

NTM. Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin
vol. 22, 1, (2014).

ISSN 1420-9144 (online)

Organising the History of Hygiene at the *Internationale Hygiene-Ausstellung* in Dresden in 1911

Claudia Stein

Die Inszenierung der Geschichte der Hygiene auf der Internationalen Hygiene-Ausstellung in Dresden 1911

Die historisch-ethnologische Abteilung der 1911 in Dresden veranstalteten Internationalen Hygiene Ausstellung war ein großer Publikumserfolg. Organisiert von Karl Sudhoff (1853–1938), dem einflussreichsten Medizinhistoriker der Zeit, versuchte diese Abteilung, die Geschichte der Hygiene zu ‘verkaufen’. Auf einer Ausstellungsfläche von mehr als 2.400 m² wurden über 20.000 Objekte in mehr als siebenzig Räumen, Hallen und Gallerien präsentiert. Die Dresdener Hygiene-Ausstellung war zwar nicht die erste ihrer Art, aber die erste, die eine derartig große Ausstellungsfläche für die Inszenierung einer Geschichte der Hygiene reservierte. Der Beitrag, der auf einer Auswertung der Korrespondenz Sudhoffs mit seinen Mitarbeitern beruht, zeigt, wie diese überaus erfolgreiche historisch-ethnologische Ausstellung möglich wurde. Das Archivmaterial, das einen Blick hinter die Kulissen erlaubt, belegt wie das Aufeinanderprallen unterschiedlicher Charaktere, verschiedener intellektueller Ziele und Organisationskulturen die spezifische Präsentation dieser Abteilung prägten.

Schlüsselwörter: Hygiene, Karl Sudhoff, visuelle Kultur der Medizin, Popularisierung/Kommunikation der Medizin, Gesundheitsausstellung

Keywords: hygiene, Karl Sudhoff, visual culture of medicine, popularisation/communication of medicine, health exhibition

During the summer of 1911 Dresden, the capital of Saxony, welcomed some 5.2 million visitors to the *Internationale Hygiene-Ausstellung* (International Hygiene Exhibition, hereafter IHA).¹ Through its centre piece – the display, *Der Mensch*, spreading over 3,200 square metres and personally conceptualised by the IHA’s organiser, the Dresden pharmaceutical entrepreneur Karl August Lingner (1867–1916)² – visitors discovered, perhaps for the first time in their lives, how their bodies functioned according to the latest biological discoveries.³ Little wonder that historians of medicine and science have often regarded the IHA as a defining moment in the popularisation of scientific medicine and its conceptualisation of the modern body.⁴

Less well known, however, is that under the presiding hand of Germany’s most eminent historian of medicine of the time, Karl Sudhoff (1853–1938) (Stein 2013), a historical and ethnological section attempted ‘to sell’ a history of hygiene. This was conducted through the display of some 20,000 objects and artefacts spread over 2,400 square metres, in over seventy rooms, hallways, and galleries. There had been hygiene exhibitions before, dating from the 1870s, but never on this scale nor with such dedicated attention to historico-ethnological display.⁵ As Sudhoff put it,

Here, for the first time and in grand style, it was attempted to present the hygienic and unhygienic moments of the entire cultural development of mankind in image, sculpture and model – albeit, only in extracts – which should tell the visitor “how it was and how it became (Programm 1909).

This article draws on the correspondence between Sudhoff and his co-organising team to explore how this grand display was made possible. The unique material helps illuminate an area of turn-of-the-century exhibition culture usually hidden from the historian’s sight: the daily, sometimes tedious negotiations and the complicated and often drawn-out decision-making processes in setting up such events. It provides a rare glimpse at an ‘exhibition-in-the-making’, a peak behind the curtain to witness the clashes of characters, differences in intellectual agenda and organisational culture that, I argue, shaped the final display of the thousands of objects in the summer of 1911. The sources, held at the University Archive in Leipzig and hitherto neglected, thus allow a unique exercise in reading from starting points rather than outcomes, from points of planning rather than end points, and from places of negotiation rather than

final conceptions and accomplishments. Ultimately these investigations into the organisation of the historical and ethnological section of the IHA challenge the widespread assumption that Sudhoff's display was simply a historicisation and material representation of Lingner's overall hygienic message; or that the objects simply had to be fitted into an already existing story line.⁶ What will be shown instead is that much of the story line – indeed its material 'building blocks', the objects on display – had to be 'made-up' along the way. The success of the historico-ethnological section was the outcome of endless negotiations about the meaning of hygiene.

History and Ethnology at the IHA

In its final display, Sudhoff's section contributed significantly to the overall success of the IHA. In terms of the numbers of viewers, it was only out-done by Lingner's section. Like *Der Mensch*, Sudhoff's section occasionally had to be closed in order to deal with the mass of visitors. They were so "eager, indeed voracious, famished", he recalled with satisfaction (Büchi 2006: 208). Situated at the exhibition's entrance in the so-called *Steinpalast*, right next to the scientific section (*wissenschaftliche Abteilung*), the historico-ethnological section was meant to introduce visitors to the great 'book of hygiene' that this ambitious global fair of health and hygiene aimed to write across its 320,000 square meters in the Great Gardens behind the Royal Summer Palais. Such was how Lingner had planned it, though he left open how exactly it was to be done.⁷

By 1911 historical and ethnographic displays were central to many of the international world fairs, such as that in London (1851), Paris (1855, 1867, 1878, 1898, 1900), Chicago (1893), and St. Louis (1904), the latter inspiring Lingner's own hygiene-focused project.⁸ Besides archaeological, ethnographical and art historical objects, these displays included native peoples from foreign lands as a means to instruct on the development of human civilisation.⁹ In an age of nation-building and increasing economic competition, especially around new technologies and scientific innovations, the displays were also guided by the particular achievements of individual western states. The 'instruction' was often discretely sold to the visitor through entertainment; typically there was the spectacle of the buzzing 'Street of Cairo', with its bazaars, cafes and restaurants, whirling dervishes and scantily dressed belly dancers.¹⁰ There

were also deliberately staged historical and ethnological displays organised by academic historians and trained ethnologists and anthropologists (von Plato 2006: 45–68).¹¹ Mock-ups of African villages, Japanese teahouses, North American tipis and the like had featured since the Great Exhibition in London in 1851. At the world’s fair in Paris 1889 there was a *histoire de l’habitation humaine* (von Plato, 2001: 245–255), which focused – for the first time – not on the life of elite culture but on everyday living from prehistoric times.¹² Through direct comparison with ‘lower’ cultures – ‘the other’ – European visitors not only witnessed the evolution of their own culture, but also had confirmed and ‘made natural’ their place at the pinnacle of civilisation.¹³

Sudhoff’s section at the IHA was well within this framework. What was new was its casting in terms of a continuous historical narrative around hygiene as central to the civilising process. Within this scheme, Sudhoff’s conception was not simply a story of scientific and medical progress, but an appreciation of achievements within each historical epoch.¹⁴



Fig. 1 Floor plan of historical section and its ethnological subsection at the *Steinpalast* (Katalog 1911: V, courtesy of the Wellcome Library, London)

He arranged his material into four broad historical categories: pre-antiquity (*Vorantike*), antiquity (*Antike*), Middle Ages (*Mittelalter*) and the modern period (*Neuzeit*), each in turn divided into either individual cultural people (*Kulturvölker*)¹⁵

or cultural spheres (*Kulturkreis*)¹⁶ (such as the prehistory and antiquity section)¹⁷ or various groups and subgroups according to hygiene-related themes. The area covering the Middle Ages, for example, exhibited more than 4,800 objects, and was divided into twelve subgroups: dwellings and heating (room 22), nutrition and drinking (room 23) clothing (room 23), child care (rooms 23, 24), washing and bathing (hair care, body exercise) (room 24), medical measures and health regimes (rooms 24, 25), state initiatives (such as travel and transport, burial practices, clothing) (room 26), Jewish culture (rooms 26, 27), measures against epidemics (room 30), plague coin collection (room 29), treatment of the sick (rooms 28, 29), and treatment of the mad (room 29) (Katalog 1911:156-264).



Fig. 2 View of the room ‘care of the sick’ in the Middle Ages (Katalog 1911, courtesy of the Wellcome Library, London)

The historical section ended with the Islamic cultural sphere (*islamistischer Kulturkreis*) through which the visitor entered the ethnological subsection of the exhibition. The latter was smaller than the historical section, stretching over 22 rooms. Although no catalogue survives, we know that it was divided into three *Kulturkreise* – Southeast Asia, East Asia and Mesoamerica – and subdivided into specialised groups with hygienic themes that mirrored those of the historical section (Führer 1911: 61–68).

The walls were crammed from the floor up to the ceiling with paintings, drawings, photographs, and small objects.¹⁸



Fig. 3 View of rooms dedicated to the ‘fighting of disease’ in the modern period (Katalog 1911, courtesy of the Wellcome Library, London)



Fig. 4 View through central aisle of the modern period (Katalog 1911, courtesy of the Wellcome Library, London)

Thousands of artefacts were carefully arranged in glass display cases of various sizes competing with hundreds of antique sculptures and figurines, models of hospitals and ships, Egyptian mummies, Greek and Roman water and heating systems, and even a medieval Jewish Sabbath room.



Fig. 5 View of the Egyptian room (Katalog 1911, courtesy of the Wellcome Library, London)

The ethnological subsection added more to this already dazzling mix. The section of the American *Kulturkreis*, for example, presented in papier mâché several life-like groups (*Lebensgruppen*) of American Indian tribes, gathering and preparing food.¹⁹



Fig. 6 View of the ethnological subsection: North American Indian culture (courtesy of the Deutsche Hygiene-Museum, Dresden)

At certain hours during the day, the inner courtyard of the *Steinpalast* invited the visitor to observe ‘real’ Japanese Geishas performing tea ceremonies, or African men and women preparing Kava and other traditional foodstuffs.

Considering that not a single item was on site in Dresden when Sudhoff took up his post in 1909, the result was a logistical triumph. From around the world every object

had first to be located, and then borrowed (or bought) from museums or private collectors. Alternatively, the objects had to be fabricated in the section's own workshops where eventually a team of 118 architects, carpenters, painters, draftsmen, photographers, sculptors and their helpers laboured around the clock.²⁰ However, more was involved in the success of the section than merely the formidable tasks of gathering and arranging. Inherent to the different cultures of organisation involved were differing conceptual, intellectual, and political agendas, which were reinforced by strong egos and exercised through fierce competition over sizes of exhibition spaces and budgets. So extensive were these differences that Sudhoff's business of 'making history' almost became no history show at all.

The Organising Team

Although Sudhoff is always given credit for the organisation of the historico-ethnological section at the IHA, he was in fact only one player, and a remote one at that.²¹ He acted as its director and its official representative at the directorial board meetings, but the day-to-day organisation of the section relied heavily on Otto Neustätter (1871–1943), who was subsequently to be assisted by Ferdinand Freiherr von Reitzenstein (1876–1929). Neustätter, a trained physician who practiced as an eye specialist in Munich, was involved from before the start of the planning for 1911. An active member of the Munich branch of the *Deutscher Verein für Volks-Hygiene*²² – a society that aimed at popularising the latest scientific ideas and practices of hygiene through a variety of educational events – Neustätter first met the Dresden manufacturer in 1905. Neustätter became involved with the local arrangements for Lingner's travelling exhibition *Volkskrankheiten und ihre Bekämpfung* (Lingner 1904: 531–547), a show, which, though modest in size, was seen by thousands of visitors. First on display in Dresden (1903), and then touring in Frankfurt (1904), Munich (1905), and Kiel (1906), it celebrated the new science of bacteriology in the fight against infectious diseases.²³ Its pedagogic techniques were new. Utilising dramatic visual materials and effects rather than merely the written and spoken word, visitors were invited, for example, to peek at living bacterial cultures through microscopes, and to cringe at realistic wax reconstructions of bodies manifesting the

destructive powers of sexually transmitted diseases (Brecht 1999, Brecht/Nikolow: 511–530).

It was Neustätter's boundless enthusiasm for, and contributions to, the meticulous organisation of the Munich exhibition that encouraged Lingner to hire him for the 1911 exhibition project.²⁴ Lingner later wrote to Sudhoff that he had disregarded the fact that Neustätter was "in the strictest sense [...] no hygienic specialist [...] though] I thought, he would be suited for a bigger exhibition project".²⁵ At any rate, "personally I liked him very much". Neustätter was in fact the only person guaranteed a full salary, not only for the IHA planning but also for five years thereafter (since Lingner was already playing with the idea of a more permanent hygiene museum).²⁶ Neustätter spoke foreign languages and had international connections, particularly with the English-speaking world.²⁷ His salary came out of Lingner's private account.

Neustätter later recalled how flattered and honored he was by Lingner's invitation, which he had no hesitation in accepting.²⁸ In 1909 he closed his practice in Munich and moved with his wife Lilian and his son Walter to Dresden-Hellerau, Germany's first Garden city, founded in 1906, and modeled on the ideas of the English founder of the Garden city movement, Ebenezer Howard (Kampffmeyer 1911, Hartmann 1998: 290–310, Nitschke 2009). In Hellerau, at the same time as Neustätter busied himself with his work for Lingner, he and his wife became involved in the city's reform school project, and it seems likely that Neustätter's interest in modern forms of education and pedagogy influenced the way he conceptualised popular exhibitions.²⁹ But despite his almost naïve enthusiasm for his new task, Neustätter was prevented from acting as the official representative of the section due to his lack of scholarly credentials in the area of academic history. This was largely for political reasons. In the face of accusations during the early planning stages of the exhibition, Lingner could not tolerate claims that he (Lingner) was only interested in shallow entertainments and advertisement gimmicks for his pharmaceutical products.³⁰ To silence his critics Lingner felt it was necessary to promote his project as being undertaken by the most qualified experts in each field. For the historico-ethnological section he therefore needed someone trained in the medical sciences who was also a qualified historian. Sudhoff, not Neustätter, was the ideal man for the job. Germany's only academic medical historian, he resided in Leipzig, only a short train journey

away from Dresden. Thus it was that at the end of May 1909 the board of directors of the IHA officially approached Sudhoff to take up the directorship of the historical section.³¹ He agreed, but only after securing the board's consent that he could work mostly from Leipzig. He also requested that his responsibilities be not restricted to his own section, but include *all* sections of the exhibition in which historical and ethnological material might be presented.³² His reluctance to leave Leipzig soon created problems, however; he only came to Dresden for official meetings, which turned out to be a constant source of annoyance to Lingner who preferred face-to-face encounters rather than phone calls, telegrams, and letters. Ultimately Lingner came grudgingly to accept Sudhoff's decision to remain in Leipzig, especially after many of his letters and telegrams inviting him to Dresden to discuss 'how we have to proceed and how the whole thing is going to pan out' were met with polite but firm refusal.³³ It was Neustätter, therefore, who came to act as the agent at the weekly meetings with Lingner and the representatives of the other sections. And it was Neustätter who mainly coordinated the lending processes and supervised the production of materials on site.

Sudhoff may have become a thorn in Lingner's side in a way that Neustätter initially was not, but he was nevertheless the ideal person to have in charge of the historico-ethnological section. In contrast to the majority of his peers in academic history departments who considered themselves first and foremost philologists, engaged exclusively with written documents (mostly of a political sort) Sudhoff was unusually open-minded about the use of artefacts and visual imagery. He thought that they permitted important insight into medicine's past (Stein 2013: 207–208). Because Sudhoff believed that the art of medicine was as much practical as intellectual, it was only logical that philological text-based historical expertise should be combined with artefact-centred archaeological, ethnological, and art historical investigative methods. His interest in different kinds of historical 'facts', and his insistence on the importance of material objects in the writing of what he defined as the 'cultural history of medicine', made him a collector and exhibition curator himself (Fahrenbach 2001)³⁴ Before his appointment as professor for the history of medicine at the university of Leipzig (in 1905), he had practiced medicine in the Rhineland, and had already organised several exhibitions on medical and cultural themes. For the occasion of the seventieth *Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte* in

Düsseldorf in 1898 he set up an exhibition on the medical and natural sciences, at the Düsseldorf arts and crafts museum (Katalog 1898).³⁵ Here some 5,000 scientific and medical objects were displayed from European and non-European cultures since prehistoric times. A year later, in 1899, at the Academy of the Arts in Düsseldorf, he organised an exhibition in relation to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's visits to the Rhineland (Katalog 1899).³⁶ In 1906, only a few years before Lingner approached him, he curated a small exhibition on the history of medicine in the arts and crafts for the opening of the *Kaiserin-Friedrich Haus* in Berlin (a vocational training centre for German physicians) (Katalog 1906).³⁷ The latter included valuable artefacts from Berlin and European museums and private collectors. Thus Sudhoff not only had considerable expertise in the acquisition of objects and their display, but also a valuable network of contacts at home and abroad.³⁸

For Sudhoff a public show of the size that Lingner imagined presented the possibility of demonstrating to a broad international audience – lay and specialist alike – the potential and importance of his newly established academic discipline, the history of medicine. Inspired by historicist ideas about the supreme importance of history for the organisation of contemporary life, and guided by decades of experiences as a practicing physician, Sudhoff firmly believed that a professionally written cultural history of the medical sciences could have *practical* bearing on contemporary socio-medical problems, as for example, on the comprehension of venereal disease and public hygiene (Stein 2013: 216–219). Useful and effective knowledge to face these problems in contemporary society, he believed, could only be produced through a close collaboration between history and the modern medical sciences with their methodological aim of 'explaining' the laws of nature. From his perspective, the natural sciences (*Naturwissenschaften*) and human sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*) should not to be placed on a collision course, nor should the latter simply be reduced to the status of handmaidens to the former. Both should be on an equal footing, he believed. The IHA thus allowed him to 'materialise' and 'visualise' his intellectual belief as well as reach many more people than his programmatic writings on the topic. Moreover, a widely visible success would help to silence those among his medical peers who decried as useless a cultural history of medicine for the education of the modern scientific physician (For these criticisms idem: 212 f.). Crowds of visitors, he

might have hoped, would demonstrate the attraction and societal relevance of his field to a professional and popular audience.

When the business of identifying suitable material for the section began early in the summer of 1909, Sudhoff felt confident. Over the following months, however, he and Neustätter became aware that the exhibition was too large to be covered by themselves alone.³⁹ It also became apparent (and not only to them) that Lingner wanted their section to be part of a more permanent exhibition structure post-1911.⁴⁰ This put further pressure on their collecting, for it meant that the established German ethnological museums became more reluctant than ever to pass their objects on to a possibly competing institution. Neustätter reported to Sudhoff in March 1910 that he had been told in confidence that Leipzig and Dresden museums directors “had revealed negative feelings against the exhibition”.⁴¹ One individual in particular was hard to convince and reluctant to collaborate, the director of the Royal Zoological and Anthropological-Ethnographical museum at Dresden, Professor Arnold Jacobi (1870–1948).⁴² Jacobi’s reservations are not entirely clear; however, considering that ethnology was still struggling to achieve full academic recognition, and that ethnological museums were aspiring to present themselves as serious institutions of scientific research and attract official funding, he was likely trying to thwart a competitive ‘popular’ enterprise in his own city (Pretzel 1996a: 27). It is also likely that compounding this reluctance was the fact that Jacobi and other museum directors were being asked to put rare and delicate objects into the hands of two men who had no demonstrable ethnological training.

Jacobi’s resistance made plain to Sudhoff and Neustätter that a trained ethnologist (preferably one with museum experience) would be advantageous. But finding such a person was difficult. The exhibition would last only until the end of October 1911, too short a period to attract anyone seeking to secure a position at a museum, or as a teacher in the German educational system. Gustav Antze, a senior curator at the *Völkerkundemuseum* (ethnological museum) in Leipzig, explained this to Neustätter when asked for help; “gentlemen who possess enough experience will be almost impossible to win”, said Antze, while “a young student will be of no use to you”.⁴³ For example, a Dr Widemann, who had come to Antze’s mind as a possible candidate and who was just then approaching his final teacher’s exam, was not likely to

postpone it because the possibilities for a permanent post in the future would not be as good. Another possible candidate, Dr Bruno Oettekinger, whom Neustätter had met and thought competent, was applying for a post in America and would only be willing to join the team as a last resort if his application fell through.⁴⁴ Antze eventually succeeded in identifying a suitable candidate. Cheerfully he reported back to Neustätter at the end of October 1909 that,

Richard Helmuth Goldschmidt, a medical student who will pass his philosophical doctoral exam here in a month's time, has agreed to be available for a period of two years. He has focused on ethnographic studies and has already begun to collect material that addresses some of the questions raised in the hygiene exhibition.⁴⁵

But cooperation with Goldschmidt was ill-fated. It became increasingly clear that his allegiances lay with his ex-supervisor, Professor Kurt Weule (1824–1926), Germany's first professor for ethnology and prehistory (*Urgeschichte*) and director of the Leipzig *Völkerkundemuseum*, one of the most important institutions of ethnological study in the country.⁴⁶ Sudhoff and Neustätter had in fact previously asked Weule himself to take up the organisation of the ethnological section, but he turned it down on grounds of overload. Unlike Jacobi, he did not fear competition from Lingner but was wary of any extra workload for him and his employees and potential costs for his institution.⁴⁷ Thus he declined any involvement with Sudhoff and Neustätter beyond that of lending some material from the museum's collection.⁴⁸ Even that came with specific conditions, however, which he openly expressed in a letter to Lingner, who, in turn, revealed its content (and his astonishment) to Sudhoff:

Particularly strange I thought [reported Lingner] was the sentence that Professor Weule would not relinquish a single item from the *Völkerkundemuseum*, unless he will be given guarantees that the necessary conditions for the exhibition of ethnology materials are met. This will only be guaranteed, he believes, if Dr G. is hired as the assistant, and if Herr Goldschmidt will be given own exhibition rooms. Thus, in other words, if we don't hire Dr G., then Weule won't give us a single item!⁴⁹

Goldschmidt, knowing Weule was behind him, began to bargain. He asked for an annual salary of 2,500 Marks, which Lingner deemed unacceptable for an assistant who had yet to pass his doctoral exam. The request would be difficult to pass through the board of directors, he predicted to Sudhoff, “because such salaries are only given to those gentlemen who at least passed their exams and have proven themselves in the practice for some time. If we now pay that much to a gentleman who has hardly finished his studies, he will run into trouble with the others because they will become discontented”.⁵⁰

Disagreements over Goldschmidt’s contract were deepened by Neustätter’s concern as to whether the young man was the right person for the job. He reported to Sudhoff that the few meetings he had had with Goldschmidt left him anxious and wondering whether the young man actually understood the aim and purpose of the historico-ethnological section. After a particularly annoying encounter with Goldschmidt in which the aims were explained to him again, Neustätter expressed the hope that “he will understand retrospectively what I meant”.⁵¹ He was particularly irritated that Goldschmidt refused to work in a team, and that he did not accept his (Neustätter’s) authority to supervise him. Nor was Goldschmidt willing to inform Neustätter about the manner in which he collected materials, or what exactly he had already identified and gathered in Leipzig.⁵² When Goldschmidt finally admitted that he was indeed collecting according to an entirely different system from Neustätter’s, the latter was so alarmed that he urged Sudhoff to bring the assistant to his senses.⁵³ Deeply worried about the overall coordination of the ethnological section, which lay in his hands, Neustätter even suggested moving the organisation of the section (including himself) to Sudhoff’s institute in Leipzig, “because then the heads of such serpents of misunderstanding can be cut off immediately”.⁵⁴

Goldschmidt was dismissed before he had even signed his contract, the circumstances behind which demonstrate how finely tuned was the hierarchy in which he was expected to work and conform. He came to Dresden on the 14th of January 1910, fully intending to sign his contract with Lingner. Most of his demands had been met: he would receive a slightly higher salary than other assistants at his level of expertise (2,000 Mark per annum). His relationship with Neustätter was redefined; he alone would be responsible for the ethnological material, reporting only to Sudhoff.⁵⁵ But

the meeting with Lingner to sign the contract went seriously wrong. Goldschmidt arrived several hours late, having thought that the meeting was to take place at Lingner's private home, not his office.⁵⁶ When he finally arrived, Lingner was at another meeting and Goldschmidt was told to wait. Goldschmidt refused and barged in, shouting and screaming. "He expressed everything in such an irritating way", Lingner wrote to Sudhoff; he talked about things which had been promised to him, and continuously mentioned the catalogue he had to do.⁵⁷ Reminded by Lingner that his first and foremost duty was to organise the ethnographic material and that the catalogue was to be an entirely different matter, Goldschmidt abrasively demanded that everything had to be decided then and there, including the definite location and size of the ethnological section. Lingner calmly sought to explain that these questions were not yet decided, whereupon Goldschmidt countered that this was not true because Sudhoff had already shown him the space for the ethnological display.⁵⁸ Lingner (now increasingly irritated) answered that this must have been a misunderstanding, to which Goldschmidt responded, that he was taking his orders from Sudhoff not from Lingner. There was no way to end the encounter amicably; Goldschmidt turned on his heels and marched out without so much as a good-bye. Reporting this to Sudhoff, Lingner deemed that Goldschmidt was suffering from some kind of nervous over-excitement, but he considered this no excuse for ungentlemanly behaviour and decided to fire him, relieved that "we didn't admit such an element into our working group". "This man", he explained, "has no life experience, is independent and has never been in a situation during his entire life, in which he could collect experiences." He assured Sudhoff that Goldschmidt would have created nothing but problems, though he agreed to compensate him for his curatorial inputs. (Ironically Neustätter would later come to attribute the same nervous pathology to Lingner after his relations with him took a turn for the worse.)⁵⁹

While Lingner's dismissal of Goldschmidt came as a relief, especially to Neustätter, it left him and Sudhoff without an expert in ethnology. And time was running out, as Neustätter repeatedly reminded Sudhoff. Not until the summer 1910, in fact, with less than a year before the May 1911 scheduled opening of the IHA, were they able to find an ethnologist. This was Friedrich von Reitzenstein who joined them sometime in July.⁶⁰ Compared to Goldschmidt, von Reitzenstein was a gift from God. Since 1908 he had been managing ethnographic collections at the *Völkerkundemuseum* at Berlin

under the supervision of the museum's director Felix von Luschan (1854–1924).⁶¹ Responsible for the department of ancient American cultures, he was not only aware of the latest scientific research in the area of ethnology and anthropology and was an active member of various relevant societies (e.g. *Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte* or the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Frühgeschichte*), but also possessed the much needed practical expertise in the art of collecting, preserving, and exhibiting of ethnographic objects. In his capable hands museums curators and private collectors could feel their precious relics were safe.

As a professional ethnologist, von Reitzenstein was unusual at the time for combining an interest in ethnological research with historical interest and expertise. Most of his peers considered their work with material objects in stark opposition to that of historians who dealt exclusively with texts.⁶² Von Reitzenstein, who had originally studied literature and art history in Munich, had no such reservations. He considered his work closely related to what was then called 'cultural history' (*Kulturgeschichte*), an area of professional history writing that had gained momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century, particularly through the work of the Leipzig historian Karl Lamprecht (1856–1915). Lamprecht had officially defied the domineering position of the (Rankean) 'political' in history writing, calling for cooperation with other disciplines of the human sciences and the introduction of their methodological tool kits into the practice of professional history writing.⁶³ Von Reitzenstein (like Sudhoff) embraced this widening of historical perspective because he himself had first become interested in the study of ethnological differences through his comparative literary research on myth and fairy tales. During the course of this research he had also begun to amass a substantial collection of literature on what was to become his subject of expertise, the cultural history of marriage, love and sexual customs (Pretzel 1996b: 16–25). By the time Sudhoff hired him he had published several books on these subjects, written for popular audiences.⁶⁴ In works, such as *Urgeschichte der Ehe. Ihre Bildung und Entwicklungsgang* (Prehistory of Marriage. Its Formation and Evolution [1909]) or *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Ehe* (The History of the Evolution of Marriage [1908]) he used archaeological, ethnographical, philological material as well as the latest research in biology and medicine to bolster what he called an evolutionary development theory (*evolutionistische Entwicklungslehre*). The central claim of this was that a distinction was to be drawn between the biological and

cultural history of human civilisation, a view not unlike Sudhoff's own (Stein 2013: 203–205). Assuming some kind of *Ur-agamid* society, von Reitzenstein reasoned that the relations between the sexes and the institution of marriage were fundamentally separate from biological need and had to be understood as culturally and historically formed, rather than merely biological and thus transhistorical (cf. Reitzenstein 1908b: 13). Through his research on marriage and love in the ancient Orient, Asia and the Americas as well as the European Middle Ages, he sought to demonstrate that marriage was primarily an economic institution. He also refused to accept theories of biological and cultural degeneration in relation to these issues, believing that his approach allowed for new, morally and religiously unprejudiced insights. His ideas were consonant with those in Germany at the time who were fighting for the emancipation of women and the loosening of sexual mores. With respect to these topics, Reitzenstein regarded his work primarily as political. He was outspoken on women's rights and an active member of the *Bund für Mutterschutz* and other feminist organisations.⁶⁵ He also had contact with sexologists such as Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935) and Iwan Bloch (1872–1922).⁶⁶ It can be assumed that for Reitzenstein, as for Neustätter (probably less for Sudhoff), the IHA was not only a means to display his ideas about the historical and cultural development of human societies but also those ideas he held on socio-political reform.⁶⁷

Identification and Collection

But how practically to apply these different research interests to an overall display? The archival sources reveal a great deal about the negotiations in the historical section of the exhibition. In May 1909 Neustätter wrote to Sudhoff, "I imagine the exhibition as divided into nations in the sections on antiquity, while the Middle Ages and modern times will be best ordered according to disciplines."⁶⁸ This, he admitted, was only a preliminary plan and left plenty of room for adjustments; it did, however, allow them to move on. (Neustätter had not bothered with an independent outline for the ethnological subsection because its organisation, he assumed at the time, would conform to the historical section.) The idea of involving other German medical historians in the collection process, such as Berlin medical historian Julius Leopold Pagel (1851–1912), was briefly discussed between the two of them but rejected as

likely only to raise additional administrative headaches and delays.⁶⁹ Neustätter also suggested that they widen their search for objects beyond the cultural history of medicine to the more general cultural history of everyday life.⁷⁰ The exhibition should begin in prehistoric times, they finally decided, and end around 1850. The period after that – largely the development of laboratory medicine and bacteriology – would be dealt with in the scientific section.⁷¹ It was also decided to utilise Neustätter's inventory technology which involved a file card for each object sought; objects for the pre-historical and classical period were to be marked on red cards, those belonging to the medieval section on dark pink ones, and those for the modern section on light pink ones.⁷² Each card was to show the name of the object, include a brief description and the place where it was held and where it had been first identified. All cards were kept in specially-built chest of drawers (so-called *Karthoteken*). This system allowed them to send cards back and forth between Leipzig and Dresden and permit a better overview of what had and had not already been identified.

While a general outline for the historical section of the exhibition was easily found, the search for suitable objects to fill the hundreds of red and pink card slips was incredibly slow. While Sudhoff could rely on an extensive network of colleagues in the human sciences and the arts, and draw on acquaintances in museums and historical societies to identify suitable objects,⁷³ Neustätter was new to the field of history and had to depend on Sudhoff. Alternatively, he had to make his own contacts. He spent long hours in the readings rooms of Dresden's public libraries compiling lists of museums and private collections and identifying the names and addresses of their directors, curators, and owners.⁷⁴ He also worked his way through the available catalogues of national and international museums and collections, and raided the international literature to compile his artefact wish lists (*Wunschlisten*), his pile of coloured cards.⁷⁵ Although Lingner was hesitant to allow Neustätter to travel, Neustätter was able to manage a few brief visits to museums to obtain an idea of what was available.⁷⁶ His report to Sudhoff after a quick trip to Berlin in July 1909 is worth quoting at length, not least for providing insight into Neustätter's rather erratic collecting method.

Thus I was in Berlin, only for two days though and was ordered back [by Lingner] here for today. I would have liked to have stayed another day over

there. I was of course unable to work my way through all the museums. Because on Monday most museums are closed, I visited the *Märkische Museum*,⁷⁷ the *Reichspost-Museum*,⁷⁸ [and] the Colonial Exhibition. The *Altes Museum*⁷⁹ I visited on Tuesday. The latter is incredibly large, and I just made it through the collection of the Antiquities and Egypt, although I did not entirely finish the latter. I took notes of everything, which might be of some kind of interest to us. The *Märkische Museum* did not yield as much as I expected. There are some interesting representations of early times in Berlin, then some caricatures, which can be turned into something; then a *Spreewald-Raum*,⁸⁰ a good example for a farm house room [and] for the development of lighting equipment; then a few interesting things from the Bronze Age. The *Reichspost-Museum*, which has the most impossible catalogue in which nothing can be found, has a few interesting things on the history of early transportation, stage coach journeys, and on early modes of travel. In the Colonial Museum⁸¹ there are some interesting ethnographic objects, such as huts, and artefacts related to water usage, nutrition, and so on. The greatest yield was made in the Egyptian collection, which contains lots of useful things, as long as we can only get these things.⁸²

During another visit to Berlin, Neustätter rushed through the *Völkerkundemuseum*, the Museum for Art and Crafts (*Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe*), the Institute of Hygiene,⁸³ Institute of Fermentation (*Institut für Gärungswesen*),⁸⁴ the museum for prints and drawings (*Kupferstichkabinett*),⁸⁵ an exhibition on civic architecture, and other places such as the exhibition for clay and cement, which (so Neustätter had read) exhibited an exact copy of a Roman villa that might be interesting for a potential display on the development of human habitation.⁸⁶ He also took time to meet some of Sudhoff's acquaintances. The sexologist and cultural historian Iwan Bloch promised to send him books and manuscripts from his own collection, and the journalist and cultural historian Eduard Fuchs (1870–1940)⁸⁷ agreed to lend some examples from his enormous collection of caricatures.

But obtaining material from outside Sudhoff's network of contacts was more difficult. How, Neustätter wondered, could he approach private collectors and institutional representatives, most of whom he had never met personally? Would they trust him

enough with their valuable objects? A small, but important first step, he thought, would be to have his name on the letterhead of the stationary for the historico-ethnological section. He explained to Sudhoff that this was vitally important because he lacked ties to academic history and the worlds of collecting.⁸⁸ Sudhoff endorsed Neustätter's request; Lingner, however, did not. He took the view that the only person who needed to be on the letterhead was the section's director and chair, as with all the other sections. Neustätter refused to back down and soon the so-called letterhead affair was a major source of tension. In a meeting with Lingner in October 1909 Neustätter reminded him that the progress of the historical section was becoming seriously compromised, since no correspondence could go out before a decision was made on the issue of the official letterhead.⁸⁹ Lingner refused to acknowledge this and accused Neustätter of inflating the issue to distract attention from the real problem, the general lack of progress with his section. Neustätter retorted by threatening that Sudhoff would seriously consider quitting his directorship of the section if no agreement over the letterhead would be reached. "Then fine too", Lingner replied, rushing out of the meeting and shouting in exasperation "You drive me crazy with your 'I cannot move on'."⁹⁰

Such altercations, and there were to be many, suggest more than just clashes of personality were involved here. Like other successful businessman of his time, Lingner was enamoured of 'efficiency' (cf. Lingner 1914); profits accrued through standardisation, rationalisation, and divisions of labour in his production sites and warehouses. He regarded his exhibition project, similarly, like a business; he thought a steady accumulation of 'facts' should have quantifiable and measurable results. He considered anything else a waste of time and a dubious way of proceeding with anything.⁹¹ Neustätter, on the other hand, had entered the more ponderous world of academic expertise and artistic connoisseurship, where intellect, not efficiency was applied to artefacts, their organisation, and meaning. He dealt with scholars from the human sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*) who worked not according to measures and time but rather to the belief that knowledge that helped to understand (*verstehen*) human nature had to be accumulated through individual and independent research, an endeavour for which no precise time frame could be set because it was open by its very nature. This was a world in which disciplinary divisions of labour were only beginning to emerge. Sudhoff, in contrast to Lingner and Neustätter, was something

of a hybrid (Stein 2013: 205–218). Having spent decades as a practitioner in the increasingly corporate and specialised world of late nineteenth-century medicine, he was no foreigner to the concept of efficiency. Nevertheless, as a cultural historian of medicine, he operated within a world of knowing that was modeled on the ideals and practices of the *Geisteswissenschaften*. While Sudhoff liked to compare his historical fact gathering to practices in the medical laboratory, he generally considered his methods in stark opposition to that of the natural sciences. In contrast to the act of explaining the laws of nature (*erklären*), the historical understanding of human nature (he agreed with Neustätter) could not be measured against the rigid standards of ‘efficiency’.

These differences in logic and mindset had outcomes that almost undermined the entire historico-ethnographic section. Amidst the evermore frequent and more fraught encounters among Neustätter, Sudhoff and Lingner, the organisers of other sections of the IHA sought to become more territorial. At a meeting at the beginning of September 1909, for example, some of them even suggested that the historico-ethnographic section be dispensed with and that in its stead its material be distributed to their own or other sections.⁹² Neustätter was outraged and insisted that “[w]e were promised our own section, [and] that all our work aims at turning the section into something independent”. Neustätter urged Sudhoff to protest against the attempted take-over. Sudhoff apparently did, but that was not the end of the matter; similar efforts to poach their material continued. The Colonial Ministry’s display, Neustätter learned, planned to include a display on the nutrition of indigenous people in the German colonies, and the section on clothing and hygiene similarly pushed to have its own historical display.⁹³ Lingner for his part, began to doubt the viability of the historico-ethnological section, fearing that it might be a colossal failure.⁹⁴ In order to gain more influence over it, he sought veto power in its decisions. Neustätter managed to prevent the move as he proudly reported back to Sudhoff.⁹⁵

But for the section to survive and be kept under their control Sudhoff and Neustätter had urgently to demonstrate that matters were in hand (and could be measured by Lingner’s standards of efficiency). Sudhoff set a deadline (1 December 1910) for the objects produced on site (for instance models, plans, drawings or photographs) and 1 February 1911, for material arriving from the outside.⁹⁶ Neustätter proceeded with

drafting the preliminary programme, as well as composing a document setting out the general conditions for the loan of objects. At a directorial meeting in the summer of 1909 he presented his draft, which was greeted with general approval – indeed was even praised by some (though not Lingner) as a "small masterpiece".⁹⁷ By the autumn of 1909 Neustätter was finally able to send out the preliminary programme to potential donors. It was a development of his and Sudhoffs' earlier ideas. "Until the Middle Ages", the programme explained, "each of the most important 'Kulturvölker' would be presented as a separate entity".⁹⁸ However, the arrangement from the Middle Ages onwards was less clearly defined. In accordance with the available material it would be ordered either through a systematic development of topics, or as an overview of hygiene in civilised nations in different historical periods. The biggest difference with the final exhibition was that the provisional programme did not refer to an independent subsection on ethnology. It was only mentioned in passing that 'ethnographic parallels' would be either interspersed in the historical material or presented independently (Programm 1909: 28). In any case, the order of the ethnographic material would broadly follow the themes of each of the chronologically ordered historical sections, with their divisions into: personal hygiene, environmental hygiene (for instance air, light, soil and climate, hygiene of dwellings), public hygiene (such as travel and transportation hygiene), the fight against disease and disease prevention, health provisions for specific life conditions (for example mother and baby care), and *Volk* customs and laws (religious and state) with hygienic and anti-hygienic tendencies (Programm 1909: 25–28).

Five pages of "explanatory remarks" accompanied the provisional programme and systematic overview of the section (Programm 1909: 19–23). They dealt in detail with possible questions that museum curators and private collectors might have concerning the themes of the section, and which might help them more readily identify suitable objects for loan. Neustätter had insisted on these explanatory remarks⁹⁹ because he realised from his meetings with representatives of the arts and human sciences that many of them had difficulty in conceptualising a historical exhibition on a subject that, for them, was entirely about the natural sciences. As the gatekeepers of the objects that Neustätter and Sudhoff were interested in, they needed to be appraised of its aims and objects. Their museums and collections were arranged according to entirely different principles, and it was hard for them to imagine how their holdings could be

relevant to an exhibition on hygiene. An illustration of this confusion is the conversation that Neustätter had with Paul Clemen (1866–1947), professor of art history at the University of Bonn.¹⁰⁰ After studying the provisional programme, Clemen commented with some astonishment that it would not be an exhibition on medicine at all but “in fact, this would be a cultural-historical exhibition”. Neustätter agreed, but assured him that he and Sudhoff would make sure that the distinction between “cultural history” and “medical hygiene” would be visible. The whole business of history made little sense to Clemen (Neustätter reported to Sudhoff) and he did not at all understand what purpose a historical hygiene exhibition could have. Similar confusions and doubts were revealed at another meeting with a professor Schäfer of the *Altes Museum* in Berlin. It was only through Neustätter’s conversations with him that he finally became “fully aware of the aims we are pursuing and understood the point of interest in the enterprise”.¹⁰¹

In the first pages of the “explanatory remarks” the reader was encouraged to understand the past from a hygienic point of view. Narrowly, “hygiene in a historical sense”, Neustätter explained, included all the contemporary meanings of hygiene and medical policing, that is, all immediate personal and public protection against disease (for the following Programm 1909: 19) In a wider sense, however, it included preventive and precautionary measures, “that aimed at the development of a healthy and strong individual and the masses (maintenance of freshness of air, waste materials, good dwellings, clean streets, waste removal, cleanliness of the body and invigoration of the body)”. But what was the difference between hygiene (understood in this way) and daily habits, the explanatory remarks then asked? This raised a problematic distinction that had plagued Neustätter in his all meetings with potential donors. Thus he put forward nutrition as an example of one such area in which the distinction between hygiene and daily habits was difficult to make out, and which became even shadier in relation to objects around the nutrition of past *Kulturvölker* (cultural peoples) or contemporary *Naturvölker* (natural peoples). The solution to the problem, he proposed in the explanatory remarks, was the invitation to measure historical and ethnographic objects against modern standards of hygiene. This could be done most easily by approaching them with the following questions in mind – “How did they influence health; how would their re-introduction today influence contemporary health conditions; how do they relate to the conditions today?” (Programm 1909: 20).

Following this mental guideline objects might then be identified by the standards of the historical actors themselves, even if they did not understand them “as hygienic”. A ritual circumcision knife, for instance, often served entirely different purposes and would only turn “hygienic” through historical hindsight. However, in order to display the long development of hygiene in time and space the objects needed to be exhibited next to those, which – according to modern standards – already worked hygienically. Ascribing a hygienic value to objects not usually thus considered, and the business of distinguishing them from more general cultural objects ought not therefore to be as difficult as might be imagined – or so the explanatory remarks anticipated. In effect, what they suggested was a rewriting of history from a newly minted hygienic perspective – or rather, currently being minted. The explanatory remarks opined that all objects of general cultural appearance, such as clothes, houses, streets, schools, and tools of trade not only have aesthetic, technical, economic, intellectual, and national dimensions but hygienic ones as well (Programme 1909: 20).

Of course there would be tricky items such as an oven, which was not simply a convenience and an example of technological progress, but also a hygienic achievement because it protected the eyes and respiratory organs from smoke and fire (Programm 1909: 21). However – and it was an important however – while such hygienic objects and more general cultural ones could blend into each other, they needed to be distinguished from ‘medical’ object (Programm 1909: 20). “Hygiene is not identical with medicine”, the preliminary remarks reminded its reader in order to conform with Lingner’s own interest in not turning his exhibition into a medical show.¹⁰² What was *not* wanted therefore were collections of medical objects – forceps, surgical saws, teeth extractor and so on – and, least of all, objects linked to the pharmaceutical industry. What *was* wanted were objects like birthing chairs, which were devised to ameliorate ‘normal’ physical conditions (unlike the forceps which was a surgical instrument designed to remove a physical dysfunction). Admittedly, this too was a rather blurred distinction and probably did more to confuse than to help potential donors.

After having expounded on how to ascribe a hygienic perspective to a cultural object, the explanatory remarks turned to hygienic objects that were particularly interesting to Neustätter’s and Sudhoff’s section. They were keen on items that were visually

attractive and immediately self explanatory (*anschaulich*), rather than relying on written or spoken explanation.¹⁰³ Some would allow direct access to a topic such as sandals, water pumps, heating systems, and photographs of living quarters. More complicated were conceptual objects of hygiene, such as ‘climate’ or ‘work’, which did not speak directly to the eye and had to be mediated through yet other objects. To understand the impact of climate on health, for instance, models of Roman dwellings in Italy and Germany might be considered through their different heating systems, and through this demonstrate how different climates influenced the structuring of domestic environments.

As mentioned above, the explanatory remarks and the preliminary programme were accompanied by a document outlining the conditions of loan and mutual responsibilities of the organisers of the historico-ethnological section and potential donors.¹⁰⁴ The latter dealt with mundane monetary matters, such as questions of insurance, transportation, storage costs, and so on. It was modeled on the general conditions of loan for the other sections of the IHA but with one important difference: unlike all the other sections in which the lender rented space per square meter, the exhibition of objects in the historico-ethnological section was free of charge.¹⁰⁵ Lenders’ names would be attached to the objects, but the lenders had to relinquish control over how the objects were to be arranged.¹⁰⁶ If the lender wished to exhibit the objects (or their names) in a more prominent way than Neustätter and Sudhoff deemed appropriate, then payment would be required at an agreed sum relative to the size of the object. Some donors may have wished to do this, for the objects that were put on display were not there purely for educational purposes, as historians have tended to assume; they were also there for sale.¹⁰⁷ The final catalogue of the historico-ethnological section reveals that almost the entire prehistoric section, for example, could be bought from O. Hauser, a collector of prehistoric materials in Basle.¹⁰⁸ Having collectors’ names and addresses displayed and printed in the catalogue for purposes of sale was not a new invention at Dresden. It continued a long tradition in the display of historical and ethnographic objects at national and international trade fairs, a tradition that made it difficult for the pioneers of a purely historical narrative to edge their way in (see Plato 2001: 172 f.). That Sudhoff and Neustätter did so was in many ways the real achievement of their historico-ethnographical section at the

IHA. The special instructions regarding the display of material and the conditions of loan for Dresden were an important means to this end.¹⁰⁹

Nevertheless, the instructions and the sale tags in the historico-ethnological exhibition are a convenient reminder that the IHA was also to some extent a sales fair, although the official rhetoric at the time – particularly Lingner’s own – tried to downplay that aspect and preferred to highlight the educational purposes of certain sections such as *Der Mensch*. Historians tend to follow Lingner’s rhetoric, and thus cement anachronistically an ethical distinction between commerce and scientific education, even though it has often been noted that Lingner made a handsome one million Mark profit from the IHA.

The preliminary programme, the explanatory remarks, and the conditions of loan document may have clarified certain issues but they did little to solve the problem of gathering the material and organising it. Consequently, they did nothing to mitigate Lingner’s pessimism on the performance of the historico-ethnological section nor to prevent ongoing attempts at its appropriation and exploitation by other sections. Some of the lenders also proved to be more than a little tetchy in their negotiations with Neustätter and Sudhoff.¹¹⁰ It was only after the appointment of von Reitzenstein that the whole historico-ethnographical section obtained a measure of security. Initially von Reitzenstein compounded problems by working for a clear methodological and conceptual distinction between ‘the historical’ and ‘the ethnological’ display of the material. Ultimately, however, this proved a blessing in disguise; instead of the original idea voiced in the preliminary programme from 1909 of mixing the historical and ethnological materials, the latter was arranged as an independent sub-section, following its own logic in conception. This simplified matters; Neustätter and Sudhoff were then able to concentrate exclusively on the historical material, leaving von Reitzenstein (who turned out to be competent and reliable) to work independently on his section. How von Reitzenstein’s ethnological division was conceptualised, and how it embedded the methodological tenets the emerging discipline of ethnology (and how these in turn differed methodologically from the assumptions in Neustätter’s and Sudhoff’s section) is beyond the scope of this paper. Here it is sufficient to note that, from the perspective of the millions who visited the section between May and October 1911, the arrangement of the 20,000 objects was greeted with enthusiasm, with some

commentators proclaiming that never before had such sophistication and comprehensibility been attained in an exhibition.¹¹¹

Organising History at the IHA: Concluding Remarks

Historical exhibitions are notoriously difficult for historians to examine, not least because the source material that illuminates their ‘making’ is often lacking. Historians have therefore resorted to interpreting final displays, thus retrospectively reading intentions and meanings from the end product. To date this ‘reading from final outcomes’ has also been applied to the historico-ethnological section at the IHA. It has been interpreted as the project of one man, Karl Sudhoff, who successfully historicised and materialised Lingner’s hygienic educational message. Yet, in the case of the historico-ethnological section new original archival material allows us to investigate its earliest beginnings. It clearly demonstrates that Sudhoff worked with a team of organisers; it was never a one-man show. The sources also reveal some of the struggles that accompanied the organisation. What emerges is an extraordinarily complex process due to the fact that there was no ready-made storyline to which historical and ethnographic artefacts could easily be fitted. Nor do the sources indicate that a storyline emerged simply through the identification and availability of suitable objects for display. This paper has highlighted the problems involved in identifying, selecting, and gathering the material. Indeed, objects had to be first conceptualised as ‘hygienic’ and brought into the context of a ‘history of hygiene’, which in the first decade of the twentieth century, still had to be written. The writing was not preordained; it was negotiated through discourses that were at one and the same time distinct, overlapping, and emergent. The major actors involved came from different intellectual, institutional and organisational worlds that involved different practices, values and virtues, which underpinned their notions of the ideal organisation of artefacts and their meaning in public display. To bring these different worlds together was not always easy.

This article thus permits a reinterpretation of the success of the historico-ethnological section. While the final display was indeed one of the visitors’ favourites, we have seen that its very making – overcoming enormous logistical challenges as well as differences in intellectual agendas and professional cultures – was already a major

achievement. Ultimately one may suggest that the success of the section was achieved long before the public gained entry, for a consensus on hygiene's meaning had been forged. That the historico-ethnological exhibition occurred at all was by no means assured as its history makes clear.

Endnotes

This article greatly benefitted from comments and suggestions by Christine Brecht, Roger Cooter, Alexander Gall, Sander Gilman, Sybilla Nikolow, Anke te Heesen, Molly Rogers, Thomas Steller, and three anonymous reviewers. I also would like to thank all participants at the colloquium at the Deutsche Museum in Munich for their helpful comments. All translations are my own.

¹ For the IHA see Führer 1911. For the planning of the IHA Steller 2008: 57–59.

² On Lingner see Wolff 1930, Funke 1996, Obst, 2005, Büchi 2006; on his most successful product, the mouthwash Odol: Väht-Hinz 1998, Roth (ed.) 1993.

³ Christina Brecht is currently completing a dissertation that focuses on Lingner's exhibition *Der Mensch*. I am grateful for her estimate of the size of Lingner's section.

⁴ Steller 2008. For current research on the IHA: *Erkenne Dich selbst: Visuelle Gesundheitsaufklärung mit Wissensobjekten aus dem Deutschen Hygiene-Museum Dresden im 20. Jahrhundert* (<http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/geschichte/abteilung/arbeitsbereiche/wissenschaftsgeschichte/forschung/dhmd/index.html> [accessed 13 September 2013]). For a good overview on recent scholarship on the popularisation of scientific knowledge see Nikolow/Schirmmacher 2007.

⁵ In the beginning, these exhibitions focused on the presentation and sale of industrial products. One of the earliest examples is the *Internationale Ausstellung für Hygiene und Rettungswesen* (International Exhibition for Hygiene and Rescue) at Brussels in 1876, which served as the model for the *Allgemeine deutsche Ausstellung für Hygiene und Rettungswesen* (1883) at Berlin. The material of Berlin exhibition was later incorporated into the display of *Hygiene Museum* at Berlin (opened in 1886). In the last third of the nineteenth century, partly inspired by Germany's new social insurance system set up in the early 1880s, exhibitions on hygiene topics became more

specialised and educational. They focused on topics such as contemporary hygiene and the health of workers, women, or infants. For an overview on such exhibitions and museums see Poser 1998, Großbölting 2008. For a helpful historical contextualization of these specialised exhibitions and their relationship to museums see te Heesen 2012: 89–115. For an excellent analysis of American health and hygiene exhibitions see Brown 2009.

⁶ For example, Schrön 2003: 314–316. However, it has to be emphasised that, it is easy to draw such conclusions from the published material. See, for example, Lingner’s introduction to the official catalogue of the IHA, see Führer 19011: 7–9. So far, only Olaf Hartung (2010: 103–107) has offered a more nuanced view of the historico-ethnological section.

⁷ For the “book of hygiene” see Anonym 1911: 20 f.; see also Lingner’s introduction in Führer 1911:16–18. For the planning phase of the IHA Steller 2008: 57–59, Funke 1996: 74–82.

⁸ The literature on international trade fairs is vast. See, for example, Greenhalgh 2008, Kretschmer 1999, Geppert 2010, Fox/Sneddeker 1997. For Germany’s presentation on such fairs see, for example, Gulich 2011. Since the 1890s the *Kaiserliche Gesundheitsamt* organised hygiene exhibitions as part of the Empire’s contribution to international trade fairs. But like the specialised national hygiene exhibitions, these displays did not include historical or ethnographic material. For such an exhibition at St. Louise in 1904: Sonderkatalog 1904.

⁹ Again, the secondary literature on this topic has grown enormously over the recent two decades and cannot be discussed here in detail. The largest anthropological exhibition took place in St. Louis in 1904. More than 2,000 indigenous peoples worked at the fair (Breitenbach 1997). For a detailed analysis of such anthropological shows Wyss 2010, for *Völkerschauen* (ethnographic shows) in Germany see Kirschnik 2002, Dresbach 2005.

¹⁰ For the history of the ‘Street of Cairo’, a key example of nineteenth-century ‘orientalism’ see Breitenbach 1997: 41 f.; for the “Street of Cairo” at the Berlin trade and colonial fair in 1896 see Reichardt 2008: 91–93.

¹¹ The *Exposition retrospective du travail et des sciences anthropologiques* at the Paris fair in 1889 is one of the earliest exhibitions where specialist of these different disciplines worked side by side.

¹² The exhibit of model houses was set up by the architect Charles Garnier in cooperation with the historian Auguste Ammann. Although their display offered a new interpretation of the past, it was not a success at the time. Experts criticised the poor quality of the buildings, and the visitors did not appreciate the mock constructions either. The prehistoric huts and caves were used as public toilets. For this exhibition see Müller-Scheessel 2011, Wyss 2010: 138–169.

¹³ The literature on ethnology and anthropology as *Herrschaftswissen* and central component of the construction of non-European culture as ‘the other’ is vast. Most of it is beyond the scope of this paper but for this article I found useful Wyss 2010: 138–171, and also te Heesen 2012: 80–82.

¹⁴ Sudhoff’s historical method, which was closely modelled on Leopold von Ranke’s famous ‘critical method’ cannot be analysed here in detail. More on his method can be found in Stein 2013. Hartung 2010: 103–107, too, draws attention to the fact that Sudhoff’s section followed a more complicated methodological storyline than commonly assumed.

¹⁵ According to nineteenth-century anthropological and ethnological theory *Kulturvölker* (including the Greeks, Romans, Japanese or Chinese) possessed writing and thus history and culture. They were to be distinguished from so-called *Naturvölker* (natural peoples) who supposedly lacked writing and therefore history and culture (for instance Africans, indigenous Americans, Pacific Islanders, and marginalized societies in Europe and Asia). For the development of these distinctions see Zimmermann 2001.

¹⁶ The concept of *Kulturkreis* was introduced by the German ethnologist Leo Frobenius (1873–1938). It became influential in the first decade of the twentieth century, particularly among the younger generation of German ethnologists. The theory assumed a cultural and historical interconnectedness of all cultures, based on the idea of a common cultural origin. The *Kulturkreislehre* challenged the older concept of *Natur-* and *Kulturvölker*. The latter promoted a sharp distinction between cultures on the basis of the availability of writing. For a good overview of this development and its key protagonists see Rössler 2007, also Zimmermann 2001: 201–216.

¹⁷ The pre-historical section focused on Germanic-Celtic, Babylonian, Assyrian, Jewish and Egyptian hygiene. Classical antiquity focused mainly on Greek and

Roman cultures and was subdivided into eighteenth sub-themes (for example nutrition, dwelling, waste removal, body care or the hygienic sciences).

¹⁸ The catalogue lists a total of 20,394 objects for the historical section. Unfortunately the total number of ethnographic objects on display is unknown.

¹⁹ Von Reitzenstein purchased these groups from the Hamburg-based company J.F.G. Umlauff, which specialized in ethnographic objects. For the history of the Umlauff enterprise see Lange 2006.

²⁰ For the list of employees: Katalog 1911: XVII.

²¹ Hartung 2010: 103–107 is the only historian who has drawn attention to the limited role Sudhoff played in the daily organisation of the section.

²² The society was founded in Berlin in 1900. For more information see Regin 1995: 305–317, and Walter/Regin 1991: 17–96.

²³ For the Dresden exhibition Wuttke 1904; for Lingner's role in the *Verein für Volkshygiene* see Regin 1995: 316.

²⁴ For Sudhoff's retrospective assessment of Neustätter's professional qualities that mirrored Lingner's see Sudhoff 1929: 376.

²⁵ 18 November 1909, University Archive Leipzig (henceforth UAL), Medical Faculty (henceforth Med. Fac.) D 05/04b, fol. 140.

²⁶ The museum was officially founded in 1912 but only got a permanent home in 1930. For the history of the museum see Funke 1996: 84–92; Steller 2008: 72–78.

²⁷ He was married to the Australian Lilian Sydnes Lindesay-Richardson, a sister of Ethel Florence Lindesay-Richardson (1870–1946), the bestselling Australian novelist. Both sisters were outspoken activist for women's rights. Ethel lived in London with her husband John George Robertson (1867–1833), University of London's first professor for German language and literature (from 1903). Under the pseudonym of Henry Handel Richardson, Ethel wrote several classic Australian novels, see Ackland 2005.

²⁸ 18 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 88.

²⁹ The school was dedicated to the method of learning and experiencing music through movement (eurythmy). Eurythmy was invented by the Swiss composer and musician Jacques Dalcroze (1865–1950) who taught at Hellerau until 1914. The school project in Hellerau was the precursor to the famous Summerhill school in the United Kingdom, founded by Alexander Sutherland Neill (1884–1873). Neill, who

had visited Dresden, married Lilian Neustätter after her divorce from Otto Neustätter in 1921. For the Hellerau school projects and Summerhill see

<http://summerhill.paed.com/summ/diplom/4.htm#11> (accessed 3 April 2013). On

Neill see Croal 1983.

³⁰ Reichardt 2008: 135 argues that Lingner feared he might be regarded as a *Kurpfuscher* (quack) by the medical establishment. This worry was probably the reason why he was reluctant to allow representatives of the German *Naturheilbewegung* participate in the IHA. Nikolow 2001, Regin 1995: 316. For contemporary concerns regarding *Kurpfuschertum* in Germany: Timmermann 1999: 149-181, Dinges 1996, Fritzen, 2006.

³¹ Directorial Board to Sudhoff, 26 May 1909, Deutsches Hygiene Museum. A copy of the letter was kindly made available to me by Ulf-Norbert Funke who found it at the *Deutsche Hygiene Museum* (DHM). Since then, the archival material containing the letter must have been re-organised because I was unable to locate the letter during my research for this article. Neustätter wrote to Sudhoff at the beginning of May to introduce himself and to inform Sudhoff that the board of directors would approach him soon. See UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 63, Neustätter to Sudhoff, 2 Mai 1909.

³² The board of seem to have agreed to that at the beginning of June 1909, Directorial Board to Sudhoff, 10 June 1909, Deutsches Hygiene Museum. I am grateful to Ulf-Norbert Funke for sending me a copy of this letter which I was unable to locate at the Deutsche Hygiene Museum.

³³ None of Sudhoff's letters survived but we can deduce from Lingner's responses at least the tone in which they were written. For the quote see Lingner to Sudhoff, 19 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 31. Although he accepted the situation, Lingner continued to invite Sudhoff to visit Dresden more often. He even promised fancy dinners and visits to his private box at the Dresden opera, cf. Lingner to Sudhoff, 7 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., D 03/05, fol. 28; for Lingner's pressure on Sudhoff see, for example, Lingner to Sudhoff, 10 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., 05/03, fol. 22; Lingner to Sudhoff, 11 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., 05/03, fol. 29; Lingner to Sudhoff, 16 October 1909, Lingner to Sudhoff 9 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., 05/03, fol. 32.

³⁴ For his collection at the Leipzig institute see Fahrenbach 2001. For his understanding of the cultural history of medicine see Stein 2013: 205–209.

³⁵ It was also the first meeting of the society that devoted a separate section to the history of medicine. Sudhoff was one of its organisers. For Sudhoff's retrospective view on this exhibition see Sudhoff 1929: 346–348.

³⁶ See Sudhoff 1929: 348 f., for his opening speech see Sudhoff 1921: 264–276.

³⁷ This non-profit foundation was dedicated to the training of academic physicians. It was named after the oldest daughter of Queen Victoria (1840–1901), the widow of the German Emperor Friedrich III, in honour of her activities in the area of medical education and training.

³⁸ He also dreamed of founding a museum for the history of medicine. Some of his ideas regarding the organisation of such a museum can be found in his foreword to the Berlin catalogue published on the occasion of the opening of the *Kaiserin-Friedrich-Haus* exhibition (Katalog 1906). See also Sudhoff 1926.

³⁹ Neustätter also tried to hire groups of indigenous peoples to demonstrate hygienic procedures. For his meeting with the American Indian Braul Sero in Berlin in the summer of 1910 see Neustätter to Sudhoff, 30 June 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04a, fol. 13.

⁴⁰ This becomes evident in the acquisition practice of the section. Increasingly Lingner agreed to buy objects and even whole collections. For the negotiations over the acquisition of a Japanese amulet collection see, for example, Siegfried Seligmann to Sudhoff, undated, ca. early October 1910; UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04a, fol. 24; Siegfried Seligmann to Sudhoff; UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04a, fol. 26, undated, ca. early October 1910; Siegfried Seligmann to Sudhoff, 1 November 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04a, fol. 293.

⁴¹ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 24 March 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04a, fol. 92.

⁴² On Jacobi's views see Jacobi 1925. On Jacobi: Meier/Petzsch 1974: 220 f.

⁴³ Antze to Neustätter, 26 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., D 05/03, fol. 2.

⁴⁴ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 4 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., D 05/03, fol. 93.

⁴⁵ Antze to Neustätter, 28 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., D 05/03, fol. 1.

⁴⁶ For Weule's views on ethnological museums: Weule 1908/1909, *ibid.* 1912; for Weule's influential role in the world of German ethnological museums see Penny 2002: 118–123, 142 f., 156–158.

⁴⁷ He also argued that the insurance arrangement were insufficient, Weule to the Directorial Board of the IHA, 28 January 1910, UAL, Med. Fac., D 05/04c, fol. 363.

-
- ⁴⁸ Weule claimed that his staff was heavily involved in the planning of several expeditions in 1911, cf. Lingner to Sudhoff, 16 January 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 12.
- ⁴⁹ Lingner to Sudhoff, 2 December 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 36.
- ⁵⁰ Lingner to Sudhoff, 26 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 35.
- ⁵¹ Neustätter to Sudhoff, undated, ca. November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 42.
- ⁵² Neustätter to Goldschmidt, 29 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., D 05/03, fol. 99.
- ⁵³ Neustätter to Sudhoff, undated, ca. November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 100b.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ For an earlier version and a draft of Goldschmidt's contract, dated 26 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 156.
- ⁵⁶ Lingner had also informed Sudhoff about Goldschmidt's dismissal in a telegram, Lingner to Sudhoff, 9 January 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04b, fol. 6.
- ⁵⁷ For the following see Lingner to Sudhoff, 14 January 1910, UAL Leipzig, Med. Fac. D 05/04b, fol. 11a.
- ⁵⁸ Lingner had sent a plan to Sudhoff. In the accompanying letter he had explicitly stated that the plan was preliminary, Lingner to Sudhoff, 16 January 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/4b, fol. 12.
- ⁵⁹ See, for example, Neustätter to Sudhoff, 18 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 03/05, fol. 88.
- ⁶⁰ The exact date of his appointment is unknown. The first postcard from von Reitzenstein to Sudhoff, announcing his arrival in Dresden, dates from 6 July 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04c, fol. 251. Von Reitzenstein, who was widely known for his progressive views on sexuality, is totally forgotten today, cf. Pretzel 1996a.
- ⁶¹ For the history of the museum see Penny 2002: 39–48; Zimmermann 2001: 172–198. On von Luschan see Stelzig 2005; and his ethnological views, particularly on the question of race, Laukötter 2007.
- ⁶² For the problematic relationship between academic history and ethnology and anthropology see Zimmermann 1991, and Zimmermann 2001: 38–61.
- ⁶³ Lamprecht's ideas initiated the so-called battle of methods (*Methodenstreit*) in the historical sciences at the end of the nineteenth century. For Lamprecht and the battle

of methods see Chickering 1993: 175–212, Luise Schorn-Schütte 1984. For Sudhoff's views on cultural history see Stein 2013: 205–209.

⁶⁴ His *Urgeschichte* was so popular that it went through 14 editions. Reitzenstein 1908a, Reitzenstein 1908b; Reitzenstein 1909; Reitzenstein 1910a, Reitzenstein 1910b, Reitzenstein 1912. For a bibliography of his many writings see Pretzel 1996b: 51–66.

⁶⁵ For his political convictions and his relationship to Helene Stöcker see Pretzel 1996a: 18–20. For Stöcker see Hackett 1984, more generally on the sexual reform movement in Germany Grossmann 1995.

⁶⁶ On Hirschfeld: Manchini 2010; on Bloch: Egger 1988.

⁶⁷ Particularly Neustätter was inspired by new reform ideas, particularly in pedagogy. It seems to have been less so for Sudhoff who held more conservative political views. For this see Rütten 2004: 95–114. Many of Reitzenstein's intellectual and political collaborators attended the International Neomalthusian Congress at the IHA in September 1911, and the *Internationale Kongress für Mutterschutz und Sexualreform* in October 1911, cf. Pretzel 1996a: 26.

⁶⁸ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 10 June 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 64.

⁶⁹ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 21 June 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 67.

⁷⁰ Ibid

⁷¹ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 28 September 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04b, fol. 129.

⁷² For the following see Neustätter to Sudhoff, 9 Oktober 1909, UAL, Med. Fac., D 03/05, fol. 83.

⁷³ For the network, see, for example, the correspondence with different private collectors, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 5–12; Sudhoff to his nephew Roland, 23 June 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04c; fol. 280 f.; for misunderstandings emerging from his reliance on friends and relatives see the controversy, Rehlen to Sudhoff, 19 October 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04c, fol. 244, *ibid.*, 12 November 1910; *ibid.*, 9 November, fol. 245.

⁷⁴ Neustätter to Sudhoff, undated, ca. October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 84.

⁷⁵ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 15 September 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 77. These wish lists were common practice in the acquisition process of new material, particularly for new museums at the time. For similar lists at the *Deutsche Museum* in Munich (opened in 1906) see Füßl 2003: 81–93.

⁷⁶ According to Neustätter, Lingner did not consider such visits central to Neustätter's curating job, see Neustätter to Sudhoff, 15 September 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 77.

⁷⁷ The museum was dedicated to the history of Berlin and opened in 1908, cf. Winkler 1999.

⁷⁸ The museum was founded in 1872, see Randa-Campani 2000.

⁷⁹ The museum, built by the architect Friedrich Schinkel and inaugurated in 1830, housed the Royal Art Collection, see Cullen/Stockhausen 1998.

⁸⁰ The *Spreewald* (Spree woods), situated about 100 km south-east of Berlin, is famous for its traditional irrigation system (total length of 1,300 km). It is still populated by the descendants of the first settlers in the *Spreewald* region, Slavic tribes of the Sorbs/Wends who have preserved many of their traditional customs to the present day.

⁸¹ The Colonial Museum in Berlin-Moabit was opened in 1899 and aimed at popularising the German colonies. It was closed in 1915 due to financial problems. For the architecture and exhibition see Osayimwese 2008.

⁸² Neustätter to Sudhoff, 7 July 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 70.

⁸³ The Institute of Hygiene developed out of the *Allgemeine Ausstellung auf dem Gebiete der Hygiene und des Rettungswesens* (1883) and was opened in 1886, see Poser 1998: 95–98.

⁸⁴ This private institute did research on behalf of several industrial associations, see Marsch 1996: 563 f.

⁸⁵ The museum was founded in 1831 to house the royal print and drawings collections.

⁸⁶ For Neustätter's description of his visit see Neustätter to Sudhoff, 30 June 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04a, fol. 11–18.

⁸⁷ Eduard Fuchs was interested in the cultural history of sexual morals. His *Illustrierte Sittengeschichte*, published between 1909 and 1912, became a bestseller. For Fuchs see Benjamin 2002, Bach 2010.

⁸⁸ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 6 August 1909, UA Leipzig, Med D 03/05, fol. 76.

⁸⁹ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 18 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 88.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ For some of the key concepts and ideals around which Lingner's organisational thinking revolved see Lingner to the Directorial Board, 18 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04b, fol. 140 f.

⁹² For this and the following quote see Neustätter to Sudhoff, 9 September 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 85.

⁹³ For this and the following see Neustätter to Sudhoff, undated, ca. October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 90.

⁹⁴ For Lingner's pessimism regarding the progress of the historico-ethnological section see Neustätter to Sudhoff, 6 August 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 76; Neustätter to Sudhoff, undated, ca., early November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 53; Neustätter to Sudhoff, undated, ca. mid-November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 42.

⁹⁵ Neustätter to Sudhoff, undated, ca. early November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 42.

⁹⁶ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 4 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 93.

⁹⁷ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 28 July 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04. Sudhoff did not attend this important meeting because he had missed the train.

⁹⁸ The program was divided into a two sections a) explanatory remarks, and b) order of material, see Programm 1909: 24.

⁹⁹ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 11 October 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 86.

¹⁰⁰ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 1 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 91. Paul Clemen was one of the most influential art historians of his time and one of the founders of the Institute for Art History at the Friedrich-Wilhelm University in Bonn. His 56-volume life's work, 'Art monuments of the Rhine province' (*Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinprovinz*) remains a standard in art history. Neustätter met him during one of his visits of the Rhine province, for Clemen see Metternich/Graf 1952: 226–233.

¹⁰¹ Neustätter to Sudhoff, 30 June 1910, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/04a, fol. 15. In the same letter Neustätter reported similar experiences with Wilhelm von Bode (1845–1920), the general director of all Berlin museums.

¹⁰² The remarks explicitly reminded the reader that, "we are not allowed to show purely medical objects!" See Programm 1909: 21.

¹⁰³ The German term used is "augenfällige Eindrücke", see Programm 1909: 21 f.

-
- ¹⁰⁴ This was decided at a meeting in November 1909. See minutes of directorial meeting, 20 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 140 (pp. 1-11).
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid. fol. 140. For general conditions see another printed copy of exhibition conditions, undated, ca. November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 03/05, fol. 150.
- ¹⁰⁶ Minutes of directorial meeting, 20 November 1909, UAL, Med. Fac. D 05/03, fol. 140, Article 3.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid., Article 1: “The historical section of the IHA in Dresden in 1911 will offer a picture of the hygienic conditions and aspirations of the past (completed by ethnographic material from today). Its aims at scientific instruction, however, the sale of exhibited objects is not impossible. The description ‘for sale’ may be added in the catalogue and next to the displayed object. (However, advertisement of all kind will be forbidden in the historical section).”
- ¹⁰⁸ The picture gallery of famous physicians was also entirely for sale, see Katalog 1911: 525 f.
- ¹⁰⁹ The same strategy can be detected in the scientific section see Funke 1996: 83.
- ¹¹⁰ For an example see archivist from town archive in Lüneburg to Sudhoff, 21 January 1911, UAL, Med. Fac. 05/04a, fol. 250.
- ¹¹¹ Particularly enthusiastic was the social hygienist Alfons Fischer (1873–1936), see Fischer 1912.

References

- Anonym, 1911. Entstehung und Entwicklung der Internationalen Hygiene Ausstellung (Fortsetzung). *Hygiene. Offizielle Monatsschrift der internationalen Hygiene-Ausstellung*, 2/3, 20–28.
- Ackland, Michael, 2005. *Henry Handel Richardson: A Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bach, Ulrich E., 2010. Eduard Fuchs between Elite and Mass Culture. In: Lynne Tatlock, ed., *Publishing Culture and the Reading Nation: German Book History in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Rochester: Camden House, 294–312.
- Benjamin, Walter, 2002 [1937]. Edward Fuchs, Collector and Historian. In: Walter Benjamin, *Selected Writings, 1935–1938*. Vol. 3. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 260–302.

-
- Brecht, Christine, 1999. Das Publikum belehren – Wissenschaft zelebrieren. Bakterien in der Ausstellung “Volkskrankheiten und ihre Bekämpfung” von 1900. In: Christoph Gradmann and Thomas Schlich, eds., *Strategien der Kausalität: Konzepte der Krankheitsverursachung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus Verlag, 53–76.
- Breitenbach, Eric, 1997. *A World on Display. Photographs from the St. Louis World's Fair 1904*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Brown, Julie, 2009. *Health and Medicine on Display. International Exposition in the United States, 1876–1904*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Büchi, Walter A., 2006. *Karl August Lingner. Das grosse Leben des Odolkönigs. Eine Rekonstruktion*. Dresden: Sächsische Zeitung
- Chickering, Roger, 1993. *Karl Lamprecht: A German Academic Life (1856–1915)*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.
- Croal, Jonathan, 1983. *Neill of Summerhill: The Permanent Rebel*. London: Routledge & Kegan.
- Cullen, Michael S./Stockhausen, Tilmann von, 1998. *Das Alte Museum*. Berlin: Berlin-Edition.
- Dinges, Martin, ed., 1996. *Medizinkritische Bewegungen im Deutschen Reich (ca. 1870–ca.1933)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Dresbach, Anne, 2005. *Gezähmte Wilde. Die Zurschaustellung “exotischer” Menschen in Deutschland 1870–1940*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Egger, Bernhard, 1988. *Iwan Bloch und die Konstituierung der Sexualwissenschaft als eigene Disziplin*. Diss. Med., University of Düsseldorf.
- Fahrenbach, Sabine, 2001. The Medical History Collection of the Karl-Sudhoff-Institute for the History of Medicine and Natural Science. In: Thomas Bremer and Patrice Wegener, eds., *Alligators and Astrolabes: Treasures of the University Collections in Europe*. Halle: Druckwerk, 39–42.
- Fischer, Alfons, 1912. Die sozialhistorische Bedeutung der Internationalen Hygiene Ausstellung in Dresden. *Annalen für soziale Politik und Gesetzgebung*, 1, 568–588.
- Fox, Timothy/Sneddeker, Duane R., 1997. *From the Palaces to the Pike. Visions of the World's Fair*. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press.
- Fritzen, Florentine, 2006. “Gesünder Leben”. *Die Lebensreformbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Funke, Ulf-Norbert, 1996. *Karl August Lingner – Leben und Werk eines gemeinnützigen Großindustriellen*. Dresden: B-Edition.

Führer durch die Internationale Hygiene Ausstellung Dresden 1911 und durch Dresden und Umgebung. 1911 (Berlin: Rudolf Mosse, 1911)

Füßl, Wilhelm, 2003. Gründung und Aufbau. In: Wilhelm Füßl and Helmuth Trischler, eds., *Geschichte des Deutschen Museums: Akteure, Artefakte, Ausstellungen.* Munich: Prestel, 59–111.

Geppert, Alexander C. T., 2010. *Fleeting Cities. Imperial Expositions in Fin-de-Siecle.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Greenhalgh, Paul, 2008. *Ephemeral Vistas. The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851–1939.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Großbölting, Thomas, 2008. *Im Reich der Arbeit. Die Präsentation gesellschaftlicher Ordnung in den deutschen Industrie- und Gewerbeausstellungen 1790–1914.* München: R. Oldenbourg.

Grossmann, Alina, 1995. *Reforming Sex: The German Movement for Birth Control and Abortion Reform, 1920–1950.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gulich, Sarah, 2011. *Die Präsentation Deutschlands auf den Weltausstellungen in Chicago 1893 und St. Louis 1904.* Norderstedt: Grin.

Hackett, Amy, 1984. Helene Stöcker: Left-Wing Intellectual and Sex Reformer. In: Renate Bridenthal, Atina Grossmann and Marion Kaplan, eds., *When Biology Became Destiny.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 109–130.

Hartmann, Kristina, 1998. Gartenstadtbewegung. In: Diehart Krebs and Jürgen Reulicke, eds., *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen, 1880–1930.* Wuppertal: Hammer, 290–310.

Hartung, Olaf, 2010. *Kleine deutsche Museumsgeschichte. Von der Aufklärung bis zum frühen 20. Jahrhundert.* Köln: Böhlau.

Heesen, Anke te, 2012. *Theorien des Museums. Zur Einführung.* Hamburg: Junius Verlag.

Jacobi, Arnold, 1925. *Fünfzig Jahre Museum für Völkerkunde zu Dresden.* Dresden: Bard.

Katalog 1898. *Katalog: Historische Ausstellung für Naturwissenschaften und Medicin in den Räumen des Kunstgewerbe-Museums, Düsseldorf, Juli–October 1898.* Düsseldorf: August Bagel.

Katalog 1899. *Katalog: Rheinische Goethe-Ausstellung in der Aula der Kgl. Kunstakademie zu Düsseldorf.* Leipzig: Ed. Wartig's Verlag.

Katalog 1906. *Katalog zur Ausstellung der Geschichte der Medizin in Kunst und Kunsthandwerk zur Eröffnung des Kaiserin Friedrich-Hauses, 1. März 1906.* Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke.

Katalog 1911. *Historische Abteilung mit ethnographischer Unterabteilung. I. Historische Abteilung.* Dresden: Internationale Hygiene Ausstellung.

Kampffmeyer, Hans, 1911. *Die deutsche Gartenstadtbewegung. Darstellung über den heutigen Stand der Bewegung.* Berlin: Dt. Gartenstadt-Gesellschaft.

Kirschnik, Sylke, 2002. Kolonialpolitik als Vergnügungskultur. In: Alexander Honold and Oliver Simons, eds., *Kolonialismus als Kultur. Literatur, Medien, Wissenschaft in der deutschen Gründerzeit des Fremden.* Tübingen: A. Francke, 221–241.

Kretschmer, Winfried, 1999. *Geschichte der Weltausstellungen.* Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

Lange, Britta, 2006. *Echt – Unecht – Lebensecht. Menschenbilder im Umlauf.* Berlin: Kadmos.

Laukötter, Anja, 2007. *Von der Kultur zur Rasse – vom Objekt zum Körper? Völkerkundemuseen und ihre Wissenschaften zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts.* Bielefeld: transcript.

Lingner, Karl August, 1904. Einige Leitgedanken zu der Sonderausstellung: Volkskrankheiten und ihre Bekämpfung. In: Robert Wuttke, ed., *Die deutschen Städte. Geschildert nach den Ergebnissen der ersten deutschen Städte-Ausstellung zu Dresden 1903.* Vol 2. Leipzig: Friedrich Brandstetter, 531–547.

Lingner, Karl August, 1914. *Der Mensch als Organisationsvorbild: Gastvortrag, gehalten am 14. Dezember 1912 vor dem Professorenkollegium der Universität Bern.* Berlin: Drechsel.

Lundgreen, Peter, 1980. *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Schule im Überblick, 1770–1918.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Obst, Helmut, 2005. *Karl August Lingner. Ein Volkswohltäter?* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Manchini, Elena, 2010. *Magnus Hirschfeld and the Quest for Sexual Freedom.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marsch, Ulrich, 1996. Industrielle Gemeinschaftsforschung in Deutschland und Großbritannien – Kaiser Wilhelm Institute und Research Associations 1916–1936. In: Bernhard von Brocke and Hubert Laitko, eds., *Die Kaiser-Wilhelm/Max-Planck-Gesellschaft und ihre Institute: Studien zu ihrer Geschichte. Das Harnack-Prinzip.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 561–574.

Meier, Gudrun/Petzsch, Hans, 1974. Arnold Jacobi. In: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*. Vol. 10. Duncker & Humblot: Berlin, 220–221.

Metternich, Wolf/Graf, Franz, 1952. Paul Clemen und die Idee der Denkmalpflege. *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 14, 226–233.

Müller-Scheessel, Nils, 2011. “To See is to Know”. Materielle Kultur als Garant von Authentizität auf Weltausstellungen des 19. Jahrhundert. In: Sandra Samida, ed., *Inszenierte Wissenschaft. Zur Popularisierung von Wissen im 19. Jahrhundert*. Bielefeld: transcript, 157–176.

Nikolow, Sybilla, 2001. Der statistische Blick auf Krankheit und Gesundheit. “Kurvenlandschaften” in Gesundheitsausstellungen am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland. In: Ute Gerhard, Jürgen Link and Ernst Schulte-Holtey, eds., *Infografiken, Medien, Normalisierung. Zur Kartografie politisch-sozialer Landschaften*. Heidelberg: Synchron: 223–241.

Nikolow Sybilla/Schirmmacher, Arne, 2007. Das Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit als Beziehungsgeschichte. Historiographische und systematische Perspektive. In: idem, eds., *Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit als Ressource für einander. Studien zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus, 11–35.

Nitschke, Thomas, 2009. *Die Geschichte der Stadt Hellerau*. Dresden: Hellerau Verlag.

Osayimwese, Itohan I., 2008. *Colonialism at the Center: German Colonial Architecture and the Design Reform Movement, 1828–1914*. PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.

Penny, H. Glenn, 2002. *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Plato, Alice von, 2001. *Präsentierte Geschichte. Ausstellungskultur und Massenmedium im Frankreich des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

Plato, Alice von, 2006. Zwischen Hochkultur und Folklore: Geschichte und Ethnologie auf den Französischen Weltausstellungen im 19. Jahrhundert. In: Cordula Grewe, ed., *Die Schau des Fremden. Ausstellungskonzepte zwischen Kunst, Kommerz und Wissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 45–68.

Poser, Stefan, 1998. *Museum der Gefahren. Das Beispiel der Hygiene-Ausstellungen und Museen für Arbeitsschutz in Wien, Berlin und Dresden um die Jahrhundertwende*. Münster: Waxmann.

Pretzel, Andreas, 1996a. Ferdinand Freiherr von Reitzenstein – Lebensgeschichte, Werk und Wirkung eines Kulturanthropologen, der sich der Sozialwissenschaften verschrieb. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 22/23, 13–50.

Pretzel, Andreas, 1996b. Ferdinand von Reitzenstein (1876–1929): Bibliographie und Rezensionen. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 22/23, 51–66.

Programm der Internationalen Hygiene Ausstellung, Historische Abteilung, 1909. Dresden.

Regin, Cornelia, 1995. *Selbsthilfe und Gesundheitspolitik. Die Naturheilbewegung im Kaiserreich (1889–1914)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Reichardt, Eike, 2008. *Health, Race and Empire: Popular Scientific Spectacles and National Identity in Imperial Germany, 1871–1914*. Lulu.com.

Randa-Campani, Sigrid, ed., 2000. "... einfach würdiger Styl! Vom Reichspostmuseum zum Museum für Kommunikation. In: *Katalog der Museumsstiftung Post und Telekommunikation*. Heidelberg: Umschau, 124–173.

Reitzenstein, Ferdinand Freiherr von, 1908a. *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Liebe*. Stuttgart: Franckh'sche Verlagshandlung.

Reitzenstein, Ferdinand Freiherr von, 1909. *Liebe und Ehe im Alten Orient*. Stuttgart: Frankh'sche Verlagshandlung.

Reitzenstein, Ferdinand Freiherr von, 1910a. *Liebe und Ehe im Europäischen Altertum*. Stuttgart: Frankh'sche Verlagshandlung.

Reitzenstein, Ferdinand Freiherr von, 1910b. *Liebe und Ehe in Ostasien und bei den Kulturvölkern Altamerikas*. Stuttgart: Frankh'sche Verlagshandlung.

Reitzenstein, Ferdinand Freiherr von, 1912. *Liebe und Ehe im Mittelalter*. Stuttgart: Frankh'sche Verlagshandlung.

Reitzenstein, Ferdinand Freiherr von, 1908b. *Urgeschichte der Ehe. Ihre Bildung und Entwicklungsgang*. Stuttgart, Frankh'sche Verlagshandlung.

Rössler, Martin, 2007. Die deutschsprachige Ethnologie bis ca. 1960: ein historischer Abriss. *Cologne Working Papers in Cultural and Social Anthropology*, 1, 1–29.

Roth, Martin, ed., 1993. *In aller Munde. Einhundert Jahre Odol*. Dresden: Ed. Canz.

Rütten, Thomas, 2004. Karl Sudhoff and "the Fall" of German Medical History. In: Frank Huisman and John Harley Warner, eds., *Locating Medical History: The Stories and Their Meaning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 95–114.

Schorn-Schütte, Luise, 1984. *Karl Lamprecht. Kulturgeschichtsschreibung zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Sonderkatalog der Hygieneausstellung. Weltausstellung in St. Louis 1904. Deutsches Reich, 1904. Berlin: Julius Springer.

-
- Schrön, Johanna, 2003. "Ein grosses, lebendiges Lehrbuch der Hygiene" – Die Internationale Hygiene Ausstellung von 1911. In: Carsten Kretschmann, ed., *Wissenspopularisierung. Konzepte der Wissensverbreitung im Wandel*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 309–322.
- Stein, Claudia, 2013. Divining and Knowing: Karl Sudhoff's Historical Method. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 87, 198–224.
- Steller, Thomas, 2008. *Das Neue Wissen vom Menschen. Entstehung und Entwicklung des Deutschen Hygiene-Museums in Dresden 1900–1931. Zur Popularisierung eines modernen Menschenbildes*. Master Thesis, Viadrina University Frankfurt a. O.
- Stelzig, Christine, 2005. Felix von Luschan. Ein kunstsinniger Manager am Königlichen Museum für Völkerkunde zu Berlin. In: Ulrich van der Heyden and Joachim Zeller, eds., "... Macht und Anteil an der Weltherrschaft." *Berlin und der deutsche Kolonialismus*. Münster: Unrast.
- Sudhoff, Karl, 1921. *Skizzen*. Leipzig: F.C.W Vogel.
- Sudhoff, Karl, 1926. An Historical Museum of the Healing Art. In: idem., *Essays in the History of Medicine*. Ed. by Fielding H. Garrison. New York: Medical Life Press, 321–339.
- Sudhoff, Karl, 1929. Aus meiner Arbeit. Eine Rückschau. *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin*, 21, 333–387.
- Timmermann, Carsten, 1999. *Weimar Medical Culture: Doctors, Healers and the Crisis of Medicine in Interwar Germany, 1918–33*. PhD Dissertation, Manchester University .
- Väht-Hinz, Henriette, 1998. *Odol. Reklamekunst um 1900*. Giessen: Anabas-Verlag.
- Walter, Frank/Regin, Cornelia, 1991. Der Verband der Vereine für Volksgesundheit. In: Franz Walter, Viola Denecke and Cornelia Regin, eds., *Sozialistische Gesundheits- und Lebensreformverbände*. 2 Vols. Bonn: Dietz Nachfahren.
- Weule, Karl, 1908/1909. Die nächsten Aufgaben und Ziele des Leipziger Völkerkundemuseums. In: *Jahrbuch des Städtischen Museum für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig*, 3, 151–174.
- Weule, Karl, 1912. *Leitfaden der Völkerkunde*. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut.
- Winkler, Kurt, ed., 1999. *Gefühlte Geschichte. 100 Jahre Märkisches Museum*. Berlin: Verlag M.
- Wolff, Julius Ferdinand, 1930. *Lingner und sein Vermächtnis*. Hellerau: Hegener.

Wuttke, Robert, ed., 1904. *Die deutschen Städte. Geschildert nach den Ergebnissen der ersten deutschen Städte-Ausstellung zu Dresden 1903*. 2 Vols. Leipzig: Friedrich Brandstetter.

Wyss, Beat, 2010. *Bilder von der Globalisierung. Die Weltausstellung von Paris 1889*. Berlin: Insel Verlag.

Zimmermann, Andrew, 2001. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zimmermann, Andrew, 1991. Geschichtslose und schriftlose Völker in Spreeathen. Anthropologie als Kritik der Geschichtswissenschaft im Kaiserreich. *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 47, 197–210.

Dr Claudia Stein

Department of History

University of Warwick

Coventry

CV47AL

United Kingdom