

The work in this volume is based on these studies, while at the same time putting the explanatory models to the test. It is important to ask, for example, to what extent the 'boomerang model' developed by Keck and Sikkink (1998: 12ff.) is applicable to earlier historical phases. This probably most prominent explanatory model for the effect of transnational networks claims that, 'when channels between the state and its domestic actors are blocked, the boomerang pattern of influence characteristic of transnational networks may occur: domestic NGOs bypass their state and directly search out international allies to try to bring pressure on their states from outside'.

The third category of publication contains a host of empirical, mostly descriptive studies which focus on a particular political problem (e.g. debt relief), policy domain (e.g. human rights), campaign (e.g. banning of landmines), or organization/network (e.g. People's Global Action; Amnesty International). These studies provide us with valuable insights into the mechanisms and processes of transnational mobilization. The studies in this volume are based partly on this research, but contextualize it strongly in two regards. The focus is on transnational networks of women and Jews (see below). To some extent they are compared with their historical precursors. Then there are contributions that address the recognition of other groups, also active outside Europe.

Status of Research and Contributions to this Volume

In terms of the number and density of studies available, the groups of *women* and *Jews* serve almost as a model of transnationalization in the broad research literature, some of whose findings we outline in what follows. It must be taken into account that the asymmetry of the research situation between Western and Eastern Europe has begun to decrease. After initially concentrating almost exclusively on Western Europe,

scholars have, after the turn of 1989 but to some extent even earlier, turned increasingly to Eastern Europe.

The quantity of literature on the transnationalization of *women's struggles*, our first domain of research, has increased significantly since the 1980s.[39] One reason for this was the International Women's Decade (1975–1985) declared by the United Nations, and the many subsequent UN conferences on women, which have contributed to the formation of a concentrated network among women's civil society groups in several countries (Keck and Sikkink 1998, chapter 5). In Europe, the transnationalizing of women's struggles has even accelerated in recent years. These international and intra-European processes have also resulted in a considerable number of studies on that topic.

Although there is much less literature for the period before the Second World War, organizations like the International Council of Women, created in 1888, have continued to stimulate and influence literature on the transnationalization of women's struggles right up to the present.[40] There is an abundance of documentation and activists' reports whose aim it is to further the processes of transnationalization in women's struggles.[41] Some literature on transnational women's struggles focuses on special topics such as historical biographies of feminist activists whose activities were cross-national (Drenth and de Haan 1999; Schüler 2004; Kinnebrock 2005), or studies on women's issues which have led to transnational discourses and actions.[42] Yet, these studies hardly take the processes of transnationalization of women's struggles into account. Finally, there is an ever-growing body of literature which explicitly analyses transnational women's movements and organizations.[43] There are studies on present transnational networks (such as the European Women's Lobby on current transnational activities in women's movements – Offen 2000: 341–78; Helfferich and Kolb 2001; Ruppert 2004; Offen 2010) as well as on major historical international organizations, namely: the International Council of Women, founded in 1888; the International Women's Suffrage Alliance, founded in 1899; and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, founded in 1915 (Vellacott 1993; Anderson 2000; Zimmermann 2002; Ruppert 2004). There is historical research[44] that points out that women who had no or only restricted access to the public sphere in the nineteenth century used the transnationalization of women's clubs to substitute for this public access deficit (boomerang model, cf. above). From this point of view, the development of the transnational movement was of crucial importance for the development of national movements and vice versa.[45]

Finally, there is also work that compares women's mobilization around specific issues – for example, prostitution in a given country in different

time periods or in different countries, including transnational aspects.[46] Another controversial issue that has been widely investigated, partly in a comparative and/or transnational perspective, is abortion (Ferree et al. 2002).

In the three countries that are the focus of our research – Poland, Germany and France – relatively little is known about the processes of transnationalization of women's struggles within the periods under investigation (1900–1930 and 1980–2005). For the Polish case, especially, literature is scant.[47] For Germany, a particularly interesting work for our research is a study on Jewish women's associations as a part of the European women's movement (Grandner and Saurer 2005). There are, however, no comparative, historically informed case studies on the three countries.

The *Jewish* struggle for recognition – even more than the case of women – appears as a kind of prototype for transnational mobilization (Diner 2003: 249). First of all, most of the literature on the history and contemporary problems of the Jewish communities refers to the national or sub-national level.[48] Special emphasis is given to the history of discrimination and annihilation of the Jewish minorities in the middle third of the twentieth century – the phase of dictatorship in several countries and the two encompassing wars.[49] Hence we already have a sizeable body of knowledge on the structure, organization, and programmatic tendencies (for a good example, see Pickhan 2001)[50] of Jews as a group and as part of the respective national societies in each of three countries under scrutiny.

Literature is scant[51] on Jewish struggles for social and cultural rights. Analyses of these actions and reactions as struggles for recognition are completely lacking. Most studies interpret struggles for equal rights as predominantly negative battles against discrimination as defined by given legal standards. These studies tend to ignore the positive aspect of struggles for the recognition of difference.[52]

While available studies deal with the domestic framework of French, German and Polish Jewry, there is little comparative work on Jewish minorities in France, Germany or Poland.[53] Studies on the historical processing of and compensation for the Shoah address the question of transnationalization.[54]

The present studies do not close the sometimes considerable gaps in research on the struggles for recognition by women and Jews. But they do address the struggles for social rights seldom treated as problems of recognition, comparing, among other things, Jewish resistance to increasing discrimination in the interwar years.

Theoretical Approaches, History and Concepts

Dieter Rucht's chapter opens this collection of articles on the transnationalization of struggles for recognition. He reflects on struggles for recognition in three different and thus far largely disconnected arenas of discourse: (a) that of the collective activists engaged in protest groups and social movements, making demands for recognition and justice; (b) that of social movement scholars studying these phenomena; and (c) that of social and moral philosophers who engage in theoretical debate about the dimensions and value bases of recognition, and the procedures for ensuring justice. Rucht presents examples of struggles for and debates around recognition in these three areas; he exposes the limits and blind spots of the discourses in each respective arena, underscoring the need to institutionalize rights of recognition and the importance of fostering public deliberation on demands for recognition. Rucht argues that the actors in all three arenas should make an effort to widen their horizons and learn from one another. In so doing, they could considerably reduce the blind spots in the respective sphere of discourse. Two groups in particular are in a relatively advantageous position for stimulating debate across the three fields of discourse: namely, the so-called 'organic intellectuals' and the social movement scholars researching demands and calls for recognition and justice. Whereas this kind of crossover approach may not necessarily result in consensus, it can nevertheless contribute to a better and more comprehensive understanding of why people engage in struggles for recognition and how they justify their claims.

How much does Axel Honneth's theory of recognition contribute to the explanation of transnational movements? *Volker Heins* takes critical stock of Honneth's model, pointing to its potential as well as to its limitations. Heins emphasizes the advantages to be gained from Honneth's theory of recognition over other theories that explain protest and opposition to political institutions primarily as a consequence of rational decisions or deviant behaviour; he calls Honneth's theory 'arguably the most elaborate and sophisticated version of a critical theory of recognition'. Honneth focuses on the causal connection between public debate, deeply ingrained social behaviour, and the suffering of entire groups, which ultimately drives them to protest against systems of injustice. Heins sees a parallel between Fanon and Honneth, in that neither of them perceived the road from disregard to liberation without 'struggle'. Heins' criticism of Honneth is twofold. First, he claims that Honneth's model fails to explain under what conditions those marginalized through

disregard or contempt would engage at all in the battle for recognition, and it fails to tell us what social factors are in play that lead to moral sentiment becoming political power. Second, Heins argues that Honneth relies too greatly on an overly harmonious notion of struggle. However, contrary to Honneth's ideals, struggles are directed not only at recognition within existing value and norm systems, but they are also aimed at overcoming these systems altogether. Two examples of this are given in the revolutionary struggle of Malcolm X and in today's transnational movements that seek to overcome national normative systems and gain recognition not from their own respective national communities but from the international community.

The Cases of Women and Jews

Part II of this volume is devoted to empirical studies of the transnational struggles of Jews and women in the course of the twentieth century.

Tobias Metzler opens this section with reflections on the transnationalization of modern Jewish history and its discontents. Post-emancipation Jews faced the challenge of reconciling strains of ethnic solidarity with the idea of national citizenship, which resulted in complex and contesting reconceptualizations of Jewishness. The activities of European Jewish organizations emerging in the final decades of the nineteenth century offer unique insights into the intricate relationship between nationalizing and transnationalizing tendencies in modern Jewish history. The aid work coordinated and conducted by the French Alliance Israélite Universelle and its British partner organization, the Anglo-Jewish Association, on behalf of their coreligionists in Eastern Europe and around the Mediterranean reveals the intrinsic ambiguities of their transnational agendas. Their entanglement in the colonial project and the yearning to demonstrate their allegiance to their respective home countries repeatedly clashed with the idea of ethnic solidarity, and underscores the arduous path towards conceptualizations of Jewish identities beyond the framework of the nation-state.

Originally established on the basis of universalist principles rooted in the tradition of republicanism, the Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU) was increasingly drawn into the maelstrom of European colonial policy and competing nationalisms. The secession of its British branches, coinciding with the Franco-Prussian War which plunged the AIU into a major organizational crisis, was an early indicator of this development. Although officially perpetuating the same universalist principals, the

creation of the Anglo-Jewish Association (AJA) paved the way towards two intertwined strains of development: the stronger association of transnational Jewish activities with the national framework, and the subsequent introduction of aspects of national competition into the joint endeavours to pursue a policy directed at promoting the status of Jews on the European periphery.

The ambivalent 'making' of the Oriental Jew, serving as core foundation for their transnational agenda, placed European Jewish organizations within the context of European colonialism. The creation of their eastern brethren as 'Other' and the call for their 'regeneration' through Western education, not only underscored the close affinity between European Jewish transnational activities and colonial ideology, but also undermined the idea of ethnic solidarity propagated by both organizations. The colonial infrastructure of their respective home countries, moreover, served as an essential precondition for setting up a transnational network of Jewish schools, with curricula mirroring those utilized in French and British institutions of learning. Over time, transnational Jewish organizations were increasingly dragged into the national competitions characterizing colonial policy. This tendency found expression in the disputes over the languages of instruction and in competing national outlooks on 'Western values' to be disseminated through educational institutions. While the line between Jewish and French/British interests became increasingly blurred, the demarcations between Anglo-Jewish, Franco-Jewish and later German-Jewish perspectives were drawn up with growing vigour. The fact that representatives of indigenous Jewish populations came to see their Western brethren more and more as advocates of French or British interests, and less as fellow Jews, is yet another indication of the trend towards the renationalization of European Jewish organizations at the onset of the twentieth century.

Drawing primarily on the organizations' records and publications, this chapter reconstructs these complex entanglements and the ambivalent shifts underpinning the attempts of Jewish NGOs to reconcile national with transnational stipulations.

Emmanuel Deonna's contribution also concentrates in the interwar period. He investigates the transnationalization of struggles for recognition from the perspective of the diplomatic fight for minority rights for Jews. Deonna deals with institution building, in particular the development and impact of the main transnational organization for Jewish recognition struggles in the interwar period, namely, the World Jewish Congress (WJC). He assumes a basic paradox underlying any transnational organization serving national and ethnic interests, which he takes the

WJC, in conjunction with the ideology of the Zionist movement, to represent. He focuses on the barriers that constrained the efforts to organize the Jewish struggle for rights transnationally. In addition to the political downfall of the minority system in the League of Nations, such barriers included, above all, internal resistance, particularly among the already endangered German Jewry. Jewish organizations in Germany felt that the boycott of German goods called for by the WJC left them under pressure from the Nazi regime, whereas German Zionists emphasized that consideration should be given to interest convergence between them and the Nazis. Although the WJC in France was initially successful in founding its first national subsidiary organization there, the French delegates came under the increasing pressure of anti-Semitism, and began to distance themselves from impecunious, political leftist Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe.

In the United States, focus was on the integrationist–Zionist split among American Jews, which hindered the activities of the WJC; at the same time, support for the German and Polish Jewish minorities was gradually becoming the primary concern of the WJC over the course of the 1930s. Thus the transnational organizational form of the WJC contributed to minimizing ideological splits between national Jewish communities, to exercising political pressure on national governments, and to easing economic misery. The WJC was also the platform for debate among increasingly forceful integrationist currents within the Jewish rights movement. Whereas the assumption may be generally valid for transnationally engaged civil society networks that they alleviate integration in a nation-state context, clearly ethonational diasporal groups are an exception in this regard. The development of the World Jewish Congress in the interwar period was characterized by growing ethnic particularism. In accordance with Nancy Fraser's theory, this demonstrates the extent to which struggles for equality and difference go hand-in-hand in the battle for recognition, and it shows the importance of that connection as a powerful impetus propelling the process of transnationalization.

Gertrud Pickhan continues with a study of the 'Bund' (the General Jewish Labour Bund of Lithuania, Poland and Russia), the largest Jewish socialist party in Poland during the interwar period. The Bund fought its battle for recognition on three fronts: first, recognition as a party for the general Jewish population, not just the genuinely Jewish socialist milieu; second, recognition as a party within the Polish national spectrum, which meant the integration of a Jewish socialist group into Poland's socialist movement; and third, recognition as a member of the Socialist International. This three-dimensional aspect – with an

ethnic, a national, and an international component – is what sets the struggles for recognition apart in Poland, in the field of tension created by multiethnicity and transnationalism. As a Jewish group, the Bund fought for the Jewish community (the *meshpokhedikeyt* family) and against Polish anti-Semitism on a national scale; as a socialist party and an association for Polish citizens, it fought for a rightful position in Poland's socialist movement; as a part of the Socialist International, it fought for transnational solidarity in the workers' movement, especially as regards the international anti-fascist struggles going on in Austria and in Spain during the Civil War. The Bund's solidarity with the Socialist International went so far that a right-wing Zionist-nationalist group within the Bund's socialist camp actually refused to participate in a public rally and demonstration together with that organization. The 'otherness' of the Bund and its struggle for recognition in a multiethnic environment in the interwar period serve as a preindication of the complex battles for recognition in our own times today, which defy the duality of national and transnational concerns.

Claudia Kraft examines the struggles for recognition of women and the processes of transnationalization from the perspective of the women's movement in Poland in the twentieth century. Her underlying assumption is that there is a relationship of tension between women's struggles and transnational processes. This derives from the fact that the nation-state is the essential guarantor of rights for its citizens, on the one hand; but that the transnationalization of struggles for recognition exerts pressure on nation-states to increase or expand those rights, on the other. In her three-part chronological march through twentieth-century Polish history, Kraft considers, first, the period leading up to and then following the First World War, when Poland gained its independence; this is a good example of a period when national and transnational struggles for recognition took place in parallel arenas. Polish women fought for women's rights in transnationally organized associations, but as citizens of Germany, Russia or the Austro-Hungarian Empire, before Polish independence. With the drafting of the constitution and the establishment of the Second Polish Republic, the political equality of women was codified; but in the area of civil rights, the traditional 'motherhood' role model continued to dominate. The second phase of Polish history that Kraft examines is that of the socialist republic after 1945. In this period, the year 1968 had a key role as the pivotal point in the debates on recognition. Before 1968, the debates on gender justice in Eastern and Western Europe had many points of convergence; on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in a myriad of similar ways, reform measures were designed to demonstrate the

achievement of modernity and social progress. After 1968, the demand for universal human rights and national sovereignty began to dominate the reform discourse of dissident circles in Eastern Europe. Only a few individual Polish feminists recognized the relationship of tension between distribution and recognition in the social struggles of women. In the West, the new feminist movement conceptualized injustice not just in terms of the class struggle but also as a gender problem. The difference between struggles for recognition and the fight for more equal distribution, stressed by Nancy Fraser, gradually began to receive stronger political emphasis. The third period of history Kraft discusses begins with the run-up to the *Wende* and the fall of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989. At this time and subsequently, women's struggles for the recognition of their rights were subsumed under a broader movement to establish and expand civil society. The concept of civil society, like that of gender justice, is an example of a travelling concept that does not halt at the borders of political systems or nations. In Eastern Europe, 'civil society' as a concept of struggle remained deeply gendered, although it had been redefined in the 1980s. The notion was also genuinely transnational in the sense that it was a crucial part and shaping element of transnationalism. And, precisely for that reason, the notion is attacked by Polish actors today, who want to defend the traditional national gender order against transnational influences. This shows the asynchronic and interrupted development of women's rights in struggles for recognition. As the political rights of women gradually increased, the basic principle of gender equality began to slip more and more into the background.

Helen Schwenken spans the arch to present-day women's struggles for recognition in her study devoted to the transnational organization of domestic workers, a highly 'feminized' occupational group. Her starting point is the adoption of the International Labour Organization's (ILO) Convention Concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers in 2011. Domestic workers often belong to groups like immigrant workers or other historically disadvantaged, socially marginalized peoples like the Dalits in India; they often fight against discrimination without having identity documents or citizenship rights in their respective countries of residency. Schwenken raises the question of how, in just three short years, despite the large geographic scope and national/ethnic heterogeneity of this occupational group, they were able to organize and achieve adoption of the ILO Convention.

Using a context-oriented method based on the notion of political opportunity structures (POS), Schwenken hypothesizes that transnational organization and the building of strategic coalitions are

the basis of the rapid success of the domestic workers. In contrast to assumptions in the literature, the movement also gained strength in a region of relatively little political integration – South America. At work, here, were experienced activists from the international labour movement who functioned as 'bridge builders'. The more the stronger domestic workers were organized nationally and regionally, the more they became engaged in the global campaign. In view of the low level of organization and the high level of regional disparity within the movement, achieving institutional power was essential for their success. This meant forming a strategic coalition with internationally organized labour unions within the ILO, and the creation on their own of legal opportunity structures in the form of an ILO convention. What they managed to do was to overcome centuries-old discriminatory structures; this is illustrated, for instance, in the abolishing of the term 'servant' in favour of the term 'worker'. This achievement in the struggle for recognition joins the economic dimension to the cultural one; the recognition and codification of rights for domestic workers is, at the same time, an act of retribution for historically suffered injustice that began with the epoch of slavery and colonialism. According to Schwenken, this once again illustrates the close connection emphasized by Nancy Fraser between struggles for material (re)distribution and struggles for cultural recognition. Through the declaration of their rights, domestic workers went from being 'impossible' subjects to 'possible' ones who gradually achieved access to overall rights as workers. According to Schwenken, through the connection to other movements struggling as transnationally engaged unions for workers' rights, or as feminist associations for gender justice, the domestic workers' movement achieved the opportunity to codetermine and have a say in the codification of their rights over the negotiation table in Geneva.

Enlarging the Scope

Part III of this volume comprises a set of studies that expand the empirical framework beyond the struggles for recognition of European women and Jews. We want to enlarge both the thematic and spatial scope so as to strengthen the aspects of cultural diversity, global extension and symbolic representation of struggles for recognition.

Holger Nehring shifts the thematic focus with his examination of the struggles for recognition of the West European peace movement during the Cold War period. The activities of the peace movement seem to represent a paradigm case of the recognition struggle. The aim of the movement

was peace, that is, non-violence, civility, and mutual respect among states. Unlike other timeless studies, Nehring's empirical examination does not rely on the assumptions of rational discourse (Habermas) or natural values theories of recognition. Instead he calls for a consequent, systematic historicization of the concept of recognition; he underscores this position, using the example of the peace movement, by attempting to show us the extent to which the concept of recognition itself is historically constructed and controversial, and therefore in no way a fixed notion. What becomes clear is that the peace activists themselves understood their primary political aim as a temporary one; at the same time, they had humanistic and idealistic aims. The transnational global community imagined by the peace activists mirrored itself in the metaphysics of a world-embracing family. On closer inspection, however, this rhetoric served a multitude of particular as well as national aims in the United Kingdom, just as it did in the Federal Republic of Germany – for example, the defence of the peace mission of an enlightened British Empire, or the national sovereignty of occupied Germany. The self-victimization of the peace activists went so far as to reverse the role of the victim: the perpetrators of former Nazi Germany became the victims of a potential nuclear war. Within the peace movement women were fighting their own battle for recognition; they protested not only against the nuclear threat, but also against a 'masculine' form of politics seething with 'technocratic necessity' and 'rationality'. At that time, this struggle for the recognition of feminine diversity and self-determination led to a clear delineation by women activists against men and their non-recognition. According to Nehring, this is precisely the reason why it is necessary, beyond any essentializing, to temporalize and historicize struggles for recognition The peace movement in the Cold War period (like the writings of Hegel at the time of the French Revolution) was shaped by the massive physical violence of the preceding epoch, and therefore more strongly influenced by these events than the mere metaphorical use of violence on Honneth's reading of struggles for recognition permits. The peace movement fought not only entirely *for* recognition of its own definition of the nuclear threat; within the movement, it also fought over the *correct* definition of recognition. Finally, the peace movement's struggles for recognition cannot be easily ordered in accordance with national–transnational duality. The motives and actions of the peace activists were shaped by their specific national contexts more strongly than they were aware; at the same time, however, their motives and actions were directed towards the global problem of peace for humankind. In this way, the peace movement simply dissolved the borders between the categories, local, national, and global, rather than struggled to overcome them.

Martin Fuchs attempts a twofold expansion of the perspective on recognition struggles in his contribution. First, he shifts from recognition of equality to recognition of difference. Second, he switches from Europe as the focal point to a non-European context, namely, the struggles of the Dalits in India. His main contention is that it is not sufficient to think about social recognition in terms of formally autonomous social actors; instead, the 'reciprocal' character of recognition must be acknowledged more seriously than is often done. For example, the right to be different is of paramount importance to the Dalits. Formerly, Dalits belonged to the so-called 'untouchable' caste of India, whose shared experiences have comprised over two thousand years of economic, political, social, cultural and religious discrimination. Regardless of political measures taken to counter these practices, the social discrimination, stigmatization and humiliation of Dalits continue today. This uniform and concerted ill-treatment makes it appear as though the Dalits were a uniform group; in reality, however, the group is socially highly differentiated and diverse. Fuchs finds that Honneth's theory of recognition can be basically applied to cases of systematic group-related disregard, like that experienced by the Dalits. However, unlike Honneth's assumption of a connected community of values, Fuchs stresses the inescapability of the tension between a necessarily particularist common good and the universality of moral principles. According to Fuchs, Honneth arrives at a dual-level universalism in which social recognition defines the universal premise of human existence, while humankind requires the achievements of specifically Western social philosophy, including nationalism and liberalism, to establish a universalistic pattern of full-fledged recognition. But what conditions of reciprocity are the prerequisites of recognition and for recognition in a social environment characterized by the greatest possible diversity of cultural reference and values, as is the case in India? Martin Fuchs emphasizes the fact that mutual respect will not be guaranteed through mere formal legal recognition; mutual respect requires, instead, social recognition, in Nancy Fraser's sense, and it is granted according to context by very different 'others'. Recognition, as an essentially intersubjective relationship, is characterized by a high degree of diversity in its various forms. Highly different forms of idiomatic articulation and language of recognition stand side-by-side – for example, Christian, Islamic and Buddhist. These different idioms can compete or conflict with one another without a uniform system of values ever being established. The different value systems are also not equivalent in view of the power relationships and contexts that underlie them. According to Fuchs, the struggle of the Dalits for recognition is an example of a specific concept of universalization, which, in turn, shows the necessity

for permitting the validity of a plurality of universal concepts. This kind of plurality accepts difference in terms of different notions of self-realization, different normative orders, and different cultural contexts; it requires us to abandon any ideas we may have had of some predefined sequence of steps taking us from universalisms to increasing abstraction. Rather, on this view, universalisms grow out of particularist value communities, tending to transcend those communities but without being able to completely shed the contextual links to them. To recognize each other's ethical universalisms requires intersubjective and intercultural recognition and reciprocity.

In the final chapter of this volume, *Thomas Olesen* opens up a global perspective on solidarity movements engaged worldwide. He poses the following key questions. Does the demonstrable similarity between global struggles for recognition and global solidarity movements imply that standing for global solidarity is an indication that some global civil sphere exists? To what extent are global solidarity activists both users and creators of a global society? Olesen builds his thesis on Gregory Alexander's concept of a global civil sphere. In accordance with Durkheim, Olesen assumes that our social lives are based decidedly on symbols beyond the spatiotemporal carriers of cultural values and norms. Accordingly, he takes symbols of global injustice to signify the emergence of a global civil sphere. Olesen analyses symbols that are relevant for the development of universal values, human rights, and democracy. This corresponds to the visions of solidarity activists, who universalize such symbols in order to obtain the greatest possible resonance for their particular problems. Solidarity activism can thus be defined as collective moral-political activities aimed at publicizing and ultimately ameliorating the unjust suffering of others collectively. Solidarity activists are not considered to be driven by interests, but rather by indignation at the unjust suffering of others. These 'others', measured on a scale of global solidarity, are, physically speaking, 'distant others'; moral-politically speaking, however, they are close. Global solidarity activists are the carriers and the beneficiaries of an emerging global civil society; that is, global solidarity activism is enabled by the presence of a global civil sphere, but this sphere, conversely, is also maintained and further developed through such action.

For Olesen, the symbols of global injustice, on which global solidarity movements draw, are connected to events or situations, prominent individuals, and visual media. These symbols are characterized by four features. First, their substantive content tends to be universalized and devoid of any concrete historical background, so that they can be

applied to new situations. Second, the creation and establishment of global symbols is a function of targeted agency and conducive, external conditions. Global symbols are not only the result of global solidarity activism, they are also the starting point or reference point for it, as the universal symbolizing of Nelson Mandela so exemplarily illustrates. Global symbols are social constructs which are often politically controversial and which can have different impacts in different regions of the world. In general, however, symbols of global injustice are directed towards a global public beyond specific national settings. Such symbols of injustice are a sign and a constituent element of an emerging global society. The concept of global society therefore arises from civil society and public sphere research constructed on a global dimension. In contrast to existing research, which focuses especially on the institutions and organizations of global society, here – in accordance with Durkheim's theory – Olesen focuses on the cultural dimension of an emerging global society, framing it in terms of global symbols of injustice. By concentrating his attention on solidarity as one of the values captured in global symbols, Olesen can explain more precisely the relationship between global activists and the symbols they use: 'Activists "produce" global symbols of injustice, and global symbols of injustice "produce" [or enable] action'. Nevertheless, concrete engagement for reasons of solidarity, as an especially politicized – and therefore also particular – form of struggle for recognition, is only partially consistent with the universal logic of a global society.

Notes

1. The concept owes a great deal to Eric Hobsbawm (1994).
2. On conceptual shift: Wehler 2000; Hoffmann 2003.
3. Osterhammel (2009: 1180): on the importance of law as the most important medium of transcultural processes of civilization even before religion; Wesel 2010: 475.
4. On current processes of juridification: Wolf 1993; Teubner 1997; Zürn and Zangl 2004; Kreide and Niederberger 2008; Schulze 2010; Pfeil 2011.
5. Action (also violent); strike, demonstration, journalistic protest – see Moore (1978) and Thompson (1978).
6. On this 'idealistic' element, with which 'moral impulses' and the 'moral process of educating the human mind' (Hegel) are stressed, see Honneth (1992: 12).
7. Up to the 'life and death struggle' in Hegel (1969: 212); see Kojève (1975: 284–86).
8. Referring to this, see Ther (2012).
9. E.g., in nationalistic associations and militaristic veterans' associations, which in 'uncivil' fashion often pursued violent goals and applied strict exclusion criteria; see in general: Trentmann 2000; Berman 2006.

10. The project, carried out by Bożena Choluj (Warsaw), Zdzislaw Mach (Cracow), Jacques Ehrenfreund (Lausanne), Dieter Rucht (Berlin) and Dieter Gosewinkel (Berlin), and headed by the latter two at the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), in the framework of which seven doctoral projects have been supported in Poland, Germany and Switzerland, was sponsored by the Volkswagen Foundation (Hanover). Participants in the project express their heartfelt thanks for this support. The author also wants to express his gratitude to the Käte Hamburger Kolleg 'Recht als Kultur', Bonn, for inviting me as a fellow in 2016.

11. For greater detail see below under *Struggles for Recognition*.

12. Summing up this traditional comparison: Münch 2001.

13. By contrasting transnationalization and internationalization according to different kinds of actors we prefer – for reasons of analytical clarity – a social science perspective to a historiographical understanding of the terms; see Patel (2008: 72–74), which emphasizes the historical meaning of international/ internationalization in the nineteenth century not differentiating between state and non-state actors.

14. On application to the Indian context, see Martin Fuchs, 'Recognition across Difference: Conceptual Considerations against an Indian Background', in this volume.

15. With reference to G.H. Mead.

16. In this I agree with Axel Honneth in the debate with Nancy Fraser.

17. Taylor 1977; idem 1993: 13–78 (25). Critical of Taylor's theory: McNay (2008); with a plea for a 'politics of acknowledgement' instead of a 'politics of recognition', see Markell (2003).

18. On Hegel's affirmation of the French Revolution, see Avineri (1976: 190).

19. Interpretation Honneth (1992: 84), with reference to Hegel (1969: 213–42).

20. On the aspect of the liberal model of society as the reason for the actuality of Hegel's recognition theory, see Anderson (2009: 7, 191).

21. I take over this critique from Honneth (1992: 235, 237, 241).

22. See Honneth (1992: 250–54); for a positive view of the 'juridical reality' that emerges in Hegel from the reality established in the struggle for recognition, see Kojève (1975: 286, 288).

23. On a different existential philosophy reception of Hegel, see Kojève (1975); on the history-of-ideas context, see Markell (2003).

24. See the brief overview: Zurn 2009; O'Neill and Smith 2012; an influential example: Taylor 1992.

25. Particularly since in the interwar period from 1917 there was a transition of a Bolshevist dictatorship.

26. On Fraser's theory of justice, see Lovell (2007).

27. On cultural rights as demands for freedom and equality, see Britz (2000).

28. On the necessary link between the struggle for 'unfulfilled claims to freedom' and a 'transnationally committed public', see Honneth (2011: 622, 624).

29. See, e.g., Torp (2005: 43).

30. See, e.g., Torp (2005: 27) with reference to Marx and Engels, *Communist Manifesto*.

31. For a discussion on the many reasons for the rise of global history, see Sachsenmaier (2011: 11–58, for Germany 126ff.)

32. For an introductory overview of the variants of transnational history (connected history, Transfergeschichte, histoire croisée, Verflechtungsgeschichte,

Translokalität und Globalgeschichte), see Budde, Conrad and Janz (2006) and Pernau (2011).

33. For overviews: Wendt (2007); Sachsenmaier (2011); single studies: e.g. Tilse (2011).

34. See the editions by Michael Werner, Michel Espagne, Matthias Middell and others in 1993 and the following years.

35. See also the series of articles at the 'Humanities: Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte' (H-Soz-u-Kult) website, <http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/index. asp?id=584 &pn=texte> (accessed 15th August 2016).

36. On the varieties of the 'internationalization of societies', of which transnationalization is a special form, see Pires (2008: 119–69). See also Vertovec (2009).

37. For example, recent studies on the conditions of transformation for formerly authoritarian regimes after 1990 and the importance of social, economic and technological ties with the West (Levitsky 2010).

38. Guidry, Kennedy and Zald 2000; a collection of important texts: Lipschutz 2006; Olesen 2011.

39. See, e.g.: Berkovitch 1999; Hesford and Kozol 2005; Ferree and Tripp 2006; Bose and Kim 2009; Dufour, Masson and Caouette 2010; Román-Odio and Sierra 2011.

40. Several threads of research will serve as backdrops but will not be discussed in detail here: comparative studies on women's movements (e.g. Rucht 1994; Banaszak, Beckwith and Rucht 2003; Miethe and Roth 2003); literature on the impacts of globalization on women, such as 'gender discrimination in a globalizing world' (e.g. Ruppert 2001) or 'globalization from a feminist point of view' (e.g. Appelt and Sauer 2001); general literature on the history of the women's movement in West Germany (e.g. Frevert 1986), France (e.g. Perrot 1998; Perrot and Duby 1991, 1992) and Poland, as well as general literature on the history of women in Europe (e.g. Bock 2000; Wischermann 2003), and comparisons between the old and the new women's movements (Holland-Cunz 2003), literature on women's movements and international relations (e.g. Braig and Wölte 2002), and studies on the institutionalization of gender politics in international and European politics (e.g. Wobbe 2001).

41. E.g., Ruf 1996; Scheub 2004. See also the Heinrich Böll Foundation conference on 'Women's Politics from a Global Perspective – International Policy Processes and Women's Activism', November 1999.

42. E.g., foot binding in China or genital mutilation in Africa; see Keck and Sikkink (1998).

43. Works in this third category include, for example, Rupp's work on the making of an international women's movement (Rupp 1997). See also: Boxer and Quataert 2000; Gubin, van Molle and Beyers 2005, Anderson 2009.

44. Zimmermann (2002), for example.

45. A similar branch of literature discusses problems that are also pressing in today's transnational movements; for instance, tensions resulting from multicultural feminism (Grewal 1998) or the question of identity in transnational feminist movements (Rupp and Taylor 1999).

46. E.g., Schmackpfeffer (1999), Outshoorn (2004).

47. In Poland, gender issues are among the newer fields of research – see: Choluj 1997; Kemlein and Walczewska 2001; Bues 2003; Augustynowicz 2003; and Kalwa 2003; for France, see Perrot and Duby 1992; Smith 1996; and McMillan 2001. While some historical volumes on East and Central European countries are available (e.g. Einhorn 1993; Lemke, Penrose and Ruppert 1996; Kemlein 2000; Kemlein and Walczewska 2001; Gehmacher, Harvey and Kemlein 2004; Lorence-Kot and Winiarz 2004, these publications do not deal with the history of transnational women's groups; transnational connections of Polish women's groups are mentioned only briefly (Urbaniak 1997; Fuchs 1999, 2003; Stycos, Wejnert and Tyszka 2002).

48. The national history of Jews in Germany (Erb 1993; Volkov 1994; Zimmermann 1997; Brenner and Myers 2002), France (Birnbaum and Abitbol 1990; Winock 2004) and Poland (Boyarin 1991; Tollet 1992; Mendelsohn 1981; Ury 2000; Tomaszewski 2002) throughout the twentieth century is well researched. Since 1986, the London-based journal, *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry*, has devoted its attention exclusively to the Jewish community in Poland.

49. For France, see Winock (2004); for Poland, see Engel (1996) and Gross (2001); on the debate, see Kowitz (2004), and on the Holocaust see Levy and Sznaider (2007). Recent studies also deal with the Jewish history and the discrimination of Jews after the Second World War (Kersten 1992; Szajnok 1992; Ambrosewicz-Jacobs and Orla-Bukowska 1998; Michlic-Coren 2000; Stola 2000; Kenney 2000; for France, see Taguieff 1987; Bergmann and Erb 1990).

50. Cf. also Melzer (1997).

51. Whereas some studies in legal history analyse the structures and aims behind the discrimination of Jews vis-à-vis their civil and political rights (see, for example, Pulzer 1992, Birnbaum and Katznelson 1995; Fink 2004 in international politics).

52. Some exception to this can be found in the works of Kaplan (1979), Gotzmann, Liedtke and van Rahden (2001), Judd (2003) and Steffen (2004).

53. Among the rare studies on the history of Jewry at the European level are: Battenberg 1990; Vital 1999; Gruber 2002; Slezkine 2004; Karády (2004). An even greater deficit is the lack of systematic research on transnational organization and mobilization. Calling for an analysis of both national and transnational processes in history, cf. Brenner 2004. Only some specific aspects are covered, such as Zionism (see, for example, Mendelsohn 1981; Nicault 1992; Birnbaum 2002; and Weinbaum 2003), images of Jews as an allegedly transnationally organized enemy (Weiss 1997), migration and Jewish migrants' networks (for France, see Bauer 1974; Caron 1999; and Gastaut 2000), and struggles for recognition in the historical processing of and compensation for the Shoah.

54. See, e.g., Kroh 2006; Levy and Sznaider 2007; Sznaider 2008; Berg and Schaefer 2009; Sznaider and Levy 2010; and Platt 2012.

Bibliography

Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, Jolanta, and Annamaria Orla-Bukowska. 1998. 'After the Fall: Attitudes towards Jews in post-1989 Poland', *Nationalities Papers* 26(2): 265–82.

Anand, Anita. 1999. 'All Together Now! What Works, What Doesn't Work and What Can Work: Organizing Challenges for Non-Governmental Organizations', in John W. Foster (ed.) with Anita Anand, *Whose World is it Anyway? Civil Society, the United Nations and the Multilateral Future*. Ottawa: United Nations Association in Canada, pp. 391–426.

Anderson, Bonnie. 2000. *Joyous Greetings: The First International Women's Movement, 1830–1860*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Sybol Cook. 2009. *Hegel's Theory of Recognition: From Oppression to Ethical Liberal Modernity*. London and New York: Continuum, 7, 191.

Andretta, Massimiliano, et al. 2003. *No Global, New Global: Identität und Strategien der Antiglobalisierungsbewegung*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Augustynowicz, Christoph. 2003. 'Ironie und Dokumentation. Frauen in Polen seit 1939', in Marija Wakounig (ed.), *Die gläserne Decke. Frauen in Ost-, Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa im 20. Jahrhundert*. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, pp. 94–112.

Avineri, Shlomo. 1976. *Hegels Theorie des modernen Staates* (*Hegel's Theory of the Modern State*. Cambridge 1972). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Banaszak, Lee Ann, Karen Beckwith and Dieter Rucht. 2003. *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Battenberg, Friedrich. 1990. *Das europäische Zeitalter der Juden 2*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.

Bauer, Yehuda. 1974. *My Brother's Keeper: A History of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1929–1939*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.

Bauerkämper, Arnd. 2004. 'Actors of Transnational Civil Society: Europe from the Late Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century'. Draft Report, Zentrum für vergleichende Geschichte Europas, Berlin.

Behrends, Jan C. 2004. 'Die erfundene Freundschaft: Propaganda für die Sowjetunion in Polen und der SBZ/DDR (1944–1957)'. Dissertation. University of Potsdam.

Berg, Manfred, and Bernd Schäfer. 2009. *Historical Justice in International Perspective: How Societies are Trying to Right the Wrongs of the Past*. Washington, DC: German Historical Institute.

Bergmann, Werner, and Rainer Erb. 1990. *Antisemitismus in der politischen Kultur nach 1945*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Berkovitch, Nitza. 1999. *From Motherhood to Citizenship: Women's Rights and International Organizations*. Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berman, Sheri. 2006. 'Gesellschaft, Konflikt und Zivilgesellschaft', *Mittelweg* 36(1): 33–48.

Birnbaum, Pierre, and Michel Abitbol. 1990. *Histoire politique des juifs en France: entre universalisme et particularisme*. Paris: Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques.

Birnbaum, Pierre, and Ira Katznelson. 1995. *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Birnbaum, Pierre. 2002. 'L'idée sioniste d'Est en Ouest', in ibid., *Sur la corde raide: Parcours juifs entre exil et citoyenneté*. Paris: Flammarion, pp. 151–68.

Bock, Gisela. 2000. *Frauen in der europäischen Geschichte. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Böckenförde, Ernst-Wolfgang. 1967. *Die Rechtsauffassung im kommunistischen Staat*. Munich: Kösel-Verlag.

Boli, John, and George M. Thomas. 1999. *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations since 1875*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bose, Christine E., and Minjeong Kim (eds). 2009. *Global Gender Research: Transnational Perpectives*. New York and London: Routledge.

Boxer, Marilyn J., and Jean H. Quataert. 2000. *Connecting Spheres: European Women in a Globalizing World, 1500 to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyarin, Jonathan. 1991. *Polish Jews in Paris: The Ethnography of Memory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Braig, Marianne, and Sonja Wölte. 2002. *Common Ground or Mutual Exclusion?: Women's Movements and International Relations*. London: Zed Books.

Brenner, Michael. 1990. 'Die jüdische Volkspartei. National-Jewish Communal Politics during the Weimar Republik', in *Leo-Baeck-Yearbook* 35, pp. 219–44.

———. 2004. 'Abschied von der Universalgeschichte: Ein Plädoyer fur die Diversifizierung der Geschichtswissenschaft', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 30: 118–24.

Brenner, Michael, and David N. Myers. 2002. *Jüdische Geschichtsschreibung heute: Themen, Positionen Kontroversen: ein Schloss Elmau-Symposion*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Brink, Bert van den, David Owen (eds). 2007. *Recognition and Power: Axel Honneth and the Tradition of Critical Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Britz, Gabriele. 2000. *Kulturelle Rechte und Verfassung*. Über den rechtlichen Umgang mit kultureller Differenz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bruszt, Laszlo, and Ronald Holzhacker. 2009. 'Three Converging Literatures of Transnationalization and the Varieties of Transnationalization: An Introduction', in Laszlo Bruszt and Ronald Holzhacker, *The Transnationalization of Economies, States, and Civil Societies*. New York: Springer, pp. 1–22.

Budde, Gunilla-Friederike, Sebastian Conrad and Oliver Janz. 2006. *Transnationale Geschichte: Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bues, Almut. 2003. 'Frauen in Polen im 20. Jahrhundert', in Marija Wakounig (ed.), *Die gläserne Decke. Frauen in Ostmittel und Südosteuropa im 20. Jahrhundert*. Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, pp. 58–93.

Caron, Vicki. 1999. *Uneasy Asylum: France and the Jewish Refugee Crisis, 1933–1942*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chatterjee, Pratap, and Matthias Finger. 1994. *The Earth Brokers: Power, Politics, and World Development*. London: Routledge.

Choluj, Bożena A. 1997. 'Gibt es eine weibliche Ästhetik literarischer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Krieg? (Seweryna Szmaglewska und Ruth Klüger)', in Philosophinnen Club von Wien (ed.), *Krieg/War. Eine philosophische Auseinandersetzung aus feministischer Sicht*, Munich: W. Fink Verlag, pp. 261–68.

Clifford, Bob. 2005. *The Marketing of Rebellion: Insurgents, Media, and International Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connelly, John. 2000. *Captive University: The Sovietization of East German, Czech and Polish Higher Education, 1945–1956*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Conrad, Sebastian, and Jürgen Osterhammel. 2004. *Das Kaiserreich transnational: Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Della Porta, Donatella, and Sidney G. Tarrow. 2005. *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Diner, Dan. 2003. 'Geschichte der Juden – Paradigma einer europäischen Geschichtsschreibung', in ibid. (ed.), *Gedächtniszeiten*. Munich: C.H. Beck, pp. 246–63 (249).

Dmitrieva, Katia, and Michel Espagne. 1996. *Transferts culturels triangulaires France-Allemagne-Russie*. Philologiques. Paris: Éd. de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.

Drenth, Annemieke van, and Francisca de Haan. 1999. *The Rise of Caring Power: Elizabeth Fry and Josephine Butler in Britain and the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Dufour, Pascale, Dominique Masson and Dominique Caouette. 2010. *Solidarities beyond Borders: Transnationalizing Women's Movements*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Eckel, Jan. 2014. *Die Ambivalenz des Guten. Menschenreche in der internationalen Politik seit den 1940er Jahre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Einhorn, Barbara. 1993. *Cinderella Goes to Market: Citizenship, Gender and Women's Movements in East Central Europe*. London and New York: Verso.

Engel, David. 1996. *Between Liberation and Flight: Holocaust Survivors in Poland and the Struggle for Leadership, 1942–1946*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved Publishers.

Erb, Rainer. 1993. 'Jews and Other Minorities in Germany since the 1990s', in *Patterns of Prejudice* 2: EBSCO Publishing, pp. 13–19.

Espagne, Michel. 1999. *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Evans, Peter. 2000. 'Fighting Marginalization with Transnational Networks: Counter-Hegemonic Globalization', *Contemporary Sociology* 29(1): 230–41.

Fahlenbrach, Kathrin, Erling Sivertsen and Rolf Werenskjold. 2014. *Media and Revolt: Strategies and Performances from the 1960s to the Present*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.

Falk, Richard.1994. 'The Making of Global Citizenship', in Bart van Steenbergen (ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 127–40.

Fanon, Frantz. 1952. *Peau noire, masques blancs*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Ferree, Myra Marx, et al. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and Aili Mari Tripp (eds). 2006. *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*. New York and London: New York University Press.

Fink, Carole. 2004. *Defending the Rights of Others: The Great Powers, the Jews, and International Minority Protection, 1878–1938*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fraser, Nancy. 2003. 'Soziale Gerechtigkeit im Zeitalter der Identitätspolitik, Umverteilung, Anerkennung und Beteiligung', in Nancy Fraser and Axel

Honneth, *Umverteilung oder Anerkennung? Eine politisch-philosophische Kontroverse*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 13–128.

Fraser, Nancy, and Axel Honneth. 2003a. 'Vorbemerkung', in Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth, *Umverteilung oder Anerkennung? Eine politisch-philosophische Kontroverse*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 7–11.

———. 2003b. *Umverteilung oder Anerkennung? Eine politisch-philosophische Kontroverse*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Frevert, Ute. 1986. *Frauen-Geschichte. Zwischen bürgerlicher Verbesserung und neuer Weiblichkeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Fuchs, Gesine. 1999. '"Europa" in den Strategien der polnischen Frauenbewegung', *Berliner Osteuropa Info* 12: 10–14.

———. 2003. *Die Zivilgesellschaft mitgestalten: Frauenorganisationen im polnischen Demokratisierungsprozess*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Gastaut, Yvan. 2000. *L'immigration et l'opinion en France sous la Ve Republique*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Gehmacher, Johanna, Elizabeth Harvey and Sophia Kemlein. 2004. *Zwischen Kriegen: Nationen, Nationalismen und Geschlechterverhältnisse in Mittel- und Osteuropa, 1918–1939*. Osnabrück: Fibre.

Geyer, Martin H., and Johannes Paulmann. 2001. *Mechanics of Internationalism, Culture, Society and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gosewinkel, Dieter. 2016. *Schutz und Freiheit? Staatsbürgerschaft in Europa im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Gotzmann, Andreas, Rainer Liedtke and Till van Rahden. 2000. *Juden, Bürger, Deutsche: zur Geschichte von Vielfalt und Differenz, 1800–1933*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Grandner, Margarete, and Edith Saurer. 2005. *Geschlecht, Religion und Engagement: die jüdischen Frauenbewegungen im deutschsprachigen Raum 19. und frühes 20. Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Böhlau.

Grewal, Inderpal. 1998. 'On the New Global Feminism and the Family of Nations: Dilemma's of Transnational Feminist Practice', in Ella Shohat (ed.), *Talking Visions: Multicultural Feminism in a Transnational Age*. New York and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 501–30.

Gross, Jan Tomasz. 2001. *Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gruber, Ruth Ellen. 2002. *Virtually Jewish: Reinventing Jewish Culture in Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gubin, Eliane, Leen van Molle and Leen Beyers. 2005. *Des femmes qui changent le monde: histoire du Conseil international des femmes, 1888–1988*. Brussels: Racine.

Guidry, John A., Michael D. Kennedy and Mayer N. Zald. 2000. *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 1969. *Jenaer Realphilosophie*. Hamburg: F. Meiner.

Helfferich, Barbara, and Felix Kolb. 2001. 'Multilevel Action Coordination in European Contentious Politics: The Case of the European Women's Lobby', in Doug Imig and Sidney Tarrow (eds), *Contentious Europeans: Protest and Politics in an Emerging Polity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 143–61.

Hesford, Wendy S., and Wendy Kozol. 2005. *Just Advocacy?: Women's Human Rights, Transnational Feminisms, and the Politics of Representation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1994. *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. London: Viking Penguin.

Hoerder, Dirk. 2002. *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hoffmann, Stefan-Ludwig. 2003. *Geselligkeit und Demokratie. Vereine und zivile Gesellschaft im transnationalen Vergleich 1750–1914*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Series: Jürgen Kocka and Arnd Bauerkämper (eds), Synthesen. *Probleme europäischer Geschichte I*).

——— (ed.). 2010. *Moralpolitik: Geschichte der Menschenrechte im 20. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Wallstein.

———. 2011. *Human Rights in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holland-Cunz, Barbara. 2003. *Die alte und neue Frauenfrage*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Honneth, Axel. 1992. *Kampf um Anerkennung. Zur moralischen Grammatik sozialer Konflikte*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

———. 2003. 'Umverteilung als Anerkennung, Eine Erwiderung auf Nancy Fraser', in Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth, *Umverteilung oder Anerkennung? Eine politisch-philosophische Kontroverse*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 129–224.

———. 2011. *Das Recht der Freiheit: Grundriß einer demokratischen Sittlichkeit*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Iriye, Akira, Petra Goedde and William I. Hitchcock (eds). 2012. *The Human Rights Revolution: An International History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Judd, Robin. 2003. 'The Politics of Beef: Animal Advocacy and the Kosher Butchering Debates in Germany', *Jewish Social Studies: History, Culture, and Society* 10(1): 117–50.

Kalwa, Dobrochna. 2003. 'Poland', in Kevin Passmore (ed.), *Women, Gender and Fascism in Europe 1919–1945*. Manchester: Rutgers University Press, pp. 148–67.

Kaplan, Marion A. 1979. *The Jewish Feminist Movement in Germany: The Campaigns of the Jüdischer Frauenbund, 1904–1938*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kárády, Viktor. 2004. *The Jews of Europe in the Modern Era: A Socio-historical Outline*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kemlein, Sophia. 2000. *Geschlecht und Nationalismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa 1848–1918*. Osnabrück: Fibre.

Kemlein, Sophia, and Slawomira Walczewska. 2001. 'Frauenrollen, Frauenrechte, Frauenbewegungen', in Ursula Becher et al. (eds), *Deutschland und Polen im 20. Jahrhundert*. Hanover: Hahn, pp. 49–62.

Kenney, Padraic. 2000. 'Whose Nation, Whose State? Working-Class Nationalism and Antisemitism in Poland 1945–1947', *Polin* 13: 224–35.

Kersten, Krystyna. 1992. *Polacy, Żydzi, komunizm: anatomia półprawd, 1939–68*. Warsaw: Niezależna Oficyna Wydawnicza.

Khagram, Sanjeev, James V. Riker and Kathryn Sikkink. 2002. *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks, and Norms*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kinnebrock, Susanne. 2005. *Anita Augspurg (1857–1943): Feministin und Pazifistin zwischen Journalismus und Politik: eine kommunikationshistorische Biographie*. Herbolzheim: Centaurus.

Kocka, Jürgen. 2003. 'Comparison and Beyond', *History and Theory* 42: 39–44.

Kocka, Jürgen, and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt. 2009. *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Kojève, Alexandre. 1975. *Hegel, eine Vergegenwärtigung seines Denken: Kommentar z. Phänomenologie des Geistes*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Kowitz, Stephanie. 2004. *Jedwabne: kollektives Gedächtnis und tabuisierte Vergangenheit*. Berlin: Be.bra Wissenschaft.

Kreide, Regina, and Andreas Niederberger (eds). 2008. *Transnationale Verrechtlichung: Nationale Demokratien im Kontext globaler Politik*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus Verlag.

Kroh, Jens. 2006. *Transnationale Erinnerung. Der Holocaust im Fokus geschichtspolitischer Initiativen*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus.

Lemke, Christiane, Virginia Penrose and Uta Ruppert (eds). 1996. *Frauenbewegung und Frauenpolitik in Osteuropa*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus.

Levitsky, Steven. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War (Problems of International Politics)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznaider. 2007. *Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: Der Holocaust*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Lipschutz, Ronnie D. (ed.). 2006. *Civil Societies and Social Movements: Domestic, Transnational, Global*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Löhr, Isabella. 2010. *Die Globalisierung geistiger Eigentumsrechte. Neue Strukturen der internationalen Zusammenarbeit 1886–1952*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lorence-Kot, Bogna, and Adam Winiarz. 2004. 'The Polish Women's Movement to 1914', in Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker (eds), *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: A European Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 206–20.

Lovell, Terry (ed.). 2007. *(Mis)recognition, Social Inequality and Social Justice: Nancy Fraser and Pierre Bourdieu*. New York: Routledge.

Madsen, Mikael Rask. 2013. 'Beyond Prescription: Towards a Reflexive Sociology of Human Rights', in Mikael Rask Madsen and Gert Verschraegen (eds), *Making Human Rights Intelligible: Towards a Sociology of Human Rights*. Oxford and Portland, OR: Hart Publishing, pp. 81–105.

Maier, Charles S. 2000. 'Consigning the 20th Century to History', *American Historical Review* 105: 807–31.

Mann, Michael. 2007. *Die dunkle Seite der Demokratie, Eine Theorie der ethnischen Säuberung*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.

Margalit, Avishai. 1996. *The Decent Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Markell, Patchen. 2003. *Bound by Recognition*. Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Marshall, T.H. 2009. 'Citizenship and Social Class', in Jeff Manza and Michael Sauder (eds), *Inequality and Society*. New York: Norton.

Mazlish, Bruce, and Akira Iriye (eds). 2005. *The Global History Reader*. New York and London: Routledge.

Mazower, Mark. 1998. *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*. London: Vintage Books.

Mazurek, Małgorzata. 2005. *Socjalistyczny zakład pracy: porównanie fabrycznej codzienności w PRL i NRD u progu lat sześćdziesiątych*. Warsaw: 'Trio'.

McMillan, James F. 2001. *France and Women 1789–1914: Gender, Society and Politics*. London: Routledge.

McNay, Lois. 2008. *Against Recognition*. Cambridge: Polity.

Melzer, Emanuel. 1997. *No Way Out: The Politics of Polish Jewry 1935–1939*. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press.

Mendelsohn, Ezra. 1981. *Zionism in Poland: The Formative Years, 1915–1926*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Michlic-Coren, Joanna. 2000. 'Polish Jews during and after the Kielce Pogrom: Reports from the Communist Archives', *Polin* 13: 253–67.

Miethe, Ingrid, and Silke Roth (eds). 2003. *Europas Töchter. Traditionen, Erwartungen und Strategien von Frauenbewegungen in Europa*. Leverkusen: Leske + Budrich.

Moore, Barrington. 1978. *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt*. White Plains, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Moyn, Samuel. 2010. *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Münch, Richard. 2001. *Nation and Citizenship in the Global Age*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Nicault, Catherine. 1992. *La France et le sionisme, 1897–1948: une rencontre manquée?* Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

Nolte, Ernst. 1989. *Der Europäische Bürgerkrieg 1917–1945. Nationalsozialismus und Bolschewismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Propyläen Verlag.

O'Brien, Robert. 2000. *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Offen, Karen. 2000. *European Feminisms 1700–1950*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

———. 2010. *Globalizing Feminisms 1789–1945*. London and New York: Routledge.

Olesen, Thomas (ed.). 2011. *Power and Transnational Activism*. London and New York: Routledge.

O'Neill, Shane, and Nicholas H. Smith (eds). 2012. *Recognition Theory as Social Research: Investigating the Dynamics of Social Conflict*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Osterhammel, Jürgen. 2001. *Geschichtswissenschaft jenseits des Nationalstaats. Studien zu Beziehungsgeschichte und Zivilisationsvergleich*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2008. *Weltgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

———. 2009. *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Osterhammel, Jürgen, and Niels P. Petersson. 2012. *Geschichte der Globalisierung: Dimensionen, Prozesse, Epochen*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Outshoorn, Joyce. 2004. *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patel, Kiran Klaus. 2008. 'Überlegungen zu einer transnationalen Geschichte', in Jürgen Osterhammel (ed.), *Weltgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Steiner, pp. 67–90.

Pernau, Margrit. 2011. *Transnationale Geschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Perrot, Michelle. 1998. *Les Femmes ou les silences de l'histoire*. Paris: Flammarion.

Perrot, Michelle, and Georges Duby (eds). 1992. *L'Histoire des femmes en Occident, de l'Antiquité à nos jours 5*. Paris: Perrin.

Peterson, Niels P. 2009. *Anarchie und Weltrecht. Das Deutsche Reich und die Institutionen der Weltwirtschaft 1890–1930*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Pfeil, Florian. 2011. *Globale Verrechtlichung: Global Governance und die Konstitutionalisierung des internationalen Rechts*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Pickhan, Gertrud. 2001. *Gegen den Strom: der Allgemeine Jüdische Arbeiterbund 'Bund' in Polen 1918–1939*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Platt, Kristin. 2012. *Bezweifelte Erinnerung, verweigerte Glaubwürdigkeit, Überlebende des Holocaust in den Ghettorenten-Verfahren*. Munich: Fink.

Polonsky, Antony, Ezra Mendelsohn and Jerzy Tomaszewski. 2004. *Jews in Independent Poland, 1918–1939*. Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Pries, Ludger. 2008. *Die Transnationalisierung der sozialen Welt*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Pulzer, Peter G.J. 1992. *Jews and the German State: The Political History of a Minority, 1848–1933*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink. 2014. *The Persistent Power of Human Rights: From Commitment to Compliance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rittersporn, Gábor Tamás, Malte Rolf and Jan C. Behrends. 2003. *Sphären von Öffentlichkeit in Gesellschaften sowjetischen Typs*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Román-Odio, Clara, and Marta Sierra (eds). 2011. *Transnational Borderlands in Women's Global Resistance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rucht, Dieter. 1994. *Modernisierung und neue soziale Bewegungen. Deutschland, Frankreich und USA im Vergleich*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus.

———. 2014. 'Changes of Protest Groups' Media Strategies from a Long-Term Perspective', in Kathrin Fahlenbrach, Erling Sivertsen and Rolf Werenskjold (eds), *Media and Revolt: Strategies and Performances from the 1960s to the Present*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 19–40.

Ruf, Anja. 1996. *Weltwärts Schwestern!: von der Weltfrauenkonferenz in die globale Zukunft*. Berlin [u.a.]: Dietz.

Rupp, Leila J. 1997. *Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rupp, Leila J., and Verta Taylor. 1999. 'Forging Feminist Identity in an International Movement: A Collective Identity Approach to Twentieth-Century Feminism', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 24(2): pp. 363–386.

Ruppert, Uta. 2001. 'Von Frauenbewegungen zu Frauenorganisationen, von Empowerment zu FrauenMenschenrechten: Über das Globalwerden internationaler Frauenbewegungspolitik', in Erna Appelt and Birgit Sauer (eds), 'Globalisierung aus feministischer Sicht', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 2: 195–212.

———. 2004. 'Frauen Menschenrechte: Konzepte und Strategien im Kontext transnationaler Frauenbewegungspolitik', in Beate Kortendiek (ed.), *Handbuch der Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung*. Opladen: Princeton University Press, pp. 704–11.

Sachsenmaier, Dominic. 2011. *Global Perspectives on Global History: Theories and Approaches in a Connected World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scheub, Ute. 2004. *Friedenstreiberinnen. Elf Mutmachergeschichten aus einer weltweiten Bewegung.* Gießen: Haland & Wirth.

Schmackpfeffer, Petra. 1999. *Frauenbewegung und Prostitution: über das Verhältnis der alten und neuen deutschen Frauenbewegung zur Prostitution.* Oldenburg: BIS Verlag.

Schüler, Anja. 2004. *Frauenbewegung und soziale Reform: Jane Addams und Alice Salomon im transatlantischen Dialog, 1889–1933.* Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Schultz, Lothar. 1972. 'Rechtsgeschichte', in C.D. Kernig (ed.), *Sowjetsystem und Demokratische Gesellschaft. Eine vergleichende Enzyklopädie, Band V Personenkult bis Sozialpsychologie.* Freiburg, Basle and Vienna: Herder, pp. 516–32.

Schulze, Detlef Georgia (ed.). 2010. *Rechtsstaat statt Revolution, Verrechtlichung statt Demokratie? Teil 1. Die historischen Voraussetzungen, Teil 2. Die juristischen Konsequenzen.* Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Siegrist, Hannes. 2006. 'Geschichte des geistigen Eigentums und der Urheberrechte. Kulturelle Handlungsrechte in der Moderne', in Jeanette Hofmann (ed.), *Wissen und Eigentum – Geschichte, Recht und Ökonomie stoffloser Güter.* Bonn: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, pp. 64–80.

———. 2011. 'Globalisierung des geistigen Eigentums in historischer Perspektive', in Corinne Michaela Flick (ed.), *Wem gehört das Wissen der Welt.* Frankfurt am Main: Frankfurter Verlagsanstalt, pp. 235–88.

Slezkine, Yuri. 2004. *The Jewish Century.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Smith, Paul. 1996. *Feminism and the Third Republic: Women's Political and Civil Rights in France 1918–1945.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steffen, Katrin. 2004. *Jüdische Polonität: Ethnizität und Nation im Spiegel der polnischsprachigen jüdischen Presse, 1918–1939.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stola, Dariusz. 2000. *Kampania antysyonistyczna w Polsce 1967–1968.* Warschau: Inst. Studiów Politycznych.

Stycos, J. Mayone, Barbara Wejnert and Zbigniew Tyszka. 2002. 'Polish Women during Transition to Democracy: A Preliminary Research Report', in Barbara Wejnert (ed.), *Transition to Democracy in Eastern Europe and Russia.* Westport, CT: Praeger, pp. 259–77.

Szajnok, Bożena. 1992. *Pogrom Żydów w Kielcach 4 lipca 1946.* Warsaw: Bellona.

Sznaider, Natan. 2008. *Gedächtnisraum Europa. Die Visionen des europäischen Kosmopolitismus. Eine jüdische Perspektive.* Bielefeld: Transcript.

Sznaider, Natan, and Daniel Levy. 2010. *Human Rights and Memory.* Pennsylvania State University Press.

Taguieff, Pierre-André. 1987. *La force du préjugé.* Paris: La Decouverte.

Taylor, Charles. 1977. *Hegel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1992. *Multiculturalism and 'The Politics of Recognition'.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1993a. 'Die Politik der Anerkennung', in idem (ed.). *Multikulturalismus und die Politik der Anerkennung.* Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, pp. 13–78.

——— (ed.). 1993b. *Multikulturalismus und die Politik der Anerkennung.* Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.

Teubner, Gunther. 1997. *Verrechtlichung – ein ultrazyklisches Geschehen* [The Ultracycle of Juridification]. Munich: Institut für Staatswissenschaften.

Ther, Philipp. 1998. *Deutsche und polnische Vertriebene. Gesellschaft und Vertriebenenpolitik in der SBZ/DDR und in Polen 1945–1956*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2012. *Die dunkle Seite der Nationalstaaten. Ethnische Säuberungen im modernen Europa*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Thompson, E.P. 1978. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Tilse, Mark. 2011. *Transnationalism in the Prussian East: From National Conflict to Synthesis, 1871–1914*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tollet, Daniel. 1992. *Histoire des Juifs en Pologne du XVIe siècle à nos jours*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Tomaszewski, Jerzy. 2002. 'Between the Social and the National: The Economic Situation of the Polish Jewry, 1918–1939', in *Simon-Dubnow-Institute Yearbook* 1, pp. 55–70.

Torp, Cornelius. 2005. *Die Herausforderung der Globalisierung, Wirtschaft und Politik in Deutschland 1860–1914*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Trentmann, Frank (ed.). 2000. *Paradoxes of Civil Society*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Urbaniak, Danuta. 1997. *Die Rolle der Frauen seit der Demokratisierung Polens*. Frankfurt (Oder): Scrîpvaz-Verlag.

Ury, Scott. 2000. 'Who, What, When, Where, and Why Is Polish Jewry? Envisioning, Constructing, and Possessing Polish Jewry', *Jewish Social Studies* 6(3): 205–28.

Vellacott, Jo. 1993. 'A Place for Pacifism and Transnationalism in Feminist Theory: The Early Work of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom', *Women's History Review* 2(1): 23–56.

Vertovec, Steven. 2009. *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.

Vital, David. 1999. *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789–1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Volkov, Shulamit. 1994. *Juden 1780–1918*. Munich: Oldenbourg.

Wehler, Hans-Ulrich. 2000. 'Die Zielutopie der "Bürgerlichen Gesellschaft" und die "Zivilgesellschaft" heute', in Peter Lundgreen, *Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 85–92.

Weinbaum, Laurence. 2003. *A Marriage of Convenience: The New Zionist Organization and the Polish Government, 1936–1939*. Boulder, CO: Columbia University Press.

Weiss, Yfaat. 1997. 'Projektionen vom "Weltjudentum" – Die Boykottbewegung der 1930er Jahre', *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte XXVI*: 151–80.

Wendt, Reinhard. 2007. *Vom Kolonialismus zur Globalisierung. Europa und die Welt seit 1500*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Wesel, Uwe. 2010. *Geschichte des Rechts in Europa*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Willetts, Peter. 1996. *The Conscience of the World: The Influence of Non-Governmental Organisations in the UN System*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Winock, Michel. 1990. *Nationalisme, antisémitisme et fascisme en France*. Paris: Seuil.

———. 2004. *La France et les juifs: de 1789 à nos jours*. Paris: Seuil.

Wischermann, Ulla. 2003. *Frauenbewegungen und Öffentlichkeiten um 1900. Netzwerke – Gegenöffentlichkeiten – Protestinszenierunge*. Königstein (Ts): U. Helmer.

Wobbe, Theresa. 2001. 'Institutionalisierung von Gleichberechtigungsnormen im supranationalen Kontext: Die EU-Geschlechterpolitik', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Sonderband 41: 332–55.

Wolf, Klaus Dieter (ed.). 1993. *Internationale Verrechtlichung*. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus.

Zimmermann, Mosheh. 1997. Die deutschen Juden: 1914–1945. Munich: Oldenburg.

Zimmermann, Susan. 2002. 'Frauenbewegungen, Transfer und Trans-Nationalität. Feministisches Denken und Streben im globalen und zentralosteuropäischen Kontext des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert', in Hartmut Kaelble, Martin Kirsch and Alexander Schmidt-Gerning (eds), *Transnationale Öffentlichkeiten und Identitäten im 20. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, pp. 263–302.

———. 2010. *Grenzüberschreitungen. Internationale Netzwerke, Organisationen, Bewegungen und die Politik der globalen Ungleichheit. 17. bis 21. Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Mandelbaum-Verl.

Zurn, Christopher F. 2009. 'Einleitung', in Hans-Christoph Schmidt am Busch and Christopher Zurn (eds), 'Anerkennung', *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie*, Sonderband 21, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, pp. 7–24 (9).

Zürn, Michael, and Bernhard Zangl. 2004. *Verrechtlichung – Baustein für Global Governance?* Bonn: Dietz (Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden).

Dieter Gosewinkel is Professor of Modern History at the Freie Universität Berlin and co-director at the Center for Global Constitutionalism at the Berlin Social Science Center (WZB) after conducting a research group on "Civil Society, Citizenship and Political Mobilization" (together with Dieter Rucht) at the WZB. His main interests are the history of modern Germany and France, European constitutional history, the history of citizenship and civil society. He has recently published *Schutz und Freiheit? Staatsbürgerschaft in Europa im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert* (Protection and Freedom? Citizenship in Twentieth and Twenty-first Century Europe) (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2016).