

MIT Open Access Articles

Review of "Berlin Electropolis: Shock, Nerves, and German Modernity."

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. *Please share* how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation: Cavicchi, Elizabeth. "Berlin Electropolis: Shock, Nerves, and German Modernity." Technology and Culture 49, no. 1 (2008): 256-257. https://doi.org/10.1353/tech.2008.0005

As Published: https://doi.org/10.1353/tech.2008.0005

Persistent URL: https://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/151951

Version: Author's final manuscript: final author's manuscript post peer review, without publisher's formatting or copy editing

Terms of Use: Article is made available in accordance with the publisher's policy and may be subject to US copyright law. Please refer to the publisher's site for terms of use.



Citation: Cavicchi, Elizabeth. "Berlin Electropolis: Shock, Nerves, and German

Modernity." *Technology and Culture* 49, no. 1 (2008): 256-257. Publisher link: https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/1/article/230898/summary

Berlin Electropolis: Shock, Nerves, and German Modernity. By Andreas Killen. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006. Pp. viii+295.

Modernity seems inseparable from electricity now, but in the past these two jolted in unsteady, often renegotiated rhythm. Killen tracks that rough ride's effect on Germans' bodies and psyches through the diagnoses and treatments they incurred as well as the insurance systems paying – or not – for these patients' treatments. The capital city of Berlin, crux of electrical and industrial modernization under the German Empire and communication center through the Weimar Republic, provides Killen's replete context for researching professionals' evolving attitudes toward psychiatric impacts of that newly frenetic life. In turn, changes in those attitudes affected society at large, as exemplified in the cultural bookends to this study: the 1896 International Trade Exhibition at Berlin's Treptow Park and the 1927 silent film *Metropolis* of Fritz Lang (a science fiction classic). While electricity and people consort harmoniously in the trade show's idealized imagery, their fusion has gone deeply awry in the mass maelstrom of human and electrical breakdown that dooms the seemingly Utopian Metropolis.

With modernity came "neurasthenia", an ailment that was considered physical when it first arose in upper-class men and mental when it later arose in the lower classes and women. Upper-class complaints of "sick nerves" repaid early sufferers with rest in rural sanatoriums, and therapeutic electrical treatments to bring the body's electricity into better balance. But the disease – or the claims made upon it – spread beyond the bounds of elite society with its personal resources for financing cures. Dealing with accelerating incidence of "nervousness" among the lower classes necessitated less lavish modalities of prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and payment. In the process of adapting to a wider clientele, the professionals reconstructed the import of nervous diseases along different lines. Whereas nineteenth century sufferers were deemed victims of accidents or other stresses instantiated in their bodies, those who succumbed in the next century were increasingly considered at fault for their condition, either by willful malingering or due to degraded heredity. These disease constructs projected a stigma onto ordinary people having psychological hardships, previously considered as hazards of modernity.

While the professionals accomplishing this shift from bodily to psychiatric causes included physicians at high-status posts, its wide implementation came through actions of others vested in publicly sponsored industries: railways, military, telephone exchanges. This new class included medical agents and examiners carrying out the health coverage provisions of German social insurance, inaugurated in 1884. As workers became savvy in articulating grounds for compensation, these examiners sought to discredit claims and to expose "simulants" (imposters), sometimes by applying electrodes while leaving the current switched off. Doctors under the mandate of cutting costs and getting patients back to work – even where that meant sending shell-shocked soldiers back to the front – began describing the social insurance program itself as the root cause of nervous maladies. Berlin telephone girls who broke down, whether from overloads such as connecting 600 calls an hour by hand or from electrical shocks, were labeled as attention-seekers manipulating the system. When a 1926 change in the insurance laws eliminated coverage for accident-induced nervous ailments, it reinforced a new medical consensus. Nervous disorders were now said to be purely psychic, having no somatic dimension. Individuals alone, not modern society, were responsible for rectifying their mental states.

The story Killen develops draws on his extensive groundwork in German sources, including physicians' publications, hospital and state archives, and periodicals of electrical industries, but omits illustrations, artifacts and nontextual resources. Authoritative tones in these professionals' writing obscure any internal, personal doubts, while patients' voices surface only in doctors' reports, not as independent authors. By contrast, through her historical fiction *Regeneration*, Pat Barker explored inner turmoils of British psychiatrist William Rivers over treating shell-shocked WWI soldiers to resume duty. Killen too suggests fiction sees into nervous sufferings what fact cannot, by repeatedly quoting Alfred Döblin's 1929 novel *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (German counterpart to Joyce's *Ulysses*). Döblin, a psychiatrist practicing in working-class Berlin, understood patients' frustrations with doctors who certify as healthy those afflicted with "sick nerves".

Handling nervous disorders as personal fiction ungrounded in factual bodies, German psychiatry established a consensus that excused modern society from upfront rehabilitation costs, leveled stigma on sufferers, and entrenched divisions between psyche and body that remain today. Perhaps Killen's historical view can assist us all in questioning those practices.

Elizabeth Cavicchi July 2007