German Historical Institute London

Bulletin

Volume XXI, No. 2 November 1999

CONTENTS

cont.

SEMINARS AT THE GHIL
AUTUMN 1999

28 Sept. PROFESSOR WINFRIED SCHULZE (Munich)
German Historians and National Socialism

Winfried Schulze has published widely on the social and political history of early modern Europe. He is also interested in the history of historiography, as is documented by his *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945* (1989), and, most recently, *Deutsche Historiker im Nationalsozialismus* (1999, ed. with O.G. Oexle).

2 Nov. PROFESSOR FRANZ-JOSEF BRÜGGEMEIER (Freiburg)
Waldsterben: The Construction and Deconstruction of an Environmental Problem

Franz-Josef Brüggemeier is professor of social and economic history. He has recently published *Das unendliche Meer der Lüfte: Luftverschmutzung, Industrialisierung, und Risikodebatten im 19. Jahrhundert* (1996), and *Tschernobyl, 26. April 1986. Die ökologische Herausforderung* (1998).

30 Nov. PROFESSOR JEREMY D. NOAKES (Exeter)
The Nazi Party and *Menschenführung*, or who was leading whom and where to?

Jeremy Noakes is one of the foremost British experts on National Socialism. He is perhaps best known for the documentary readers on various aspects of the Third Reich which he has edited, the most recent being *German Home Front in World War II* (1998).

7 Dec. PROFESSOR WOLFGANG REINHARD (Freiburg)
European Models of the State in Colonial and Post-Colonial Power Processes

Wolfgang Reinhard has published widely on many aspects of the history of European expansion, as well as on the history of the papacy in early modern Europe. His most recent publications include *Geschichte der Staatsgewalt. Eine Verfassungsgeschichte Europas von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (1999), and *Parasit oder Partner: Europäische Wirtschaft und Neue Welt 1500-1800* (1998).

Seminars are held at 5 p.m. in the Seminar Room of the GHIL.
Tea is served from 4.30 p.m. in the Common Room, and wine is available after the seminars.

THE 1999 ANNUAL LECTURE

Continuity and Change
Political and Social Developments in Germany
after 1945 and 1989/90

will be given by

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. GERHARD A. RITTER (Munich)

on Friday 12 November 1999, at 5 p.m.

Reception to follow

REVIEW ARTICLES

MAJOR BIOGRAPHIES OF MARGINAL FIGURES?

by Andreas Fahrmeir

SAUL DAVID, *Prince of Pleasure: The Prince of Wales and the Making of the Regency* (London: Little, Brown and Co., 1998), x + 484 pp. ISBN 0 316 64616 4. £22.50
E. A. SMITH, *George IV*, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), xiv, 306 pp. ISBN 0 300 0768 5 1. £25.00
BRUCE SEYMOUR, *Lola Montez: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), x + 468 pp. ISBN 0 300 07439 5. £10.95 (paperback). ISBN 0 300 06347 4. £25.00 (hardback)
THOMAS WEIDNER (ed.), *Lola Montez oder eine Revolution in München* (Eurasburg: Edition Minerva, 1998), 367 pp. ISBN 3 932353 23 4. DM 98.00. EUR 49.28

George IV and Lola Montez were people of very different rank. The moment George Augustus Frederick was born as the heir to the throne of Britain and Hanover it was clear that, unless death intervened prematurely, he would at least appear in many historical works. When Elizabeth Gilbert was born on 17 February 1821 in Grange near Sligo as the daughter of a British officer, it was relatively unlikely that she would be remembered much after her death. Yet in spite of the huge difference in status, the two figures shared the fate of having remained for many years on the fringes of historical interest, until a surprising recent renaissance. For the regent and later king of a country which had emerged victorious from a protracted war against Napoleon, and which did not permanently diverge from a course of reform, modernization, and industrial growth, George IV has had a singularly bad press. Indeed, historians usually considered him largely irrelevant to the successes or failures of the British political system, and too much of a 'bad king' to be taken seriously even as a patron of the arts.[1] In

[1] Rudolf Muhs, 'Georg IV.', in Peter Wende (ed.), *Englische Könige und Königinnen. Von Heinrich VII. bis Elisabeth II.* (Munich, 1998), pp. 242-4.

different ways, both Saul David and E. A. Smith set out to revise this impression.

In the case of Lola Montez, the resurgence of interest is even more stunning. At least five books on her, three of them biographies, have appeared since 1992 – before then, not even a handful of biographies of her had been published.[2] However, the subject headings attached to these books in the catalogue of the British Library confirm that, at this level, at least, her relevance is still seen as restricted to 'Ludwig I – King of Bavaria – Relations with women' (although a book limited to Lola Montez can only scratch the surface of this topic), 'Courtesans – Biography', or 'Mistresses – Biography'. There is no mention of such categories as 'Bavaria – 1848 Revolution – Cause of', which would seem equally justifiable. Books on George IV, by contrast, are, of course, indexed under the much better-sounding 'Kings and Rulers – Biography'.

The sudden interest in such figures as George IV and Lola Montez by leading academic publishers seems to be more than a coincidence. Others could have been chosen, but it so happens that two books on each figure have appeared in the last couple of years. To a certain extent, these books – and others treating similar 'marginal figures' – seem to represent the latest episode in the continuing search by historians (whether full-time university employees or independent authors) for topics that will appeal to a broader audience and therefore 'sell' books, first to publishers, then to readers. In this perspective, the combination of plenty of sex, some politics, and a dash of adventure which characterized their lives makes both George IV and Lola Montez ideal subjects for such an exercise today. From the more specialized viewpoint of professional historians, these books provide an opportunity for a re-examination of seemingly well-known periods from a different perspective. In doing so, they raise new questions: in the one case, about the character and political significance of Britain's perhaps most maligned king in recent memory; in the other, about the remarkable career and short-lived political impact of one of the world's most interesting adventuresses. So how successful is this new approach in an intellectual perspective?

2 In addition to the books reviewed here, these are Roberto Giardina, *Lola Montez: Ballerina e avventuriera. Vita di Eliza Dolores Gilbert contessa di Landsfeld* (Milan, 1992); Reinhold Rauh, *Lola Montez: Die königliche Mätresse* (Munich, 1992); and James F. Varley, *Lola Montez: The California Adventures of Europe's Notorious Courtesan* (Spokane, 1996).

I

On the face of it, the biographies of George IV by Saul David and E. A. Smith are quite similar. Both promise readable 'lives' written for a public which extends beyond specialists; both indicate that they will re-evaluate their key figure in the light of new evidence and new interpretations. In one sense, this seems comparatively easy (in so far as it can ever be easy to write a good biography), as it is hard to make George IV's life appear dull. Its main events are well known, and need hardly be repeated here: his difficult relationship with his father; his gambling and building debts; his secret and illegal but temporarily happy marriage to Mrs Maria Fitzherbert, a Catholic, which might have cost him the throne; his legal marriage to Caroline of Brunswick, which allowed him to discharge some of his debts, but which proved disastrous; his architectural enterprises; his splendid coronation; and the sad figure he cut in politics. It is as Prince of Wales that George has become most prominent in popular perception: as a blond blockhead in *Blackadder*; as a scheming figure in the background of the royal court, conspiring against the emotionally challenged but competent Prime Minister, Pitt the Younger, in *The Madness of King George*.

The difficulty lies partly in giving a new twist to this story, and partly in actually telling the story well. George IV's correspondence has been published. All documents associated with his secret marriage came to light some time ago. New revelations are thus not really to be expected. The two biographies discussed here approach the challenge this presents in different ways. Whereas Saul David emphasizes the cultural achievements of 'the Regency in its widest sense (1800-1830)' (p. 3), the late E. A. Smith wants to re-evaluate George's image as a politician, crediting him with the 'survival' of the function of the monarch in British politics (p. xi). David has picked the more promising approach, but written a disappointing book, whereas Smith has written a magisterial biography which does not quite manage to support the thesis he sets out in the introduction.

Saul David's book is geared towards a somewhat wider readership than Smith's. It includes more general background than the volume in the Yale English Monarchs series, ranging from passages on Britain's economic and industrial development to the history of Mrs Fitzherbert's family. David does not hesitate to render episodes in direct speech (if the sources permit this), and generally writes in a lighter vein than Smith. The caricature on the dust jacket is also more inviting than the more

austere (but, considering Smith's purpose, more apt) official portrait on the cover of the Yale volume. Finally, David is more confident in accepting some of the more controversial findings of recent research or speculation, which makes his book appear more on the 'cutting edge' of developments. He has no doubt whatever that George III, George IV, and probably George IV's daughter Charlotte suffered from porphyria, whereas Smith more prudently 'prefers to reserve judgement' (Smith, p. 50). David also gives some credence to Kenneth Griffith's recent assertion that George III, too, contracted a secret marriage, and in fact had a son from this union who was sent to a remote part of South Africa. It is disappointing, however, that the only reference David provides is to an article in the *Sunday Times*, even though documents in support of the theory are said to have been found in Court of Chancery files, which should have been checked as well.

However, David's book suffers from a number of major problems. First, there are numerous obvious errors, which may be due to the oversights of copy-editors or typesetters, but which are nevertheless annoying. For example, readers could get the impression that George III somehow acceded to the British throne several times over, and that the 'first' of these accessions occurred in 1769 (p. 6), that there was one 'Livery Company of London' (p. 40), and that Mrs Fitzherbert possessed an abundance of 'moral turpitude' (the intended sense being 'goodness') (p. 278).

The second, more serious, point is the odd way in which David skips straight from Queen Caroline's trial to the death of George IV. No explanation for this is provided. As mentioned above, his introduction defines the 'Regency' as the period up to 1830, and George's cultural influence was arguably stronger when he was king than when he was merely Prince of Wales or regent. By contrast, if David merely wished to deal with the prehistory and history of the Regency proper, there is no reason to include the trial of Queen Caroline in the House of Lords for adultery, which occurred after George became king. The structure leaves the somewhat unfortunate impression that David's interest lies more in the Prince's sexual escapades, which seem to have decreased after his coronation as a consequence of age and obesity, than in any other aspect of George's career.

This impression is confirmed by David's somewhat exaggerated fondness for his discovery of an 'extraordinary account' of the Prince of Wales's wedding night with Princess Caroline in the Malmesbury

Papers (p. 170). As far as I can see, it does not really add much to our previous knowledge of that unfortunate occasion. George, a lover of beauty with a fondness for women older than himself was so appalled by the fact that his younger bride had a deep-seated aversion to soap and water that he could only bring himself to marry her in a state of intoxication, and to consummate the marriage as soon as he had sufficiently recovered early the next morning. And, as coincidence would have it, he fathered a daughter on this occasion. The one interesting element of the detailed description of what exactly turned George off, namely 'scars', which could have been a reference to venereal disease, is not exploited by David, but the statement that the prince and princess actually had intercourse three times (rather than, as had previously been thought, once) is repeated at intervals throughout the book (for example, pp. 2, 170, 279).

Equally unfortunate is the fact that George's cultural influence, ostensibly one of the main topics of the book, is merely postulated rather than documented and explored. We are told what Carlton House cost to build, and the consequences of the debt, but little about its design, furnishings, and the like. Unfortunately, therefore, David's answer to his guiding question, namely whether George was the 'most polished gentleman' or 'the most accomplished blackguard' remains extremely superficial (p. 429).

E. A. Smith's biography, a much more carefully researched and produced book, covers the whole life of its subject, placing particular emphasis on his years as king. It does not devote quite as much space to the Queen Caroline affair as one might have expected, perhaps because Smith did not wish to go over ground which he has already discussed elsewhere (*A Queen on Trial*, 1993). It is clear that this book will be the standard biography of George IV for many years to come. Smith emphasizes the structural problems of George's position much more clearly, even though his interpretation does not differ greatly from David's: George's difficult relationship with his father, his permanent debts, his dependence on anybody who was willing to help pay them off, and his personal friendship with Charles James Fox, which led to the mutual attraction between him and the opposition until he actually came close to becoming regent or king. His political affiliation in turn deepened his estrangement from his parents, thus making it even more unlikely that his financial affairs would be sorted out. Smith argues that when George actually obtained power, a little-known side of his character

became apparent. He turned out to be not a creative or inspired, but at least a prudent politician, who managed to hang on to part of the royal prerogative against the odds, both by using it carefully and by courting popularity in the more remote parts of his dominions, in Scotland, Ireland and Hanover. This interpretation is backed up by a careful study of his interventions in the formation of governments, and, indeed, Smith succeeds in showing that George acquired a degree of political maturity.

While this is a much-needed correction of the traditional image of George IV, it does not quite deliver what Smith promises in his introduction. Even if George IV can be credited with saving the monarchy in troubled times (which assumes a degree of revolutionary potential in Britain in the years around 1800 which may not actually have existed), the real or imaginary threat of the monarchy's demise as a political factor was largely, if not entirely, a result of disastrous policy choices made by George as Prince of Wales and as regent, which Smith documents in great and damning detail. A comparative perspective would perhaps have made this point even better. Whereas other monarchs began to refashion their image as prudent servants of the state – as David Barclay has shown for Frederick William IV of Prussia, who admittedly ruled a generation later[3] – George IV failed to acquire a reputation other than that of a rake about town. His building programme, too, which remains his most lasting achievement, seems curiously out of date. At a time of severe economic disruption, vast sums of public money were being squandered on private residences (which, in the case of Carlton House, did not even survive for very long), not, as in Ludwig I's Bavaria, for example, on public buildings and monuments. Even his 'discovery' of Scotland and the kilt indicates his artistic sensitivities, but not a systematic public relations exercise. If Britain indeed came close to curbing the monarch's role, then George IV may well have been saved from disaster by his comparatively prudent choice of mistresses, particularly by the loyalty of Maria Fitzherbert (who could, after all, have moved to France or elsewhere, published the fact of her wedding, and caused serious trouble for George).

Thus Smith's book does not provide any striking new insights into the Regency era, but that was neither his nor the series' editors intention. Indeed, it would seem that such new insights are relatively unlikely to

3 David E. Barclay, *Frederick William IV and the Prussian Monarchy 1840-61* (Oxford, 1995).

emerge from a study of such a well-researched figure as the Prince Regent, if the perspective remains focused largely on his private life on the one hand, and politics on the other.

II

While there is not much of a connection between George IV and Lola Montez, George IV and Ludwig I of Bavaria did share two passions: women and architecture. But whereas George IV did not lose his throne over his affairs (even though he may have come close to doing so), Ludwig I was less fortunate in this respect. His problems began on 7 October 1846, when he made the acquaintance of a young woman calling herself Lola Montez. The sixteen months she spent in Munich turned her from an exotic dancer into a political figure, albeit only for a brief period and within the confines of a medium-sized German state. Bruce Seymour's lively and sympathetic biography traces the life of Elizabeth Rosanna Gilbert from her birth on 17 February 1821 in Grange near Sligo to her death in New York on 17 January 1861. Elizabeth Gilbert grew up in the environment of the Indian military, her mother having moved there with her husband. When Elizabeth was sent back to Britain to receive an education befitting a lady, she, too, eloped with an Indian officer; the marriage took place in 1837.

Eliza Gilbert does not appear to have been an easy woman to live with. The marriage soon failed. By 1840, she was back in London, co-habiting with a Lieutenant Lennox, who also soon tired of her, but whose existence allowed her first husband to sue for divorce. Their separation was pronounced in 1842, but, as usual in those days, it gave neither party the right to remarry. At this point, Eliza found it necessary to embark on a career of her own. She went to Spain, where she acquired a knowledge of Spanish and Spanish dances, and returned in 1843 as Lola Montez, a 'noble refugee' from the political turmoil in her native country, forced to make a living on the stage. Seymour traces her theatrical successes and failures in Britain and Europe through the published reviews. In London, of course, some people remembered her under a different name, and more questioned her Spanish credentials. In northern Europe, a pattern soon emerged: a swift departure after an initial success (or without being allowed on stage), due either to negative criticism, or conflicts with the authorities because, in common with other British travellers of the day, Eliza Gilbert did not suffer Continental gendarmes gladly or quietly. Having arrived in Paris in

1844, Lola settled down in a relationship with the editor of the left-leaning journal *La Presse*, Alexandre-Henri Dujarier. When Dujarier was killed in a duel the next year, she was driven back on to Europe's stages.

When she appealed to Ludwig I in person against the refusal of her request to appear on stage in the Bavarian capital, she met a king enthusiastic about all things Spanish, who was immediately fascinated by her. The feeling appears to have been somewhat one-sided, or Lola Montez was extremely gifted at assessing the erotic needs of her partners. While she granted her favours much more generously to other residents of Munich, she allowed the monarch to make love to her only twice (the correspondence between 'Luis' and 'Lolitta', which was edited in 1995 by Bruce Seymour and another of Lola Montez's biographers, Reinhold Rauh, spells this out in great detail, probably because they did not have all that much else to write about).

However, the presence of an assertive, emancipated royal favourite, who smoked and meddled in politics, soon proved to be more than the burghers of the Catholic city of Munich were willing to accept. Tensions between Ludwig and his church-orientated government were heightened by Lola's ill-judged demand for Bavarian citizenship. The issue arose because even if Lola was able to hoodwink Ludwig into believing she was Spanish, it would have been more difficult to convince a Spanish consular official, and applying for British travel documents at a British consulate would have called her bluff. Her request for naturalization, which Ludwig received with enthusiasm, led to the resignation of the cabinet of prime minister Karl-August von Abel. Lola Montez did become Bavarian on 28 February 1847 after a new prime minister had been appointed, but as time went by Ludwig had increasing difficulty in finding ministers willing to countenance his generosity in the face of increasing popular hostility to the obnoxious foreigner. Created Countess of Landsfeld in August 1847, by February 1848 Lola was forced to flee Munich by violent demonstrations, and on 17 March 1848 Ludwig denationalized her and ordered her arrest should she return to Bavaria. However, only the abdication of the king in favour of his son, Maximilian II, could restore calm. To be sure, Maximilian's affection for Prussian, Protestant historians was also to cause some popular opposition, but this never even remotely threatened his rule.

Seymour chronicles the remainder of Lola Montez's life in equal detail. The allowance Ludwig paid her was not enough to finance exile in Switzerland in the style to which she deemed herself entitled.

Returning to Britain, she married an officer named Heald who possessed a considerable income, but only narrowly escaped a conviction for bigamy by forfeiting £2000 bail, her first husband not having been considerate enough to die on time. When Heald decided to leave her, Lola could do little more than attempt to convert her notoriety into cash by publishing her memoirs, and by going on tour with a play purporting to represent her experience in Bavaria. Her search for an audience led her farther and farther afield: from the East Coast of the United States to California, and finally to Australia. During the last years of her life she lectured in the United States and Britain and wrote on such topics as *The Arts of Beauty*. She was buried under a name she never used, Mrs Eliza Gilbert. Her gravestone was recently restored by Bruce Seymour.

Seymour's book is a gripping account of what must have been one of the most remarkable careers of the nineteenth century. If there is one criticism one can make of it, it is its narrow focus on Lola Montez's personal biography, which is a drawback in the chapters on Munich. Seymour does point out that Lola Montez's behaviour there, not least her calls for censorship and more heavy-handed state intervention against her enemies are at odds with the role of the persecuted Anglo-Saxon-style liberal she later claimed to have been. By showing how Ludwig ruthlessly used his influence to have officials who disagreed with Lola Montez posted to other locations or demoted, Seymour also highlights the limits of the rule of law, and the extent of absolute monarchical power in this comparatively progressive German state – painting a very different picture from the harmonious, professional image of Bavaria which appears in Marita Krauss's recent *Herrschaftspraxis in Bayern und Preußen im 19. Jahrhundert* (1997), for example. On the other hand, James F. Harris's *The People Speak! Anti-Semitism and Emancipation in Nineteenth-Century Bavaria* (1994) has documented the depth of popular opposition to Jewish emancipation, which suggests that, under the circumstances, censorship and authoritarian government may have been necessary to achieve liberal goals in some cases. In short, the details of Bavarian politics of the day, and the identity of the pro- and anti-Lola factions remain somewhat vague.

This gap is filled by Thomas Weidner's volume on *Lola Montez oder eine Revolution in München*, which contains everything one could ever wish to know on the subject. The book is one of those lavish exhibition catalogues which German regional and municipal museums fortunately are still able to produce, and which are not only of high intellectual

quality, but also an aesthetic pleasure. The first part of the book contains eight essays on the events of 1847-8 in Munich (described by Richard Bauer) and on their context; Ralf Zerback, who has recently published an excellent monograph on the Munich middle classes,[4] examines the relationship between 'King, Lady, and Bourgeois'; Karin Hellweg discusses Ludwig I's fascination with Spain in the context of the fashions of the day; Raimund Wünsche describes a collection of fake antique vases Lola Montez assembled in Munich; Christof Metzger contributes a biography of Prince Ludwig of Oettingen-Wallerstein, Abel's successor as prime minister; Achim Sieg analyses the place of the 1848 revolution in the memoirs of Ludwig I's successor Maximilian II; Bruce Seymour deals with 'Lola Montez's lies', that is, her somewhat one-sided version of what happened in Munich; and Reinhold Rauh draws out the long perspectives, 'From Lola Montez to Madonna'.

The second part of the book is a highly informative and entertaining essay on Lola Montez in Munich by Thomas Weidner, covering everything from her first meeting with the king to the portraits painted of her, caricatures, the building and furnishing of her *palais*, Lola Montez as a modern woman (the shock of Munich burghers at the arrival of modern times is exemplified by the fact that they preserved the last cigarette she smoked in the city in the local history collection), the intrigues at court, and Ludwig's abdication. The volume concludes with a list of the exhibits displayed in the Munich Stadtmuseum last year. It does much to strengthen the case for viewing the Bavarian situation as exceptional even in the diverse circumstances of the 1848 revolution. The spark which set off the revolution was the entirely coincidental situation which brought Ludwig I and Lola Montez together in an unlikely, explosive mixture. Had he picked another mistress, things might well have turned out very differently. Because the revolution began earlier in Munich than elsewhere in Germany, and because its focus was, in some ways, moral rather than political or social, it was comparatively easy to control by removing the two offending personages: Lola Montez by deportation, and Ludwig I by abdication. In this case, the spotlight on Lola Montez does produce something of a new perspective for the overall view of nineteenth-century Bavarian history.

4 Ralf Zerback, *München und sein Stadtbürgertum. Eine Residenzstadt als Bürgergemeinde, 1780-1870* (Munich, 1997).

ANDREAS FAHRMEIR has been a Research Fellow at the German Historical Institute London since 1997. His Cambridge Ph.D. thesis will be published in 2000 as *Citizens and Aliens: Foreigners and the Law in Britain and the German States, 1789-1870*. His current project is a study of municipal self-government in the Corporation of London in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

REFLECTIONS ON WRITING NATIONAL HISTORY IN GERMANY, 1870-1970

by Georg G. Iggers

ULRICH LANGER, *Heinrich von Treitschke. Politische Biographie eines deutschen Nationalisten* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1998), vi + 445 pp. ISBN 3 7700 1093 0. DM 49.80
HANS CYMOREK, *Georg von Below und die deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft um 1900*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 142 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998), 374 pp. ISBN 3 515 07314 0. DM 128.00
THOMAS HERTFELDER, *Franz Schnabel und die deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft. Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Historismus und Kulturkritik (1910-1945)*, 2 parts, Schriftenreihe der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 60 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 835 pp. ISBN 3 525 36053 3. DM 180.00
ERNST SCHULIN, *Hermann Heimpel und die deutsche Nationalgeschichtsschreibung. Vorgetragen am 14. Februar 1997*, Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, 9 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1998), 121 pp. ISBN 3 8253 0765 4. DM 28.00
PETER SCHÖTTLER (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung als Legitimationswissenschaft 1918-1945* (Frankfurt on Main: Suhrkamp, 1997), 344 pp. ISBN 3 518 28933 0. DM 24.80

Recent theoretical discussions have re-emphasized the central role of narrative in historical writing. Except for very occasional attempts at dispensing with narrative in the models of the new economic history, all written history has been narrative. Yet many historians have been no more conscious of this than we are of breathing the air. Recent discussions have challenged two basic characteristics of historical studies in the past two centuries. One is the notion of objectivity, the belief that historians deal with a concrete past which can be recaptured through critical reference to sources. Critics such as Roland Barthes and Hayden White have argued that every historical account, once it proceeds beyond the mere statement of factual data, involves elements of imagination which link these data into a coherent story. Hence, they conclude, there is no clear line of demarcation between history and literature. A second related criticism concerns the alleged prejudice of Western thought

since the Enlightenment to project what Lyotard and others have called a 'master narrative' into the past, to see a continuous story which possesses unity and direction. This narrative always serves to give legitimacy and a sense of identity to a community which, most commonly in the historical writing of the past two centuries, has been a national community, although other communities – regional, transnational, confessional – are possible.

One of the major arguments of recent literature on nationalism (Anderson, Gellner, Hobsbawm)[1] has been that the awareness of national identity is a product of the recent past, that it did not exist in the distant past as nineteenth-century historians such as Michelet, Droysen, or Macaulay assumed, but rather, that it had consciously been 'invented' by political intellectuals since the era of the French Revolution, and that historians had played a significant role in this process of invention. There is undoubtedly a strong element of truth to this, but some sense of ethnic, if not national identity, was certainly present at a much earlier stage, if we think of the tradition of anti-French and anti-Italian sentiment in Reformation Germany, or of anti-German sentiment in Hussite Bohemia, although these sentiments did not involve commitment to the idea of a national state. All of the works under review in this essay deal with German historians of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century who, as Kevin Charles Cramer argues, sought to construct 'a coherent, unifying, and persuasive national narrative of the divisive episodes of the German past' and 'wanted to establish a "German history" on a par with the histories of France and Britain'.[2]

I am intentionally beginning with Cramer's 1998 dissertation, although it has not been yet published but is available only through UMI Dissertation Services, because it formulates most clearly the theoretical problems involved in the construction of a German national history and keeps in mind the fact, too often neglected in the literature,

1 See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983); Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford, 1983); Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge, 1990).

2 Kevin Charles Cramer, 'The Lamentations of Germany: the Historiography of the Thirty Years' War, 1790-1890', Ph. D. Dissertation (Harvard University, 1998), p. 1.

that there were counter-narratives to the dominant Prussian-Protestant historiography. Cramer also espouses the idea that national identities were 'invented', not 'found'. While David Hume could write an English national history in the eighteenth century, which, as he claimed, lay on every coffee table in Great Britain, this was not possible in Germany at that time because there was no German nation. There were *Reichsgeschichten*, but these were not the histories of a national community. 'Most Germans', Cramer writes, 'could not conceive of a "national" history such as existed in the collective memory of the English or the French. The German historical consciousness was grounded in *Heimat*, village, town, and city ... But modern nation building required that these divisive alliances be bound together within the unitary scheme of a coherent national history.'[3] Yet the construction of a German historical identity took place in the aftermath of the destruction of the Holy Roman Empire in the Napoleonic era in a conflict between Prussian-orientated Protestants and Habsburg-orientated Catholics. Hence it resulted in the construction of two national histories along confessional lines, one *kleindeutsch* and one *großdeutsch*, the latter not in the Nazi sense of a unitary racial nation, but of a confederation of German states including Austria. 'The debate over the "meaning" of the Thirty Years' War was a struggle over historical national identity', Cramer argues.[4] The victory of the Prussian Protestant side established the hegemony of its historiography.

It is, of course, ironic that the very professionalization of historical studies in the nineteenth century with its imperative of objectivity and research went hand in hand with the ideological uses of historical study for the legitimization of national aspirations. Yet Hayden White's reduction of competing versions of the same events in the past reduces historical controversies into mere 'stylistic and linguistic clashes'. But these clashes, Cramer maintains, were more than that: they centred on political issues. They were attempts to extract 'moral meaning from the "chaos" of history through the construction of a coherent narrative ... Their arguments about meaning, while ideological, were still about reality not representation.'[5]

Yet with the military decisions of 1866 and their political consequences, the *großdeutsch* conception was increasingly forced into the

[3] Ibid., p. 270.
[4] Ibid., p. 4.
[5] Ibid., p. 12.

background, at least in Germany. However, it continued to be dormant, and later in the twentieth century it flowed into the historical world picture of the Nazis, as we shall see in the Schöttler volume to be discussed below. A very different Catholic viewpoint, as we shall also see below, is formulated from a democratic perspective in Franz Schnabel's history of Germany in the first half of the nineteenth century. First we shall turn, however, to Ulrich Langer's political biography of Heinrich von Treitschke. Treitschke marks the transition of German historical consciousness from an earlier liberalism to an increasingly aggressive and authoritarian nationalism. One may argue about the extent to which his radical nationalism represented the outlook of a majority of Germans after 1871 – not only Social Democrats and Catholics but also Progressives deviated from his extreme position and projected different conceptions. Nevertheless Treitschke played a crucial role, although more through his journalistic writings and public statements than his actual historical work. Yet his history of Germany in the nineteenth century, which ends before 1848, in its judgements on people and events, points to the course Germany took under Bismarck.

Langer pursues two central theses. The first is that Treitschke's nationalism and that of the German, or at least the *kleindeutsch*, movement for national unity had deep roots in political liberalism. The second is that German liberalism differed profoundly from the normative liberalism dominant in Western Europe. Langer introduces his book with a long critical survey of writings on Treitschke followed by an extensive discussion of works on German liberalism. Outside Germany, particularly during the First World War, Treitschke was presented as the most representative historian of the Kaiserreich who preached a Darwinian doctrine of *Machtpolitik*. In the First World War French intellectuals such as Ernest Lavisse and Emile Durkheim, as well as British historians, held Treitschke responsible for a mentality which had led directly to the war, and was later seen as having contributed to the ideology of National Socialism. Right-wing ideologists such as Otto Westphal and Hans Herzfeld – the latter moved in a more democratic direction after 1945 – vigorously defended Treitschke against these charges, as did the moderate Friedrich Meinecke, who nevertheless rejected Treitschke's view of 'power as the basic purpose (*Selbstzweck*) of the state' (p. 7).

Langer examines two major studies of Treitschke, both written after the end of National Socialism, Walter Bußmann's *Treitschke. Sein Welt- und Geschichtsbild* (1952) and Andreas Dorpalen's *Heinrich von Treitschke*

(1957). Bußmann's study, in Langer's view, constitutes an attempt to rescue Treitschke and the German national tradition from its critics after the German collapse in 1945. Langer criticizes Bußmann for concentrating almost exclusively on the period before 1871 and thus overlooking the time after 1871 in which Treitschke's 'chauvinism, militarism, anti-socialism, and anti-Semitism' became most pronounced (p. 18). In contrast, he heralds Dorpalen's study as 'the only extensive, comprehensive and truly critical biography' of Treitschke, (p. 19), and as one with which he can identify. The question then arises as to why Langer's political biography is needed. Langer notes that no German-language biography of Treitschke exists. Dorpalen, educated in Germany, fled from the Nazis to the United States, and wrote his biography in English. Unfortunately, it has never been translated into German. Unlike Dorpalen, who writes a comprehensive life of Treitschke which links personal development, political involvement, and scholarly work, Langer concentrates on Treitschke's political writings,

The key question which Langer asks is that of Treitschke's relation to liberalism, and the place of liberalism in German politics during Treitschke's adult life time. The title of Langer's dissertation from which this book resulted was, in fact, 'Heinrich von Treitschke und der Liberalismus'. For Langer there is no doubt that Treitschke, at least until the *Reichsgründung*, was a liberal; afterwards his relationship to liberalism became increasingly problematical. However, the question arises here of what exactly is meant by liberalism in this context. In a very useful section Langer examines various studies of German liberalism. The most significant of these are by Leonard Krieger[6] and James Sheehan,[7] both Americans. Langer agrees with them that liberalism in Germany was something different from in the West, where it had a 'normative' meaning which stressed the autonomy of the individual against the power of the state. Liberalism in Germany, as in Western Europe, was closely linked with the *Bürgertum*, which was the dominant and rising social force in Germany, as it was in Western European societies. Although there was what Langer calls a radical liberal wing in Germany, it was marginal; for the main currents of the *Bürgertum* freedom could exist only within the framework of a powerful national state. For

[6] Leonard Krieger, *The German Idea of Freedom. History of a Political Tradition* (2nd edn; Chicago, 1972).

[7] James J. Sheehan, *German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago, 1978).

Krieger the key fault of German liberalism was that it separated itself from the 'democratic ideal of popular sovereignty' (p. 37).

Sheehan tries to modify Krieger's perception by stressing that the social basis of the liberal movement was not narrowly situated in the classes of *Besitz* and *Bildung* but also included 'artisans, farmers, students, and apprentices' (pp. 45-6). In the face of industrialization and the rise of political and social protest movements, the liberal movement after 1848 included not only a minority wing which affirmed modernization, but also an increasingly large wing which faced modernization ambivalently, was afraid of its economic and cultural consequences, and saw the state as a guarantor of social order (p. 46). This development was undoubtedly not restricted to Germany. It intensified after the failed 1848 revolution in response to the intense pressure for national unification and the realization that this could be achieved only under the auspices of the Hohenzollern monarchy. Treitschke's liberalism, even in the earlier phases of his life, represented this second form of liberalism, although he admired English parliamentarism and local self-government. In Langer's words, he was 'outraged by the one-sided privileged position of the Prussian nobility' (p. 379) and their control of the *Herrenhaus*, which he considered a 'bulwark of stagnation'. He thus identified with the *Bürgertum* and its desire for economic and social modernization. On the other hand, he was always fervently opposed to democracy, and proposed the rule of an élite of *Besitz* and *Bildung*. In his essay on Cavour, he embraced a Machiavellianism which accentuates strong personalities, the ruthless use of force, and the beneficial function of war in the cause of national unification.

Langer sees Treitschke until 1871 as a liberal in the German sense, which differs from Western normative forms of liberalism in stressing a strong state. But he notes a radicalization of Treitschke's position after 1871, and especially after 1878, which reflected a change in the German political climate. There was little left of the older liberal heritage. Treitschke became the herald of a radical right which included rabid anti-Semitism and xenophobia, the glorification of military might and war, Lutheranism wedded to a cult of authority, the affirmation of a rigid class society, and an ultra-conservative view of the family and the role of women. Langer thus concludes by giving Treitschke a great deal of responsibility for the 'rise of a climate of intolerance ... and national hubris' which was taken up in the aggressive militaristic and imperialist agitation of the Pan Germans (p. 387) that paved the way to catastrophe.

While there is an extensive literature on Treitschke, including several monographs, Hans Cymorek's study is the first full-scale biography of Georg von Below. And while Treitschke began as a liberal, even if in a specific German sense, von Below was never one. From the beginning he espoused an 'anti-Semitically coloured chauvinism' (p. 37). Cymorek describes Treitschke as von Below's 'idol'. Another of his idols was Adolf Stöcker. Von Below saw Bismarck as the great hero who brought German history to a triumphant culmination. He shared Treitschke's chauvinism and militarism, and pitilessly pursued and persecuted those who deviated from this view. He led the attack against Karl Lamprecht's *Kulturgeschichte* and set out to destroy Lamprecht professionally. He succeeded in having Veit Valentin surrender his *venia legendi* in 1917, and actually put an end to his university career when Valentin opposed the radical annexationism which Below supported. He advocated unrestricted submarine warfare, was a bitter enemy of Bethmann-Hollweg, and an impassioned opponent of the Weimar Republic.

Yet as Cymorek describes, he was full of contradictions. Hans-Ulrich Wehler called him an 'arch-reactionary conservative', while Hartmut Boockmann saw him as the 'grandfather of the *Annales*' (p. 17). Wehler is undoubtedly right; Boockmann overlooks how Marc Bloch saw him, as becomes apparent from his obituary (see below). Nevertheless, there were several sides to Below. Despite his focus on politics and his diatribe against Lamprecht's attempt to broaden historical studies to include society and culture, he was one of the main practitioners of social and economic history. In an unusual alliance, he joined the Viennese Social Democrat, Lujo Brentano, in 1903 to edit the *Vierteljahrshefte für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. Two things are striking about this journal: its international character – until 1914 it included articles in German, French, English, and Italian, and numbered among its collaborators leading historians, foremost among them Henri Pirenne; and the extent to which it pioneered work in social and economic history. Cymorek has an interesting section on von Below's relationship with Max Weber, which was surprisingly cordial. Both agreed in criticizing Lamprecht and Schmoller as speculative, unscientific historians. Each regarded the other as someone who, in his concern with social themes, worked in a *wissenschaftlich* manner. Von Below respected in Weber the economist (*Nationalökonom*), 'who proceeded from historical studies and continuously pursued historical studies' (p. 186). Yet

Cymorek concludes that von Below never fully understood what Weber was about (p. 188). After 1914 the character of the journal changed. It became a German-language periodical during the war and remained one afterwards. From then on economic and social history increasingly gave way in its pages to constitutional and administrative history. The same applied to Below's intensive occupation with medieval German cities, which he analysed in terms of these categories. Otto Brunner, certainly no liberal, saw Below's projection of the nineteenth century into Germany's medieval past as the key weakness of his work. Below's approach to history now seems anachronistic. In Cymorek's opinion, there is a contradiction between Below's programme, which stressed the centrality of great individuals in history, and his actual portrayal of a past dominated by impersonal institutions. Cymorek cites Marc Bloch's obituary of Below: 'La ville l'interessait plus que les bourgeois. Sur l'Etat allemand du moyen âge ... il a écrit tout un volume, sans dire un mot des Allemands' (p. 208).

Thomas Hertfelder in his biography of Franz Schnabel examines the historical work and the political thought of a liberal Catholic historian who did not fit into the dominant paradigm of German national history. Nevertheless Schnabel was trained by historians who came from the Prussian school. He studied with the two foremost neo-Rankian historians, Erich Marcks and Max Lenz, and wrote his dissertation on political Catholicism in the 1848 revolution under another leading neo-Rankean, Hermann Oncken. The neo-Rankeans deviated from the Prussian school in theory in stressing that historians must return to Ranke's commitment to objectivity. But in practice they shared the basic premisses of the Prussian school, namely the teleological view that saw in Bismarck's creation of a Prussian-centred nation-state under Hohenzollern auspices the fulfilment of modern German history. Their Rankeanism consisted primarily in the application of Ranke's concept of the great powers to the entry of Germany as a major player on the world scene.

Yet Schnabel from the beginning deviated from the political and, as we shall see, historiographical assumptions of his teachers. He was a believing Catholic, but a liberal who thought that the Catholic Church must open itself to the modern world (p. 124). He stood to the left of the Catholic *Zentrum* party. Deeply influenced by Friedrich Nietzsche's and Henri Bergson's critique of modern culture, and acknowledging the close relationship between intellect and life, he nevertheless remained

committed to scholarly rationality. Although he studied in Heidelberg, he was remarkably little affected by the cult of Stefan George (p. 640). As a Catholic and a liberal it was difficult for him to find a position in an academic establishment dominated by a Protestant, Prussian outlook. Both from a Catholic and a liberal perspective he remained aloof from the admiration for Bismarck and the Reich Bismarck created. Although he had understanding for Bismarck's restrained foreign policy after 1870, he found his domestic policy disastrous. For him Bismarck remained a captive of 'a patriarchal mental world' which had no understanding for the 'national significance of the workers' movement' (p. 153). From his perspective the Kaiserreich suffered from the contradiction inherent in a modern industrial society imprisoned by a 'patriarchal *Beamtenstaat*' (p. 154). In his critique of Imperial Germany he moved close to the positions of Friedrich Naumann and Max Weber. Although no chauvinist, he agreed with Naumann and Weber that Germany was forced to pursue *Weltpolitik*, and that this required a modernization of the political system.

Schnabel's position in the First World War was unique among German historians. He did not share in the 'ideas of 1914' which were propagated by German intellectuals, and especially academics, who presented the war as a struggle between two cultures, German *Kultur* and Latin and Anglo-Saxon *Zivilisation* (p. 127). As a Catholic, he continued to believe in a European cultural community of which both France and Germany were important members. Stationed in France in occupied Cambrai, he wrote its history without viewing it as a city which Germans could claim because it had once been part of the Holy Roman Empire. Unlike Naumann and Weber he never advocated German expansion, even in the early stages of the war. Acknowledging Germany's defeat in 1918, Schnabel rejected the idea of the 'stab in the back', and also the notion that Allied encirclement had forced Germany into a defensive war. He recognized that Germany bore a substantial share of responsibility for the outbreak of the war. He endorsed the Weimar Republic because it corresponded to his belief in the rule of law and in federalism. Schnabel was thus very much an outsider in the German historical profession. He found a niche at the Technical University in Karlsruhe, but did not receive a chair at a major university until 1947, when he was appointed to the University of Munich.

In 1929 Schnabel published the first volume of his *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert*, a conscious attempt to replace Treitschke's history

of the same name. Like Treitschke's, Schabel's history broke off on the eve of the 1848 revolution. Schnabel's history deviated remarkably from the main tradition of German academic historiography. It was a broadly cultural history, dealing with science, technology, scholarship, literature, and aspects of daily life without focusing narrowly on politics, and least of all on Prussian ascendance. The German world was consciously seen in a broader European context. The book enjoyed a broad readership equalled by few, if any, works written in the mainstream of historical scholarship. Gerhard Ritter regarded Schnabel's first volume as *geistreich*, but he did not really consider it a scholarly work based on careful research (pp. 631-2). The few scholarly reviews of this popular work were generally negative. Three more volumes followed. In 1936 Schnabel was forced into early retirement by the Nazi regime and shortly thereafter was forbidden to publish.

In the meantime Schnabel had written the fifth volume of his *Deutsche Geschichte*, but it was never published, not even after the end of the Nazi regime. Hertfelder finds that Schnabel made considerable concessions to the Nazis in the manuscript for this volume (pp. 690-729). The proposed title is suggestive: *Das Erwachen des deutschen Volkstums*. Here Schnabel, who had never previously expressed any racist or anti-Semitic sentiments, cites early nineteenth-century anti-Semites, such as Immermann and Arndt, without distancing himself from them, and speaks of Börne, Heine, and Karl Marx 'as coincidentally three Jews from the Rhineland' who had 'condemned and ridiculed everything German' (pp. 720-21). This did not suffice for Schnabel to receive permission to publish the volume. It may, however, have persuaded him not to attempt to publish it after 1945. Hertfelder's study ends in 1945; we thus cannot follow Schnabel into the post-Second World War period as a professor at Munich, and after 1951 also as president of the prestigious *Historische Kommission* of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences.

While Schnabel does not fit into the mainstream of historians who wrote history from a narrowly nation-oriented perspective, Hermann Heimpel (1901-1988), a student of von Below, does. Ernst Schulin has published a slender volume, originally a lecture held in 1997 at the *Heidelberger Akademie* and then once more at the Max Planck Institute for History, whose first director was Heimpel. This volume is dedicated to Schulin's wife in memory of his 'revered (*verehrten*) teacher', and concentrates on Heimpel's lifelong efforts to write a German national

history. In essential ways Heimpel's conception of such a history follows the main lines of nationally orientated conservative historiography. Heimpel represents a generation aware of a cultural crisis in the modern world, which did not exist in the consciousness of older historians writing in the national tradition such as Treitschke and Below. For Heimpel, it took on a much more radical form in its rejection of Enlightenment values of rationality than it did in Schnabel's thought as depicted by Hertfelder. Michael Matthiesen, first in his dissertation, *Gerhard Ritter – Studien und Werk bis 1933* (1993), and then in a recent extensive essay dating from 1995 and published in 1998,[8] has described the atmosphere in Heidelberg and Freiburg during Heimpel's student years which was deeply affected by the mystic nationalism of Stefan George and the George circle. Heimpel was influenced even more by the geo-political thought of Karl Haushofer, in whose circle he moved in Munich. His thought was thus much more radically *völkisch* than that of state-orientated conservative historians of an older generation.

Both Schulin and Matthiesen take into account Heimpel's affinity with the New Right, and his early sympathy for Nazi aspirations for national rejuvenation. Heimpel happened to be present in the Munich *Hofbräuhaus* on the night of Hitler's putsch attempt on 9 November 1923. Nevertheless Heimpel, as Schulin (and Matthiesen) describe him, appears never to have been an anti-Semite, nor to have propounded a racist perspective. Both Schulin and Matthiesen refer to his close friendship with Arnold Berney, like Heimpel a radical German nationalist, but of Jewish origin. This friendship, however, evaporated once the Nazis came to power. Heimpel then enthusiastically endorsed the Nazis in a number of public statements and identified with his colleague, Martin Heidegger, during the latter's tenure as rector of Freiburg University in 1933-34. Schulin discounts these statements, which clearly express Heimpel's endorsement of the Nazi revolution and of Hitler at least in these early years, and sees in them a hidden (*verklausulierte*) dissociation (*Distanzierung*), which I, on careful reading, cannot discover. Schulin, moreover, argues in what amounts to an apology for Heimpel, that this endorsement of the Nazi regime must be understood in terms of the 'national exuberance' (*nationale Hochstimmung*) of the time (p. 33). In fact, Heimpel never distanced himself from the Nazis before 1945 and

[8] Michael Matthiesen, *Verlorene Identität. Der Historiker Arnold Berney und seine Freiburger Kollegen 1923-1938* (Göttingen, 1998).

had a successful career in the Third Reich. It began in 1934 in Leipzig, where he replaced his teacher Hellmann, who later died in Theresienstadt. In 1941 he assumed a Chair at the 'Reichsuniversität Straßburg'.

After 1945 Heimpel became a good democrat. As already mentioned, he was the first director of the newly established Max Planck Institute for History in Göttingen, and was seriously considered for the German Federal presidency as the successor to Theodor Heuss. He delivered a series of lectures, three of which are appended to Schulin's volume, in which he sought to construct a German national history. Schulin carefully analyses these lectures. There is no break with older conservative traditions of German history-writing from a national or nationalistic point of view. Heimpel projects a German national consciousness into the distant medieval past. He removes himself from a racist interpretation of the German *Volk* by dating the beginnings of the German nation not to primeval Germanic times, but to the creation of a political entity with the beginnings of the Holy Roman Empire. The lectures which follow each select a city, beginning with Aachen, as a remembrance site – Schulin sees a parallel to Pierre Nora's *lieux de mémoire* – representing a stage in German history. But Schulin notes that this history, despite its ambitious attempt at historical synthesis, turns out to be a 'history of the Reich and the state, hardly one of the people (*Volk*), in the Middle Ages, almost only the history of the emperors, princes, and the nobility ... Also in the modern period it is primarily the history of the rulers and their politics' (p. 53). A critical view of the German past is missing from Heimpel's history. The events of the Second World War, including the Holocaust, are mentioned only very briefly.

In 1970 Heimpel finally submitted his completed manuscript to the publishers Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, who had not only published a collection of his essays, but were also bringing out a series of scholarly studies for the Max Planck Institute for History. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht turned the manuscript down; Heimpel's conception of German history no longer fitted into the intellectual or political setting of Germany in the 1970s. They had begun to publish a ten-volume history of Germany which, as Joachim Leuschner, the editor of the series, wrote in the preface to each of the ten volumes, no longer conceived of German history as national history, but as one which needed to fit into the broader context of European history as well as to pay attention to regional history, and to deal with social, economic, and legal aspects in the broadest sense. Volume nine in the series was Hans-Ulrich Wehler's

Deutsches Kaiserreich 1871-1918, a critical examination of the Empire created by Bismarck with its disastrous results for Germany and the world. The tradition which had dominated German historical thought and writing from Treitschke to Heimpel had come to an end.

Again and again the claim has been made that the historical profession in Germany remained aloof from the Nazis. After 1945 leading German historians such as Gerhard Ritter, Hans Rothfels, and, among the younger generation, Theodor Schieder, maintained that with very few exceptions German historians had remained immune to Nazi influence and loyal to the profession's commitment to objective scholarship.[9] This exculpation is reiterated most recently in Ursula Wolf's dissertation, *Litteris et patriae. Das Janusgesicht der Historie* (1996). This overlooks the close affinity between the conservative historians and the Nazis in their opposition to Weimar democracy, in their demand for an authoritarian state, their calls for the westward and especially eastward revisions of the German borders, and their anti-Semitism. The collection *Geschichtsschreibung als Legitimationswissenschaft 1918-1945*, edited by Peter Schöttler, documents the extent to which many historians not only agreed with the Nazi's key aims, but put their scholarship in the direct service of the Nazi programmes of ethnic cleansing and genocide. Of the contributors to this volume, Bernd Faulenbach has previously written about the anti-democratic nature and the ultra-nationalism of the historical establishment in the Weimar Republic,[10] Karen Schönwälder[11] has shown to what extent German historians recast their scholarship in the Nazi period to be in accord with the Nazi programme and to serve the war effort, and Willi Oberkrome[12] has analysed the

[9] See Gerhard Ritter, 'Der deutsche Professor im Dritten Reich', *Die Gegenwart*, no. 1 (December 1945), pp. 23-6, and 'Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 1 (1950), pp. 81-6, 129-37; Hans Rothfels, 'Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft in den 30er Jahren', in Andreas Flitner (ed.), *Deutsches Geistesleben und Nationalsozialismus* (Tübingen, 1965), pp. 90-107; Theodor Schieder, 'Die deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 189 (1959), pp. 1-104.

[10] Bernd Faulenbach, *Ideologie des deutschen Weges. Die deutsche Geschichte in der Historiographie zwischen Kaiserreich und Nationalsozialismus* (Munich, 1980).

[11] Karen Schönwälder, *Historiker und Politik. Geschichtswissenschaft im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt on Main, 1992).

[12] Willi Oberkrome, *Volksgeschichte. Methodische Innovation und völkische Ideologisierung in der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft 1918-1945* (Göttingen, 1993).

formation of a racially-orientated historiography which sought to replace the fixation of established historians on the Bismarckian nation-state with a *Volksgeschichte* centred on the German people as a racial community.

Schöttler raises the issue of the 'continuity of German historiography through all regimes' from Imperial Germany to the present day. 'Authoritarian university structures and a conservative cartell of *Ordinarien'* ensured that 'historical science as a profession remained the domain of nationalistically orientated (*nationalgesinnter*) men' (p. 7). However, this volume is not restricted to the ideological precursors of the Holocaust, but examines 'the concrete contributions of academics, some of them prominent, to the propaganda and the planning for the war of annihilation' (p. 14). The contributions touch on a number of themes. One is the role of the more traditional historians, including some, such as Gerhard Ritter, who maintained a certain distance to the Nazis, and who, after 1945, continued to occupy positions of power within the academic profession. Faulenbach stresses that a *Gleichschaltung* of the historical profession under the Nazis was not necessary because of the affinities of these historians on the points which mattered to the Nazis. Another theme concerns the younger proponents of *Volksgeschichte* who identified with the Nazi movement and who, like Theodor Schieder, Werner Conze, and Otto Brunner, became the mentors of a post-1945 generation of social historians. Oberkrome in his essay rejects their conception of history and society and their agrarian romanticism, but nevertheless suggests that in their attempts to write a comprehensive history of a population they laid the foundations, once their language had been cleansed of its racial code, for modern German social history.[13]

In his introduction Schöttler takes issue with Oberkrome's stress on the 'relative progressiveness' of this historiography, and argues that its historiographical notions cannot be separated from Nazi ideology. As Schöttler notes, one must remember that 'the seemingly innovative writings of a Franz Petri, a Werner Conze, or an Otto Brunner' were written under the auspices of Nazi *Forschungsgemeinschaften* with a specific political purpose (p. 19). Nevertheless, there was an attempt to de-Nazify this language after 1945. Gadi Algazi deals with this in the

[13] For a similar position, see Winfried Schulze, *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945* (Munich, 1989).

case of Otto Brunner who after 1945 exerted a major influence on West German medievalists. The concept of *Volk* gave way to that of *Struktur*. Brunner claimed that he had freed medieval German history from the anachronistic language of the traditional political historians who had projected nineteenth-century conceptions of the modern state into the past. While Brunner claimed to see this past in its own terms, Gazi shows to what extent Brunner had, in fact, projected Nazi conceptions of law based on power and race into the Middle Ages.

Karl-Heinz Roth's essay challenges Oberkrome's benign view of the *Volkshistoriker* and demonstrates their involvement in the politics of genocide. Ingo Haar portrays the merger of three currents at the University of Königsberg in the late 1920s and the Nazi years: the political historiography of Hans Rothfels, the nationalistic youth movement, and the *Volk*-orientated historians. Rothfels as the *Ordinarius* in Königsberg became the spokesman for German expansion eastward in a state which would extend its hegemony over Slavic and other non-German populations. Alongside the openly Nazi Gunter Ipsen, he was the mentor of young historians coming from the youth movement, who sought to base their history on the concept of a racial community. It was only Rothfels's Jewish parentage which, despite the attempts by influential Nazis to save his career, prevented him from becoming a leading historian in the Third Reich and ultimately forced him to emigrate. Rothfels could return after 1945 as a victim of the Nazis. Karl-Heinz Roth discusses the direct involvement of Hans Joachim Beyer, 'Heydrich's Professor', and other academics in the planning and carrying out of the *Umvolkung* in the East. Schöttler in a separate essay deals with the historians, including Fritz Petri, who carried out *Westforschung* with the aim of preparing the ethnic cleansing of Francophone populations in Belgium and the areas of France to be annexed.

The question remains whether there is a continuity between conservative nationalistic historiography and present-day historiography. Schöttler claims emphatically that there is. At the end of his essay on Heimpel, Schulin suggests that the sort of national history which Heimpel wrote had to give way to a new critical social history of politics. The generation of historians born in the late 1920s and the 1930s, and educated after 1945, moved in the direction of this critical history. But the recent controversies about the Nazi past of their teachers, particularly of Schieder, Conze, and Brunner, have raised the question of the extent to which this younger generation in fact represented a new orientation

in national history and historiography. It is true that many of them, including Hans-Ulrich Wehler, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Hans Mommsen, Helmut Berding, and others, were students of Schieder and Conze. But others, slightly younger, such as Jürgen Kocka and Hans-Jürgen Puhle, were students of Gerhard A. Ritter, born in 1929, who represented a different outlook. In his *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945*,[14] Winfried Schulze argued that the sources of the new social history were to be found in the innovative aspects of *Volksgeschichte* which had been cleansed of its racial orientation. *Volksgeschichte*, he held, first challenged the narrow political and élitist approach of traditional German historiography. As *Strukturgeschichte* it provided the foundations for a modern German social history which owed little to the *Annales* or to the American social sciences.

I would agree regarding the limited influence of the *Annales*. Yet what distinguishes the Bielefeld school of critical social history from its German mentors is the critical view of the German past which the latter lacked. The 'historical social science' of the 1970s is unthinkable without the influence of the historians and sociologists who were driven from Germany in 1933, without the Frankfurt School and the younger Meinecke students, Eckart Kehr, Hans Rosenberg, Hajo Holborn, and others such as Arthur Rosenberg. The new social sciences owed much to Marx seen through the eyes of Max Weber. The fixation on institutions, politics, and economics resulted in a challenge to this orientation in the 1980s and 1990s by critics who argued that this historiography lacked cultural components. One serious criticism which could be levelled at the students of Schieder, Conze, and Brunner is that while they were committed to examining the German past critically, with a focus on the Nazi era, they shied away from looking with similarly critical eyes at the historical discipline itself, and at their teachers. It is an important merit of Schöttler's volume and his recent work in general, as well as of the writings of Götz Aly,[15] that they have opened up this question.

[14] See note 13.

[15] See Götz Aly and Susanne Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung. Auschwitz und die deutschen Pläne für eine europäische Ordnung* (Frankfurt on Main, 1995); Ulrich Herbert (ed.), *Nationalsozialistische Vernichtungspolitik 1939-1945. Neue Forschungen und Kontroversen*, with contributions by Götz Aly (Frankfurt on Main, 1998).

GEORG G. IGGERS is Distinguished Professor emeritus of History at the State University of New York at Buffalo. His publications include *The German Conception of History. The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (1968), 4th expanded German edition, *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft* (1997); *New Directions in European Historiography* (1975); *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline* (ed. with James Powell, 1990); and *Geschichtswissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert* (1993), expanded American edition, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century* (1997).

THE DEVIL IN THE DETAILS: THE CONCENTRATION CAMP AS HISTORICAL CONSTRUCT

by Omer Bartov

ULRICH HERBERT, KARIN ORTH, and CHRISTOPH DIECKMANN (eds), *Die nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager. Entwicklung und Struktur*, 2 vols (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 1998), 1,192 pp. ISBN 3 89244 289 4. DM 84.00

Even as the genocide of the Jews was unfolding, Rabbi Yizkhak Nissenbaum, writing in the ever-diminishing Warsaw Ghetto, attempted to distinguish between past persecutions of Jews and the 'Final Solution'. His point, however, was not merely to categorize different types of exclusion, inhumanity, and butchery, but to set new parameters for the manner in which the persecuted ought to react to this new and unprecedented assault: 'This is a time to sanctify life (*kiddush hakhayim*) and not to sanctify God (*kiddush hashem*) through death. In the past the enemies demanded the soul and the Jew sacrificed his soul to sanctify God; now the oppressor demands the body of the Jew, and it is the Jew's duty to defend it, to protect his life.' This crucial distinction, between those who fought to die with honour, and those who struggled to survive as human beings, had both immediate existential implications and profound long-term ramifications for Jewish identity. And yet, in a Europe occupied by a regime sworn to destroy each and every Jew, survival ultimately depended much more on coincidence and luck than on any consciously chosen mode of conduct. And as luck was in short supply, the majority of European Jewry perished.

The tension between *kiddush hashem* and *kiddush hakhayim* has haunted Jewish memory and identity ever since the Holocaust. But from a more universal perspective, it is the distinction between 'human' and 'inhuman' that has remained at the core of the event. The Nazis, of course, categorized humanity according to genetic and racial components and their alleged social and moral ramifications. Thus the handicapped were sterilized and later murdered as 'lives unworthy of life'; homosexuals, 'asocials', and 'habitual criminals' were persecuted, incarcerated in camps, and often killed; such Slav peoples as the Russians and the

Poles were defined as *Untermenschen* ('subhumans') who must be decimated and enslaved; and the Sinti and Roma (Gypsies), whose alleged racial inferiority combined with asocial predilections, were slated for eradication as a destabilizing social element. Yet the Jews were by far the worst enemy of all because of their supposed mission to pollute all other races and take over the universe. Hence the Jews were an 'anti-race', a living contradiction of and a mortal threat to 'noble humanity' as embodied in the 'Aryans'. Their destruction was an ideological *sine qua non* and became a major goal of Germany's wartime policies.

Conversely, both in Soviet Russia and among the Western Allies there were those who insisted during the war on the inherently evil or at least sick 'nature' of the German people, while others (who eventually won out) stressed that the Germans themselves were victims of a criminal dictatorship from which they too had to be liberated. But following the collapse of the Third Reich, and the exposure of the horrors of the concentration camps, it was difficult to avoid the question: who carried out these atrocities, in whose name, with what kind of conviction, for what ends? Moreover, one was faced with the dilemma of defining the humanity of the perpetrators: were they sadists, insane, ideological fanatics, or were they normal human beings just like the rest of us, indeed, just like their victims? And what were the implications of either conclusion for the understanding of modern tyranny and genocide?

The response by the late Israeli poet and Holocaust survivor, Dan Pagis, to this question, should echo in our minds whenever we confront the 'concentrationary universe'. As he writes in the poem *Testimony*: 'No no: They were certainly / Human beings: Uniforms, boots. / How to explain. They were made in the image. / I was a shadow. / I had another maker. / And He in His mercy left nothing in me to die. / And I escaped to Him, I rose, light, blue, / Reconciled, I'd say: Penitent: / Smoke to omnipotent smoke / Without body and image.' For Pagis, then, the question is not the humanity of the perpetrator, which is, after all, perfectly visible in his overpowering, lethal presence and decisive, fateful actions. The question has to do with the humanity of the victim. For on the one hand, the perpetrator strives to deprive the victims of their human attributes so as to deny their existence even before he murders them. But on the other hand, the victims desperately hold on to these attributes to maintain a sense of humanity and a reason to

survive; yet, at the same time, they long to escape the killer's gaze, to vanish from sight as individual human entities. Writes Pagis: 'He stands, stamps his boots a little, / Rubs his hands: He is cold in the morning breeze, / A diligent angel who labored for his promotion. / Suddenly he imagines he made an error: All eyes / He counts again in the open notebook / The bodies waiting for him in the square, / A camp within a camp: Only I / Am not there, not there, I am an error, / Quickly extinguishing my eyes, erasing my shadow. / I won't be missed, please. The sum will add up / Without me: Here forever.'

The volumes under review, despite their massive size and the generally high scholarly level of the contributions they contain, are hardly concerned with these questions. This is somewhat curious, especially considering the fact that the preface, by Barbara Distel, is a plea for the importance of the survivors' testimony in the historical reconstruction of life in the concentration camps. To be sure, some of the contributors do draw on testimonies and other documents by camp inmates and survivors. But the main thrust of this work lies elsewhere. What it is about, and what it both consciously and unconsciously sets itself against, can be gleaned from a passing remark in the main introduction by the editors. For while this collection indeed presents the results of a great deal of new research conducted in Germany, Poland, Lithuania, France, Austria, Italy, Israel, and the United States, and thus constitutes a crucial addition to our knowledge, it is also predicated on looking at the Nazi camps from a specific perspective. As the editors note, the chapters in the two volumes are based on papers delivered at a conference that was held in Weimar in 1995, the first such international meeting on the Nazi camps since the 1980 conference at Yad Vashem, which was, according to the editors, 'primarily preoccupied with the meaning of the concentration and death camps for the Holocaust and the fate of the Jewish inmates' (p. 32).

This new German collection thus maintains a complex relationship with its predecessor, the Hebrew language publication of the Yad Vashem proceeding, edited by Yisrael Gutman and Rachel Manbar as *The Nazi Concentration Camps* (1984). While the assertion that the Israeli volume is mainly concerned with the fate of the Jews is a somewhat unfair exaggeration, there is no doubt that the Holocaust, as a general term for the specific event of the genocide of the Jews, plays a larger role in it than in the more recent German publication. Moreover, the Yad Vashem collection differs in that it goes beyond the chronological

parameters of the historical events in order to evaluate their repercussions both on survivors and on later generations by way of sociological and psychological studies and by analysing representations of the Holocaust especially in memoirs and fiction. Conversely, the volumes under review adhere strictly to the historical reality of the concentration camp system, and pay far more attention to their organization from the perspective of the perpetrators than to the manner in which they were experienced by the victims. Indeed, this publication edited by Herbert *et al*. manifests a certain degree of ambivalence toward the relationship between the Holocaust (as the genocide of the Jews) and the concentration camps (as a system of political repression, labour exploitation, and murder). Put differently, these volumes have little to say either on the origins or on the legacy of the camps; they are only marginally concerned with the death camps (whose major victims were the Jews); and they are inconsistent about and uncomfortable with the specific fate of the Jews in the Nazi system.

This is related to another issue about which there is a more or less general consensus among the contributors, namely, the assertion that ideological factors played at best a minor role in the conceptualization and implementation of the 'concentrationary universe'. Hence, for instance, the term anti-Semitism is hardly ever mentioned, whereas such notions as logistical constraints, economic pressures, bureaucratic procedures, and competition between agencies are greatly highlighted. There is nothing very surprising in this interpretative predilection, based as it is on a 'functionalist' tradition in German scholarship on the Third Reich, however much this paradigm has been revised and modified over the last few years. Yet considering recent debates over the role of anti-Semitism in the Holocaust, the centrality of the 'Final Solution' for the Third Reich, and the motivation of and relationship between perpetrators and so-called 'ordinary Germans' or 'ordinary men', it is somewhat perplexing that little attention is paid to such questions in this new collection, a massive work certain to have a major impact on future research in Germany and elsewhere.

Another characteristic feature of these volumes is their almost obsessive preoccupation with facts and general timidity in gauging their findings' more general implications. Again, this is, of course, part of a larger trend in German historical scholarship, especially understandable in the case of research on the camps. In the last decade or so, young German scholars have, for the first time, carried out extensive

archival research and thereby undermined many of the theoretical assumptions of their elders, which often had little to do with the 'facts on the ground' and the documents in the archives. One also sympathizes with the psychological and methodological difficulties of working on this topic, and the tendency to prefer a detached, dry, scholarly approach so as to avoid the empty rhetoric and simplifications of the early post-war years. But the result of this is still rather disappointing, since too many of the essays in these volumes read as lists of facts sorely in need of analysis and contextualization. Fortunately, the editors have included the closing comments made by more mature scholars at the end of each panel. In most cases, these more general essays do attempt not merely to criticize the papers but, even more important, to locate them within a larger historiographical context and interpretative framework. Even if one does not necessarily agree with the commentators' own interpretations, they are extremely useful in giving the raw material of documentation some sense, meaning, and direction.

Looked at from a different perspective, this new collection of essays was conceived as a response to the theses propounded by the sociologist Wolfgang Sofsky in his study *The Order of Terror* (German 2nd edn., 1993; English edn., 1997). In this sense, while most of the contributors distance themselves from what they see as an overly committed and engaged approach to the study of the Holocaust by Jewish scholars, they simultaneously set themselves apart from the perceived abstractions and insufficient sensitivity to historical dynamics of Sofsky's sociological method. And yet, for this reader, while there is plenty of room to disagree with Sofsky's interpretation – not least because he too cannot fit the genocide of the Jews into his model of the 'concentration camp' – his ability to isolate the main facets of camp society, and his brilliant analysis of the function of power and control in the camp (a taste of which is given in his concluding chapter to these volumes), far supersedes the imperfectly digested facts and figures that fill many of the preceding thousand pages.

This being said, there can be no doubt that these two volumes will be an indispensable source for anyone wishing to write on the Nazi camps for a long time to come. The main conceptual historical paradigm on the development of the camps is the thesis proposed as early as 1978 by Falk Pingel (who also features prominently in the 1984 Yad Vashem book). According to Pingel, the history of the camps can be divided into three more or less distinct phases: (a) 1933 to 1936, when concentration

camps were used mainly for the suppression and re-education of real and imaginary domestic political opponents; (b) 1936-7 to 1941-2, in which the camps were transformed into tools for the elimination of so-called asocial and criminal elements and increasingly also for racial persecution; and, finally, (c) from 1942 to the end of the war, during which the camps became pools of forced labour under the conditions of total war and a growing lack of manpower, and, at the same time, facilitated the extermination of millions of undesirable human beings.

Much of the debate on the role of the concentration camps concerns the implications of this historical development. Thus while the camps had succeeded in suppressing political opposition by 1936 and from this point of view could be dismantled, they were, in fact, greatly expanded as a means to purge society of undesirables and to justify the central role of the SS within the state. Even more crucially, by the latter years of the war an inherent contradiction between forced labour and mass killing in the camps seemed to develop. What the SS called 'destruction through labour' (*Vernichtung durch Arbeit*) could be seen as exemplifying the Nazi state's self-destructive dynamics; conversely, it may also reflect its inner, if murderous, logic. From our own perspective, it is difficult to understand why a regime in such dire need of labour would simultaneously sanction the direct or indirect murder of so many camp inmates. One answer is that, in the final analysis, ideological arguments – particularly in the case of the Jews – always took precedence over economic factors. Most contributors to these volumes, however, argue that the 'logic' of 'destruction through labour' was derived from the seemingly inexhaustible supply of new inmates. They did not die because the regime wanted to kill them, but because it did not care if they lived and saw no reason to invest in their survival, since until late in the war they were easily replaceable. In this sense, the term 'slave labour' is a misnomer; neither acquiring nor losing working inmates through death had a price-tag. This was an economy based on free labour and an extraordinarily high turnover of manpower whose life expectancy was a mere few months (with the partial exception of a few skilled workers whose living conditions were somewhat better).

This is a convincing argument as far as non-Jewish inmates are concerned, but as many other recent studies have shown (and some essays in these volumes too) in the case of the Jews ideological factors were paramount; Jews were either plucked out of the labour force and murdered, or were subjected to intentional 'destruction through labour'.

Indeed, as can be read in this collection, there was a certain degree of improvement in the general treatment of concentration camp inmates between 1942 and 1944, when labour was in high demand and food provisioning and accommodation could still be assured. Only in 1944-5, due to the disintegration of the Nazi state and the evacuations of labour and concentration camps away from the front-lines in horrendous 'death marches', did the death-rate climb again to unprecedented levels. And yet, it was precisely during this period, 1942-4, that the mass of Europe's Jewish population was murdered. Moreover, the genocide continued until the last possible moment: in the fifty days between 8 May and 7 July 1944, more than 300,000 Hungarian Jews were gassed in Birkenau, a daily average of 8,000 to 9,000 men, women and children. To be sure, some other Hungarian Jews were taken to labour camps, such as the Mittelbau-Dora complex, in which they died in vast numbers digging underground facilities for Germany's V rockets. But there was obviously no relationship whatsoever between the numbers of able-bodied men and women murdered and the labour needs of the Reich's economy.

The fundamental difficulty in the interpretative thrust of these two volumes is therefore that they fail to integrate the Holocaust into the general explanation of the concentration camp system. Had the Nazi regime not conducted the genocide of the Jews, but rather treated the Jews more or less in the same manner as all other political, ethnic, and national groups it was busily exploiting and murdering, then the approach proposed by these volumes would have appeared quite reasonable. Indeed, we would have had to conclude that the Nazi camp system was substantially similar to that of other totalitarian states, not least the Soviet Union. It is possible to argue, of course, that in the Nazi case we have two separate, though related, developments: the concentration camp system on the one hand, and the persecution and genocide of the Jews, on the other. But since neither the editors nor the contributors propose such an approach, one is left unclear as to how these events and developments fit together and what is the relationship between them.

Here, to be sure, different scholarly and national traditions offer their own solutions. Polish scholars (both in the new German collection and in the earlier Israeli volume) are keen to point out the sacrifice of the Polish nation and the help rendered by Poles to Jews in escaping or fighting the Germans. These historians are reluctant to concede the anti-

Semitism that pervaded Poland in the 1930s and 1940s, and tend to underplay the differences between German anti-Polish and anti-Jewish policies. Conversely, a fair number of Israeli and non-Israeli Jewish scholars stress the uniqueness of the Jewish fate in the war and the role of anti-Semitism in determining the course and nature of the Holocaust. Such views, however, are at best under-represented in the volumes under review, especially as far as anti-Semitism is concerned. For their part, most German scholars contributing to these volumes tend to relegate ideological motivation and traditional prejudice to a secondary role, and appear intent on redressing a perceived imbalance in the scholarship on the camps that over-stresses the case of the Jews.

One could conclude by saying that those who have access to both languages and wish to survey the full array of current research, trends, and debates in scholarship on the Nazi camps and the Holocaust, would do well to read all two-thousand pages in the German and Israeli collections. But there is one last important issue that is unfortunately only fleetingly referred to in the volumes under review, namely, the long-term impact of the camps on our current existence. Considering the public debates in Germany over the legacy of Nazism, it is a pity that these volumes avoid any discussion of such crucial topics as post-war justice in Germany, the politics of 'overcoming' the past, the individual and collective psychological impact of Nazism on the Germans, and the teaching and representation of that period. It is, after all, well worth asking why, fifty years after the event, a new generation of German scholars has undertaken to study Nazism with such zeal and energy.

In his 1969 novel, *Man Son of Dog*, the Israeli writer Yoram Kanyuk described the impact of the Holocaust on Israeli society:

> Who is left? Burnt remnants, wretched nervous wrecks .... Halved people, quartered people .... All of us – moaning and yawning and striving to make money, build houses, hurry, quick quick, but all this happens during the daytime. At night we wake up in the roomy houses, the modern apartments, the elegant cars, at night we have nightmares and we scream, because the devil scratched blue numbers on our arms. Do you know ... what kinds of screams fill this country in the middle of the night? Powerful screams ... all those numbers, screaming and weeping, not knowing why and for what reason and how and when ... there is no escape. Therefore they scream, they weep with burning

> humiliation. The knowledge ... that they were raw material in the most sophisticated factory in Europe, under a heaven in which God sat as an exiled foreigner .... That knowledge drives us insane – and we have become a country which is the greatest insane asylum on earth.

This harrowing passage illustrates the need to integrate the aftermath of the camps into any historical work that wishes to analyse their meaning for our time. Indeed, nothing would widen the perspective of German scholars writing on Nazism more than a new focus on its long-term impact on the victims. For it is only in this manner that we can come to realize the extent to which the crimes of the Third Reich have stamped our entire civilization throughout the second half of the twentieth century and beyond.

OMER BARTOV is Professor of History at Rutgers University, New Brunswick. He has published widely on Nazi Germany, the Holocaust, and inter-war France. Among his books are *Hitler's Army: Soldiers, Nazis, and War in the Third Reich* (1991) and *Murder in Our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation* (1996). His new book, *Mirrors of Destruction: War, Genocide, and Modern Identity*, will be published in 2000. With Matt Matsuda, Omer Bartov is Project Director of the 1999-2001 Project 'Utopia, Violence, Resistance: Remaking and Unmaking Humanity'.

DEBATE

Michael Maurer responds to John J. Breuilly*

It is a pleasure to respond to a reviewer who has really read a voluminous German book, and presents it to a British public precisely and without misunderstandings. Terminology relating to the subject of the book, however, presents an obstacle to communication from the start. John Breuilly calls my *Bürgertum* 'bourgeoisie'. But is a country parson 'bourgeois'? He is most certainly a *Bürger*. Another reviewer insinuated that in my book the discussion shifts from the *Bürgertum* to the *Bildungsbürgertum* (Urs Häfner, writing in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 28 May 1997). This is obviously an anachronistic projection of nineteenth-century conditions back to earlier times. In the nineteenth century, the *Bildungsbürger* was commonly opposed to the *Wirtschaftsbürger*, but this terminology is not helpful for the eighteenth century. In any case, the category *Bürgertum* / bourgeoisie, in its sociological and supra-historical sense, is questionable, even misleading, as applied to German history. In my view, there are at least three phases of development which it would actually have been worth distinguishing between, in terminological as well as other respects: the *altständische Bürgertum*, which was anchored in the towns, and whose core was made up of artisans and merchants (Middle Ages and early modern period); the *aufgeklärte Bürgertum*, or the *neue Bürgertum*, which was still part of a corporate society but had developed new opinions and new media, which makes it possible to distinguish it clearly (eighteenth century); and finally the nineteenth-century *Bürgertum*. We must consider whether this is adequately described in terms of the dichotomy between *Wirtschaftsbürger* and *Bildungsbürger*. The core of the nineteenth-century *Bürgertum* was the *Wirtschaftsbürgertum*, those who were economically active in a trade or business, manufacturers, and members of the free professions who really were 'bourgeois', and mostly also liberal. The heart of the eighteenth-century *Bürgertum*, however, was drawn from the scholarly

* Michael Maurer's book, *Die Biographie des Bürgers. Lebensformen und Denkweisen in der formativen Phase des deutschen Bürgertums (1680-1815)* (1996), was reviewed by John J. Breuilly in the May 1999 issue of the *Bulletin*, Vol. XXI, No. 1, pp. 22-29.

class (*Gelehrtenstand*), the majority of whom were in the service of the state, whether as professors or administrative officials. It is a German peculiarity that clergy in the Lutheran territorial states and teachers, who had not yet completely formed their own profession, were also quasi-officials.

After these preliminary comments about the subject of the book, we can see more clearly that it is not a history of the German *Bürgertum* as such, but concerns the second of the three phases outlined above. Nor is it really a history of the *Bürgertum* (in the sense of a social history). Rather, it is intended to show how, during this phase of history, a particular social group (that is, the *Bürger*), used a discussion of values on the literary market to elevate itself into a position from which it could dominate the whole of society, achieving a hegemony of values over all other social groups. This core idea has two components: setting boundaries upwards (delimitation *vis-à-vis* the nobility) and downwards (separation from, for example, peasants and domestic servants); and consolidation within the *Bürgertum* (that is, bridging the gulf between artisans and merchants on the one side, and the academically educated on the other).

John Breuilly's first objection relates to the methodology of my study. While he notes with approval that I do not 'introduce any fashionable jargon about discourse' (p. 27), the problem is the effect of the biographies which I use as a source. The book itself contains many-layered reflections on this problem; I am far from reading biographies simply as a mirror of the life and values of the *Bürgertum*. On the one hand the biographies (however stylized) contain reports of reality, about life as it was lived. On the other hand, they can also be read as normative: 'The model described was industrious and successful – ergo, be industrious and you will be successful too!' One of my reviewers who saw this point particularly clearly expressed it thus: 'The type of source is skilfully selected, for the biography has a particular affinity with the new *Bürgertum* in two respects: from now on it is not origin and predetermined social position within the corporate social structure that dictate social-moral logic, but what the individual "makes of his life". Secondly, the biography is located exactly on the interface between norm and praxis. It contributes to the creation and articulation of values, but is in direct contact with life as it is lived.'[1]

[1] Edwin Dillmann, writing in *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 38 (1998), p. 730.

The question is how such biographical sources should be used. I decided to de-contextualize them and exploit them *en masse*, in a way which John Breuilly describes as 'qualitative literary analysis' (p. 27). This means that although assessments were made on the basis of a very large group of sources, the account is in parts a summary, enlivened by examples which seemed typical. Important sequences of ideas are derived, step by step, from the sources (and where possible, extracts are quoted), but I dispensed with quantitative analysis. This is, quite clearly, a matter of how the discipline is regarded. A social scientist would probably not have hesitated to write the sort of sentences which do not appear in my book: 'Ninety-nine per cent of all *Bürger* were industrious; in only 3 per cent of cases could sexual misdemeanours be demonstrated.' I regard this as pseudo objectivity. Such sentences feign a degree of precision which perhaps makes them less vulnerable to attack, but is incompatible with my understanding of historical work. It should not be forgotten that even with large data bases, the latitude for interpretation is still considerable. As the data is differentiated, even large samples become small, with the result that percentages derived from them are illusory.

A related element is that of temporal differentiation (to which Breuilly pays little attention). At each individual point in my analyses, for example, of the understanding of love, age, and the many other themes and sub-themes which are addressed in long chapters, an attempt was made to locate the point precisely within the total temporal framework spanning the years 1680 to 1815 by asking: since when? how long? how did it change over the whole period of the investigation? In combination with the attribution to professional groups, functional élites, and religious confession (where possible), the numbers that resulted in each case were often quite small, despite the size of the total data base. To this extent the whole argument is often constructively built up; the findings are not simply derived from the sources and a quantitative analysis of them, but are the result of a complex process of interpretation involving a reconstruction of the local world and the value horizons of the *Bürgertum*, for which the method of 'qualitative literary analysis' which I chose seemed appropriate.

Breuilly's second objection concerns the coherence of my argument and the coherence of the *Bürgertum*. Perhaps the diversity was greater than it seemed to me. But in order to be able to present my view of the *Bürgertum* at all, I had to give particular weight to one main idea (plus

a few secondary ones). Yet I believe that the examples I quote give my account so much life and reality that no reader is likely to gain the impression that my *Bürgertum* was a mere construct, a paper concept.

The third objection relates to a terminological difficulty concerning *Bürgertum*/bourgeoisie, and the temporal limitation of my work to the eighteenth century. Reviewers such as Lothar Gall, writing in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on 3 December 1996, read my work essentially as a pre-history of the nineteenth-century *Bürgertum*. On the basis of the material I consulted, I cannot claim to have done more. Yes, the nineteenth-century *Bürgertum* differed from the Enlightened *Bürgertum*. But is it not fascinating to trace how those values were built up which ultimately made it possible to have a good conscience while earning money?

The unity of the *Bürgertum* will continue to present a problem. For me, the result of eighteenth-century developments presents itself as a model of acculturation. As the *Bürgertum* equated itself with humanity, it had to be an open group: entry was possible by the adoption of its values. The attractiveness of this model is demonstrated by women who wanted to become equal, by Jews who wanted to become equal, and even by those members of the nobility who found this model of a new time more attractive than the revival of corporate society (which, as we know, was the ideal of another section of the nobility in the nineteenth century). I do not need to remind the historian of nationalism of the unifying power of general ideas! On the other hand, differences within Germany admittedly remained very large – in terms both of religious confession and region. But that the population as a whole could be conceived of as 'society' where life on the ground revealed only differences and fragmentation is probably the result not only of political and social ideas, but also of the dominant values of the *Bürgertum*, which I have described.

One of the crucial aims of my study (which Breuilly clearly recognizes) was also to assess the significance of the Christian religion in the process of forming the *Bürgertum*. The fact that norms and values were primarily to be dictated by religion was widely accepted in the eighteenth century, and not only by preachers. At its end, of course, we find a highly differentiated condition which cannot simply be described as secularized, but which had clearly been changed by secularized elements.

The final, decisive point, in my opinion, is that our view of the eighteenth century changes completely if we communicate not in terms

of the universal categories of social history, or the reified concepts of the Enlightenment, but instead allow diverse historical reality to emerge as it is reflected in the perceptions of contemporaries when they describe the lives of their fellow men. From today's perspective it is easy to see that the condition reached at the end of our period of investigation was only a transitional one. Among others, Romanticism and Restoration provided alternative models to the ordered world of the Enlightened *Bürgertum*. These flirted with the revival of the nobility, the corporate world of the Middle Ages, and pre-Reformation Catholic unity. But that is another story . . .

MICHAEL MAURER is Professor of Cultural History at the University of Jena. His books include *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (1987), an anthology *'O Britannien, von deiner Freiheit einen Hut voll.' Deutsche Reiseberichte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (1992), a three-volume edition of Johann Wilhelm von Archenholtz's *England und Italien* (1993), an edition of the correspondence of Sophie von La Roche (1983, 1985), *Kleine Geschichte Englands* (1997), *Kleine Geschichte Irlands* (1998), *Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (1999), and *Neue Impulse der Reiseforschung* (1999).

BOOK REVIEWS

MANFRED GROTEN, *Köln im 13. Jahrhundert. Gesellschaftlicher Wandel und Verfassungswirklichkeit*, Städteforschung. Reihe A: Darstellungen, 36 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1998), xlii + 342 pp. ISBN 3 412 07998 7. DM 78.00

Friedrich Lau's century-old foundational work on the medieval social origins of Cologne's municipal constitution has finally been updated by Manfred Groten, whose comprehensive study brings much more clarity and depth to this crucial aspect of urban history in Germany. In particular, Groten argues that the development of municipal institutions – especially the *Rat* (city council) – during the thirteenth century was not shaped merely by well-known conflicts between the city's archiepiscopal lord and its leading citizens. Rather, this development was equally influenced by rivalries between competing factions within the burgher élite itself (the so-called *Meliorat*), which modern scholarship has tended to portray as a community unified against the archbishop. Indeed, splits within the *Meliorat* enabled archbishops and the *Rat* to weaken the monopolistic power of certain élite burgher families (*Geschlechter*) by the end of the century.

As the thirteenth century began, the leading *Geschlechter* dominated the *Schöffenkollegium* (a body of lay administrators, known in Latin as *scabini*, who served in the archiepiscopal court and were bound by a loyalty oath to the archbishop). As such they were the leading representatives of the burgher *Stadtregiment*, since the *Rat* did not yet exist. Yet Groten discerns a split within this ruling élite during the years of the Welf-Staufen *Thronstreit* (1198-1216). Although the majority of the *Meliorat* supported Otto IV, probably because of economic considerations, a minority pro-Staufen faction emerged under the leadership of the von der Mühlengasse *Geschlecht*.

The rivalry within the *Meliorat* gradually intensified until a final resolution in 1267-8, and thereby did much in the intervening years to shape the city's constitutional development. By the 1230s the von der Mühlengasse faction succeeded in monopolizing the *Schöffenkollegium* through an electoral process of co-optation. Groten asserts that members of this faction, eventually referred to as 'the Wise' (*die Weisen*), maintained an aristocratic culture based on Latin and French learning and saw themselves as the élite leaders of the city (*nobiles burgenses Colonienses*).

Such 'egoistische Personenpolitik' (p. 159) by the *Weisen* led to a loose coalition of opposing *Geschlechter*, whose knightly culture only contributed further to the growing rivalry within the city's ruling class. First led by Hermann von der Kornpforte, this latter faction would gradually look to the *Rat* to further its political power under the leadership of the Overstolz *Geschlecht*. Excluded from city-wide administration, they turned to parish-based administration.

The *Rat* itself, though eventually co-opted by the Overstolz faction as a counterweight against the *Schöffen* monopoly of the *Weisen*, actually owes its origin to the social tensions between the *Meliorat* and the original parish-level leadership (*Amtleutekollegium*). These parish officials (*Amtleute*) first formed the *Rat* in 1216 as a protest against the *Schöffen Stadtregiment* which, they felt, increasingly neglected parochial interests. Hence the *Rat* emerged as an institution directed against the *Meliorat* rather than against episcopal lordship as in other medieval German cities. This unique constitutional tension in burgher society between the *Meliorat* and the *Mittelstand* of wealthy parochial leaders was initially stifled in 1216 when both archbishop and *Geschlechter* suppressed the *Rat*. But the archbishop and the Overstolz faction revived and co-opted the *Rat* from the 1220s onwards as a tool to weaken the *Schöffenregiment* of the *Weisen*. The parishes, now having lost the *Rat* as their representative institution, looked in turn to the artisan guilds (*Handwerkerbruderschaften* or *Zünfte*) to defend their interests.

This tangled institutional and social history of *Meliorat*, *Rat*, *Schöffenkollegium*, and artisan guilds reached its climax during the decade of upheaval (1258-68). Archbishop Konrad von Hochstaden (1238-1261) launched his 'revolution from above' in 1258-9 to subject *Geschlechter* power in the city once again to archiepiscopal authority. He made skilful use of the factionalism within the *Meliorat* in order to depose and exile the *Weisen* partisans, and thereupon he widened the spectrum of political participation by installing representatives from both the merchant *Mittelstand* and the artisan guilds as *Schöffen*. Groten's prosopographical study of the new *Schöffen* makes clear that a mixture of *Geschlechter* leaders from the Overstolz faction, merchants, and guild masters comprised this *Schöffenkollegium*, rather than the so-called *Zunftregiment* of weavers, as has been erroneously asserted so often in the past. The *Rat* itself was formally recognized at this time as a legitimate city-wide representative body and its governmental role was expanded.

This transition in burgher governance structures was interrupted briefly by the death of Archbishop Konrad von Hochstaden in 1261. Thereafter the *Weisen* faction succeeded in returning from exile and regaining control of *Schöffen* offices; with parish support they eliminated guild participation in the *Stadregiment* after the Weavers' Revolt of 1265. The new archbishop, Engelbert II von Falkenburg (1261-74), then formed an alliance with the *Weisen* faction in an attempt to take advantage of the factionalism within the *Meliorat*. This move, however, only resulted in war (1267-8), at the conclusion of which the archbishop found himself in the count of Jülich's prison and the *Weisen* permanently driven out of Cologne by the Overstolz faction. The peace settlement of 1271 released Archbishop Engelbert in exchange for his formal recognition of the reformed *Stadtregiment* of the 1250s. Thus the burgher élite achieved *de facto* constitutional independence before their famous victory at the Battle of Worringen (1288), which merely confirmed their liberty from the archbishop.

According to Groten, this was not only liberty from achiepiscopal lordship but also from the *Schöffen* monopoly of the *Weisen*, which finally cleared the way for the *Rat* to emerge as the leading municipal institution. Dominated now by *Meliorat* members, the *Rat* became the institution of choice for broader representation in the city's governance instead of the narrower archiepiscopal institution of the *Schöffen*. By the early fourteenth century an adjunct institution, the *Weite Rat*, further broadened representation among the ruling élite in a way that the *Schöffenkollegium* could never do. The *Rat*, therefore, emerges in Groten's account not only as a symbol of independence from achiepiscopal lordship, but also from the aristocratic *Schöffen*-oligarchy of the *Weisen*.

Groten is at his best when exhibiting his impressive skills in palaeography, diplomatics, sigillography, prosopography, and linguistic analysis. His deft handling of charter witness lists, literary histories, and *Schreinskarten*/*Schreinsbücher* entries yields valuable new information on kinship ties and social relations between the *Meliorat*, mercantile *Mittelstand*, and artisan groups. Thus the social history of Cologne is augmented and nicely integrated with traditional concerns about constitutional development. Also very valuable is Groten's inclusion of parochial institutions and leaders as active players in municipal constitutional development. In his account the parish *Gemeinden* play as active a role as the *Geschlechter* and the archbishops in shaping the city's constitutional history. The *Amtleute*'s exercise of low

justice in parish courts, collection of direct taxes (*Grundsteuer*), and organization of the city's defence were valuable contributions to burgher self-governance. Fortunately, Groten gives the *Amtleute* as much attention as he does the *Schöffen*. Finally, Groten is most helpful in providing comparative evidence from other German cities, a practice which is often neglected in such studies.

Groten's general thesis and overall presentation are convincing, and therefore allow only minor criticisms on individual details. The book's emphasis on internal political dynamics necessarily results in the down playing of external forces in Cologne's history. It remains unclear, for example, why Groten rejects Cologne's economic interests in England as a major external influence on the city's allegiance to Otto IV, while he asserts the same interests as the reason for Cologne's support of Frederick II once the emperor married the English princess Isabella. However, he is right to emphasize the many other foreign economic interests in addition to England that motivated the Cologne merchants. Yet this variety of foreign involvements in itself speaks for the importance of the role which external forces played in Cologne's internal politics.

Several assertions in the book must be tentative in nature simply because of the thin evidentiary base which survives. For example, the documentation is more convincing when Groten argues for the knightly culture of the Overstolz faction of the *Meliorat* than when he claims an aristocratic, Francophile culture for the *Weisen* faction. Yet there are few scholars who know these Cologne sources, especially the abundant yet still largely unpublished *Schreinsbücher*, as well as Groten, and he is consistently circumspect when making hypotheses in order not to strain the evidence beyond credibility. This book should only inspire further confidence in his scholarship.

In summary, Groten has displayed the riches of the historical sources on medieval Cologne and thereby offered valuable correctives to the existing historiography. In particular, he has shown that the emergence of Cologne's *Rat* as the central municipal institution of burgher governance had a unique history among medieval German cities. This book deserves to be translated into English in order to find a wider Anglophone audience.

JOSEPH P. HUFFMAN is Associate Professor of History at Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania. He is the author of *Family, Commerce,*

and Religion in London and Cologne: Anglo-German Emigrants, c. 1000 - c. 1300 (1998), and his *The Social History of Medieval Diplomacy: Anglo-German Relations (1066-1307)* will be published in 1999. His current project is a study provisionally entitled *Ad usus pauperum: Urban Poor Relief in Medieval Cologne before the Black Death*.

MICHAEL ROTHMANN, *Die Frankfurter Messen im Mittelalter*, Frankfurter Historische Abhandlungen, 40 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998), 726 pp. ISBN 3 515 06883 X. DM 198.00

In 1990 Frankfurt-on-Main celebrated the 750th jubilee of the granting of Frederick II's privilege, which in 1240 placed all visitors to the Frankfurt fair under his royal protection. As a city still famous for its fairs, and seat of both the Bundesbank and the Central European Bank, Frankfurt could not let an event of this sort go unnoticed. The celebrations in 1990 were marked by numerous publications. A collection edited by Johannes Fried, *Die Frankfurter Messe. Besucher und Bewunderer. Literarische Zeugnisse aus ihren ersten acht Jahrhunderten* (1990), and the three-volume exhibition catalogue edited by Rainer Koch, *Brücke zwischen den Völkern. Zur Geschichte der Frankfurter Messe* (1991), deserve particular mention. These publications, however, were not accompanied by a major scholarly monograph on the Frankfurt fairs in the Middle Ages. Since Alexander Dietz's *Frankfurter Handelsgeschichte* (1919-1925) and the numerous monographs and essays by Hektor Ammann, published between 1920 and 1960, no book has dealt specifically with the economic, financial, and political functions of the two Frankfurt fairs (Louis of Bavaria granted the second privilege in 1330), which brought together the most important people concerned with trade, finance, and commerce in late medieval Europe each spring and autumn. The 1994 study by Nils Brübach, *Die Reichsmessen von Frankfurt am Main, Leipzig und Braunschweig (14.-18. Jahrhundert),* does deal with this topic, but leaves gaps since the timespan is not really appropriate to the case of Frankfurt, and his attempt to compare fairs which were very different in nature is somewhat over-ambitious. Thus a major chapter of economic history remained to be written, in order to extend our knowledge of the other European fairs of this period in Geneva, Antwerp, Nördlingen, and Chalon-sur-Marne.

Michael Rothmann has done this magnificently. Not only does his comprehensive study fill a gap, but he also writes a new chapter in medieval economic history. He presents the Frankfurt fairs as a complete urban system, as an 'economic and social entity' (p. 23). The plural retained in the title (*Die Frankfurter Messen)* is quite justified. It underlines the fact that from 1330 the fair took place twice a year, and it emphasizes the diversity of an event which brought together economic spaces that were sometimes complementary, sometimes opposing, and which

attracted people with motives and aspirations that sometimes converged, sometimes diverged.

Rothmann's major achievement in this book is to have embedded the history of the fairs in an overall history of the town. His aim is not to paint a traditional picture of the external framework, or to provide an equally standard description of the town's favourable geographical position and its political and social structures. Instead he presents a complex system which reflects the strategy, the will, and the deliberate policy of a whole town. The population of Frankfurt, which never exceeded 9,000 to 10,000 during the entire Middle Ages, doubled during the period of the fair. This temporary demographic increase, and the problems of organization, accommodation, and supplies connected with it, recurred when the Diets met there and, after the Golden Bull of 1356, during the election of the German king. Rothmann rightly points out that the fairs and the imperial gatherings could not have been staged without minimal political consensus and adaptation of the town's institutions, finances, taxes, and customs duties.

From this point of view the author has written a comprehensive political history of the fairs, something which we have so far lacked. Such a history includes not only legal and institutional aspects, but also foreign policy conducted to the advantage of the fairs. This foreign policy was characterized by a complicated and effective *Geleit* system. Rothmann's description is all the more successful for showing how this system was linked to the city's alliances with princes, towns, and kings, and that it both adhered to and determined the main thrust of the town's territorial policy. The early introduction of a system of messengers (*Boten*) similarly testifies to the fact that the policies of the Council (*Rat*) were adapted to the needs of the fairs. In addition, Frankfurt maintained a wide network of allies, envoys, and councillors around the king and his court, and around important Electors, in order to guarantee, defend, and protect the fairs' privileges. Thus Rothmann also writes a history of the dangers and jealousies that regularly threatened the fairs in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is no coincidence that the book begins by describing Frankfurt's struggle to destroy neighbouring fairs, and to adapt to the calendar of more distant ones. At this point in the study the author proposes a definition of the fair which takes account of how merchants and bankers of the time compared the fairs with one another, weighing up their advantages and disadvantages and bringing them into competition

with each another. This is already how the late medieval economy functioned.

Clearly, it is hardly possible to write a history of the fairs without also analysing communications and news systems. This means that the transfer of goods and of news were already inseparable at that time. In these two spheres the Council, as the town's representative and decision-making authority, played a considerable role, one that could only rest on the consensus of the citizens and the town's élites. One cannot but agree with the author when he shows that the Council, and over and above this, political factors, were the crucial reasons for the growth of the fair. Part of this *Messepolitik* was a strong awareness of how the centrality and influence of the fairs could be exploited to the advantage of the urban social corpus as a whole. Perhaps *Messepolitik* was one of the main reasons for the peace that reigned in Frankfurt between 1360 and 1520. Ultimately the healthy state of the town's finances (despite the defeat at Kronberg in 1389 and the fall of the city of Mainz in 1462), and the fact that it avoided wars and debts, demonstrated that the Council's *Messepolitik* was the right one.

The perspective Rothmann chooses for his investigation, and his knowledge of the most recent trends in medieval financial and monetary history, and the history of credit payments, enable him to refute at least three common assumptions about the history of trade in Frankfurt. Traditionally, the rise of the Frankfurt fairs was attributed to the disintegration of the network of fairs in Champagne. Likewise, it has long been assumed that the Frankfurt fairs gradually declined after 1350. Finally, the rapid rise of the Frankfurt fairs as a market for financial products has been interpreted in various different ways, and often disputed. His detailed examination of the system of payment and credit in Frankfurt allows Rothmann to extend and underpin our knowledge of the financial significance of the Frankfurt payment calendar (*Frankfurter Termin*) for the most important economic regions of the time. By contrast, he pays less attention to the history of the transfer of goods in and around Frankfurt, taking the wine trade as his main example. However, this imbalance seems justified in two respects. Firstly, the material and commercial aspects of Frankfurt trade relations have already been well researched, particularly as regards cloth, grain, and metals. Secondly, the author's chosen methodological perspective is the right one: the Frankfurt fairs can be understood only if their financial dimension is taken into account.

This financial aspect was significant far earlier than was thought, and it contributed to the fact that the Frankfurt fairs achieved supra-regional and even international importance. The numerous receipts, accounts, bills, and commercial books examined by the author, not only in Frankfurt but also, of course, elsewhere, testify to this. The role of the *Frankfurter Termin* was all the more important since only major fairs could function as financial markets for the whole of the Empire in the late Middle Ages. Four aspects of this are examined here: firstly the business of minting connected with the fairs; secondly the exchange of gold at the Frankfurt fairs at a time when both gold and silver coins were in circulation; thirdly the establishment of a market for precious metals; and fourthly the development of a supra-regional credit system. The logical objective of such a complex and coherent policy was the development of a stock market advantageous to the town's finances, but also to the Council élites. Thus the town's leading patrician families (*Geschlechter*), who were involved in both the Council and the trade associations, could benefit from the fairs' credit, while at the same time the stock market guaranteed Frankfurt's good reputation. The stock market, which can only be understood in relation to the fair market, thus combined internal and external factors which linked the policy of the Council and the business of all merchants. The detailed study of the stock market shows how profitable, but also dangerous, this market was. The towns of Mainz and Wetzlar had to declare themselves bankrupt, which shows the down-side of this business, but neither of them had a fair as significant as the Frankfurt fairs to provide their salvation.

All these financial dealings, whether credit, money exchange, or stocks, expanded during the fifteenth century, both geographically and financially, far more than was previously realized. It is impossible to summarize this development in this review. I can only recommend reference to the many tables and graphs with their extensive commentaries, as well as to the useful appendix, and the register of participants in the *Geleit* or the list of Frankfurt, Erfurt, and Strasburg stock-holders. Analysis of Frankfurt's traffic in payments and credits confirms the central significance for the Frankfurt fair of Nuremberg and the economic area of Franconia in southern Germany. At the same time, however, another important connection becomes apparent, namely with the economic network of Cologne. Here Rothmann provides further well-founded evidence of the strength and diversity of trade

relations along a geographical axis centred around Cologne, Frankfurt, and Nuremberg. This axis of the late-medieval German economy connected, by means of roads, rivers, and mountains, the seas to the north and the south which were so crucial to the entire European economy.

It should therefore come as no surprise that the final part of the book, rather than offering a conclusion, quotes the great names and figures of foreign trade and international finance of the time: Ott Ruland of Ulm, Matthäus Runtinger of Regensburg, Hildebrand Veckinchusen of Lübeck, and the owners of the major Nuremberg trading companies. For ultimately a fair was, and remains, above all a meeting point for people – artisans, merchants, and bankers, but also princes – all of whom were convinced, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, that the *Frankfurter Termin* was indispensable to the conduct of political, economic, and financial affairs.

PIERRE MONNET is *maître de conferences* in medieval history at the University of Dijon and has been deputy director and *Referent* in medieval history at the Mission Historique Française en Allemagne in Göttingen since 1996. His dissertation was published as *Les Rohrbach de Francfort. Pouvoirs, affaires et parenté à l'aube de la Renaissance allemande* (1997). He is currently working on diplomacy and the foreign policy of German towns in the late Middle Ages.

HILLAY ZMORA, *State and Nobility in Early Modern Germany: The Knightly Feud in Franconia, 1440-1567* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), xiv + 232 pp. ISBN 0 521 56179 5. £35.00. $59.95

Hillay Zmora rejects the widespread view that the late medieval feud was a symptom of the decline of the nobility. He argues instead that princely state-building made proximity to princes the crucial factor in determining the fate of noble families. The result was a competition within the nobility for resources that were important to the princes. Feuds played a central part in this struggle, which led to the creation of an élite of noble families upon whose power and wealth the princely state depended.

The study under review covers the period from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth century. Around 1440 territorial conflicts between the Franconian princes became more intense, and the role of knightly feuds in these struggles became more important and clearer; in 1567 the execution of Wilhelm von Grumbach marked the end of the last feud on Franconian soil. In addition to numerous published sources and a wealth of secondary literature, Zmora draws on manuscript sources from the state archives of Amberg, Bamberg, Nuremberg and Würzburg, the Bavarian Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich, the Geheime Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin, the Freiherrlich Fuchs'sche Archiv in Burgpreppach, and the Library of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg.

Zmora starts by outlining the image of the feud in historiography. Ulrich von Hutten had already defended the right and duty to conduct feuds against the common criticism that feuds were no more than robbery. Historians long assumed that 'feuding' was merely a cover under which impoverished knights acted as robbers ('robber-knights'). In his book *Land und Herrschaft* (1939) Otto Brunner rehabilitated the feud within the context of his understanding of *Alteuropa*, which Zmora critically acknowledges, as a way of preserving the law and as a constituent of the contemporary social order. Werner Rösener, by contrast (*Zur Problematik des spätmittelalterlichen Raubrittertums*, 1982), again sees economic crisis among the lower aristocracy as an important cause of feuding.

The author avoids giving a 'positive' definition of the feud. Instead, he describes two 'typical' but exceptionally well documented examples (Vestenberg versus Vestenberg, 1484 ff.; Schott versus Nuremberg, 1498

ff.) of this 'structured conflict over various rights'. He goes on to list features of the feud, and emphasizes that feuds were inevitably connected with larger political conflicts. Differentiating between feuds and other forms of violent conflict is made more difficult by the lack of uniformity in the contemporary terminology used in the sources.

Zmora begins the main part of his study by investigating the foundations of noble existence. He concludes that there was no general crisis among the late medieval German nobility that could explain the phenomenon of the feud. Rather, he argues, a process of social differentiation was set in motion by the consolidation of the princely territorial state. Zmora identifies a number of indicators of high status which were factors in the process of stratification: holding of high offices in the prince's administration, transactions with princes as creditor or guarantor, and marriage to the daughters of high-status nobles. In this context, he speaks of a 'plutocratic élite', but its size in relation to the entire Franconian nobility is not made clear. Nor is there any further differentiation of the factors, listed above, by which this élite is defined.

The second step in Zmora's argument is a prosopographical examination of feuding nobles. Of the 313 main protagonists he found, Zmora had to exclude seventy-one (22.7 per cent) because they could not be unequivocally identified. The remaining list he regards as representative because it is hard to imagine that a feud was not documented in the sources, and because difficulties in identifying individuals can be the result of high as well as low status. Zmora investigates the 242 feuding nobles he identified in terms of both individual and family parameters. The individual parameters are the factors, listed above, for determining the social status of nobles; family parameters are, in addition to the status of the father, the family's access to cathedral chapters, the survival of the family until the beginning of the seventeenth century, and its participation in jousting. What emerges is that the feud was to a large extent the domain of the noble power élite; about 70 per cent of Zmora's sample were high-status nobles, and these were responsible for about four-fifths of all feuds. The interpretation of the feud which Zmora offers is intended largely to explain this finding. It encompasses five points, which can only briefly be summarized here.

(1) *From aristocracy to nobility*. Between 1300 and 1500 Franconia underwent a process of feudalization. In the first half of the fifteenth century the (lower) aristocracy emerged as a clearly differentiated

group, as Hans-Peter Baum has shown (*Der Lehenhof des Hochstifts Würzburg im Spätmittelalter*, 1990). The main criterion for belonging to this group was the possession of a free knightly fief. As valuable fiefs which conferred power were also a crucial factor in securing the continued existence of a family, and demand exceeded supply, conflicts were inevitable.

(2) *Territorializing princes and feuding noblemen*. Princes were dependent on the nobility for state-building, and thus competed for their loyalty; noblemen's lordships played an important part in the conflicts between the Franconian territorial powers. The nobles for their part competed for proximity to princes. As the demand for district governorships (*Amtmannschaften*) and valuable fiefs outstripped supply, the princes had to select from among the applicants, which resulted in a stratification within the nobility. Relations between the princes and the nobility were inconsistent. Ultimately the noble élite thwarted the princely state-building to which it owed its existence; as conflict between the princes escalated in a fragmented Franconia, the nobility became more powerful, and princes were less able to integrate them into their territories as subjects.

(3) *Wars and feuds*. The wars of the Franconian princes in the early 1460s set in motion a chain of feuds. The main leaders of feuds were high princely officials or pledge-holders, which suggests that the prince 'ordered' their feuds. It is likely that more feuds were initiated by princes through their most loyal nobles than we have direct evidence for today. However, this cannot explain the majority of the feuds in which high-status nobles were involved. Unlike Regina Görner (*Raubritter. Untersuchungen zur Lage des spätmittelalterlichen Niederadels, besonders im südlichen Westfalen*, 1987), Zmora stresses that feuding nobles were mostly pursuing their own interests; even a mere overlap of interests was enough to allow nobles and princes to work together.

(4) *Lordship, 'protection', and the feud*. Otto Brunner explained the connection between landlordship (*Grundherrschaft*) and the feud, and Zmora takes this approach further. Control over people and land was the source of the nobility's livelihood, and the social and political basis of its position as the leading class. An essential element of the relations between a lord and his followers was the provision of protection (*Schutz und Schirm*). The main victims of a feud were the peasant subjects of the adversary. The exposure of the ineffectiveness of the protection offered by a rival undermined his power, and one's own protection was offered

as an alternative. In this way, feuds resulted in an accumulation of lordship. Moreover, by producing force nobles reproduced the situation of peasants as the recipients of protection and, ultimately, their own situation as lords.

(5) *State-making and the feud*. Feuds could lead to the consolidation or localized disintegration of a principality. Princes could therefore not afford to remain passive. They had to intervene in order to gain territorial advantages, or at least to maintain the *status quo*. They had to support those wealthy families whose power and capital were essential for state-building; it was annoying for princes that most feuds took place between nobles who were members of the upper stratum and were thus more or less equally useful to them, or posed more or less the same degree of threat. Princes used feuds to achieve a breakthrough, without an expensive war, in the territorial stalemate that dominated Franconia, but at the risk of alienating powerful nobles. Nobles profited from rivalry between the princes. On the one hand, they used this to preserve a degree of independence. On the other, feuds brought them into greater proximity to the prince whose support they accepted, which was associated with improved access to resources. Princes granted lordships (fiefs, *Amtmannschaften*, *Pfandherrschaften*) to those who could most effectively serve their territorial goals: 'noblemen had to provide princes with capital and coercion in order to gain (or retain) access to capital and coercion' (p. 117). By expanding their lordships, not least through feuds, nobles increased the resources which they could then make available to the prince. 'Underlying them all was the concomitance of the competitions over accumulation and concentration of landlordship and territorial lordship. These competitions converged on the capacity of the feud to subserve hand in hand the interests of some princes and some noblemen acting in tacit or overt union against other princes, noblemen and cities' (p. 118). The ability of a family to combine its own interests with those of a prince determined its rise or decline.

In the concluding chapter, Zmora investigates the reasons for the decline of the feud in the sixteenth century. One commonly held view is that this was the direct consequence of the rise of the state. Zmora, by contrast, sees an indirect connection between the two phenomena. The rise of the early modern territorial state forced nobles to redefine their relations with the princes. While they remained vassals of the prince, whom they continued to serve as officials, they opposed integration

into the territories created by the prince. And thereby, according to Zmora, the deeper causes of feuds fell away: 'The dissolution of the territorial ties to the princes meant that the nobles and their lordships lost their former value as elements of state-building' (p. 142). They were no longer the object of conflicting claims by the princes, and as a result, frictions within the nobility lost their political significance and were less likely to lead to feuds. The nobility stood up to the princes by forming the Imperial Knighthood with the Emperor's support. Zmora describes its creation, starting in 1331. In order to evade the grip of the territorial state, nobles were forced to work together in a project of deliberate self-disciplining, including internal pacification by suppressing the feud: 'Individual freedom could be saved only by institutionalised political solidarity which necessarily constrained it' (p. 146).

Although Zmora's argument is logical, it should not blind us to the fact that there were also other reasons for the decline of the feud. For example, it cannot seriously be doubted that the imperial proscription on feuding (*Landfriede* of 1495) and its improved enforcement through the *Exekutionsordnung* of 1555, as well as the superiority of the princely states in terms of power had a disciplinary effect, directing the nobility towards the amicable or juridical settlement of disputes.

An appendix provides the statistical material upon which the discussion of the stratification of the Franconian nobility during the period under investigation is based. It contains the following lists: (A) creditors and guarantors of the (Franconian) Margraves of Brandenburg (incumbents of high offices are indicated); (B) high princely officials (from A; in addition, the stewards of the Franconian princes) whose fathers-in-law could be identified and were also high officials; (C-F) individual and family parameters of the feuding nobles (subdivided into two groups). Every piece of information in the appendix is verified by a mention of sources used. A comprehensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources, and an index (of names, places, and subjects) round off the volume.

Much fundamental research still needs to be done before a social history of the Franconian lower nobility can be written; this is indirectly confirmed by Cord Ulrich's book, *Vom Lehnhof zur Reichsritterschaft. Strukturen des fränkischen Niederadels am Übergang vom Spätmittelalter zur frühen Neuzeit* (1997), which Zmora was not able to consult. Given this handicap, Zmora arrives at remarkable results concerning the social location of the feud using his chosen method. His subsequent

interpretation of the feud and explanation of its decline are, on the whole, convincing. Going beyond its immediate subject, Zmora's investigation provides a good insight into the situation of the lower nobility and its relationship with the princes and their territories. It also has much to say about the nature of the state in late medieval and early modern Franconia (an important additional reference here is H. H. Hofmann, *Adelige Herrschaft und souveräner Staat*, 1962).

CHRISTOPH BAUER is *Wissenschaftlicher Angestellter* at the archives of the city of Würzburg. He is the author of *Melchior Zobel von Giebelstadt, Fürstbischof von Würzburg (1544-1558). Diözese und Hochstift Würzburg in der Krise* (1998), and of articles on Franconian history in the confessional age and on the history of Würzburg. At present he is contributing to an edition of the chronicle of the Bishops of Würzburg (742-1495) by Lorenz Fries (1489-1550), and a multi-volume history of Würzburg.

PETER H. WILSON, *German Armies. War and German Politics 1648-1806*, Warfare and History (London: UCL Press, 1998), xix + 432 pp. ISBN 1 85728 106 3. £14.95

Recent research has changed our image of the Holy Roman Empire in a number of ways. It has become considerably more differentiated, and is also generally seen in a much more positive light. Insights into the destructive potential of sovereign nation-states, to which the author expressly refers (p. 1), our present-day experience of how difficult it is to develop transnational security systems, and demonstrations of how badly they work have all led scholars to revise earlier judgements. The previously dominant view was that this central European confederation suffered a process of dissolution and decline that began in the late Middle Ages and accelerated after 1648. This assessment was shaped by several influences: the criticisms of contemporary constitutional law; the attractions of what were seen as 'more modern' concepts of the state; and the condemnations, still effective today, of nineteenth-century historians obsessed by the nation-state.

Wilson's main aim in the book under review is to offer a corrective to the stereotype that the imperial organization was weak and fragmented, outdated and inefficient. He does this by looking at the Holy Roman Empire's military organization. Wilson examines its internal development and how it interacted with the political system, as well as its role in the European wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. At the same time, he wants to do away with the generalization that older German militarism was, in principle, aggressive by nature. The attempt to explain to an Anglophone readership from a British point of view the structures and particular problems, the traditions and mentalities governing the armed forces and military policy under the specific 'geopolitical' conditions of a state encompassing all the Germans forms a constant subtext in this well-informed and committed account. And, given the current debate on the Federal Republic of Germany's new political role in Europe and the world, it is certainly worth taking note of this subtext. Wilson's main concern, which can be summed up as attempting to achieve a reconciliation with German militarism through the history of the Holy Roman Empire, gives his work significance at a number of levels. It is important as a contribution to research which also adds to the present-day debate. And as a survey intended for a broad expert audience, it will also be useful for students.

The revision and relativization of current judgements and clichés about Brandenburg-Prussia, supposedly the purest embodiment of an aggressive German military state, the careful reassessment of it in the context of the Holy Roman Empire, and the comparison of the Hohenzollern Estates with the Imperial Diets (pp. 242 ff.) fits into this line of argument.

This individual case is anticipated here because of its extraordinary historiographical impact. However, it is less the development of individual states than that of the Holy Roman Empire as a whole that provides the frame of reference for Wilson's study – one which to this reviewer seems logically built up and convincingly filled in. Going far beyond a narrow military historical approach, the author begins by outlining the complex political structure of the Holy Roman Empire, and showing how it was integrated into the international order. Taking a systems analysis approach, he looks at constitutional 'texts' and constitutional 'realities'. The crucial factors – Emperor, Imperial Diets, circles (*Kreise*), and Provincial Estates – are analysed in terms of position, function, and interests in the context of the formation of the early modern state. Wilson clarifies inherent tensions and external influences, and, finally, discusses the main potential developments in the concept of the state and the organization of force within this multidimensional system. Possible options identified by Wilson, and placed within their political context, are deterrence and defence. Deterrence is visible in imperial absolutism and the absolutism of individual states.

The scenario that Wilson develops out of these considerations – the Holy Roman Empire as a defensive union of individual members orientated towards expansion and subjected to expansionist pressure from external powers – is a suitable point from which to embark upon an analysis of the system. Combining structural investigation and an account of what happened, the author asks how the imperial organization reacted to changes caused by relative gains in the power of individual members, and to external threats. He asks how it survived actual military challenges, and how it dealt with internal tensions, and finally, how it put up with these pressures for so long. He concludes that, given limited resources of its own, the state and military organization of the Holy Roman Empire displayed a relatively high degree of efficiency *vis-à-vis* superior enemies. Moreover, its achievement in integrating the expansive interests of individual Imperial Diets which threatened the collective system was astonishing.

We can agree with this positive view of the Holy Roman Empire as a self-regulating system that had to, and obviously did, cope with enormous tensions, and long remained stable. It is equally clear that its military system was defensive in nature, even if, as far as Brandenburg-Prussia is concerned, this thesis goes a good deal beyond the 'national' perspective outlined, and the strict integration of this (to put it mildly) particularly dynamic state into the total context. However, this reviewer wondered whether Wilson's undoubtedly necessary and legitimate revisionist attempt does not occasionally go too far in wanting to see the Holy Roman Empire over the whole period of one and a half centuries, right up to the conflicts with revolutionary France, as a success story. Up to the beginning of the eighteenth century argument and assessment merge seamlessly, but for the later period contradictions become apparent. Thus the author makes clear how much the military's organizational and political constellations had changed since the 1740s, and how much the Seven Years War, in particular, contributed to the long-term decline of the collective security system; at the same time, however, he clings tenaciously to the fundamental possibility of integration (p. 280).

The problems emerge especially clearly in the discussion of the reasons for the rapid and thorough military defeat and later political dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire. The view that the causes of the collapse should be sought not in the weakness of the Empire, which after all had stood up relatively well to the French armies, but in the lack of will of its members to preserve the imperial organization (p. 298) seems, like much of the basically positive assessment, to rely heavily on an internal perspective. It leaves itself open to the question of whether history would have taken a different course if the internal constitution of the Holy Roman Empire had been stronger. Of course, the author is well aware of this problem, and in the concluding chapter he clarifies and differentiates the external factors which contributed to the Empire's failure. In particular, his accounts of the completely different military doctrines and the refusal of the imperial armies to imitate their enemy and wage 'total war' contribute more to our understanding than the global socio-economic explanations which Wilson thoroughly and convincingly debunks. And the reader will not fail to notice the political message that Wilson's explanations convey.

The strengths of this study are not merely that it connects careful argument and firm judgement, thus stimulating thorough reflection. It

also offers an impartial view, which steers clear of prejudices and treats various potential developments as, in principle, equal. It offers a balance between the discussion of problems and the need to give an overview, and focuses on the Empire as a whole even when analysing developments specific to particular states or regions. Yet this book does more than present the development of military organization in the context of European power politics. Its particular value is that it can be read as an introduction to, and problem-orientated survey of military, society, and politics in the Holy Roman Empire. Moreover, it can also be used as a reference work to help readers untangle the confusions of European diplomacy and cabinet wars, and explain complex connections. The chronological division into large sections, an account saturated in facts which none the less never loses the thread, the discussion of research positions and gaps in the research, a comprehensive bibliography which is supplemented by references to specialized literature in the footnotes and demonstrates again that Wilson has a fine grasp of the material, and finally, a detailed index plus tables of the rulers of the larger Imperial Diets and maps of the administrative organization of the Holy Roman Empire all contribute to making this such a useful work.

When examples are given to illustrate specific cases, they are frequently drawn from south-western Germany. This does not merely reflect Wilson's own research, in particular, on Württemberg, but is also justified by the fact that during the period under discussion south-western Germany was one of the main focuses of military conflict with its powerful neighbour, France. Occasionally, however, the author tends to overload his text. While the attempt to include the experiences and suffering of contemporaries is certainly praiseworthy (and comes across especially clearly on pp. 70 f. and pp. 84 ff., for example), the passages on social history, everyday life, and cultural history ultimately detract from the grand sweep and the systematic approach. The everyday experience of war would certainly have deserved separate treatment. And because this study is assured of success as a reference work and text book, it might have been helpful to take more account of the history of research on the topic. Scattered references could usefully have been brought together in the introduction or in an appendix. This would have made it even clearer how much the historiography of this sensitive topic has been shaped by influences from outside the subject, and by the various (German and non-German) authors' views on the problem of the German state in general, and German militarism in particular. These

criticism are by no means intended to detract from the positive assessment of Wilson's work.

BERNHARD STIER is *Privatdozent* in Modern History at the University of Mannheim. His publications include *Fürsorge und Disziplinierung im Zeitalter des Absolutismus. Das Pforzheimer Zucht- und Waisenhaus und die badische Sozialpolitik in 18. Jahrhundert* (1988), and *Staat und Strom. Die politische Steuerung des Elektrizitätssystems in Deutschland 1890-1950* (1999). At present he is working on perceptions of Britain in Germany's technological, economic, and political discourse in the nineteenth century.

WOLFGANG BURGDORF, *Reichskonstitution und Nation. Verfassungsreformprojekte für das Heilige Römische Reich Deutscher Nation im politischen Schrifttum von1648 bis 1806*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, Abteilung Universalgeschichte, 173; Beiträge zur Sozial- und Verfassungsgeschichte des Alten Reiches, 13 (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1998), xi + 578 pp. ISBN 3 8053 2499 5. DM 98.00

Despite the more positive view that has emerged since 1945 of the history of the Holy Roman Empire, many elements of the traditional picture have endured. The prevailing view has been dominated since the 1960s by the writing of Karl Otmar von Aretin, most recently his magisterial three-volume study (*Das Alte Reich*, 1993-1997). Aretin emphasizes that after 1648 the Reich provided a framework of unity but that it was living on borrowed time. The system was held in place by inertia and by the strong interest in its survival of the minor Estates. The most important developments, however, were those which took place in opposition to it. The revival of Imperial power in the late seventeenth century benefited Austria rather than the Reich itself. The rise of Prussia and its opposition to Austria's great power aspirations also brought it no advantage. Neither Austria nor Prussia was willing to take responsibility for the Reich. The 'modern' ideal of state sovereignty proved infinitely more attractive than the increasingly anachronistic Imperial ideal. From 1740 at the latest the Reich was doomed.

According to Aretin, the progressive sclerosis of the Reich was also reflected in the literature devoted to its constitution. The vast compendia of Imperial law and custom produced in the eighteenth century by figures such as Johann Jacob Moser were largely descriptive. They delighted in recording the myriad anomalies and inconsistencies that characterized the history of the Reich. Yet their empirical approach apparently implied a sense of the hopelessness of a system that defied theoretical analysis, and they remained immune to enlightened ideas and the development of the modern theory of the state. This literature was inherently conservative: description seemed to argue against change. Thus in some ways it contributed to the stability of the Reich and it also perhaps explains why so many commentators, previously critical of the Reich, leapt to its defence after the French Revolution and sang the praises of the system as the embodiment of true German freedom. On the other hand this affirmative and potentially stabilizing function counted for nothing in the subsequent crisis of the 1790s. Furthermore,

after 1806 the whole tradition of *Reichspublizistik* became redundant and, so Aretin and other scholars have argued, it bequeathed little of value to the new German state system of the early nineteenth century.

Wolfgang Burgdorf's ambitious and highly original study conducts an extended polemic against the conventional view. His book contains a wealth of material, much of it new, and his argument abounds in insights that shed a novel light on many aspects of the Reich's history. Its central conclusions can perhaps be summarized in four main theses.

Firstly, while the Reich indeed proved incapable of change, its history since 1648 is accompanied by a continuous tradition of projects for reform. The analysis of this tradition and its significance for the political history of the Reich forms the core of Burgdorf's analysis.

Secondly, while the discourse of reform evolved within a framework of tradition, Burgdorf argues that it saw, among many other things, the emergence of the idea of the Reich as a nation state founded on the sovereignty of the people. This, he argues, was propagated with particular energy from Vienna in the 1760s and 1780s. As a result the traditional idea that the modern nation state was conceived in the struggle against Napoleon by Protestant Prussian ideologues, drawing on the notions of patriotism developed in the drive for state sovereignty by the larger territorial states since 1750, needs to be revised.

Thirdly, writing about Imperial reform in the eighteenth century was not exclusively preoccupied with the idiosyncratic German character of the Reich. It is, on the contrary, characterized by the active reception of the ideas of the major thinkers of the time, including Montesquieu, Rousseau, Justi, Adam Smith, and Kant. Furthermore one of the most striking features of this debate is the crystallization of the demand for a written constitution and the emergence of proposals that were more radical, more 'modern', than anything later produced by the Frankfurt Parliament. In other words, far from being a dead-end, the tradition of *Reichspublizistik* provided the framework for thinking about the organization of the German states and largely set the agenda for the theoretical political debate in those states for the period before 1871.

Fourthly, the very fact that this debate developed at all is evidence for the existence of a politically aware public sphere. This was not the creation of a revolutionary *Bürgertum* in search of emancipation; it was rather in a sense sponsored by the Imperial and territorial governments whose employees and representatives were the prime authors of the literature of reform. These works were part of what Burgdorf terms an

'intergovernmental discourse': they constituted a reality that often seemed more significant than the day-to-day politics that were its inadequate reflection.

The focus of Burgdorf's analysis lies in the period after 1750, yet the later literature of reform drew on two important sources from the previous century. On the one hand Bogislaus Phillipp Chemnitz's *Dissertatio de ratione Status in Imperio nostro Romano-Germanico* (1640) formed the starting point for a new discussion about the constitution. In refuting Dietrich Reinkingk's influential monarchical view of the Reich and in reasserting the aristocratic interpretation, it provided the ideological weaponry for those who subsequently opposed Habsburg ambitions and aspired to re-establish the role of the Estates and the Reichstag. On the other hand the Peace of Westphalia laid down an agenda of reform that preoccupied the Reichstag of 1653-4 and its 'perpetual' successor after 1663. The following decades saw the appearance of innumerable reform tracts which ranged widely over the whole gamut of problems faced by the Reich: the reform of the judicial system, the desirability of overcoming the religious divisions, the need for an effective army and for a co-ordinated economic policy. The urgency of the arguments increased at times when the French threat was most acute. Yet despite the widely recognized need for change, very little happened. In part this was because of the successful re-establishment of Habsburg power, but also because the Estates themselves, always fearful that any change might undermine their prerogatives in unforeseen ways, were unable to agree on concrete measures. Collectively, however, these writings effected a transformation in the way that the Imperial constitution was conceived. The debate about the *Forma imperii* gave way to a broad consensus on the validity of positive constitutional law and to the view, expressed most eloquently in the work of Johann Jakob Moser, that the Reich could only be understood historically.

This new consensus, Burgdorf argues, ensured that the crisis of 1740, when the death of Charles VI without a male heir posed the Electors with the task of finding a non-Habsburg emperor, did not plunge the Reich into chaos. Instead the two-year interregnum and the ensuing three-year reign of the Wittelsbach Charles VII revived the possibility of reform. In fact, lacking both money and an adequate territorial base, Charles VII proved too weak to live up to any of the hopes placed in him. Furthermore the concessions he was obliged to make in his Electoral

Capitulation ensured that no subsequent Habsburg Emperor was able to exercise the same power as Leopold I, Joseph I, or Charles VI. More fatefully, his unrealized schemes for a reorganization of the Reich involving the secularization of ecclesiastical territories and the dissolution of many smaller secular units launched a potent new element into the discussion of the future of the German lands. Both factors were to become crucial in the ensuing struggle between Austria and Prussia.

The unresolved conflict between the Reich's two leading powers over Silesia was fought out in the Seven Years War. It then continued in the political wrangles over Joseph II's reform and reorganization plans of the 1770s and over the *Fürstenbund* in the 1780s. All of these crises produced new waves of political propaganda in which several clear lines emerged. In Prussia the tone was set by Johann Heinrich Gottlob von Justi's massive commentary on Chemnitz's *Dissertatio* published in 1761, which envisaged the Reich as a federation more explicitly than Chemnitz himself had ever done. At the same time Thomas Abbt preached territorial patriotism at the expense of the Reich. During the Seven Years War itself this anti-imperial propaganda offensive forced the Vienna authorities into a defensive position and fostered the emergence of a purely Austrian constitutional theory. After the end of the war, however, the Imperial camp launched a counter-offensive in the field of Imperial theory, hiring Friedrich Karl von Moser, whose *Von dem deutschen Nationalgeist* (1765) appealed to the 'nation' to rally round the Emperor against the princes in the reform and revitalization of the Reich.

The themes of Moser's work, and of the debate stimulated by its publication, then also provided the framework for the next major ideological confrontation: the debate aroused by the formation of the *Fürstenbund* in 1785. The spectrum of reform plans analysed by Burgdorf demonstrates the proliferation of views and elaboration of the key concepts. Prussian federalist theory in effect envisaged the destruction of the Reich. The proposals of Dalberg and other writers of what became known as the 'third Germany' aimed to conserve the Reich in more or less its traditional form. The renewed pro-Austrian propaganda for a reform of the Reich led by the Emperor envisaged its transformation into something like a centralized nation state. Appeals to justice, patriotism and freedom are found in tracts of all hues, but nowhere are these concepts deployed more radically than in the pro-Austrian writings of authors such as Wekhrlin and Johann Friedrich Pfeiffer. Using

arguments inspired by Linguet, Montesquieu, Adam Smith and others, these writers proclaimed the Emperor as the only guarantor of the people's freedom against the absolutism of the princes. Furthermore, a centralized and rationalized empire, they argued, was the best vehicle for the promotion of the material welfare of the nation. The fact that these ideas were the ideological accompaniment to Joseph II's attempts to acquire Bavaria, and thus dominate the Reich from a strong southern territorial base, does not invalidate their radical thrust. Nor does the fact that Joseph's successors soon abandoned the idea of a German Imperial nation in favour of an Austrian empire founded on the *Erblande* diminish their significance in the context of the debate over reform. They certainly vindicate Burgdorf's argument that the 'nation state' was not first conceived in the struggle against France after 1806.

This extensive public discussion of the state of the Reich before 1789 extended naturally into the next decade. It was revived by the dispute over the issue of legislative powers during the interregnum following Joseph II's death in 1790 and the debate over the Electoral Capitulations of Leopold II and Francis II. These questions, Burgdorf argues, were of more immediate significance for the German political world than the implications of what was happening in France. In fact, quite independently of French developments, the German discussion focused on the desirability or otherwise of a written constitution (in the form of a 'perpetual' Capitulation) and on the rights of the people. Furthermore the German debate also produced plans for Imperial reform that were explicitly republican – most notably the anonymous three-volume *Kritik der deutschen Reichsverfassung* (1796-1798), inspired by Montesquieu and Adam Smith rather than the Jacobins.

Burgdorf views the *Kritik*, with which he concludes his study, as the high point of the early modern Imperial reform tradition. That leads him to pass over the subsequent writings of scholars such as Leist (1803), Gönner (1804), Schmalz (1805), and Schnaubert (1806) with their equally striking visions of the dissolution of the territories in the Reich as a state constituted by free *Reichsbürger*. However, its republican conclusions, embodying popular sovereignty and the division of powers, certainly underline his claim that virtually every option and variation had in some shape or form been elaborated before 1806.

Of course none of these reform proposals were ever implemented. Burgdorf does not disagree with Aretin and others on the reasons why the formal structures of the Reich were never reformed. He suggests,

however, that the very debate about reform in itself created new political facts. His work also implicitly corrects a teleological bias in Aretin's account of the Reich's history after 1648. Austro-Prussian dualism may have undermined it. The sovereign territorial state may have triumphed over it. But the political culture of the German state system after 1806 was fundamentally that which had been developed by the literature of reform in the previous century. Arguably that literature also tells us at least as much about the Reich itself as the familiar theme of the struggle between Austria and Prussia. For that reason this highly original and meticulously researched book will be obligatory reading for anyone interested in the Reich after 1648 and the development of German political culture in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

JOACHIM WHALEY is a Fellow of Gonville and Caius College and a Lecturer in German at the University of Cambridge. He is the author of *Religious Toleration and Social Change in Hamburg, 1529-1819* (1985), and of numerous articles on various aspects of German history in the eighteenth century. He is currently writing a history of the Holy Roman Empire in the early modern period.

JAMES M. BROPHY, *Capitalism, Politics, and Railroads in Prussia, 1830-1870*, Historical Perspectives on Business Enterprise Series (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998), 273 pp. ISBN 0 8142 0751 0. $50.00

History is written by members of one generation and rewritten by the next. In recent years this practice has become increasingly common, and it has produced considerable amounts of evidence that qualifies earlier approaches to crucial elements of our collective consciousness. One of the periods of modern German history that has attracted a great deal of attention by recent scholars, and has merited considerable qualification of what used to be the state of the art of historiographical understanding, is Prussian history during the Industrial Revolution. From approaches that were primarily concerned to look back to the roots and causes of the disaster of twentieth-century German history with its two world wars and the Nazi regime, the focus has increasingly shifted towards a more differentiated exploration of what characterized Prussian, or more generally German, history in its own right in the nineteenth century. The focus of research interest and questioning has shifted from structuralist approaches to meso-level and micro-level studies, which have made a considerable contribution to qualifying many of the historical findings of the previous generation of historians. While this earlier generation needs to be given credit for having brought social and economic history to the centre of historiographical interest, credit must also go to many more recent historians who have tested structuralist assumptions and revealed a surprisingly colourful and differentiated picture.

This study of capitalism, politics, and the railways in Prussia by James M. Brophy is a fine example of this sort of work. It sets out to examine the relationship between capitalism, the bourgeoisie (represented by one of its most prominent groups, Prussian railway entrepreneurs), the state, and the development of the Prussian political system. It is common knowledge that railways lay at the heart of industrialization in many of the first industrializing countries, though they may have played different roles, ranging from that of a demand-driven sector in an already growing economy to that of a supply-side booster. Which of these roles they played could vary from region to region within one country, but, despite these differences, the railway industry was closely intertwined with the rise of capital markets, the banking system, and the emergent stock market. As other recent studies

have shown, the exponents of the bourgeoisie who were the driving actors behind these developments constituted a core group of the rising middle class, and were deeply embedded in many varieties of networks that connected them with each other and with other social classes. The correctness of the author's belief 'that collectively railroad businessmen represented Prussia's capitalist class better than their counterparts in other sectors of the economy' (p. 20) has recently been demonstrated by a German study.

The author thus has a good justification for choosing this industry as his focus and as the empirical basis from which to test far reaching questions and research interests. In brief, he aims to help qualify the *Sonderweg* debate by assessing the activities of the railway entrepreneurs as a part of the bourgeoisie, and examining their attitudes to Prussian politics and the state. He doubts that simplistic formulas of 'betrayal, alliance, and symbiosis' (p. 3) represent appropriate descriptions of the relationship between bourgeois entrepreneurs on the one hand and their government, the state, and the traditional landed élites on the other. In order to bring to light the empirical evidence which allows him to identify which ambiguous and conflict-driven relationship between business and politics actually prevailed in Prussia, the author concentrates on the Rhenish bourgeoisie involved in the railway sector. This is a limitation, although it does not prevent the author from coming to clear conclusions based on sound argument and evidence.

By concentrating on the conflict over night trains, the controversies over joint-stock banking and the development of the banking system in general, and the activities of the Prussian Railway Fund with regard to the private sector, Brophy can indeed demonstrate the ambiguities of the relationship between the middle classes and the government. Ironically enough, the core political actor in the conflicts described was the Prussian minister von der Heydt, who himself came from a Rhenish middle-class banking background, as did most of his opponents in the business world. This detail seems to have escaped the author. However, this does not invalidate his findings, which shed light on a history of conflict and co-operation, each episode driven by the requirements of business and its interests, and not by adherence to, or betrayal of, a political vision.

The author's evidence underpins the view that German liberalism as represented by the railway entrepreneurs, a group which included many leading liberals, was clearly distinct from Western European

liberalism in that it did not seek fundamentally to alter the political system, but rather aspired to limited reform to establish the rule of law and secure investment conditions for their business aspirations. Unlike the English middle classes, German entrepreneurs did not aspire to parliamentary representation in order to advance their interests, but acted within a system of negotiation, bureaucratic and legal proceduralism, and reconciliation. They had become accustomed to the bureaucratic rather than parliamentary representation of their political interests, and to reconciling conflicts of interest. The pre-1848 period, therefore, was an era of state encouragement and financial support for the railway industry, but at the price of tremendous inefficiencies in the political system. Because he does not take a comparative approach to his questions (in regard to other German states or to other countries), the author can show that the bourgeoisie struggled with its government, but he can make only a limited contribution to any assessment of how successful it was by comparison with other options in state-society relations.

It becomes quite clear that the Prussian business class had some power to shape both the pre-1848 and the post-revolutionary political setting, and exercised it. But it is equally obvious that in the long term the middle classes had to give way to a state which itself became an exponent of a capitalist and competitive strategy in the railway market. Middle-class entrepreneurs could avoid personal losses – always their primary concern – in that competitive battle by selling their property, at considerable compensatory rates, to the Prussian state when Bismarck nationalized the railways. But they had not changed their attitude as compared to the early years when they were developing their sector: they looked upon the state literally as a guarantor of their securities.

This book makes a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Germany's bourgeoisie and its activities in the leading sector of the railways. Despite some limitations in scope as the result of its Rhenish focus and the author's decision not to take a comparative perspective, this concise and clearly written study presents a lively image of German middle-class history. It goes well with a number of other recent studies which qualify nineteenth-century Prussian history by looking at the possibilities offered by micro-history.

VOLKER THEN is Director, Philanthropy and Foundations, at the Bertelsmann Foundation, Gütersloh. He is the author of *Eisenbahnen*

und Eisenbahnunternehmer in der Industriellen Revolution. Ein preußisch/deutsch-englischer Vergleich (1997) and is currently working on foundation governance and management as well as civil society issues.

HARTMUT BERGHOFF, *Zwischen Kleinstadt und Weltmarkt. Hohner und die Harmonika, 1857-1961. Unternehmensgeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997), 670 pp. ISBN 3 506 70785 X. DM 58.00

Despite its daunting scale and apparently arcane subject matter, Hartmut Berghoff's study of Hohner and the German harmonica industry is a book worth reading and reading in its entirety. Within a few pages, the reader is engrossed in a rich narrative which spans more than a century of German economic history, from proto-industrialization to the *Wirtschaftswunder*, tracing the history of three generations of the Hohner family – musical instrument suppliers to the world. Primitive harmonicas first appeared in the 1820s as tuning aids. By the 1830s they were becoming popular as instruments in their own right. The early centres of production were Vienna, Graslitz in Bohemia, and Klingenthal in Saxony. The impoverished south Württemberg village of Trossingen entered the growing market in the 1850s. Matthias Hohner, son of impoverished farmers and a trained watchmaker, was one of the first generation of Trossingen craftsmen to acquire the necessary skills. And at first, harmonica manufacture in Trossingen was pursued in the secretive fashion of a traditional craft skill. However, by the 1860s business was booming. Hohner set up a small 'factory' producing key parts, whilst assembly was put out to the surrounding villages. From the outset Hohner and the other Trossingen manufacturers concentrated on foreign markets, in particular the homesick migrant population of the United States. Exploiting what was a seller's market, Matthias Hohner established his firm by the 1890s as the dominant supplier of high quality instruments. The founder's five sons, led by Jakob Hohner, consolidated this position. Through brutal commercial practices and innovative marketing techniques they secured Hohner's position as the dominant supplier of the world's most popular instrument. In the early twentieth century the Hohner brothers crushed their German rivals and established a global marketing network embracing the United States, the British Empire, Asia and all of Europe. By 1913 Hohner was selling no less than 11 million harmonicas, and had a total turnover of 5.3 million Marks annually.

Ironically, for a company so international in orientation, popular nationalism was central to its sales strategy. With remarkable lack of shame, Hohner associated its harmonicas with every form of popular

imperialism and militarism across the globe. There were harmonicas for Britain hailing the new dreadnought battleships and for Germany to celebrate the cult of the new fleet and the achievements of Graf Zeppelin. A special edition for the Japanese market in 1905 commemorated the famous victory over the Russian navy. Hohner even tried to cash in on the turbulent politics of revolutionary Mexico, but found its commercial agility stretched to breaking point. The Mexican sales office was stranded with an unsaleable stock of harmonicas celebrating the wrong presidents. And the course of the twentieth century was to reveal the deeper tensions inherent within this marriage of commerce and nationalism. The outbreak of the First World War faced Hohner with an unprecedented crisis. There was huge demand from the German troops, but in the long-term the company could only prosper through trade. Its main markets were still overseas and it was critically dependent on imported raw materials, particularly brass. Throughout the war the company therefore engaged in a deliberate effort to subvert and circumvent the regulations of the war economy. As late as 1916 Hohner was continuing to supply 'Alliance Harps' to the forces of the British Empire through a cover firm in Switzerland. The harmonicas were only repackaged after a public outcry and a boycott of Hohner products.

Having survived the war, Hohner enjoyed a brief revival in the 1920s, driven by a recovery in exports. In particular, Hohner profited from America's unprecedented prosperity to secure a near monopoly of a huge market. It took advantage of every channel of the new media – newsprint, radio, and cinema – to embed the Hohner harmonica in popular culture. However, the recovery was short-lived. The year 1929 saw the onset of a second disastrous crisis. The personal finances of the Hohner family was hit hard by the Wall Street crash. Jakob Hohner had to throw himself on the mercy of the local banking community, triggering the succession from second to third generation. It was Ernst Hohner, Jakob's eldest son, who was to steer the firm through the vicissitudes of the Great Depression, the Third Reich, and the early years of the *Wirtschaftswunder*. In the face of renewed economic nationalism, Hohner struggled. For the first time the firm was forced to find more than half its sales at home. It also had to cope with the ambiguities of Nazi cultural policy. Having forfeited markets abroad the firm might have hoped to cash in on Germany's national revolution and the new age of mass organization. The first months of the Third Reich saw an SA harmonica and a special edition adorned with the Imperial flag and the Swastika.

But as Hohner was soon to discover, National Socialism was profoundly ill at ease with the tawdry commercial nationalism of the nineteenth century. The party took vigorous action to protect its emblems from kitsch commercialism. Hohner responded by depoliticizing its marketing campaign and expanding its product range to include up-market accordions. However, here, too, it faced obstacles. Hitherto, the firm's success in the vast popular markets of the United States had allowed it to ignore the disdain of Europe's cultural élites for all forms of modern popular music. Now Hohner could no longer escape the conflict between 'high' and 'low'. Ernst Hohner embarked on a quixotic personal quest to establish the harmonica and the accordion as serious musical instruments, both in schools and the concert hall. By the 1930s he had made few inroads. It was the war that allowed Hohner to consolidate its grip on the domestic market, providing solace to the far flung troops of the Third Reich.

Hohner thus emerged from the disasters of the early twentieth century more attached to Germany than ever before. At home it could draw on an enormous fund of good-will amongst the older generations. Harmonicas and accordions provided a welcome escape from the ruins and relentless hard work of the post-war Federal Republic. Hohner instruments provided the indispensable accompaniment to the many on-screen seductions of such matinee idols as Hans Albers and Freddy Quinn. Abroad, the new liberalism in international trade promised a return to the Wilhelmine glory days. However, Hohner was now faced with a fundamental challenge. Its core products were reaching the end of their life cycle. Incomes were growing across the world. Radios and record players became ubiquitous by the 1960s. Recordings replaced private music-making. And it was the guitar and 'keyboards' that thrilled the younger generation. Instead of moving with the tides of popular demand, Hohner retreated into the kind of cultural conservatism it had once despised. Ernst Hohner joined the advocates of classical *Hausmusik* in denouncing the sterility of the new mass culture. And, closer to home, the Hohner patriarch was increasingly preoccupied with maintaining the old order. In a remarkable concluding chapter Berghoff shows how Hohner struggled to maintain his family's hold over the local community, at virtually any price. In the 1950s and 1960s the firm spent more on social welfare provision and local amenities than it did on productive investment. In particular, it missed the chance to establish a low-cost manufacturing base to cater for Third World

markets. Various experiments with new electronic instruments ended in embarrassing failure. By the 1970s Hohner was in terminal decline. The fourth Hohner generation was eased out of the management in the 1980s, but it was too late to save anything but the name. Today, the brand is owned by a holding company operating out of a tax haven in the Caribbean.

Berghoff's case study cuts an elegant cross-section through more than a century of German history, and it has more to offer than conventional business history. Berghoff provides a fascinating account of the Hohner family as members of a *nouveau riche* provincial élite. He dissects the industrial relations of the firm and analyses the position of the family and the firm in the context of local economy, society, and politics. A particularly successful aspect of the book is his painstaking investigation of the culture of paternalism at Hohner. Skilled labour was crucial to musical instrument production and careful management of the work-force was very much in the firm's interest. But, as Berghoff reveals, the image of the firm as a household had deep cultural roots. The mid-nineteenth century enterprise was inseparable from the Hohner family home and even when harmonica production expanded to an industrial scale, the household remained the central metaphor through which both the owners and the employees of the firm understood their relationship. As Berghoff convincingly argues, Matthias Hohner's entrepreneurial activity was not directed against the traditional social norms of Trossingen. Hohner turned to harmonicas in the 1850s because they seemed to offer the possibility of a respectable and God-fearing existence. Well into the twentieth century this meant above all ownership of the family home and agricultural land. Whilst building the harmonica business, Matthias Hohner continued to invest in property and remained active as a farmer until his death in 1902. He encouraged his work-force to do likewise. This was undoubtedly functional in economic terms. It allowed Hohner to vary the working-time and wages of his work-force according to business conditions. But more importantly it was driven by considerations of credit. Hohner was able to finance the expansion of his harmonica business by loans secured on his extensive land-holding. Metaphorically, his translation of industrial profits into land-holding added to the social capital of his family, establishing them by 1900 as the 'kings' of Trossingen. Employment at Hohner and references supplied by the firm in turn provided a source of credit for his cosseted core workers. It also, of course, provided the Hohners with enormous

power over their employees. As Berghoff demonstrates, except for a brief episode in the aftermath of the First World War, the Hohner management were able to exclude free trade unions from the family firm and to marginalize social democracy in local politics. Though Berghoff avoids the term, his study in fact provides a fascinating insight into the multi-faceted operation of hegemony in a small industrial town.

Berghoff's ambition is to use business history as a vehicle for *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* – societal history as pioneered by the so-called Bielefeld school, notably Hans-Ulrich Wehler – but *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* with a difference. In his introduction Berghoff criticizes Wehler for his unquestioning assumption that the nation is the suitable unit for analysis. According to Berghoff this involves imposing a political framework on social and economic processes that in fact operate largely at the regional or sub-regional level. This is an argument of fundamental methodological importance and Berghoff's book certainly has much to contribute to such a discussion. However, the point is never fully developed nor is it driven home. The conclusion is by far the most disappointing section of this admirable book. At the end of his enormous labour, Berghoff appears to have run out of argumentative energy. The big questions of the introduction remain unanswered. This is unfortunate because the opposition between national and local approaches to societal history as formulated in the introduction is simplistic and inadequate to the complexity of Berghoff's own account.

For the mid nineteenth century a microhistorical approach is surely justified. As Berghoff shows, Trossingen struggled to resist external influence at almost any price. His narrative begins in early March 1848 with a scene of panic, sparked by the rumour that French troops were advancing into Germany. Villagers buried their belongings and made ready to flee to the forests. The men sharpened their scythes. By evening the rumour was dispelled and accumulated tension vented itself in a village brawl. This incident, Berghoff argues, reveals the profound trauma left in provincial Württemberg by the catastrophic wars of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Trossingen in the mid nineteenth century was a closed world, suspicious of anyone who did not hail from the immediate vicinity, a Protestant monoculture deeply prejudiced against Catholics and Jews. And the community's effort to insulate itself from outside forces and to manage the transition to modernity on its own terms is one of the continuous threads in Berghoff's narrative. By

the 1870s local élites were enthusiastic about national unification. However, there was little that bound them to Berlin. Trossingen's growing commercial success did not tie it more closely to the nation. The German market was shunned until the turn of the century. The overwhelming majority of Trossingen's Harmonicas went to the United States. And it was to America, not to the expanding urban centres of the new Germany, that Trossingen emigrated. Both in personal and commercial terms the modernization of Trossingen was propelled by its relationship with New York not Berlin. Though Berghoff does not drive this point home, he makes a strong case not merely for a local *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, but more generally for a *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* of the nineteenth century shorn of anachronistic assumptions about national society, capable of encompassing both the local and the global.

However, this conclusion must be relativized in two respects. Any local study must face the question of its representativeness. Trossingen and its harmonica manufacturers are clearly not representative of the Württemberg backwoods. Berghoff has chosen to study a 'winner', a community which by virtue of its commercial success was able to negotiate modernization from a position of strength. Trossingen's autonomy in the process of modernization was achieved at the expense of its surrounding environment. As Berghoff shows in great detail, the less successful villages in the region became subordinate nodes in a global manufacturing and marketing networks managed from Trossingen. For such dependent areas, the story of autonomy and strategic negotiation Berghoff tells for Trossingen does not apply. For them modernization was indeed a massive external force imposing wrenching social change from the outside. In this sense the broader conclusion we should draw from Berghoff's study is not that economic and social development in the nineteenth century occurred everywhere as it did in Trossingen, but that industrialization was an essentially uneven process. It was a process which produced winners and losers. Studies based on national statistics, or even data pertaining to large regions, necessarily obscure this essential fact.

Furthermore, in Berghoff's introduction the opposition between the local and the national is surely drawn too starkly. As he himself shows, the First World War marked a fundamental break. The war 'nationalized' Trossingen. The Allied blockade cut Trossingen off from its global markets. At the same time, it increased its attachment to Germany. Trossingen businessmen for the first time gained experience of dealing

with the authorities in Berlin. And local men and boys participated enthusiastically in the national experience of the *Frontgemeinschaft*. The revolution brought national politics to Trossingen for the first time. For a few years in the early 1920s the socialist mobilization broke the stranglehold of local élites on communal politics. And the hegemony of the Trossingen *Bürgertum*, which depended crucially on isolating the local community from its wider context, was not easily restored. The upsurge of National Socialism after 1930 bound Trossingen even more closely to the nation. One of Württemberg's most prominent Nazis, Fritz Kiehn, was based in Trossingen. And for the first time the town played host to national celebrities in the form of Gregor Strasser and Joseph Goebbels. National politics now mattered in a new way. As a result of the Depression and Nazi trade policy, the town's prosperity depended, as never before, on national markets.

Berghoff's rich narrative thus undercuts the stark simplicity of his critique. In the introduction he formulates a static antithesis between the local and national approaches to *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. And for the early nineteenth century this may make sense. But the grand sweep of Berghoff's book in fact cries out for a conceptual framework that is more subtle and dynamic. If it is misleading to write the societal history of the nineteenth century from the perspective of the nation, Berghoff has surely also demonstrated the indispensability of the national context to the societal history of the twentieth century. What we need is not a static opposition between the local and the national, but a framework which encompasses the production and reproduction of the national in a local context. Berghoff has written not a local business history but a magnificent case study of the formation of national society.

J. ADAM TOOZE lectures on twentieth-century European economic history at the University of Cambridge and directs studies for Jesus College. He is currently completing a study of the Statistisches Reichsamt entitled *The Making of Modern Economic Knowledge: Statistics and the German State 1900-1945* (forthcoming).

FRANK LOTHAR KROLL, *Utopie als Ideologie. Geschichtsdenken und politisches Handeln im Dritten Reich. Hitler – Rosenberg – Darré – Himmler – Goebbels* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998), 368 pp. ISBN 3 506 74827 0. DM 88.00

It is, as Frank Lothar Kroll points out, paradoxical that whereas there is a considerable literature on German professional historians' relationships to Nazi ideology in the Third Reich, so little should have been written about leading Nazis' own engagements with history. Kroll has sought to plug this considerable gap by producing this, essentially a study of five Nazi ideologues: Hitler, Rosenberg, Darré, Himmler, and Goebbels. The undertaking is not only welcome, but noble. It has involved the author in a great deal of rummaging around in the detritus of Nazi tracts and speeches, and sometimes also diaries and correspondence, in an endeavour to extract from them understandings of past societies, uses of the past in contemporary politics, and the relationship between their historical imagination on the one hand and their 'utopian' visions of the future on the other. It takes Nazi ideology seriously, and neither as a purely propagandist and manipulative scheme, nor yet as simply a jumbled morass of borrowed ideas. That is also to be welcomed.

Kroll's intention goes beyond a recovery of Nazi conceptions of history. He seeks also to contribute to the decades-long debates between 'intentionalists' and 'structuralists', and more particularly to add a further dimension to well-established interpretations of Nazism and the Third Reich as a 'polycracy of the pursuit and exercise of power'. For this, he posits a markedly less thoroughly explored 'polycentrism of ideological conceptions' (p. 19) which, he suggests, simultaneously paralleled and informed power struggles and differences over policy within the Nazi Party and regime. In that sense, Kroll is an avowed 'intentionalist' (p. 18). Logically, then, he has chosen as the subjects of his interwoven case studies Nazis who each held a world-view and a view of history which corresponded to it, *and* had opportunities to act upon them. The essence of his case is that whereas the Nazis strove to impose a unitary conception of history, individual Nazi ideologues' understandings and uses of history differed significantly. These divergent comprehensions of history directly influenced the formation and implementation of a range of key Nazi policies, and so contributed both to the criminal and to the chaotic and contradictory qualities of Nazi

rule. These are large claims. Kroll's endeavours to establish them are, however, not always convincing.

At the outset, and again in his conclusion, Kroll rehearses a rather vulgar form of the totalitarianism thesis. It serves him as a stick with which to bludgeon not only Stalinism (which is permissible) and Leninism (debatable, but certainly legitimate), but even Marxism *tout court* in consequence of the alleged kinship between Marxists' and Nazis' conceptions of history (cf. p. 13). For the most part, this marks degeneration into abuse. Thus Kroll, in lieu of making any substantive criticism, dismisses Jost Hermand's study of *völkisch* utopias and National Socialism – which overlaps slightly with his own – simply because of its author's purported 'unpleasant salon Marxist attitude' (p. 72, fn. 227). This is no very enlightening way of conducting an academic dispute. References to their 'astonishing' resemblance in sharing 'praxeological' approaches to history aside (p. 18), the only sustained argument advanced by Kroll which might place Marxism in proximity to Nazism is his contention that Nazi ideologues, in particular Hitler and Rosenberg, habitually thought about history 'dialectically'. Hitler, he suggests, reasoned dialectically when he counterposed 'Aryans' to Jews (p. 52 ff.), Rosenberg when he set 'the Germanic' in opposition to Roman Catholicism (p. 145) as thesis and antithesis respectively. To call this 'dialectical' is sloppy thinking: Nazism simply constructed its world view on polar oppositions, the resolution of whose conflictual relationship was to be found in the triumph of the one and annihilation of the other. Such a resolution is far removed from 'synthesis', let alone from altogether more subtle workings of *Aufhebung* in Hegel's and Marx's thought. The Nazis' habits of mind are reminiscent rather of Manichaean dualism.

Only very patchily, for instance in his account of Himmler's anxiety to promulgate his view of history both through German society at large and within his own SS 'élite' in particular, does Kroll consider the promotion and reception of Nazi versions of history. It is decidedly odd, given that he takes totalitarianism as his premise, that Kroll should deliberately evade a fuller discussion of the question of how far the versions of history he describes came to permeate German society either in the years of the Nazis' rise to power or in the Third Reich. His calm remark that this would, after all, have involved him in a quite different project (p. 17, fn. 15) is not as unproblematic as he would have us believe. First, it deprives him of an opportunity to test what is surely

a crucial domain of Nazi totalitarian praxis. Second, it denies him a way of illustrating and explaining the 'mediating' position he accords to Hitler in relation to the other ideologues, and so of accounting for the paradoxical internal pluralism of Nazism. Thus, he is content merely to confirm the already well-established fact that the mania for Germanic tribes shared by Darré and Himmler was treated with disdain not only by Goebbels but also by Hitler. Goebbels, in fact, did, at least sporadically, seek to banish this infatuation from the public domain (though he was in no position to dictate to Himmler's SS empire on any such matter). Hitler, in contrast, made no effort to curtail the cultic obsession with *Germanen*, his contempt for Himmler's infatuation notwithstanding. For this, the 'salon Marxist' Hermand offers a plausible explanation. Hitler's approach to the varieties of history promoted within his regime was essentially functionalist: he cared less about *how* his racialist and expansionist politics might acquire historical legitimation than *that* they should acquire it in the first place. When academic historians endeavoured to counter the view – evidently widespread in the Third Reich – that *Karl der Große* should be denounced as a 'slaughterer of Saxons', not praised as a German hero, they found an ally within the regime not in Hitler, but in Goebbels.[1] For the most part, however, professional historians appear to have been hard-pressed to assert their interpretations in the climate created through popular media from the mid-1930s onward. The medievalist Fritz Rörig, for instance, feared that the very concept *deutsch* was in danger of giving way to the construct *Germanen* in the historical and nationalist language of Nazi Germany.[2] It is useful up to a point, then, for Kroll to be able to demonstrate some divergencies in Nazi ideologues' evaluations of the relationship between Germanic tribalism and the early medieval Reich. But much of the potential value of his argument is lost since he attempts neither to establish which view predominated beyond the confines of a minute group of ideologues, nor yet to determine whether or in what ways specific positions were contested.

1 The correspondence between two Tübingen medievalists, Johannes Haller and Heinrich Dannenbauer in *Bundesarchiv Koblenz*, Haller Papers no. 19, here esp. Dannenbauer to Haller, 13 December 1936, provides a good example.

2 *Archiv der Hansestadt Lübeck*, Rörig Papers no. 50, Rörig to Martin Lintzel, 15 January 1935.

The first substantive chapter is an elegant appraisal of the several levels of Hitler's approaches to history. Kroll first establishes Hitler's insistent claims to possessing a talent for comprehending history and the high degree of significance he unsurprisingly attached to it. Although Hitler dredged up a fair share of highly specific 'object lessons', culminating toward the end of his life in attempts to draw sustenance from Frederick the Great's survival of crises in the Seven Years War, he was far more concerned with viewing history from a 'higher plane'. Concerned neither with genuine historical accuracy nor yet with the elaborate inventions of Rosenberg or of Himmler, Hitler's vantage point was built on myth as a dim but real 'memory' of a distant 'reality' characterized by 'struggle between Gods and giants' (p. 54). This enabled him both to forge a 'universal' conception of history and to perceive 'great lines of development'. He liked to think in terms of millennia. The grand continuities that stretched over what might be thought of as epochs were all ultimately grounded in the racial antagonism of 'Aryans' and Jews. Here, Hitler combined ideas which did not necessarily belong together: the concept of race with anti-Semitism and with Darwinism. While Hitler could sound perfectly conventional in the vital role he accorded to 'great men' in history, Kroll argues that he departed from the norm in emphasizing rather the role of vanguardist élites. Here, the parallel with Leninism which Kroll stresses is suggestive (p. 70). And Kroll is persuasive again in arguing that imperial Rome, far more than any chapters of German history, served as a model for Hitler. He sought to emulate and, of course, surpass its achievements. In contrast to many other Nazis, Hitler claimed to discern a continuity between the Roman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, a linkage which helped legitimize his expansionism in Europe – and, Kroll asserts, one that has 'hitherto astonishingly been completely overlooked' by historians (p. 80).

If Kroll's claims to originality in such particulars are sometimes overblown, this case-study does usefully pull together the strands of Hitler's thinking about history. It is clear and well-written. However, as the other four case-studies which comprise this book pile up, repetition, the fragmentation of themes, and the incessant cross-references to earlier and later sections of the text which that fragmentation makes necessary, become irritating. Kroll defends his method of organizing his material on the grounds that it was the most appropriate way of making

evident the dissonances within Nazism. But were all the discordant notes he hears actually played? Kroll's contention that Nazi historical ideology was 'pluralist', and that the individual ideologues developed more or less cohesive but in important ways mutually incompatible doctrines, itself becomes problematic in relation to his account of the role played by racialism. Goebbels, he argues, had no racial conception of history at all. This set him apart from the other four. However, Rosenberg's racism differed fundamentally from that of Darré (and, if not quite as sharply, from that of Hitler and Himmler), so that these four did not constitute much of a bloc either.

Rosenberg, as depicted by Kroll, was a 'metaphysical' racist, Darré an extremely biological-determinist one, and so they represented opposite ends of one kind of Nazi spectrum. Kroll takes his cue from Rosenberg's characterization of race as a 'mythic experience' and from his various musings about the 'racial soul' (*Rassenseele*). Rosenberg, we read, took from H. S. Chamberlain and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß 'a quite specific understanding of "race" as a whole'. This conception sees race 'not as a biological/natural scientific given based on corporeal differences, but as an "ideal" quantity'. Thus, Rosenberg 'dispensed not only with a biological determination of the racial concept, but with any precise definition of it at all'. If Rosenberg *did* occasionally allow 'biologisms' to creep in none the less, these testify only to his eclecticism and the sometimes 'contradictory' qualities of his thinking (pp. 109-10), and Kroll wastes no more words on these apparently inconsequential lapses.

At this point, I should emphasize, I became very suspicious of where the argument was going. Is it practically possible for the 'metaphysical' racist to eschew 'biological' reference points? And does not the would-be 'scientific' racist relapse into 'metaphysics' – precisely because his 'science' is necessarily anti-rationalist? Could Nazism have contained a clear-cut distinction between them? Kroll had me scuttling for Rosenberg's *Der Mythus des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts* (1930), and so gave me some hours of unpleasurable reading. On close examination, Kroll's representation of Rosenberg proves not only to be patchy, but even as 'eclectic' as Rosenberg's own work. Indeed, it is completely misleading. Thus, when Kroll quotes Rosenberg to the effect that the racial is 'not something one can grasp with one's hands', he omits the rider in Rosenberg's continuation of the same sentence: 'and yet it is realized in the *Volkstum* bound together by blood'. There is scarcely so much as a

hint of 'blood' in Kroll's chapter on Rosenberg, but it 'oozes', 'pours' and 'flows' from virtually every pore of Rosenberg's own execrable prose. A 'law of the blood', indeed, 'determines the thought and deed of Man' (Rosenberg, *Mythus*, p. 22). That 'blood', it is true, does have mystical properties, but it also has biological ones, and 'racial history is therefore natural history and the mystique of the soul at the same time' (ibid., p. 23).

In respect of the nature of Rosenberg's anti-Semitism, the one-sidedness of Kroll's account is alarming, amounting to a misrepresentation which tends to render Rosenberg's polemics against the Jews relatively harmless and certainly makes them appear archaic. First, Kroll depicts Rosenberg's prejudices as being not really racial at all, but based on the 'traditional, pre-modern form of anti-Semitism, that of anti-Judaism'. This is itself a dubious proposition. Peter Pulzer has usefully pinpointed a shift *within* the species of anti-Semitism which employed religious tropes. Specifically racial anti-Semitism is distinguished from its earlier, Christian-conservative, counterpart in as much as the former holds that 'men create their own gods rather than that God creates men; hence the racialist ... regarded all religion and morality as the product of race'. By this definition, Rosenberg certainly belongs in the camp of the 'modern' and racial anti-Semites. The Jewish 'God' (Rosenberg's inverted commas!) was simply the 'myth' of the Jews and invented in their own image (*Mythus*, p. 462). Nevertheless, Kroll persists in maintaining that Rosenberg's analysis of the origins of the Jewish character resided 'in the Talmud as *the* pivotal and cardinal point', that the Pharisees and Jewish religious laws had constructed the Jews, that their 'materialism' was not a result of 'Jewish racial qualities', but a function of 'Jewish *religion'*, and that Rosenberg's arguments were conducted through the 'renunciation of a racial-biological foundation in favour of a primarily theological' perspective (Kroll, pp. 122, 123).

This picture is simply untenable in the light of what Rosenberg actually maintains about the origins and nature of the 'Jewish race'. In the context of an elaboration of 'the conflict between German genius and the Jewish demon' (*Mythus*, p. 460), Rosenberg describes the causes of Jewish 'parasitism'. 'Parasitism' is, 'in this connection, not to be understood primarily as an ethical value judgement but as a characterization of a (biological) fact of the laws of life (*einer lebensgesetzlichen (biologischen) Tatsache*), just as we speak of parasitic phenomena in plant and animal life. When the pea crab (*Sackkrebs*) bores its way through the

vent (*After*) of the edible crab (*Taschenkrebs*), and grows into it progressively, soaking up its last life-force, then that is the same process as when the Jew thrusts his way into society through the open wounds of the *Volk*, and lives off its racial and creative force – until the demise of the host ensues' (ibid., p. 461).[3] This is explicitly biological racism – in spades. It deploys precisely the kind of parallelism from natural history which Kroll maintains is absent from Rosenberg's writings just as it is ubiquitous in Darré's. And the function Rosenberg accords to this 'discovery' of a 'biological' trait of the Jews is far from being a peripheral adjunct without consequences for the rest of his anti-Semitic thought. It is here that Rosenberg sees the essence of the Jewish 'counter-race' (*Gegenrasse*); only its practice of 'blood-selection' (*Blutauslese*) is then explained in terms of a Pharisaic/Talmudic doctrine of election and separateness, an 'unscrupulous moral codex' without which 'Jewry as an entity is unthinkable'. Theology is thus accorded the function of *preservation* and not *creation* of the Jewish race. And so the purported difference in kind between Rosenberg's and Darré's conceptions of racial history collapses into a mere difference of emphasis. What Kroll then says about Darré – that he contrived both a 'reduction' of race to biology and its 'raising to the status of a metaphysical quantity' (p. 169) seems accurate in itself, but equally applicable to Rosenberg.

Whether Goebbels's historical ideology was as free of racial underpinnings as Kroll asserts is also open to question. Racial antagonisms, he argues, gave way in Goebbels's thought first to his identification of struggles between vibrant 'young' nations and degenerating 'old' ones, and second to the espousal of 'socialism' as its core tenets. Without reflecting on its implications for his contention, Kroll himself devotes a lengthy passage to Goebbels's unambiguously racial anti-Semitism (p. 303). An 'Aryan' positive counterpoint to the negative image of Jews may have surfaced much less frequently in Goebbels's recorded thoughts than in those of other leading Nazis, but he had in fact begun to think

[3] Rosenberg got even his marine biology wrong here, since no crab is parasitic on any other crab. Whether the pea crab is parasitic on other kinds of marine life, and whether it may be described as a true parasite, are questions still debated by marine biologists. I am grateful to Dr John Fisch of the Institute of Biological Sciences at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, for this information.

precisely in terms of 'Aryan'-Jewish polarities from an early point.[4] Kroll imputes to Goebbels, and more convincingly to Rosenberg, a departure from Hitler's population policies regarding eastern Europe. Where Rosenberg had seen the minority peoples of the Soviet Union as potential allies, Goebbels is depicted as seeing in the Russian Slavs themselves prospective collaborators, since he purportedly viewed them as a still vibrant 'young' nation who need only be rid of Bolshevism to flourish (pp. 302, 306-7). This, too, is a picture Kroll contrives to present only through selective quotation. For Goebbels also perceived Slavs as intrinsically incomprehensible to a 'Germanic' people, and persuaded himself that it was the Soviet Union's lack of 'Germanic leadership' that rendered it harmless to the Third Reich.[5] In any event, as Kroll points out, neither Rosenberg's nor Goebbels's deviations from Hitler's thinking about eastern Europe had any practical consequences, since neither had the power to act on their dissenting views.

Goebbels's inclusion in this study is in one respect curious, since Kroll is at pains to emphasize that history itself occupied only peripheral spaces in his ideology. In contrast to other Nazis, Goebbels generally disdained a politics of nostalgia and advocated newness, not renewal. Kroll is broadly right, but overstates his case – especially as far as the purported 'modernity' of Goebbels's 'socialism' and concern for the working class is concerned. Goebbels in fact conceptualized workers in anti-modernist ways: as an estate, not as a class. Besides, his critique of the actual condition of modernity implied backward-looking as well as futuristic perspectives. 'Modern man' was 'perhaps the unhappiest mixture of the species of *homo sapiens* there has ever been.' Whereas – or perhaps because – 'the head is free and clear and thinks clear, sensible things', he lacked both style and race. 'How poor we have become!' is a complaint that is surely not altogether free of nostalgia.[6]

Repeatedly, and quite rightly, Kroll explicitly refers to the sheer inventions the Nazis' ventures into history entailed. That being so, the very words *Geschichte* and *Geschichtsdenken* should really have appeared in inverted commas in nine tenths of their occurrences in this book.

4 Cf. his diary entry for 6 August 1924, in Ralf Georg Reuth (ed.), *Joseph Goebbels. Tagebücher*, vol. 1: *1924-1929* (Munich, 1992), pp. 125-6.

5 Diary entry for 15 March 1940, ibid., vol. 4: *1940-1942* (Munich, 1992), p. 1389.

6 Cf. diary entry for 25 July 1924, ibid., vol. 1, p. 113.

Even Goebbels's profound hostility to Rosenberg's, Darré's, and Himmler's fantasies was based not so much (if at all) on a concern with historical accuracy or with a desire to guard against ahistorical fictions or perversions as on his propagandist's intuition. What troubled him was that the reduction of German history to myths and cults left too narrow a range of sources from which Nazism could be legitimized. 'Here, Mussolini proceeds much more cleverly', Goebbels noted in his diary entry for 6 June 1938. 'He occupies the whole of the history of Rome, from the earliest Antiquity onward, for himself. We are all parvenus by comparison.'[7] Irrespective of how successful or otherwise they may have been in their uses of 'history', the Nazis perceived it in precisely these terms: as a territory to be occupied or invaded, then put to work in their cause.

All five of the Nazi ideologues Kroll's study appraises practised 'pseudo-history' at best and scarcely ever showed the slightest regard for historical evidence. If professional historians who placed themselves in the service of the Nazi regime mangled the historical record and perverted scholarly norms, and if nationalist German historiography had itself required any amount of imaginative plugging of gaps to facilitate the narration of the nation, the constructs of their imagination remained historical. The Nazi leaders' 'history' constituted a series of backward projections of present ideological fixations and dystopias, which were then recycled to justify policies in the present and visions of the future. In this sense, their ideology and engagement with 'history' constituted a single hermetically sealed unit and rested on a circular argument. From the Nazis' own perspective, this no doubt frequently functioned as a virtuous circle. But it leaves one with an uncomfortable feeling of unease about Kroll's entire undertaking. If – as seems perfectly plain from Kroll's account of it – Hitler's and his collaborators' 'history' was indeed no more than a repackaging of the familiar array of the ideological bric-à-brac of Nazism, then there is a circularity to Kroll's own thesis as well. Unavoidably, any distinction between Nazi constructions of 'history' and Nazi ideology is thus eradicated.

What then is left of Kroll's contention that 'recourse to the past was of central importance, not only in the establishment of [Hitler's] world-view, but also in ... the tendency of his practical political actions', or that

[7] Ibid., vol. 3: *1935-1939* (Munich, 1992), p. 1222.

Hitler's 'picture of history determined the making and form of his ideology' (p. 29)? Kroll in fact answers himself: Hitler's 'higher plane' of historical understanding was 'always only the mirror image of his subjective wishes and plans' (p. 31). When Kroll claims that Nazi conceptions of history influenced political outcomes in the Third Reich, he is really saying nothing more than that Nazi ideology had a bearing on Nazi practice. Put in these terms, the central proposition of his work begins to seem banal. One wonders whether his material warranted an exploration impelled in large measure by a narrow 'history of ideas' approach. Kroll succeeds, for instance, in demonstrating that Hitler believed in the end of history, while Himmler believed history to be ceaselessly cyclical. Neither of these views is inherently original or particularly interesting. And nothing of any consequence followed from the contrast between them. Nevertheless, Kroll's work does suggest interesting questions, ones which are potentially more rewarding than the comparison with the GDR's use of history which he himself advances in his conclusion. Why was a discourse of 'history' so central to Nazi ideology and, Goebbels's 'modernist' inhibitions about over-reliance on it notwithstanding, to much of their propaganda as well? What might this tell us about the political culture of Nazism? Or about the importance and meanings a wider German public attached to history? These questions have really only just begun to stimulate new research – on the invention of tradition in the Third Reich and such offshoots as the faking of folklore and development of a heritage industry, for instance. 'History' furnished themes and images for the ritual enactments of a new German identity. Kroll's focus has been on the inwardnesses of Nazi ideology. Both the context in which it was forged and its reception and influence deserve more attention than they have received from him in this book.

PETER LAMBERT is Lecturer in the Department of History and Welsh History at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth. He is the author of a number of articles especially on German historiography, and is currently working on a study of the Weimar Republic.

GEORGE L. MOSSE, *The Crisis of German Ideology. Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (New York: Howard Fertig, 2nd edn. 1998), xii + 373 pp. ISBN 0 86527 426 6. $16.95

George Mosse, who died on 21 January 1999, was one of the greatest experts on the intellectual origins of the *völkisch* movement and of National Socialism. His comprehensive analysis of all the relevant material, in particular, numerous contemporary intellectual publications on the subject, remains unsurpassed. The reader will constantly make new discoveries about the ramifications of *völkisch*-nationalist ideology in nineteenth-century Germany, and George Mosse deserves great respect as a genuine expert in this field.

However, it is difficult to say whether it was really a good idea to produce, in 1998, a new, and virtually unchanged edition of this book, which was highly acclaimed when it first appeared in 1964 and was also translated into German. Mosse himself admitted that were he to write the book today, he would place greater emphasis on the First World War as the crucial period when anti-Semitic tendencies acquired unprecedented political impact and virulence.

The early sections of the book, which deal with the dissemination of the *völkisch*-nationalist ideology, contain a wealth of useful and stimulating information. But here, too, the criticism could be made that Mosse lumped together as *völkisch* all intellectual trends that were against liberal traditions. This creates the impression of an inner cohesion in the complex intellectual developments of the last third of the nineteenth century which did not really exist. The attempt to synthesize it artificially into a 'German ideology', ranging from the *Deutschkonservativen* to the reform movement, seems somewhat contrived. Of course, this attempt has something seductive about it, but such a unilinear presentation of German intellectual history from Romanticism to the First World War as the incubation of National Socialism is in many respects too monocausal.

In Mosse's treatment of the period between 1918 and 1933, taking in the history of the political parties and associations, the striking drawbacks of having neglected what international research has produced in the intervening period become really obvious, whether we are looking at the history of the *Stahlhelm*, the NDVP and the ADV, the DHV and the *Deutsch-völkischer Schutz- und Trutzbund*, or the DAP and the NSDAP. For Mosse thus continued to perpetuate many errors of judgement and

factual mistakes which may have been forgivable or unavoidable when the book was first published, for example, the use of Hermann Rauschning's *Gespräche mit Hitler* as a reliable historical source, or the allocation of Friedrich Naumann to the anti-Semitic parties.

The main argument of the book is that Hitler instrumentalized various aspects of *völkisch* ideology that had crystallized into a 'German ideology' and transformed them into an 'anti-Semitic revolution'. Mosse admitted that this was not always primarily anti-Semitic, particularly in a racial sense. None the less, he stressed that anti-Semitism had penetrated all national questions and had had a crucial influence on the nation long before Hitler took the political stage. Most important in this respect was the tendency to 'dehumanize the Jews'. Against this background Hitler just appears as the person who adapted to these tendencies and redefined them for his own ends.

Ignoring all secondary literature that suggests otherwise, Mosse greatly overemphasized the strength of anti-Semitism in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Apart from that, with this interpretation that ascribes the decisive role in Hitler's seizure of power to anti-Semitism combined with the *völkisch* ideology, he proves to have been one of the intellectual precursors of Daniel Goldhagen, for example, in highlighting the murderous characteristics of anti-Semitism since the nineteenth century. He overlooked the fact that during the phase when the Nazis were coming to power anti-Semitic propaganda was clearly reduced, that the DHV, for example, did not allow itself to be *gleichgeschaltet* just like that, that the extremely anti-Semitic wing of the DNVP had broken away from the DVFP, that the *bündische Bewegung* cannot be equated with the *völkisch* splinter groups, and that the *Freikorps* did not embody the form of a *Bund*. Even Hitler's self-styled claim that he was the one to bring about the 'greatest Germanic racial revolution in world history' requires some interpretation.

All in all, Mosse was one of the grand old men in the field of German intellectual history. His reprinted book is a document of the critical evaluation of the German mind in the post-war period and under the impression of the Holocaust, and to this extent, it is important for an assessment of the historiographical constellation of the early 1960s. It is especially interesting for the attempt to pinpoint the origins of the Nazi *Weltanschauung*, reaching back into the nineteenth century, against an apologetic interpretation depicting the Nazi dictatorship as an unfortunate accident of German history.

HANS MOMMSEN is Professor emeritus of the Ruhr University Bochum. His numerous publications include *Die verspielte Freiheit. Der Weg der Republik von Weimar in den Untergang 1918 bis 1933* (1989) and, with Manfred Grieger, *Das Volkswagenwerk und seine Arbeiter im Dritten Reich* (1996).

DAVID WILLIAMSON, *A Most Diplomatic General. The Life of General Lord Robertson of Oakridge* (London and Washington: Brassey, 1996), xvi + 265 pp. ISBN 1 85753 180 9. £25.00

In Britain General Sir Brian, later Lord Robertson might be regarded as just one of a whole string of British top brass generals who witnessed the sunset of Empire and organized the transfer of power. For the Germans, however, he holds a special place: he was Deputy Governor, then Military Governor and, finally, for a short while, High Commissioner of the British Zone of Occupation. Along with Lucius D. Clay, his American opposite number, he acted as midwife at the birth of the Federal Republic, and his biography is long overdue. Clay was given all the credit, both at the time and afterwards, while Sir Brian Robertson has always remained in his shadow. To a large extent this was due to his personality. He was an elusive, though awe-inspiring man who shunned the limelight, wrote no memoirs (unlike Clay), and left hardly any private papers. He was the antithesis to Clay, who was a go-getter, impatient and pushy, and constantly on the look-out for ways to satisfy American public opinion. Sir Brian gave the impression of being cool, detached, unperturbed, every inch the gentleman officer in control of the situation. In their different ways the two Anglo-Saxon proconsuls in western Germany represented the political culture of their countries, and this could not have been lost on the Germans, especially those in the north, who, in temperament, were so much more like their English cousins than the south Germans.

German historians have been very interested in General Robertson, the man he was, the views he held, the power he wielded. Yet they have been unable to satisfy their curiosity because he seemed to be inaccessible except via the official documents left at the Public Record Office. They therefore have every reason to be grateful to David Williamson, who was not put off by the daunting task of sifting through this material. He has meticulously reconstructed Robertson's career, while never losing sight of his personality. It is most unlikely that any German historian would have been able to accomplish this with anything like Williamson's insight and intuition.

Robertson's German years cover only two of eight chapters. In this sense the biography is a balanced account of his life. But it is equally true to say that his approach to the task in Germany can only be fully appreciated within the context of his previous career, almost arche-

typically that of a 'late British imperial figure' (p. 220). The son of a famous Field Marshal, Robertson was born in India in 1896 and spent most of his military career as a staff officer at the front. In other words, Robertson was not a fighting general renowned for great military victories, but a competent administrator in charge of the army's organizational back-up. He only took command of troops for five years, when he was posted to the Indian Army (1920-25). In 1934 he left the army because of 'the boredom of regimental soldiering in peace' (p. 28). The outbreak of the Second World War saw him working for Dunlop in South Africa; he now rejoined the army, first the South African, then the British, and ended up as General Alexander's Chief Administrative Officer in Italy. Montgomery recognized the administrative genius of this Scotsman who got things going.

Brian Robertson's five-year posting to Germany marked his 'finest hour', as his biographer puts it with reference to Churchill's memoirs. This was the mission that earned him the title of the biography: 'A Most Diplomatic General.' Though constituting only two chapters, these years take up almost a third of the whole text. In other words, it is not only Germans who naturally focus on this period; it is also a priority justified by a fair assessment of Robertson's overall achievement. During these years he emerges as a figure of international importance, as the British general closest to the Cold War battle zone. In an oral history interview in August 1970 he frankly admitted that before his appointment he did not speak a word of German and had never visited the country. Nor had he taken part in the preparatory work for the occupation period carried out in London. Was all this a reflection on the British attitude to its new German dominion? The War Office was not particularly impressed by Whitehall's planning and admittedly much of it had in any case become obsolete by the end of the war because the principle of indirect rule via Berlin and German central authorities could not be applied. Robertson, who was forty-nine when he arrived in Germany, came with a fresh mind, and as one of the first men on the spot was soon to discover that there were other priorities than those which had been laid down in so many directives at a time when it was not at all clear what kind of Germany the Allies would be burdened with.

The first problem was to win the 'battle against the winter'. The down-to-earth attitude and absence of the missionary zeal so characteristic of later arrivals from Britain greatly contributed to the general acceptance of military rule by the Germans. British authority, Robertson

felt, could best be established by helping the Germans to help themselves. For this he would have liked more time than the other major allies were prepared to allow. He looked upon Germany as an 'errant child who urgently needs education' (p. 87). However, above all, the Germans needed to be housed and fed, with 50 per cent of housing stock in the British Zone destroyed or badly damaged. Robertson did all he could to cope with the food shortage and prevent starvation. It was he who persuaded the British government to introduce rationing at home in order to feed the Germans in their care. He might have been somewhat paternalistic in his outlook, but this also implied a deep sense of responsibility for his subjects. He suspended the denazification policy when the management of pits was at risk and urged London to reduce the French allocation of Ruhr coal. Years later he was to say: 'We had to save Germany physically from starvation, squalor and penury, spiritually from despair and Communism' (p. 87).

During the early months of occupation Robertson acted as Montgomery's Chief of Staff and deputy, both on the Control Council in Berlin and in co-ordinating military government at the zonal level. Even though he was keen to maintain inter-Allied co-operation he fought tenaciously for a higher rate of German steel production than either the Russians or the Americans would accept. Coal and steel were the only resources left to Germany to pay for vital imports and regain a measure of stability. Robertson's overall objective was a lasting peace in Europe, which in his view required Germany to be not only completely demilitarized and democratized, but also whole and undivided. The latter proved to be the most difficult task to achieve. Unlike Clay, who was to push for a separate West German state, Robertson was opposed to the division of Germany, clearly anticipating that this would lead to the division of Europe into opposing camps. Nor did he agree with Clay's penchant for a speedy return to private ownership and economic *laissez-faire*. One of his subordinates called him a 'military socialist' (p. 110). More determinedly than Clay he tried to maintain co-operation with the Russians, particularly Sokolovsky, his opposite number, whom he respected as a fellow soldier. In the end, however, he also came to realize that quadripartite government in Germany had become a 'farce'. But the solution he had in mind differed substantially from the general direction which pointed to the creation of a West German state.

No doubt the Berlin blockade (June 1948 to May 1949) was both the first serious showdown with the Russians and a personal challenge to

Robertson. By now he had become Governor of the British Zone and Commander-in-Chief responsible for all British troop movements. The Berlin crisis was triggered off by the need for currency reform, a prerequisite for economic recovery in Germany. Robertson hoped against hope that a quadripartite currency reform could be sold to the Russians. He was no appeaser in the negative sense, as Williamson points out, but he was willing to meet the Russians half-way at a time when his own government was no longer prepared to accept an unworkable scheme. But the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia strengthened the position of those pressing for a West German state. Discussions with the Russians on financial reform ended in deadlock when the Soviet representative withdrew from the Control Council. The story of the Berlin blockade is well known. What is less well known is that the airlift was first suggested by a British Air Commodore to Robertson, who then converted Clay to the idea as a temporary measure, not least in order to dissuade the American Governor from despatching an armed convoy. Sir Brian Robertson was one of those generals who based his policy on the worst case scenario. Neither he nor Montgomery believed that a city like Berlin could be supplied entirely from the air. They underestimated the determination of both the Americans and the Berlin population. Unlike Clay, Robertson was not prepared to pledge Allied commitment at any cost. His approach was: 'say nothing and stay put.' It was politicians such as Bevin and Lord Pakenham who argued that Britain should stand firm over Berlin and said so in public. For them the Allied presence in Berlin, negotiated after all by the British, was a moral issue. In this matter they pursued an ethical foreign policy, to use today's terminology. Robertson, on the other hand, felt that in military and logistical terms the Western position in Berlin was untenable in the long run. This was a perfectly logical conclusion to draw from the situation, except that history rarely follows logical patterns.

For Robertson the only way out was a political solution acceptable to both East and West. On 12 July 1948 he came up with a startling plan which urged the Foreign Office to make a U-turn in its German policy in the sense of abandoning the road towards a separate West German state and trying once again to reach an agreement on Germany as a whole. The Western Allies should insist on setting up an all-German administration in Berlin with only a reconstituted *Kommandatura* as a supervisory body. Allied forces should be withdrawn behind given frontier areas, leaving Berlin and the main part of Germany to a single

German government. He was less fearful than others of Germany going Communist because he sensed that the Germans would not tolerate a Soviet puppet regime installed in Berlin. Without doubt this was the last chance to avoid the division of Germany. The Foreign Office hotly debated the Robertson Plan, only to reject it in the end as too risky.

It is worth noting that only a few months later George Kennan, head of the State Department's newly created think-tank, proposed a similar plan as a solution to the Berlin Crisis. His ideas, though carefully worked out, were simply ignored by his superiors. The fate met by these two plans is a clear indication that by 1948 British and American decision-makers had given up all hope of co-operation with the Russians and were thinking only of consolidating the Western alliance, of which West Germany was to become the cornerstone. Nor were they prepared to tolerate a potentially neutral Germany in the middle of Europe.

Williamson does not come up with anything sensational or new. But he casts Britain's chief representative in Germany in a new light, as somebody who was not just following orders and certainly not somebody who could be described as the Americans' poodle. He also shows that officials of Robertson's standing, while pursuing British interests, were indeed conditioned by the German environment, far more so than their Whitehall colleagues.

For the last two years of his German mission Robertson tried hard to eliminate the contradictions in British policy *vis-à-vis* Germany. Thus he advocated putting a stop to dismantling and perceiving West Germany as a potential ally in the defence of the West. From Germany Robertson proceeded to the Middle East as Commander-in-Chief of Land Forces. Fortunately, he left the army before the Suez debacle confirmed the end of Empire. His last active years saw him as Chairman of the British Transport Commission, where his organizational talents were much in demand. Towards the end of his life he was 'passionately in favour' of Britain's entry into the Common Market, fully aware that by now 'these islands are too small to stand alone' (pp. 216-17). Williamson does not suggest that Robertson had this foresight immediately after the war when Britain was in a position to weld Europe together. As in many other cases, the experience of Suez may have been the turning point.

LOTHAR KETTENACKER is Deputy Director of the GHIL and Professor of History at the University of Frankfurt-on-Main. He has written a

major study on British planning for Germany during the Second World War, *Krieg zur Friedenssicherung. Die Deutschlandplanung der britischen Regierung während des Zweiten Weltkrieges* (1989). His most recent publication is *Germany Since 1945* (1997), and he is currently working on German unification.

ARND BAUERKÄMPER (ed.), *'Junkerland in Bauernhand'? Durchführung, Auswirkungen und Stellenwert der Bodenreform in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone*, Historische Mitteilungen im Auftrag der Ranke-Gesellschaft, Beiheft 20 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996), 230 pp. ISBN 3 515 06994 1. DM 74.00

One tends to think of the former German Democratic Republic as a predominantly urban society, containing, as it did, such conurbations as Dresden, Leipzig, and Halle, marching towards smokestack socialism. Yet, around the hammer and dividers at the centre of the national emblem curled the wheatsheaves of the countryside. The GDR always referred to itself as the 'Workers'-*and*-Peasants' State'. Especially in the northern regions of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Brandenburg it was indeed almost completely rural, constituting a large part of the imaginary land of 'East Elbia', home of the Junkers. Moreover, the destruction wrought by the Second World War, in the shape of bombing and evacuations, and the influx of refugees in its wake, turned eastern Germany into an even more rural society than it had been before 1939. This ruralization by default was brought to a head by the land reform in the Soviet Zone of 1945, which broke up the landed estates and redistributed them to hundreds of thousands of smallholders and refugees. Despite the magnitude of these changes at the time, and the legal wrangling they have created since reunification, we nevertheless know relatively little about this massive upheaval. Only recently has Norman Naimark devoted a chapter to the issue in his excellent *Russians in Germany*, but Arnd Bauerkämper's edited volume, based on a 1995 conference, is the first in-depth study and is thus very much to be welcomed.

The diplomatic historian, Jochen Laufer, opens by examining the role of Soviet Military Government (SMAD). It is true that land reforms occurred in all territories under Soviet control in eastern Europe after 1945, yet it was not at all clear to the German Communists returning under Ulbricht that this would be the case in the Soviet Zone (SBZ). Their reports to Moscow in the late spring of 1945 did not contain calls for agrarian change, since they were primarily concerned to stabilize the situation in the countryside, not to engage in potentially disruptive experiments. For reasons which remain obscure, Stalin appears to have changed his mind in early June, when he directed visiting KPD leaders to instigate an immediate democratic land reform. This duly appeared

a few days later in the party's refounding appeal as the call for the 'liquidation of large landed estates'. The Soviet apparatus itself seems to have been caught on the hop by this policy initiative. The SMAD's Agriculture Department first made proposals for a more sweeping reform, including even *Großbauern* in the 40 to 100 hectare category. Stalin apparently opted for a more liberal variant. Indeed, the final cut-off point of 100 hectares – an area one kilometre by one kilometre – was more lenient than the usual 50 hectares in other eastern European countries, since the Soviets were clearly at pains to limit potential opposition in the German countryside. Yet Laufer is sceptical about subsequent Soviet claims, for instance in Semenov's memoirs, that Moscow had always been the voice of moderation. In practice the SMAD insisted on a hard line, refusing to allow expropriated landowners a rump estate or the right of abode in their home district. In 1947, for instance, there was a renewed wave of banishments of the local squirearchy and demolitions of manorial homes. Yet what does seem certain is that the various land reform decrees, issued by the German *Land* administrations in September, were practically verbatim copies of a draft law originally drawn up by Semenov and the Soviet People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs earlier in the summer. Moscow was taking few chances.

What is more tantalizing in Laufer's account is the 'informal' means by which the local military governors were supposed to steer through land reform, and to which he only alludes on p. 28. The Russians proved themselves masters of heavy-handed obstructionism and it would have been useful to have had some examples of how military government operated on the ground. He none the less nicely highlights the wider political importance of land reform. It was not carried out merely to solve economic or refugee problems. The Soviets were hopeful that unilateral socio-economic restructuring in their zone might be just as effective as diplomatic forays in solving the 'German question' to their advantage. It is also clear that the Soviets were aware from the outset that this would cause ructions with the western members of the Allied Control Council, but that they were prepared to risk conflict.

Saxony-Anhalt was chosen as the testing ground for reform in order to circumvent anticipated Christian Democratic opposition in the central anti-fascist bloc in Berlin, by creating a regional *fait accompli*. Despite the fact that even the KPD was only fully apprised less than two weeks before the event, the Communist party soon became the SMAD's main

motor of reform. Several authors in the volume speculate about whether Ulbricht and fellow leaders were banking on a spontaneous grass roots movement to help them through the breakneck timetable. From late August 1945 the party was indeed instructing its district and local organizations to unleash a massive wave of propaganda, culminating in a rally at Kyritz where KPD leader Wilhelm Pieck issued the famous slogan 'Junkerland in Bauernhand' on 2 September. Yet, since this popular movement failed to materialize, with hesitant farmers and labourers insisting on legal backing, the KPD resorted to an administrative campaign from above in the various regional governments and local land commissions.

It is already well known that there was stiff opposition to the envisaged expropriation without compensation from the Christian Democrats in the SBZ. This stance even cost Christian Democratic leaders Hermes and Schreiber their jobs in December. It is a pity therefore that there is not a contribution on the CDUD (Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands) in its own right. Nevertheless, Andreas Malycha gives us new insights into the less strained relationship between Communists and Social Democrats. From the outset the eastern SPD had recognized the need to work with the KPD, yet its leadership under Grotewohl was taken very much by surprise by a KPD line which seemed to be encouraging a class of smallholding capitalists. Even among the rank and file of the KPD there were misgivings about this un-Marxist policy. The SPD was also perturbed at the implications of losing the economies of scale of the estates to a mass of unviable smallholdings. Instead, it called for state nationalization of land and the formation of co-operatives. It also preferred to see the Allied Control Council deciding the issue. Malycha also documents numerous forlorn complaints that the KPD was railroading the other parties with the impossibly fast tempo. Nevertheless, despite the differences over means, the Social Democrats clearly agreed over the ends of land redistribution. The party's agrarian expert, Klimpel, even envisaged a reagrarianization of Germany and the necessity for a long-term settlement policy. Harking back to Weimar schemes, allotment gardeners and smallholders were to be the pioneers in the new socialist state.

After an exploration of central decision-making in the opening chapters there follows a series of *Land*-by-*Land* case-studies. Manfred Wille deals with the pilot region, Saxony-Anhalt, chosen for its strong pool of industrial workers to provide back-up in the countryside. At the

crucial first *Landtag* session KPD leader Wilhelm Koenen was under orders to accept no amendments to Communist proposals, but despite the KPD's pressure tactics, was unable to overcome Christian Democratic and Liberal objections. Only threats from the Communists and Social Democrats to split the anti-fascist bloc, and the thinly veiled disapproval of the SMA, forced through the land reform decree. Desperate for some other legitimation, the KPD looked to history. Expropriation was justified as atonement for the *Bauernlegen* of the sixteenth century, citing Thomas Müntzer's call to arms, 'nicht länger sein der Knecht!'. In one symbolic quid pro quo, a descendant of this early-modern expropriation was even ceremonially handed back the land taken from his forebears four hundred years before.

Siegfried Kuntsche covers the lati fundia heartlands in the northern region of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. Stressing the political consensus of the four anti-fascist parties in 1945, aided by a left-leaning CDUD, he demonstrates that local Communists and Social Democrats in some cases tried to mitigate the sweeping nature of the changes. Nevertheless, even here the KPD resorted to procedural tactics to limit genuine discussion and evaded parliamentary scrutiny in the many district land commissions. Unsurprisingly, Mecklenburg yielded the highest area of tilled land (54 per cent) to expropriation (in Thuringia it was only 15 per cent). In sum, 2,199 private landowners were affected, including 472 estates, but so were the state settlement co-operatives founded during the Weimar Republic. Interestingly, church property remained exempt. One might easily also overlook the fact that 450 large farmsteads were included under the provisions against Nazi activists and war criminals. One did not have to be a Junker to fall within the scope of reform; active Nazi membership made expropriation an integral part of denazification. Moreover, as Kuntsche reminds us, there were structural as well as political reasons for reform of the big estates. Foreign forced labourers, the wartime mainstay on the land, had been repatriated and many of the estates' original labourers were still being held as POWs. Only 30 per cent of cattle survived after 1945 and many horses had either been commandeered by the *Wehrmacht* or taken by fleeing Germans or foreign workers. Last but by no means least, the Red Army continued to requisition considerable numbers of livestock. The dismantling of repair shops and saw mills left Mecklenburg further underequipped. All told, 77,178 new plots were created, half falling to agricultural workers and half to refugees and expellees. Yet, considering that almost a million refugees had arrived in

Mecklenburg, the fact that only 39,000 families received such land puts the reform into perspective. It has been one of the enduring truisms of the redistribution that it served mainly the interests of the refugee *Neubauern*, but other authors in the volume show that local nepotism invariably put the indigenous population at the front of the queue. Until at least the early 1950s 'resettlers' had an uphill struggle to make do with inadequate tools; even in 1951, 39 per cent of arable crops in Mecklenburg were still being harvested by scythe! Kuntsche may be somewhat of a statistical fetishist, and the figures take some wading through, but the clear implication of all this evidence is that, in the short term, the land reform caused more problems than it solved.

Brandenburg was also a heartland of the landed estates. Arnd Bauerkämper, in what is probably the most thought-provoking piece in the volume, highlights the continuities in the countryside. The KPD/SED simply did not have the wherewithal to transform it overnight. In the immediate wake of war, chaos reigned and led to a localization of politics, rendering local patronage networks doubly important. The eastern approaches to Berlin through the Oderbruch had been particularly ravaged by war. Here parish land commissions, consisting of labourers and smallholders with less than 5 hectares, presided over what was by all accounts an emotionally-charged event. The *Landrat*, party representatives, Soviet officers, clergy, and, of course, the farmers and their families themselves, took part in what were ritual acts, complete with village street garlands. The land allocated was tied, with no possibility of sale or lease, and as in Mecklenburg, a smallholding agrarian structure emerged. In the early days, however, newly empowered small farmers were reluctant to seize the initiative. Former estate managers continued to influence former employees and some estates were still worked collectively, much to the aggravation of the authorities. Indigenous farmers kept outsiders away from much of the best land or machinery, giving preference to friends and relatives. As one administration noted in 1946: 'The *relationship* between the old farmers and the new farmers in the province Mark Brandenburg is generally described as *not good*' (pp. 81-2). Under these circumstances it is easy to understand why by 1950, 2,000 *Neubauern* had left the countryside. In terms of forging a new political clientele among the peasantry, the SED had correspondingly modest success. Local elections in the autumn of 1945 showed only limited KPD gains compared with Weimar, and by 1947 less than 10 per cent of SED members were farmers.

In Saxony agriculture had traditionally been a small-scale affair, with farms falling mainly in the 5 to 20 hectare category. This trend was accentuated with the land reform, which permitted parcels of land no larger than 5 to 10 hectares. Like other contributors, Ulrich Kluge puts the land reform in the broader context of the ravaged post-war economy and the long-standing need for reform. The 1946 harvest was about a quarter below the wartime norm. Despite the authorities' lack of an overview of farm inventories, the SMA pushed through a local command economy after systematically destroying the old land registers. Although the *Altbauern* bore the brunt of this new quota system – despite some local authorities helpfully falsifying figures to cover up a thriving black market economy! – even in a region of smallholders it was the old large farmers who maintained their social patronage. Thuringia had even fewer estates and saw many large and even medium farmers fall victim to expropriation under the denazification regulations. Yet, as Jochen-Christoph Kaiser shows, relatively little land went to landless workers, and in Thuringia only 5 per cent of *Neubauern* were from beyond the Oder-Neisse. Many refugees simply arrived too late to benefit or were frozen out by existing village networks. Nevertheless, the land reform did succeed in Kaiser's view in creating a limited clientele for the SED in the region. He calculates that about 8 per cent of the population benefited directly one way or another, rendering them complicit with the ruling party and thus with a vested interest in the preservation of the system.

Wolfgang Meinicke has already written more generally about the experience of refugees in the SBZ. Here he focuses on their experience of land reform. Initially many refugees hoped to return east and showed little interest in settling in the countryside. They received proportionally most land in the north of the SBZ – in Mecklenburg, for instance, 39 per cent of new farmers were refugees. By the end of the reform 91,155 refugees made up 43.3 per cent of all new farmers with an average plot of 8.4 hectares – about the size of a large British back garden! Meinicke also shows how the scale of migration tangibly shaped the process. Local authorities had to cut the cake very small in order to accommodate the continuing influx. Here, too, locals found devious ways to marginalize their new neighbours. In one village lots were drawn for cattle, with each local receiving one cow, but with every other refugee literally drawing the short straw and receiving nothing. Similarly, in arable areas newcomers were often allocated the poorest soil. By 1947 less than

a third of refugees had a farmhouse to live in, forcing them to live in communal quarters, and by 1949 it was still less than half, helping to explain the high failure rate of refugee farms.

Jonathan Osmond concentrates on women's experience of agrarian change, pointing out the high proportion of women in agriculture after the decimation of men by war. Moreover, the majority of refugees were women and children. In the absence of males the brunt of expropriation was frequently borne by wives and daughters, and the legal loopholes of ownership were exploited to the disadvantage of female heads of family. Osmond also provides fascinating insights into the experience of expropriation, with its harshness and arbitrariness, which few other contributors in the volume attempt. Yet even among the new owners, women found it difficult to penetrate the male chauvinist environment of the tractor stations and peasant co-operatives, so much so that between 1946 and 1949, 2,675 women farmers returned their holdings after their husbands had failed to reappear. Later on, once collectivization had begun in the 1950s, women were often the last to join; others perceived the benefits of collective crèches and laundries to alleviate the back-breaking work in the fields. Osmond concludes by describing women's leaders such as Frieda Haas, active in the *Vereinigung der gegenseitigen Bauernhilfe*, who hoped for a general change in gender relations, but were largely ignored by the SED hierarchy.

The contrasting situation in western Germany is examined in contributions by Ulrich Enders and Peter Exner. After the initial anti-fascist, and above all anti-militarist, consensus, the western Allies concentrated on presenting reform as a means to increased production. Particularly in the British Zone there was a genuine fear of a food catastrophe, but this was also used as an argument for not going 'too far'. Yet land reform was still recognized as one of the last remaining areas of possible four-power co-operation in the unfolding Cold War. In 1947, after the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers, the three western occupiers attempted to keep the wartime alliance going with legislation for land reform, but Enders sees this as little more than quadripartite lipservice. In the end, land reform probably did more to harm East-West relations. Although keen at the time to avoid a public rift, the Americans and British criticized the timing and dubious legality of events in the SBZ. The federal parliaments in the western zones were soon using the same arguments to put the brakes on more moderate plans in their areas, which were ultimately watered down to nullity. There were, in

any case, less than 2,000 estates in private hands in the British and American Zones (many more were under corporate ownership). The Americans' proposed *Siedlungsgesetz* was little more than a sop to more radical demands; instead the Anglo-Americans were seeking more liquidity and capitalization of the land market, while at the same time staunchly defending the principle of private property.

In a final piece, a micro-study of the parish of Ottmarsbocholt in Westphalia, Peter Exner follows the trials and tribulations of the Silesian refugees who were imported into this Catholic, smallholding milieu after 1945. Many did not come from a rural background, but even those who did found it difficult to acquire land in this tight-knit community. By the early 1960s only 2.8 per cent of Westphalia's farmers were former refugees. Other former farmers from the East had to take a social step down as farmhands, or, when the economic upturn came in the 1950s, left for factory jobs in the Ruhr. Ottmarsbocholters also effectively excluded refugees from the important parish council committees. The few Social Democratic refugee members found themselves confronted by a solid CDU bloc. Of all the authors, Exner also goes furthest into the demographics of change, using marriage as a litmus test of integration. Marriages between locals and refugees were far from the norm, and if they did occur, then involved those lower down the village hierarchy. Religious affiliation still played a major role in village social stratification: refugees were effectively barred from the shooting club (Catholics only), whereas the riding club was reserved for the well-to-do. The refugee association similarly showed little interest in involving locals, cocooning itself in members-only cultural evenings in front of the inevitable *Heimat* film. Only in the village football team was there any significant opening up. Exner's conclusion is that the much-touted rapid integration of refugees into West German society was a far more painful and slower process than has generally been accepted.

It is, of course, for the new insights into East German rural life that this collection is unique. Arnd Bauerkämper is to be congratulated on bringing together such a comprehensive range of contributions. As he himself points out on p. 70, in the past social historical analysis of this event has suffered at the expense of political accounts. If there is any criticism of the volume, it is that it has not gone far enough in this direction, especially in terms of experiential history. Readers do not get very much metaphorical mud on their boots from such an earthy subject. The experience from below, among both winners and losers, is

nevertheless crucial to an understanding of the workings and limitations of the East German state. For many years to come the SED clearly saw the countryside as 'enemy territory', where the village policeman was often cold-shouldered by village notables whose political pasts put them in direct conflict with the new social order. It is at the micro-level, as this volume hints, that the complexities of Communist rule in an anti-Communist environment will become more apparent.

Patrick Major is Lecturer in History at the University of Warwick. He is the author of *The Death of the KPD. Communism and anti-Communism in West Germany, 1945-1956* (1997) and is currently working on a social history of the building of the Berlin Wall.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

'Acquiring the knowledge necessary for advancement in life'. Prince Albert and the Development of Education in England and Germany in the Nineteenth Century. Victoria and Albert Museum, 9 July 1999

This conference, organized jointly by the Victorian Society and the Coburg-based Prince Albert Society in collaboration with the German Historical Institute London, had two related aims. On a thematic level, it investigated the links between the development of elementary, secondary, and vocational education in the German states and Britain in the nineteenth century. Methodically, many of the papers discussed the relationship between the content of education and the structure of the locations where it took place. Rather than being a direct focus of the conference, Prince Albert's influence in these fields appeared more or less explicitly at some point in the majority of papers.

In his opening statement, H. E. Gebhardt von Moltke, the German Ambassador in London, emphasized the enduring importance of Prince Albert's legacy for Anglo-German relations, exemplified not least in the splendid restoration of the Albert Memorial unveiled last year. In their brief greetings, William Filmer-Sankey (London) of the Victorian Society and Franz Bosbach (Bayreuth) of the Prince Albert Society described the various activities of their respective organizations. They expressed their intention to make this joint venture the starting point for a series of co-operations between their societies, and pointed out that this event was the first instalment of a two-part conference. It was followed by the Prince Albert Society's annual conference in Coburg in September 1999 on 'Prinz Albert und die Entwicklung der Bildung in England und Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert /Prince Albert and the Development of Education in England and Germany in the Nineteenth Century', which covered higher education and Anglo-German relations in the humanities, the sciences, and literature. In the most substantial of the introductory statements, Hermione Hobhouse (London) outlined the importance of Prince Albert, beginning with the testimony of various contemporaries. While her talk covered both his private and his professional life, she placed particular emphasis on Albert's reforms of the royal household's finances (which provided money for additional activities and private residences), as well as on his interest in farming on

scientific principles, the improvement of the living conditions of the labouring classes, statistics, the reform of higher education, the Royal Society of Arts, and, of course, the Great Exhibition of 1851.

The first session of the conference, chaired by Hermann Hiery (Bayreuth) consisted of a paper by Irene Hardach-Pinke (Marburg) on 'German Governesses in England'. It explained why Britain was particularly attractive as a place of employment for German governesses. Even though their social status was lower than in Germany, in Britain they received higher wages, and had the chance to acquire fluency in English while teaching German to their pupils. Moreover, the profession was not regulated in Britain, whereas female teachers had to complete an examination in Prussia from 1838. It was therefore possible to work sooner in Britain than in parts of Germany. A number of examples illustrated how varied the experiences of German governesses could be. Nevertheless, in general terms, their position appears to have become more difficult as the century progressed. From the 1850s, employment could no longer be procured by correspondence, but it became necessary to travel to Britain without the certainty of a suitable position. This led to the foundation of a self-help organization for German governesses in London in 1876. After 1900, the demand for German governesses declined, and the average stay became shorter as more opportunities became available in the expanding German education sector.

The second session, chaired by Hermione Hobhouse, compared the design of primary schools in England and Germany in the nineteenth century. In his paper '"Germany presents the finest model in the world": E. R. Robson and the Influence of German School Planning in Later Nineteenth-Century England', William Filmer-Sankey (London) focused on the reform of the layout of English primary schools in the aftermath of the 1870 Education Act. Traditionally, pupils had been taught to learn by rote under the supervision of one master, who had to be able to view the whole, usually T-shaped, classroom from one place, and a number of pupil teachers in charge of subsections of the room. In Germany, by contrast, pupils were taught in several classrooms. When the new London School Board commissioned the surveyor of the Corporation of Liverpool, Edward Robert Robson, to make suggestions for new school architecture, he picked Germany as his main comparative example. The only features he disapproved of in German schools were the unnecessarily costly *Aula* (general assembly hall), the lack of ventilation, and the fact that toilets were placed at the ends of corridors. By

1873, a school had been built in Stepney on the German model, including an assembly hall. As time went by, even Robson himself seems to have abandoned his opposition to a school hall.

Heidemarie Kemnitz (Berlin) approached the same subject from a different perspective by showing how the architecture of Berlin primary schools evolved over time as the result of an 'interplay between modernization and disciplinary' influences. In the early nineteenth century Berlin's primary schooling had been provided by cheap and largely unregulated, usually overcrowded primary schools or more expensive parish schools. From 1837 public elementary schools were established. Originally, these schools had a distinctly military flavour. Not until the later nineteenth century was more regard given to aesthetic considerations in buildings which remained broadly utilitarian, but now included, for example, sculptures suitable for children.

The third session, chaired by Franz Bosbach, turned to secondary education. Jürgen Apel (Bayreuth) first described the different phases in the development and expansion of the Prussian secondary school system: the complex interplay between the demand for places, the shortage or abundance of suitably qualified teachers, and the creation of new types of secondary schools which were gradually granted parity with the classics-oriented *Gymnasium* in a shift towards secondary education of a more 'national' bent. In the second part of his paper he discussed the evolution of the style of *Gymnasium* buildings which, at a different level, paralleled that of elementary school design: the 'barracks model' followed by more representative buildings in styles such as Neo-Renaissance in the 1890s. This, in turn, gave way to a new functionalism around 1900, which anticipated some of the aspects of *Bauhaus* style.

The question of what was taught in English classrooms was in the foreground of Bill Brock's paper on 'Putting the S in the 3Rs: Science and the English Schools'. By 1900 scientific education, particularly in chemistry, was widespread in British schools, and was considered an essential part of the curriculum because of its practical worth. In the 1830s, however, denominational schools taught only 'reading, writing and 'rithmetic', whereas grant-maintained schools began to experiment with the introduction of scientific education at the elementary level. For the most part, however, these attempts did not receive the support of scientists, and from the 1860s, agitation for the introduction of scientific education, which was also influenced by the reform of the armed forces with their increased demand for specialized scientific knowledge,

focused almost exclusively on the secondary level. Public schools took the initiative and started to build laboratories, which soon became a standard feature of all schools.

In the final paper of the session, J. R. Piggott (Dulwich College) provided a case study of the modernization of an educational institution. Founded in 1619 by the actor and theatre proprietor Edward Alleyn, the college was not, at first, a great success. It became a byword for lazy, if well-paid teachers, whose pupils hardly ever progressed to university. In 1857 the school was reformed and divided into a 'lower school' for poor students, and the public school called 'upper school'. Its further development was determined by a productive conflict between the utilitarian governor, William Rogers, and the public-school orientated headmaster, Alfred Carver. The enormous compensation which the school received when the railways purchased part of the school grounds paid for new buildings in an eclectic style, which Piggott analysed in great and illuminating detail.

The final session, chaired by William Filmer-Sankey, dealt with 'Education and Training for Industry and Manufacture'. Klaus Harney (Bochum) emphasized the increasing importance of formal technical education as opposed to traditional guild apprenticeships in nineteenth-century Germany. Using the Mannesmann family as an example, he described the generational shift in training patterns from hands-on experience to scientific education. In his paper on 'The Department of Science and Art', a government department set up in 1853 to foster vocational training in art and science, Anthony Burton (London) introduced a new motif into the debate by suggesting that the reasons for the foundation of institutions of practical education in Britain modelled on those of other countries (and vice versa) can be summed up in the phrase 'the grass is always greener on the other side'. From the 1830s at the latest, there was growing concern that British manufactures were being overtaken by competing products from abroad. This impression led to the foundation of the school of design in 1837, on a French model. This institution ultimately moved to the complex of schools and museums in South Kensington built with the profits of the 1851 Great Exhibition and overseen by the Department of Science and Art, which was only in charge of four additional provincial schools. The existence of this institution appeared to cause a dramatic improvement in the quality of British products between 1851 and 1861. Soon afterwards, the art school in South Kensington began to decline. In 1867, the

emphasis shifted to scientific education, and rivalry between the two sub-departments of Science and Art characterized the rest of the period up to the merging of the Departments of Education, and Art and Science in 1900. Around 1900 it appeared that something would again have to be done to improve the colour of the grass on the British side. Imperial College of Science and Technology was founded in 1907.

In the last paper of the conference, Dorothy Bosomworth described the various approaches to 'Design Education in the Provinces'. By analysing practice in different provincial schools, she demonstrated that the word 'design' could be interpreted so widely that design schools could be anything from art schools to institutions which offered additional training for craftsmen, although their opening hours and fees reduced their accessibility to these groups. The participants in the conference also had an opportunity to take part in a guided tour of South Kensington, and in an excursion to educational establishments in the greater London area.

ANDREAS FAHRMEIR

Flotsam of Revolution: European Exiles in England after 1849. German Historical Institute London, 15-17 July 1999

In his opening address, Peter Wende (London) reported that the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines 'flotsam' as: 'People or things that have been rejected and are regarded as worthless.' Political refugees are certainly people who have been rejected or turned away. But it was the task of the conference, he went on, to find out whether the members of this intellectually and culturally rich community in exile were considered 'worthless', either by their host country, or by their countries of origin, which, as a rule, continued to be the target of exile politics. The aim of the conference was to investigate, within the context of an international comparison, what has so far been treated only within specific national historiographies: the political exile of French, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, Czech, and German refugees in England; their opportunities for political activity in exile; the forms of political co-operation that existed between exiles from different European countries, and with organizations and politicians in England; and finally, the attitude of the host country towards the refugees, and their perceptions of the country which had granted them asylum.

John Saville (Hull), opened the conference with a paper on '1848 – Britain and Europe', in which he outlined the general political situation of Britain in 1848. The February revolution in France, he suggested, influenced the course of British foreign and domestic policy like no other event. The memories of 1789 which it stirred in Britain conjured up fears of invasion. At the very least, there was concern that the conflict of ideas in Europe would grow into a European war. Palmerston made special efforts to put Anglo-French relations on a new footing in 1848. On occasion, he deliberately used the emigrants as instruments of his foreign policy to demonstrate Britain's political superiority and domestic stability, which did not appear to have been threatened by the influx of political refugees. The myth of Britain's internal political stability, however, Saville argued, was created at a time when there could be no question of its existence in reality. In general, the refugees were treated with distrust. The ideological affinities between the continental Socialists and Communists in exile, and the English Chartists had quickly given rise to conspiracy theories which saw the refugees as the real instigators of the Kennington Common Rally, broken up by the police on 10 April 1848.

The first session, chaired by Peter Wende, looked at the relationship between 'Englishmen and Refugees'. In his paper on 'British Attitudes towards the Refugees of the 1848 Revolution' Bernhard Porter (Newcastle) explained why England was the country of choice for political refugees. He made clear that, contrary to long held views, it was not love of England, nor a deliberate decision based on approval of a particular political system that brought the refugees to the country, but simply a lack of alternatives. Britain not only had liberal asylum legislation, but also lacked any regulations that curbed the stream of refugees. Porter suggested that the British public tolerated the refugees partly because their aversion to regulations was even greater than their dislike of the influx of refugees. As a rule, there were few points of contact between the English people and the refugees, and so the British public was not able to develop any real understanding of the problems of the refugees. In general, there was a widespread view that the struggle for existence absorbed most of their political energies, and that hard work would eventually render them harmless. Police surveillance of the refugees, initially ordered by the authorities, was gradually relaxed as it became clear that 'exile politics' were, almost without exception, directed towards their countries of origin, where they hoped to change political conditions.

Andreas Fahrmeir's paper on 'British Exceptionalism in Perspective: Political Asylum in Continental Europe' linked up with a number of points made by Porter. Fahrmeir also stressed the unique character of British policy on asylum and immigration, placing it into a comparative European perspective. While most European states had accepted refugees at various times since the French Revolution, he explained, permission to enter and remain was only granted where there was some compatibility between the political aims of the government of the host country and those of the refugees. Thus Britain was initially a favoured country of asylum for conservative exiles, whereas other groups had preferred to go to Switzerland, France, or Belgium during the *Vormärz*. None of these countries had a formal asylum law, but extradition was generally prohibited. After the failed revolution of 1848, however, these countries in particular refused to allow political refugees to enter. Programmes of financial support such as those which had been organized in France for Polish refugees in the 1830s were stopped, or were not extended to the refugees of 1849, and the protection against extradition for political offences was rescinded, at least in France. The combination

of financial and political pressure and deportations left the political refugees who wanted to stay in Europe no alternative but Britain.

Tibor Frank's (Budapest) paper, 'Waiting to Return. The Hungarian Exile Community in England, 1849-67', opened the session on 'Emigré Communities', which was chaired by Robert Evans. Frank concentrated on Lajos Kossuth, the best known Hungarian refugee in London. His case illustrates the fact that political refugees in exile did not have the support of institutions or organizations, and that the existence of any significant exile politics frequently depended on individual politicians in exile and their personal ability to establish contacts with the politicians of the host country. As the Hungarians in exile in London were not a unified group, unity had to be conjured up by reference to Kossuth. This became their quasi programme. Spiritualism, which had come into fashion since the 1830s, also contributed to Kossuth's eventual status as a secular saviour. Kossuth's primary aim was always to transform political conditions in his country of origin. He made no attempts to establish himself in England, yet even after the Austrian-Hungarian agreement of 1867, he did not return to Hungary like other Hungarian politicians in exile, such a Pulzky.

In his paper on 'New Qualities and Continuations: Polish Emigration in England after 1849', Krzysztof Marchlewicz (Poznan) compared the activities and political goals of the 'grand emigration', which had been in England since the 1830s, with those of the group who arrived after 1849. After 1849, he pointed out, the social composition of the Polish emigration changed, and its political orientation moved to the left. Previously dominated by conservative, aristocratic circles, it was now more strongly influenced by artisans and workers with a Socialist-Communist background. The older generation based in the 'Hôtel Lambert' was still hoping for support from the Western powers in the struggle for Polish independence, in order to set up a constitutional monarchy along British lines. The strongest faction after 1848, however, the Polish Democratic Society, was working towards an independent Republic of Poland with a single-chamber parliament elected on the basis of universal suffrage. The London revolutionary commune, the Polish People, which was supported by Polish workers and artisans, by contrast, aimed to set up a Slavic federation within a world-wide Socialist republic, in which private property would be abolished, and land and industry communally owned. Ideological affinities with other groups of exiles led to co-operation. The common denomi-

nator between all Polish factions was the desire for an independent Poland.

Ivan Pfaff (Heidelberg / Prague), speaking on 'Czech Revolutionaries in England after 1849', took as examples two Czechs who belonged to different political camps, but who both chose England as a temporary country of exile: the liberal Frantisek Ladislav Rieger, and the radical Josef Vaclav Fric. Rieger used his time in England to travel. He gathered information on economic and social conditions, and made it available to his country of origin, whereas Fric went to England to join the Russian revolutionary, Alexander Herzen. Herzen, however, regarded the Czech national movement as unviable and incapable of supporting democracy, and Fric left him in disappointment to work as a journalist for a while with Hungarian, German, and Polish radicals. English intellectuals had little feeling for the situation of the Czechs, in contrast to that of the Poles. There was no understanding for the demands of a nation of whose very existence Europe seemed unaware. If they wanted to preserve their own nationality, Palmerston advised Rieger, the Czechs should join Russia in order to prevent 'Germanization'.

In his paper on 'The French Exiles and the British', Fabrice Bensimon (Paris), too, looked at the interaction between the host country and a community in exile, in this case the French. Traditional mistrust on both sides had shaped relations. In the eyes of many French exiles, Britain was a materialistically orientated country which shamelessly exploited the working classes. With an inadequate knowledge of the language, and able to find only badly paid work, most of them never considered staying permanently in Britain. Their first priority was to return to France. The British attitude towards the French was no less ambivalent. The French were regarded as troublemakers with subversive tendencies. The events of 1789, 1830, and 1848 had shown that the unsteady French were incapable of sticking to one opinion or one political system.

The third session, 'Emigré Politics', chaired by Jonathan Sperber, dealt with the chances for political action in exile and the forms it could take. Denis Mack Smith (Oxford), speaking on 'Mazzini: Utopian or Realist', introduced probably the most influential figure of the European emigré community. A reputation as a 'professional conspirator' had preceded Mazzini's arrival in London in 1837, although it was not true. The case of Mazzini illustrates that the success of exile politics could largely depend on the integrative force of the individual personality. Like no other, he was able to enlist the support of the English authorities,

reforming politicians, and members of society for the cause of an independent Italy. The anti-Socialist republicanism whose theory he established attempted to bring together all the democrats in exile who were not committed to the Socialist-Communist bloc. His efforts to encourage international co-operation bore fruit in the setting up of the Central European Democratic Committee. Its members included the French radical Alexandre Ledru Rollin, the Polish republican Alfred Darasz, and the German republican and leftist Hegelian, Arnold Ruge.

Christine Lattek (London) gave a paper entitled 'German Socialists between Mazzini and Auguste Blanqui', in which she examined the political activities of German exiles and their co-operation at international level. Whereas moderate liberal democrats such as Arnold Ruge and Gottfried Kinkel first had to create a forum for their exile politics, German Socialists and Communists could make use of the existing infrastructure in London, and they were rapidly integrated. As the universal claims of Socialist theories went beyond national borders and characteristics, the refugees from the 1848 revolution were able to contribute to an internationalization of the radical workers' movement. When Marx left the Communist League the movement split, with the result that the group around August Willich and Karl Schaper had more members than that around Marx and Engels. Co-operation with French Blanquists and English Chartists seemed an obvious move in the attempt to create a common anti-democratic bloc.

Sabine Freitag (London) followed three London exiles to America in her paper on 'Begging Bowl of Revolution: the Exiled Revolutionaries' Fund-Raising Tours of North America in 1851-2'. During the first months of their exile in London, most of the refugees still believed that another revolutionary upheaval on the Continent was imminent. This made it imperative to procure funds for weapons and propaganda. Differences in opinion about organizational ways and means meant that the German faction split. In the end, each group sent its own representative to America. Gottfried Kinkel advocated a German national loan, while Amand Goegg, who arrived in the USA three months after Kinkel, hoped to drum up regular donations for his *Amerikanischen Revolutionsbund für Europa*. The third to arrive on American soil was Lajos Kossuth. His claim that the USA was morally obliged to provide financial and military support for the oppressed Hungarians gave rise to a discussion on humanitarian intervention in the USA. Most American politicians rejected Kossuth's demands. In the months that followed his popularity among Americans

declined rapidly. Kossuth therefore concentrated on winning over the large German-American population, whose members still took an interest in the fate of central Europe, whereas there were too few Hungarians living in the USA to provide effective support. All three fund-raisers returned from their journey disappointed by the amount of money they had raised, but the co-operation between German and Hungarian revolutionaries that had started in the USA continued in London.

Sylvie Aprile (Paris) examined one of the most significant exile activities, the publishing of newspapers and journals, which was also one of the most important sources of income for exiles. In this respect the journal *L'Homme* represented a milestone in the history of the international press. Edited by French exiles, its columns were open to exiles from the whole of Europe. The political programme of a 'republique universelle et social' within a 'United States of Europe' ruled out the Anglophobia that was typical of many French exiles.

The session on 'Life in Exile', chaired by Pamela Pilbeam, was devoted to everyday life in exile. In his paper on 'Pubs, Clubs, and other Forums: on the Infrastructure of Life in Exile', Rudolf Muhs (London) reported on the places where the refugees attempted to continue their political agitation. As exile politicians hardly ever had the chance to act, all they could do was talk. In the pubs and clubs frequented by like-minded people and those with a common fate, the refugees could indulge the illusion that they still had a public role. In truth, however, their audience had already been limited at home, and in London it dwindled even further. The search for new fields of public activity and an audience could take on grotesque forms. Soon the only listeners the refugees had left were those with a professional interest in their discussions: old sympathizers who had become spies for the despotic continental powers or the London police.

In her paper 'Keeping Busy in the Waiting Room: German Women Writers in London following the 1848 Revolution', Carol Diethe (London) described exile in London from the perspective of German women emigrants, focusing on Jenny Marx, Johanna Kinkel, and Malwida von Meysenbug. All three faced particularly difficult conditions in exile. Each headed a political household which was visited by numerous exiles every day. In the belief that their exile was only temporary, they educated their children, for example, with an eye to returning to their countries of origin. Jenny Marx used up her creative energies in the daily struggle for money, whereas Johanna Kinkel and Malwida von Meysenbug were able to use

their experience of exile in literary form. All three were astonished by the greater political freedom England offered, but they also criticized the lack of any state welfare for the weaker members of society.

The closing session, 'Legacy', chaired by Lothar Kettenacker (London), provided an opportunity to reflect on the topic of the conference. Bruce Levine (Santa Cruz, USA) gave a paper on 'Refugees and Immigrants. Who were the "Real" Forty-Eighters in the United States?' which allowed a comparison to be drawn between the fate of the craftsmen and workers who went to America, and those who went to Britain. German emigrants in America, especially in big cities such as Chicago, had a greater impact on the country's labour and social policy than those in England. Foreign-born employees in America enjoyed greater political freedom, but they also felt the lack of state welfare in cases of economic crisis and unemployment. The initiatives they set up on the German model, such as co-operatives and societies of producers and consumers, did not succeed in America's profit-orientated market economy. But some of the organizational forms and institutions which they supported, such as unions, associations, strikes, mass demonstrations, and unemployment benefits brought wide circles of American and other foreign-born workers together, and allowed them to grow into a political power.

How long does an exile remain an exile? Successful integration into the host country can put an end to this condition, as can a return to the country of origin. But does this overcome the feeling of strangeness? Ansgar Reiss (Regensburg), speaking on 'Home Alone? Political Exiles Returning to their Native Countries', looked at the problems of returning exiles, and at difficulties of researching their return. Political changes in the home country and amnesties could encourage people to return. Of course, the actual reasons for returning were as varied as the individuals themselves. Kossuth, Kinkel, Mazzini, and Marx, for example, never returned to their home countries. To attempt a general 'social history of returnees', or a collective biography deriving general statements from individual biographies would, therefore, pose substantive problems. To this day, there is no international comparison of, for example, prominent returnees. In general, though, it can be said that few returnees played much of a political role in their home countries after the revolution. Further research is needed to establish why.

SABINE FREITAG

NOTICEBOARD

Research Seminar

The GHIL regularly organizes a research seminar at which recipients of grants from the Institute and other scholars report on the progress of their work. Any postgraduate or postdoctoral researchers who are interested in the subjects are welcome to attend. As a general rule, the language of the papers and discussion is German.

The following papers will be given in November. Further meetings maybe also arranged. Future dates will be announced on each occasion, and are available from the GHIL. For further information contact Professor Lothar Kettenacker on 0207 404 5486. Please note that meetings begin promptly at 5 p.m. and that there is no public access to the building after this time as the front doors are closed.

9 November	Dr Abigail F. F. Green The *Zollverein* on Show. The German States at the World Fairs (1851-1862)
23 November	Christian Handschell Parteieliten im Vergleich: Kandidaten und Abgeordnete von SPD und Labour Party nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg

As a matter of interest to readers, we record the following papers which were given in October, before the publication date of this **Bulletin**.

5 October	Christian Sepp Die politischen Beziehungen Englands zum Reich unter den späten Tudors
12 October	Jessica Jürgens Die neue politische Elite in der britischen Besatzungszone, exemplarisch dargestellt anhand ausgewählter Persönlichkeiten aus dem norddeutschen Raum

19 October Donate Strathmann
Wiederaufbau jüdischer Gemeinden im Kontext der westdeutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft am Beispiel der Gemeinden Düsseldorf und Bremen 1945-1960

Thirlwall Prize and Seeley Medal 1999

Dr Andreas Fahrmeir, now a Fellow of the GHIL, shared the Thirlwall Prize for his Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation, 'Alien Status, Citizenship and Nationality in England and the German States, *c*. 1815-1870'. He was also awarded the Seeley Medal.

Introduction to German Palaeography

The German Historical Institute London is offering a special course to be held at its premises in London from 6-10 March 2000. The introduction to German palaeography is designed for British postgraduate students working on German history, and will be taught by Dr Günter Hollenberg from the Hessisches Staatsarchiv Marburg. It will include learning to read German handwriting from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, and provide information required to use German archives. There is no charge for the course, but a booking fee of £20.00 is payable, which will be refunded to participants. As numbers will be limited, please register early. The deadline for registration is 1 January 2000. For further information contact the Secretary of the GHIL.

Writing World History, 1800-2000: Historiography, Ideology, and Politics

The German Historical Institutes in London and Washington are planning a joint conference on writing world history to be held at the GHIL from 30 March to 1 April 2000. This conference is intended as a follow-up to the workshop that took place in Washington in October 1997 at which we discussed the processes by which the historical disciplines were professionalized, and studied the origins, mechanics, and results of mutual exchanges between different historiographical cultures in order to define the workings of the international relationship between Western and non-Western scientific communities. We were picking up the current interest in the development of the historical discipline in an international, transcultural perspective, drawing particular attention to non-European historiographical traditions (see *Bulletin of the GHIL*, vol. XX, no. 1, May 1998, pp. 93-6). The proceedings of this conference are in the process of being published.

The second conference will look at world historiography, comparing Western and non-Western historical patterns. Focusing on the different conceptions of the world in various cultures within the period from 1800 to 2000, we plan to discuss the writing of 'world history' in terms of, for example, cultural hegemony, which implied specific political outlooks and purposes. We will ask what the meaning of 'universal', 'world', or 'global' history is in different cultures, and how it changed over these 200 years in the various national traditions. Who defined the 'world', and were there any 'claims' to a monopoly on the interpretation of world history in the colonial and post-colonial age? What are the parallels and divergences in the construction of the 'world' in different cultures, and what traditions were used? What impact did decolonization have on Western concepts of the 'world'? What are the epistemological and methodological differences between earlier and present world historiographies?

For further information please contact Dr Benedikt Stuchtey at the GHIL, or Dr Eckhardt Fuchs at the German Historical Institute Washington, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, USA.

LIBRARY NEWS

Recent Acquisitions

This list contains a selection of recent publications in German and English, primarily on German history, acquired by the Library of the GHIL in the past year.

Addison, Paul and Angus Calder (eds), *Time to Kill. The Soldier's Experience of War in the West, 1939-1945*, with a Foreword by Len Deighton (London: Pimlico, 1997)

Albrecht, Dieter, *Maximilian I. von Bayern 1573-1651* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998)

Amery, Carl, *Hitler als Vorläufer. Auschwitz – der Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts?* (Munich: Luchterhand, 1998)

Archivalien des Deutschen Exilarchivs 1933-1945. Bestandsübersicht (Frankfurt/M.: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1998)

Arndt, Johannes, *Das Heilige Römische Reich und die Niederlande 1566 bis 1648. Politisch-konfessionelle Verflechtung und Publizistik im Achtzigjährigen Krieg*, Münstersche Historische Forschungen, 13 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Arnsberg, Paul, *Zivilcourage zum Widerstand. Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Deutschen, Juden, Israelis. Anläßlich des 90. Geburtstags von Frau Rosl Arnsberg* (Frankfurt/M.: Societäts-Verlag, 1998)

Auschwitz. Geschichte, Rezeption und Wirkung, ed. by Fritz Bauer Institute, Jahrbuch zur Geschichte und Wirkung des Holocaust, 1996, 2nd edn. (Frankfurt/M. and New York: Campus Verlag, 1997)

Ayaß, Wolfgang (ed.), *'Gemeinschaftsfremde'. Quellen zur Verfolgung von 'Asozialen' 1933-1945*, Materialien aus dem Bundesarchiv, 5 (Koblenz: Bundesarchiv, 1998)

Banach, Jens, *Heydrichs Elite. Das Führerkorps der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD 1936-1945* (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1998)

Bance, Alan F. (ed.), *The Cultural Legacy of the British Occupation in Germany. The London Symposium*, Stuttgarter Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 350; Publications of the Institute of Germanic Studies, 70 (Stuttgart: Heinz, 1997)

Barclay, David Edward and Eric David Weitz (eds), *Between Reform and Revolution. German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 1998)

Barer, Robert, *One Young Man and Total War. From Normandy to Concentration Camp, a Doctor's Letters Home* (Edinburgh etc.: Pentland Press, 1998)

Barthel, Henner (ed.), *Politische Reden in der DDR. Eine kritische Dokumentation* (St Ingbert: Röhrig Universitätsverlag, 1998)

Bast, Jürgen, *Totalitärer Pluralismus. Zu Franz L. Neumanns Analysen der politischen und rechtlichen Struktur der NS-Herrschaft*, Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts, 22 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999)

Baum, Rolf-Joachim (ed.), *'Wir wollen Männer, wir wollen Taten!' Deutsche Corpsstudenten 1848 bis heute* (Berlin: Siedler, 1998)

Bebel, August, *Briefe einer Ehe, August und Julie Bebel*, ed by Ursula Herrmann (Bonn: Dietz, 1997)

Belting, Hans, *The Germans and their Art. A Troublesome Relationship*, transl. by Scott Kleager (New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 1998)

Berggötz, Sven Olaf, *Nahostpolitik in der Ära Adenauer. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen 1949-1963*, Forschungen und Quellen zur Zeitgeschichte, 33 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1998)

Berthold, Will, *Die 42 Attentate auf Adolf Hitler* (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1997)

Bilz, Fritz and Klaus Schmidt (eds), *Das war'ne heiße Märzenzeit. Revolution im Rheinland 1848/49* (Cologne: PapyRossa Verlag, 1998)

Blickle, Peter, *Der Bauernkrieg. Die Revolution des Gemeinen Mannes* (Munich: Beck, 1998)

Bookchin, Murray, *The Third Revolution. Popular Movements in the Revolutionary Era*, vol. 2 (London, Washington, D.C.: Cassell, 1998)

Bracker, Jörgen, Volker Henn, and Rainer Postel (eds), *Die Hanse. Lebenswirklichkeit und Mythos. Textband zur Hamburger Hanse-Ausstellung von 1989*, 2nd revised edn. (Lübeck: Schmidt-Römhild, 1998)

Brady Jr., Thomas A., *The Protestant Reformation in German History*, with a comment by Heinz Schilling, Annual Lecture 1997; German Historical Institute Washington, D.C, Occasional Paper 22 (Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute, 1998)

Braham, Randolph L. and Scott Miller (eds), *The Nazi's Last Victims. The Holocaust in Hungary* (Detroit, Ill.: Wayne State University Press, 1998)

Brandmann, Paul, *Leipzig zwischen Klassenkampf und Sozialreform. Kommunale Wohlfahrtspolitik zwischen 1890 und 1929*, Geschichte und Politik in Sachsen, 5 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Brandmüller, Walter, *Das Konzil von Konstanz 1414-1418*, vol. 2: *Bis zum Konzilsende* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997)

Brandt, Hartwig, *Der lange Weg in die demokratische Moderne. Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte von 1800 bis 1945* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998)

Bringmann, Tobias C., *Reichstag und Zweikampf. Die Duellfrage als innenpolitischer Konflikt des deutschen Kaiserreiches 1871-1918*, Hochschulsammlung Philosophie, Geschichte, 10 (Freiburg: Hochschulverlag, 1997)

Buchheit, Eva, *Der Briand-Kellogg-Pakt von 1928. Machtpolitik oder Friedensstreben?*, Studien zur Friedensforschung, 10 (Münster: Lit-Verlag, 1998)

Buchholz, Werner (ed.), *Landesgeschichte in Deutschland. Bestandsaufnahme, Analyse, Perspektiven* (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1998)

Budde, Gunilla-Friederike (ed.), *Frauen arbeiten. Weibliche Erwerbstätigkeit in Ost- und Westdeutschland nach 1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Budraß, Lutz, *Flugzeugindustrie und Luftrüstung in Deutschland 1918-1945*, Schriften des Bundesarchivs, 50 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1998)

Butzer, Hermann, *Diäten und Freifahrt im Deutschen Reichstag. Der Weg zum Entschädigungsgesetz von 1906 und die Nachwirkung dieser Regelung bis in die Zeit des Grundgesetzes*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 116 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1999)

Chiari, Bernhard, *Alltag hinter der Front. Besatzung, Kollaboration und Widerstand in Weißrußland 1941-1944*, Schriften des Bundesarchivs, 53 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1998)

Clemens, Gabriele, *Britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland 1945-1949. Literatur, Film, Musik und Theater*, Historische Mitteilungen. Beiheft, 24 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997)

Cooper, Alice Holmes, *Paradoxes of Peace. German Peace Movements since 1945*, Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1996)

Courtois, Stéphane, Nicolas Werth, Jean-Louis Panné, *et al*., *Das Schwarzbuch des Kommunismus. Unterdrückung, Verbrechen und Terror*, transl. from the French by Irmela Arnsperger *et al*. (Munich and Zurich: Piper, 1998)

Cordes, Albrecht, *Spätmittelalterlicher Gesellschaftshandel im Hanseraum*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur hansischen Geschichte, NS 45 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Corum, James S., *The Luftwaffe. Creating the Operational Air War 1918-1940*, Modern War Studies (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 1997)

Deuse, Christiane, *Die Leipziger Zeitung. Geschichte eines Lizensblattes in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone 1946-1948*, Kommunikationsgeschichte, 1 (Münster: Lit-Verlag, 1997)

Diemel, Christa, *Adelige Frauen im bürgerlichen Jahrhundert. Hofdamen, Stiftsdamen, Salondamen 1800-1870* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1998)

Dietrich, Susanne and Julia Schulze Wessel, *Zwischen Selbstorganisation und Stigmatisierung. Die Lebenswirklichkeit jüdischer Displaced Persons und die neue Gestalt des Antisemitismus in der deutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft*, Veröffentlichungen des Archivs der Stadt Stuttgart, 75 (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1998)

Domentat, Tamara, *'Hallo Fräulein'. Deutsche Frauen und amerikanische Soldaten* (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1998)

Dünnwald, Achim, *Konfessionsstreit und Verfassungskonflikt. Die Aufnahme der niederländischen Flüchtlinge im Herzogtum Kleve 1566-1585*, Schriften der Heresbach-Stiftung Kalkar, 7 (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 1998)

Ehrlich, Lothar and Jürgen John (eds), *Weimar 1930. Politik und Kultur im Vorfeld der NS-Diktatur* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Eichner, Klaus and Andreas Dobbert, *Headquarters Germany. Die USA-Geheimdienste in Deutschland*, Rote Reihe (Berlin: edition ost, 1997)

Erdmenger, Katharina, *Diener zweier Herren? Briten im Sekretariat des Völkerbundes 1919-1933*, Nomos Universitätsschriften. Geschichte, 9 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1998)

Fairbairn, Brett, *Democracy in the Undemocratic State. The German Reichstag Elections of 1898 and 1903* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997)

Fait, Barbara, *Demokratische Erneuerung unter dem Sternenbanner. Amerikanische Kontrolle und Verfassunggebung in Bayern 1946*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 114 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1998)

Falck, Uta, *VEB Bordell. Geschichte der Prostitution in der DDR*, Forschungen zur DDR-Gesellschaft (Berlin: Links, 1998)

Feldkamp, Michael F., *Der Parlamentarische Rat 1948-1949. Die Entstehung des Grundgesetzes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Feucht, Stefan, *Die Haltung der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands zur Außenpolitik während der Weimarer Republik, 1918-1933*, Moderne Geschichte und Politik, 10 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1998)

Findbuch Stadtarchiv Wendlingen am Neckar. Bestand Wendlingen am Neckar 1616-1965, ed. by Michael Konrad et al., Archivinventare des Landkreises Esslingen, 11 (Esslingen: Kreisarchiv Esslingen, 1998)

Flacke, Monika (ed.), *Mythen der Nationen. Ein europäisches Panorama. Eine Ausstellung des Deutschen Historischen Museums unter der Schirmherrschaft von Bundeskanzler Helmut Kohl. Begleitband zur Ausstellung vom 20. März 1998 bis 9. Juni 1998* (Berlin: Deutsches Historisches Museum, 1998)

Förster, Stig and Jörg Nagler (eds), *On the Road to Total War. The American Civil War and the German Wars of Unification, 1861-1871*, Publications of the German Historical Institute Washington, D.C. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Fricke, Karl Wilhelm and Roger Engelmann, *'Konzentrierte Schläge'. Staatssicherheitsaktionen und politische Prozesse in der DDR 1953-1956*, Analysen und Dokumente, 11 (Berlin: Links, 1998)

Fritze, Lothar, *Täter mit gutem Gewissen. Über menschliches Versagen im diktatorischen Sozialismus*, Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung, 6 (Cologne and Weimar: Böhlau, 1998)

Fritzsche, Peter, *Germans into Nazis* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1998)

Gall, Lothar (ed.), *1848 – Aufbruch zur Freiheit. Eine Ausstellung des Deutschen Historischen Museums und der Schirn Kunsthalle Frankfurt zum 150jährigen Jubiläum der Revolution von 1848/49. 18. Mai bis 18. September 1998 in der Schirn Kunsthalle Frankfurt* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1998)

Gall, Lothar and Manfred Pohl (eds), *Unternehmen im Nationalsozialismus*, Schriftenreihe zur Zeitschrift für Unternehmensgeschichte, 1 (Munich: Beck, 1998)

Gassert, Philipp, *Amerika im Dritten Reich. Ideologie, Propaganda und Volksmeinung 1933-1945*, Transatlantische Historische Studien, 7 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997)

Gay, Peter, *My German Question. Growing up in Nazi Berlin* (New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 1998)

Geinitz, Christian, *Kriegsfurcht und Kampfbereitschaft. Das Augusterlebnis in Freiburg. Eine Studie zum Kriegsbeginn 1914*, Schriften der Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte, NS 7 (Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 1998)

Gerlach, Christian, *Krieg, Ernährung, Völkermord. Forschungen zur deutschen Vernichtungspolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1998)

Geßner, Klaus (ed.), *Befehle der Sowjetischen Militäradministration des Landes Brandenburg 1945-1949*, Quellen, Findbücher und Inventare des Brandenburgischen Landeshauptarchivs, 4 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1997)

Geyer, Martin H., *Verkehrte Welt. Revolution, Inflation und Moderne, München 1914-1924*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 128 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Giel, Robert, *Politische Öffentlichkeit im spätmittelalterlich-frühneuzeitlichen Köln, 1450-1550*, Berliner historische Studien, 29 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1998)

Goldberg, Hans-Peter, *Bismarck und seine Gegner. Die politische Rhetorik im kaiserlichen Reichstag*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 112 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1998)

Goltermann, Svenja, *Körper der Nation. Habitusformierung und die Politik des Turnens 1860-1890*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 126 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Gordon, Bertram M. (ed.), *Historical Dictionary of World War II France. The Occupation, Vichy, and the Resistance, 1938-1946* (London: Aldwych Press, 1998)

Gottschlich, Rudolf, *Der Stellenwert Japans und Chinas in Politischer Geographie und Geopolitik zwischen 1919 und 1945 vor dem Hintergrund der Ostasienpolitik des Deutschen Reiches* (Frankfurt/M.: Verlag Neue Wissenschaft, 1998)

Götz von Olenhusen, Irmtraud (ed.), *1848/49 in Europa und der Mythos der Französischen Revolution*, Sammlung Vandenhoeck (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Grassmann, Antjekathrin (ed.), *Niedergang oder Übergang? Zur Spätzeit der Hanse im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur hansischen Geschichte, NS 44 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Gritschneder, Otto, *Furchtbare Richter. Verbrecherische Todesurteile deutscher Kriegsgerichte* (Munich: Beck, 1998)

Grosser, Dieter, *Das Wagnis der Währungs-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialunion. Politische Zwänge im Konflikt mit ökonomischen Regeln*, Geschichte der deutschen Einheit, 2 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

Groten, Manfred, *Köln im 13. Jahrhundert. Gesellschaftlicher Wandel und Verfassungsentwicklung*, Städteforschung. Reihe A: Darstellungen, 36 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Gundermann, Iselin (ed.), *Via Regia. Preußens Weg zur Krone. Ausstellung des Geheimen Staatsarchivs Preußischer Kulturbesitz 1998* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1998)

Haberkorn, Eva, Anja Hering, and Hugo Spengler (eds), *Kreis Erbach, 1821-1945. Abt. G 15*, Repertorien des Hessischen Staatsarchivs Darmstadt, 43 (Darmstadt: Hessisches Staatsarchiv, 1998)

Hahn, Hans-Joachim, *Education and Society in Germany* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 1998)

Hartmann, Anne and Wolfram Eggelling, *Sowjetische Präsenz im kulturellen Leben der SBZ und frühen DDR 1945-1953*, Edition Bildung und Wissenschaft, 7 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1998)

Hartung, Ulrike, *Raubzüge in der Sowjetunion. Das Sonderkommando Künsberg 1941-1943* (Bremen: Edition Temmen, 1997)

Hastings, Adrian, *The Construction of Nationhood. Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Hausmann, Frank-Rutger, *'Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft' im Zweiten Weltkrieg. Die 'Aktion Ritterbusch', 1940-1945*, Schriften zur Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte, 1 (Dresden and Munich: Dresden University Press, 1998)

Havemann, Nils, *Spanien im Kalkül der deutschen Außenpolitik. Von den letzten Jahren der Ära Bismarck bis zum Beginn der Wilhelminischen Weltpolitik, 1883-1899*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preußischen Geschichte, 11 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1997)

Hayward, Joel S. A., *Stopped at Stalingrad. The Luftwaffe and Hitler's Defeat in the East, 1942-1943*, Modern War Studies (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 1998)

Heil, Johannes and Rainer Erb (eds), *Geschichtswissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit. Der Streit um Daniel J. Goldhagen* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1998)

Herbert, Ulrich and Axel Schildt (eds), *Kriegsende in Europa. Vom Beginn des deutschen Machtzerfalls bis zur Stabilisierung der Nachkriegsordnung 1944-1948* (Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 1998)

Hermand, Jost and Marc Silberman (eds), *Contentious Memories. Looking Back at the GDR*, German Life and Civilization, 24 (New York etc.: Lang, 1998)

Herrmann, Ludger, *Die Herausforderung Preußens. Reformpublizistik und politische Öffentlichkeit in Napoleonischer Zeit, 1789-1815*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 3: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, 781 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1998)

Herzog, Roman, *Demokratie als Friedensstrategie. Reden und Beiträge des Bundespräsidenten*, ed. by Dieter S. Lutz, Demokratie, Sicherheit, Frieden, 111 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997)

Herzog, Roman, *Zukunft bauen. Erziehung und Bildung für das 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Michael Rutz (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

Hessen 1848. Revolution für Freiheit und Einheit, Recht und Gerechtigkeit. Eine Ausstellung der Hessischen Staatsarchive, des Hessischen Landtags und des Hessischen Rundfunks, ed. by Hessischer Landtag and Hessisches Staatsarchiv Marburg; text by Günter Hollenberg (Marburg: Hessisches Staatsarchiv, 1998)

Heuss, Theodor, *1848. Die gescheiterte Revolution*, new edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

Heyde, Philipp, *Das Ende der Reparationen. Deutschland, Frankreich und der Youngplan 1929-1932* (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1998)

Hinz, Hans-Martin and Christoph Lind (eds), *Tsingtau. Ein Kapitel deutscher Kolonialgeschichte in China 1897-1914* (Eurasburg: Edition Minerva, 1998)

Hiob, Hanne and Gerd Koller (eds), *'WIR VERREISEN ...' In die Vernichtung. Briefe 1937-1944* (Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 1998)

Hirschfeld, Gerhard, Gerd Krumeich, *et al.* (eds), *Kriegserfahrungen. Studien zur Sozial- und Mentalitätsgeschichte des Ersten Weltkriegs*, Schriften der Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte, NS 5 (Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 1997)

Hopbach, Achim, *Unternehmer im Ersten Weltkrieg. Einstellungen und Verhalten württembergischer Industrieller im 'Großen Krieg'*, Schriften zur südwestdeutschen Landeskunde, 22 (Leinfelden-Echterdingen: DRW-Verlag, 1998)

Hoppe, Bernd, *Von der parlamentarischen Demokratie zum Präsidialstaat. Verfassungsentwicklung am Beispiel der Kabinettsbildung in der Weimarer Republik*, Schriften zur Verfassungsgeschichte, 55 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1998)

Hörster-Philipps, Ulrike, *Joseph Wirth. 1879-1956. Eine politische Biographie*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Forschungen, 82 (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1998)

Jäger, Wolfgang and Michael Walter, *Die Überwindung der Teilung. Der innerdeutsche Prozeß der Vereinigung 1989/90*, Geschichte der deutschen Einheit, 3 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

Jarnut, Jörg and Peter Johanek (eds), *Die Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt im 11. Jahrhundert*, Städteforschung. Reihe A: Darstellungen, 43 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Jost, Ekkehard, *Staatsschutzgesetzgebung im Zeitalter des Absolutismus. Dargestellt am Beispiel Brandenburg-Preußens in der Zeit von 1640 bis 1786*, Schriften zur Rechtsgeschichte, 73 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1998)

Kärcher, Thomas, *Bibliographie zur Revolution von 1848/49 mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Südwestdeutschlands* (Stuttgart: Haus der Geschichte Baden-Württemberg, 1998)

Kater, Michael H., *The Twisted Muse. Musicians and Their Music in the Third Reich* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Keitel, Wilhelm, *Mein Leben. Pflichterfüllung bis zum Untergang. Hitlers Generalfeldmarschall und Chef des Oberkommandos der Wehrmacht in Selbstzeugnissen*, ed. by Werner Maser (Berlin: edition q, 1998)

Kerbs, Diethart and Jürgen Reulecke (eds), *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen, 1880-1933* (Wuppertal: Hammer, 1998)

Kissener, Michael and Joachim Scholtyseck (eds), *Die Führer der Provinz. NS-Biographien aus Baden und Württemberg*, Karlsruher Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus, 2 (Constance: Universitätsverlag Konstanz, 1997)

Klein, Michael, *Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung des Genossenschaftsgründers Friedrich Wilhelm Raffeisen, 1818-1888. Dargestellt im Zusammenhang mit dem deutschen sozialen Protestantismus*, Schriftenreihe des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte, 122 (Cologne: Rheinland-Verlag, 1997)

Kluttig, Thekla, *Parteischulung und Kaderauslese in der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands 1946-1961* (Berlin: Berlin-Verlag, 1997)

Knöbl, Wolfgang, *Polizei und Herrschaft im Modernisierungsprozeß. Staatsbildung und innere Sicherheit in Preußen, England und Amerika 1700-1914* (Frankfurt/M. and New York: Campus Verlag, 1998)

Kolinsky, Eva (ed.), *Social Transformation and the Family in Post-Communist Germany* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1998)

Kopstein, Jeffrey, *The Politics of Economic Decline in East Germany, 1945-1989* (Chapel Hill, N.C. and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997)

Korte, Karl-Rudolf, *Deutschlandpolitik in Helmut Kohls Kanzlerschaft. Regierungsstil und Entscheidungen 1982-1989*, Geschichte der deutschen Einheit, 1 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

Kotowski, Albert S., *Polens Politik gegenüber seiner deutschen Minderheit 1919-1939*, Studien der Forschungsstelle Ostmitteleuropa an der Universität Dortmund, 23 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998)

Krohn, Claus-Dieter, Patrik von zur Mühlen, *et al.* (eds), *Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration 1933-1945* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 1998)

Kuhn, Gerd, *Wohnkultur und kommunale Wohnungspolitik in Frankfurt am Main 1880 bis 1930. Auf dem Wege zu einer pluralen Gesellschaft der Individuen*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Sozialgeschichte (Bonn: Dietz, 1998)

Küsters, Hanns Jürgen and Daniel Hofmann (eds.), *Deutsche Einheit. Sonderedition aus den Akten des Bundeskanzleramtes 1989/90*, Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998)

Kvistad, Gregg O., *The Rise and Demise of German Statism. Loyalty and Political Membership* (Providence, R.I. and Oxford: Berghahn, 1999)

Latzel, Klaus, *Deutsche Soldaten, nationalsozialistischer Krieg? Kriegserlebnis, Kriegserfahrung 1939-1945*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 1 (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1998)

Lebe, Reinhard, *Ein Königreich als Mitgift. Heiratspolitik in der Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

LeBor, Adam, *Hitler's Secret Bankers. How Switzerland Profited from Nazi Genocide* (London etc.: Pocket Books, 1999)

Lieberman, Ben, *From Recovery to Catastrophe. Municipal Stabilization and Political Crisis in Weimar Germany*, Monographs in German History, 3 (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1998)

Liebermann, Doris, Jürgen Fuchs and Vlasta Wallat (eds), *Dissidenten, Präsidenten und Gemüsehändler. Tschechische und ostdeutsche Dissidenten 1968-1998*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, 11 (Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 1998)

Lipp, Carola (ed.), *Schimpfende Weiber und patriotische Jungfrauen. Frauen im Vormärz und in der Revolution 1848/49*, 2nd edn. (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1998)

Litten, Freddy, *Gesamtverzeichnis der mikroverfilmten Archivalien in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, Mitteilungen des Osteuropa-Instituts München, 36 (Munich: Osteuropa-Institut, 1998)

Lorenz, Einhart, Klaus Misgeld, *et al.* (ed.), *Ein sehr trübes Kapitel? Hitlerflüchtlinge im nordeuropäischen Exil 1933 bis 1950*, IZRG-Schriftenreihe, 2 (Hamburg: Ergebnisse Verlag, 1998)

McCullagh, C. Behan, *The Truth of History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998)

Mählert, Ulrich, *Kleine Geschichte der DDR* (Munich: Beck, 1998)

Maier, Charles S., *Dissolution. The Crisis of Communism and the End of East Germany* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997)

Mandrou, Robert, *Die Fugger als Grundbesitzer in Schwaben, 1560-1618. Eine Fallstudie sozioökonomischen Verhaltens am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, transl. by Eckart Birnstiel, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 136; Schwäbische Forschungsgemeinschaft bei der Kommission für Bayerische Landesgeschichte. Reihe 4, 26; Studien zur Fuggergeschichte, 35, 2nd edn. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Marcuse, Herbert, *Feindanalysen. Über die Deutschen*, ed. by Peter-Erwin Jansen and with an intro. by Detlev Claussen (Lüneburg: zu Klampen, 1998)

Markovits, Andrei S. and Simon Reich, *The German Predicament. Memory and Power in the New Europe* (Ithaca, N.Y. and London: Cornell University Press, 1997)

Matthiesen, Michael, *Verlorene Identität. Der Historiker Arnold Berney und seine Freiburger Kollegen 1923-1938* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Maurice, Florian, *Freimaurerei um 1800. Ignaz Aurelius Feßler und die Reform der Großloge Royal York in Berlin*, Hallesche Beiträge zur Europäischen Aufklärung, 5 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1997)

Meier, Andreas, *Jugendweihe, Jugendfeier. Ein deutsches nostalgisches Fest vor und nach 1990* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1998)

Melis, Damian van, *Entnazifizierung in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. Herrschaft und Verwaltung 1945-1948*, Studien zur Zeitgeschichte, 56 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999)

Mensing, Björn, *Pfarrer und Nationalsozialismus. Geschichte einer Verstrikkung am Beispiel der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche in Bayern*, Arbeiten zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Darstellungen, 26 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Merseburger, Peter, *Mythos Weimar. Zwischen Geist und Macht* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

Mieck, Ilja and Pierre Guillen (eds), *Nachkriegsgesellschaften in Deutschland und Frankreich im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998)

Mittenzwei, Ingrid, *Zwischen Gestern und Morgen. Wiens frühe Bourgeoisie an der Wende vom 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert*, Bürgertum in der Habsburgermonarchie, 7 (Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar: Böhlau, 1998)

Möllers, Heiner, *Reichswehrminister Otto Geßler. Eine Studie zu 'unpolitischer' Militärpolitik in der Weimarer Republik*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 3: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, 794 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1998)

Mommsen, Wolfgang Justin, *1848. Die ungewollte Revolution. Die revolutionären Bewegungen in Europa 1830-1849*, 2nd edn (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1998)

Morsey, Rudolf, *Von Windthorst bis Adenauer. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zu Politik, Verwaltung und politischem Katholizismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by von Ulrich von Hehl, Hans Günter Hockerts *et al.*, Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Görres-Gesellschaft, NS 80 (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1997)

Muir, Edward, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*, New Approaches to European History, 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Müller, Gerald, *Hunger in Bayern 1816-1818. Politik und Gesellschaft in einer Staatskrise des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 3: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, 812 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1998)

Müller, Klaus-Dieter, Konstantin Nikischkin, and Günther Wagenlehner (ed.), *Die Tragödie der Gefangenschaft in Deutschland und in der Sowjetunion 1941-1956*, Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung, 5 (Cologne and Weimar: Böhlau, 1998)

Müller, Rolf-Dieter and Gerd R. Ueberschär, *Hitler's War in the East, 1941-1945. A Critical Assessment*, texts transl. by Bruce D. Little (Providence, R.I. and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1997)

Nakath, Detlef, Gero Neugebauer, and Gerd-Rüdiger Stephan (eds), *'Im Kreml brennt noch Licht'. Die Spitzenkontakte zwischen SED/PDS und KPdSU 1989-1991* (Berlin: Dietz, 1998)

Neubert, Ehrhart, *Geschichte der Opposition in der DDR 1949-1989, Forschungen zur DDR-Gesellschaft*, 2nd revised edn. (Berlin: Links, 1998)

Neuwöhner, Andreas, *Im Zeichen des Mars. Quellen zur Geschichte des Dreißigjährigen Krieges und des Westfälischen Friedens in den Stiften Paderborn und Corvey*, with a contribution by Manfred Wolf, Studien und Quellen zur westfälischen Geschichte, 35 (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 1998)

Nevin, Thomas, *Ernst Jünger and Germany. Into the Abyss, 1914-1945* (London: Constable, 1997)

Noack, Paul, *Ernst Jünger. Eine Biographie*, 2nd edn. (Berlin: Fest, 1998)

Oertle, Vincenz, *'Sollte ich aus Rußland nicht zurückkehren...'. Schweizer Freiwillige an deutscher Seite 1939-1945. Eine Quellensuche*, Documenta militaria (Zurich: Thesis-Verlag, 1997)

Offenberg, Ulrike, *'Seid vorsichtig gegen die Machthaber'. Die jüdischen Gemeinden in der SBZ und der DDR 1945-1990* (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1998)

Opll, Ferdinand, *Leben im mittelalterlichen Wien* (Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar: Böhlau, 1998)

Otto, Reinhard, *Wehrmacht, Gestapo und sowjetische Kriegsgefangene im deutschen Reichsgebiet 1941/42*, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, 77 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998)

Overmans, Rüdiger, *Deutsche militärische Verluste im Zweiten Weltkrieg*, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, 46 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999)

Palonen, Kari, *Das 'Webersche Moment'. Zur Kontingenz des Politischen* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1998)

Persson, Hans-Åke, *Rhetorik und Realpolitik. Großbritannien, die Oder-Neiße-Grenze und die Vertreibung der Deutschen nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg*, Frankfurter Studien zur Grenzregion, 3 (Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 1997)

Planert, Ute, *Antifeminismus im Kaiserreich. Diskurs, soziale Formation und politische Mentalität*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 124 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Poeppel, Hans (ed.), *Die Soldaten der Wehrmacht* (Munich: Herbig, 1998)

Pohl, Karl Heinrich (ed.), *Historiker in der DDR* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Pohl, Manfred and Kathleen Burk, *Die Deutsche Bank in London, 1873-1998* (Munich and Zurich: Piper, 1998)

Press, Volker, *Adel im Alten Reich. Gesammelte Vorträge und Aufsätze*, ed. by Franz Brendle and Anton Schindling with Manfred Rudersdorf and Georg Schmidt, Frühneuzeit-Forschungen, 4 (Tübingen: bibliotheca academica Verlag, 1998)

Pütz, Alexandra, *'Aber ein Europa ohne Großbritannien kann ich mir nicht vorstellen!' Die Englandpolitik der Ära Adenauer 1949-1963*, Dortmunder Historische Studien, 20 (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1998)

Reder, Dirk Alexander, *Frauenbewegung und Nation. Patriotische Frauenvereine in Deutschland im frühen 19. Jahrhundert, 1813-1830*, Kölner Beiträge zur Nationsforschung, 4 (Cologne: SH-Verlag, 1998)

Reese, Claudia Linda, *Neuseeland und Deutschland. Handelsabkommen, Außenhandelspolitik und Handel von 1871 bis 1973*, Beiträge zur Kolonial- und Überseegeschichte, 72 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998)

Rieke-Müller, Annelore and Lothar Dittrich, *Der Löwe brüllt nebenan. Die Gründung Zoologischer Gärten im deutschsprachigen Raum 1833-1869* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Rieker, Yvonne, *Kindheiten. Identitätsmuster im deutsch-jüdischen Bürgertum und unter ostjüdischen Einwanderern 1871-1933*, Haskala, 17 (Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Olms, 1997)

Ritter, Gerhard A., *Über Deutschland. Die Bundesrepublik in der deutschen Geschichte* (Munich: Beck, 1998)

Ritter, Jürgen and Peter Joachim Lapp, *Die Grenze. Ein deutsches Bauwerk*, with an intro. by Rainer Eppelmann and a contribution by Ulrich Schacht (Berlin: Links, 1997)

Rogasch, Wilfried (ed.), *Victoria and Albert, Vicky and The Kaiser. Ein Kapitel deutsch-englischer Familiengeschichte* (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje, 1997)

Rohrschneider, Michael, *Johann Georg II. von Anhalt-Dessau. 1627-1693. Eine politische Biographie*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preußischen Geschichte, 16 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1998)

Rothmann, Michael, *Die Frankfurter Messen im Mittelalter*, Frankfurter historische Abhandlungen, 40 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998)

Rühle, Otto, *Achtzehnhundertachtundvierzig. Revolution in Deutschland*, Klassiker der Sozialrevolte, 2 (Münster: Unrast, 1998)

Rüther, Martin, Uwe Schütz, and Otto Dann (eds), *Deutschland im ersten Nachkriegsjahr. Berichte von Mitgliedern des Internationalen Sozialistischen Kampfbundes aus dem besetzten Deutschland 1945/46*, Texte und Materialien zur Zeitgeschichte, 10 (Munich: Saur, 1998)

Sabrow, Martin, *Die verdrängte Verschwörung. Der Rathenau-Mord und die deutsche Gegenrevolution* (Frankfurt / M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1999)

Salzmann, Siegfried (ed.), *A Catalogue of the Works of Art from the Collection of the Kunsthalle Bremen Lost during Evacuation in the Second World War*, 2nd revised edn. (Bremen: Kunstverein in Bremen, Kunsthalle Bremen, 1997)

Schäfer, Bernd, *Staat und katholische Kirche in der DDR*, Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung, 8 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Schäfers, Bernhard and Wolfgang Zapf (eds), *Handwörterbuch zur Gesellschaft Deutschlands* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 1998)

Schilling, Johannes, *Klöster und Mönche in der hessischen Reformation*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 67 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997)

Schleicher, Ilona, and Hans-Georg Schleicher, *Die DDR im südlichen Afrika. Solidarität und Kalter Krieg*, Arbeiten aus dem Institut für Afrika-Kunde, 97, 2nd edn. (Hamburg: Institut für Afrika-Kunde, 1998)

Schmauder, Andreas, *Württemberg im Aufstand. Der Arme Konrad 1514. Ein Beitrag zum bäuerlichen und städtischen Widerstand im Alten Reich und zum Territorialisierungsprozeß im Herzogtum Württemberg an der Wende zur frühen Neuzeit*, Schriften zur südwestdeutschen Landeskunde, 21 (Leinfelden-Echterdingen: DRW-Verlag, 1998)

Schmidt, Alexander, *Reisen in die Moderne. Der Amerika-Diskurs des deutschen Bürgertums vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg im europäischen Vergleich* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1997)

Schmidt, Frank (ed.), *Zwangsarbeit in der Provinz Brandenburg 1939-1945. Spezialinventar der Quellen im Brandenburgischen Landeshauptarchiv*, Quellen, Findbücher und Inventare des Brandenburgischen Landeshauptarchivs, 6 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1998)

Schmidt, Karl-Heinz, *Dialog über Deutschland. Studien zur Deutschlandpolitik von KPdSU und SED, 1960-1979* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1998)

Schmitz-Berning, Cornelia, *Vokabular des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1998)

Schönwald, Matthias, *Deutschland und Argentinien nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Politische und wirtschaftliche Beziehungen und deutsche Auswanderung 1945-1955* (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1998)

Schröder, Nina, *Hitlers unbeugsame Gegnerinnen. Der Frauenaufstand in der Rosenstraße* (Munich: Heyne, 1998)

Schroeder, Klaus and Steffen Alisch, *Der SED-Staat. Partei, Staat und Gesellschaft 1949-1990* (Munich: Hanser, 1998)

Schulze, Winfried, *La politique de la science en Allemagne au vingtième siècle. Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris le 10 octobre 1997*, intro. by Werner Paravicini, Conférences annuelles de l'Institut Historique Allemand, 4 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998)

Schütte, Leopold (ed.), *Der Dreissigjährige Krieg und der Alltag in Westfalen. Quellen aus dem Staatsarchiv Münster*, Veröffentlichungen der Staatlichen Archive des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Reihe C: Quellen und Forschungen, 43 (Münster: Nordrhein-Westfälisches Staatsarchiv, 1998)

Schüttemeyer, Suzanne S., *Fraktionen im Deutschen Bundestag 1949-1997. Empirische Befunde und theoretische Folgerungen* (Opladen and Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1998)

Seeler, Hans-Joachim, *Die Deutschen, Opfer und Alptraum Europas. Der Weg der Deutschen durch ihre Geschichte* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1998)

Sellier, Ulrich, *Die Arbeiterschutzgesetzgebung im 19. Jahrhundert. Das Ringen zwischen christlich-sozialer Ursprungsidee, politischen Widerständen und kaiserlicher Gesetzgebung*, Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Görres-Gesellschaft, NS 82 (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 1998)

Sicken, Bernhard (ed.), *Stadt und Militär 1815-1914. Wirtschaftliche Impulse, infrastrukturelle Beziehungen, sicherheitspolitische Aspekte*, Forschungen zur Regionalgeschichte, 25 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998)

Sieferle, Rolf Peter and Helga Breuninger (eds), *Kulturen der Gewalt. Ritualisierung und Symbolisierung von Gewalt in der Geschichte* (Frankfurt/M. and New York: Campus Verlag, 1998)

Sowinski, Oliver, *Die Deutsche Reichspartei 1950-1965. Organisation und Ideologie einer rechtsradikalen Partei*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 31: Politikwissenschaft, 337 (Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1998)

Speitkamp, Winfried, *Jugend in der Neuzeit. Deutschland vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Steger, Manfred B., *The Quest for Evolutionary Socialism. Eduard Bernstein and Social Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Stiglic, Anja, *Ganz Münster ist ein Freudental ... Öffentliche Feierlichkeiten als Machtdemonstration auf dem Münsterschen Friedenskongress*, Agenda Geschichte, 13 (Münster: agenda Verlag, 1998)

Stöber, Rudolf, *Die erfolgverführte Nation. Deutschlands öffentliche Stimmungen 1866 bis 1945* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998)

Stolleis, Michael, *Der lange Abschied vom 19. Jahrhundert. Die Zäsur von 1914 aus rechtshistorischer Perspektive. Vortrag gehalten vor der Juristischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin am 22. Januar 1997*, Schriftenreihe der Juristischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin, 150 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1997)

Tebbutt, Susan (ed.), *Sinti and Roma. Gypsies in German-Speaking Society and Literature*, Culture and Society in Germany, 2 (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 1998)

Ther, Philipp, *Deutsche und polnische Vertriebene. Gesellschaft und Vertriebenenpolitik in der SBZ/DDR und in Polen 1945-1956*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 127 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Timm, Angelika, *Hammer, Zirkel, Davidstern. Das gestörte Verhältnis der DDR zu Zionismus und Staat Israel* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1997)

Timmermann, Heiner (ed.), *Entwicklung der Nationalbewegungen in Europa 1850-1914*, Dokumente und Schriften der Europäischen Akademie Otzenhausen, 84 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1998)

Toury, Jacob, *Deutschlands Stiefkinder. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur deutschen und deutsch-jüdischen Geschichte*, Schriftenreihe des Instituts für deutsche Geschichte, Universität Tel Aviv, 18 (Gerlingen: Bleicher, 1997)

Ulrich Bernd (ed.), *Besucher einer Ausstellung. Die Ausstellung 'Vernichtungskrieg. Verbrechen der Wehrmacht 1941 bis 1944' in Interview und Gespräch* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1998)

Walter, Rolf, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Vom Merkantilismus bis zur Gegenwart*, Wirtschafts- und Sozialhistorische Studien, 4, 2nd revised edn. (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Watts, Meredith W., *Xenophobia in United Germany. Generations, Modernization, and Ideology* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1997)

Weber, Jürgen (ed.), *Aufbau und Neuorientierung. Die Geschichte der Bundesrepublik 1950-1955* (Landsberg am Lech: Olzog, 1998)

Wehler, Hans-Ulrich, *Die Herausforderung der Kulturgeschichte* (Munich: Beck, 1998)

Weidenfeld, Werner, Peter M. Wagner, and Elke Bruck, *Außenpolitik für die deutsche Einheit. Die Entscheidungsjahre 1989/90*, Geschichte der deutschen Einheit, 4 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

Weiher, Uwe, *Flüchtlingssituation und Flüchtlingspolitik. Untersuchungen zur Eingliederung der Flüchtlinge in Bremen 1945-1961*, Veröffentlichungen aus dem Staatsarchiv der Freien Hansestadt Bremen, 61 (Bremen: SelbstVerlag des Staatsarchivs, 1998)

Weimer, Wolfram, *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Von der Währungsreform bis zum Euro* (Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1998)

Wilhelm, Cornelia, *Bewegung oder Verein? Nationalsozialistische Volkstumspolitik in den USA*, Transatlantische Historische Studien, 9 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998)

Winkler, Heinrich August, *Streitfragen der deutschen Geschichte. Essays zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Beck, 1997)

Winkler, Karl Tilman, *Wörterkrieg. Politische Debattenkultur in England 1689-1750* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998)

Winkler, York Rasmus, *Flüchtlingsorganisationen in Hessen 1945-1954. BHE, Flüchtlingsverbände, Landsmannschaften*, Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Nassau, 64; Forschungen zur Integration der Flüchtlinge und Vertriebenen in Hessen nach 1945, 6 (Wiesbaden: Historische Kommission für Nassau, 1998)

Wolf, Markus with Anne McElvoy, *Man without a Face. The Autobiography of Communism's Greatest Spymaster* (London: Cape, 1997)

Wolle, Stefan, *Die heile Welt der Diktatur. Alltag und Herrschaft in der DDR 1971-1989* (Berlin: Links, 1998)

Wunschik, Tobias, *Baader-Meinhofs Kinder. Die zweite Generation der RAF* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1997)

Wüst, Wolfgang, *Censur als Stütze von Staat und Kirche in der Frühmoderne. Augsburg, Bayern, Kurmainz und Württemberg im Vergleich. Einführung, Zeittafel, Dokumente*, Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultäten der Universität Augsburg, 57; Historisch-sozialwissenschaftliche Reihe (Munich: Vögel, 1998)

Zeppenfeld, Burkhard, *Handlungsspielräume städtischer Finanzpolitik. Staatliche Vorgaben und kommunales Interesse in Bochum und Münster 1913-1935*, Düsseldorfer Schriften zur neueren Landesgeschichte und zur Geschichte Nordrhein-Westfalens, 51 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 1999)

Zessin, Helmut, Edwin Schwertner, and Frank Schumann (eds.), *Chronik der PDS. 1989 bis 1997* (Berlin: Dietz, 1998)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Vol. 1: Wilhelm Lenz (ed.), *Archivalische Quellen zur deutsch-britischen Geschichte seit 1500 in Großbritannien; Manuscript Sources for the History of Germany since 1500 in Great Britain* (Boppard a. Rh.: Boldt, 1975)

Vol 2: Lothar Kettenacker (ed.), *Das "Andere Deutschland" im Zweiten Weltkrieg. Emigration und Widerstand in internationaler Perspektive; The "Other Germany" in the Second World War. Emigration and Resistance in International Perspective* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1977)

Vol. 3: Marie-Luise Recker, *England und der Donauraum, 1919-1929. Probleme einer europäischen Nachkriegsordnung* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1976)

Vol. 4: Paul Kluke and Peter Alter (eds), *Aspekte der deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im Laufe der Jahrhunderte; Aspects of Anglo-German Relations through the Centuries* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978)

Vol. 5: Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Peter Alter and Robert W. Scribner (eds), *Stadtbürgertum und Adel in der Reformation. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Reformation in England und Deutschland; The Urban Classes, the Nobility and the Reformation. Studies on the Social History of the Reformation in England and Germany* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1979)

Vol. 6: Hans-Christoph Junge, *Flottenpolitik und Revolution. Die Entstehung der englischen Seemacht während der Herrschaft Cromwells* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980)

Vol. 7: Milan Hauner, *India in Axis Strategy. Germany, Japan, and Indian Nationalists in the Second World War* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 8: Gerhard Hirschfeld and Lothar Kettenacker (eds), *Der "Führerstaat": Mythos und Realität. Studien zur Struktur und Politik des Dritten Reiches; The "Führer State": Myth and Reality. Studies on the Structure and Politics of the Third Reich* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 9: Hans-Eberhard Hilpert, *Kaiser- und Papstbriefe in den Chronica majora des Matthaeus Paris* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 10: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds), *Sozialprotest, Gewalt, Terror. Gewaltanwendung durch politische and gesellschaftliche Randgruppen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 11: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds), *Die Entstehung des Wohlfahrtsstaates in Großbritannien und Deutschland 1850-1950* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 12: Peter Alter, *Wissenschaft, Staat, Mäzene. Anfänge moderner Wissenschaftspolitik in Großbritannien 1850-1920* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 13: Wolfgang Mock, *Imperiale Herrschaft und nationales Interesse. 'Constructive Imperialism' oder Freihandel in Großbritannien vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 14: Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exil in Großbritannien. Zur Emigration aus dem nationalsozialistischen Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 15: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds), *Auf dem Wege zur Massengewerkschaft. Die Entwicklung der Gewerkschaften in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880-1914* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984)

Vol. 16: Josef Foschepoth (ed.), *Kalter Krieg und Deutsche Frage. Deutschland im Widerstreit der Mächte 1945-1952* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985)

Vol. 17: Ulrich Wengenroth, *Unternehmensstrategien und technischer Fortschritt. Die deutsche und britische Stahlindustrie 1865-1895* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Vol. 18: Helmut Reifeld, *Zwischen Empire und Parlament. Zur Gedankenbildung und Politik Lord Roseberys (1880-1905)* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 19: Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 20: Karl Heinz Metz, *Industrialisierung und Sozialpolitik. Das Problem der sozialen Sicherheit in Großbritannien 1795-1911* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 21: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Schwentker (eds), *Max Weber und seine Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 22: Lothar Kettenacker, *Krieg zur Friedenssicherung. Die Deutschlandplanung der britischen Regierung während des Zweiten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)

Vol. 23: Adolf M. Birke and Günther Heydemann (eds), *Die Herausforderung des europäischen Staatensystems. Nationale Ideologie und staatliches Interesse zwischen Restauration und Imperialismus* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)

Vol. 24: Helga Woggon, *Integrativer Sozialismus und nationale Befreiung. Politik und Wirkungsgeschichte James Connollys in Irland* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 25: Kaspar von Greyerz, *Vorsehungsglaube und Kosmologie. Studien zu englischen Selbstzeugnissen des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 26: Andreas Wirsching, *Parlament und Volkes Stimme. Unterhaus und Öffentlichkeit im England des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 27: Claudia Schnurmann, *Kommerz und Klüngel. Der Englandhandel Kölner Kaufleute im 16. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 28: Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, *Vom Wiener Kongreß zur Pariser Konferenz. England, die deutsche Frage und das Mächtesystem 1815-1856* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 29: Peter Alter (ed.), *Im Banne der Metropolen. Berlin und London in den zwanziger Jahren* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 30: Hermann Wentker, *Zerstörung der Großmacht Rußland? Die britischen Kriegsziele im Krimkrieg* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 31: Angela Schwarz, *Die Reise ins Dritte Reich. Britische Augenzeugen im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland (1933-1939)* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 32: Johannes Paulmann, *Staat und Arbeitsmarkt in Großbritannien: Krise, Weltkrieg, Wiederaufbau* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 33: Clemens Picht, *Handel, Politik und Gesellschaft. Zur wirtschaftspolitischen Publizistik Englands im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 34: Friedrich Weckerlein, *Streitfall Deutschland. Die britische Linke und die "Demokratisierung" des Deutschen Reiches, 1900–1918* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994)

Vol. 35: Klaus Larres, *Politik der Illusionen. Churchill, Eisenhower und die deutsche Frage 1945-1955* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 36: Günther Heydemann, *Konstitution gegen Revolution. Die britische Deutschland- und Italienpolitik 1815-1848* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 37: Hermann Joseph Hiery, *Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee (1900-1921). Eine Annäherung an die Erfahrungen verschiedener Kulturen* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 38: Michael Toyka-Seid, *Gesundheit und Krankheit in der Stadt. Zur Entwicklung des Gesundheitswesens in Durham City 1831-1914* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 39: Detlev Clemens, *Herr Hitler in Germany. Wahrnehmung und Deutung des Nationalsozialismus in Großbritannien 1920 bis 1939* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 40: Christel Gade, *Gleichgewichtspolitik oder Bündnispflege? Maximen britischer Außenpolitik (1910-1914)* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Vol. 41: Benedikt Stuchtey, *W. E. H. Lecky (1838-1903). Historisches Denken und politisches Urteilen eines anglo-irischen Gelehrten* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Vol. 42: Sabine Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalismus im englischen Exil. Zum sozialen und politischen Innenleben der deutschen Kolonie in London 1848 bis 1871* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997)

Vol. 43: Knut Diekmann, *Die nationalistische Bewegung in Wales* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998)

Vol. 44: Bärbel Brodt, *Städte ohne Mauern. Stadtentwicklung in East Anglia im 14. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997)

Vol. 45: Arnd Reitemeier, *Außenpolitik im späten Mittelalter. Die diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Reich und England (1370-1422)* (Paderborn: Schöningh, forthcoming 1999)

Vol. 46: Gerhard A. Ritter and Peter Wende (eds), *Rivalität und Partnerschaft. Studien zu den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Festschrift für Anthony J. Nicholls* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1999)

Vol. 47: Ulrich Marsch, *Industrieforschung in Deutschland und Großbritannien. Betriebsinterne und Gemeinschaftsforschungen 1880 bis 1936* (Paderborn: Schöningh, forthcoming 1999)

Vol. 48: Lothar Reinermann, *Der Kaiser in England. Wilhelm II. und die britische Öffentlichkeit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, forthcoming 1999)

STUDIES OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON – OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Eckhart Hellmuth (ed.), *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1990)

Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility. The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450-1650* (Oxford, 1991)

Rolf Ahmann, Adolf M. Birke, and Michael Howard (eds), *The Quest for Stability. Problems of West European Security 1918-1957* (Oxford, 1993)

Alfred Haverkamp and Hanna Vollrath (eds), *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1996)

John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth (eds), *Rethinking Leviathan. The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford, 1999)

Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds), *British and German Historiography 1750-1950. Traditions, Perceptions, and Transfers* (Oxford, forthcoming 2000)

Willibald Steinmetz (ed.), *Private Law and Social Inequality in the Industrial Age. Comparing Legal Cultures in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States of America* (Oxford, forthcoming 2000)

FURTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds), *The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany* (London: Croom Helm, 1981)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds), *Social Protest, Violence and Terror in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe* (London: Macmillan, 1982)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Lothar Kettenacker (eds), *The Fascist Challenge and the Policy of Appeasement* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1983)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exile in Great Britain. Refugees from Hitler's Germany* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion, Politics and Social Protest. Three Studies on Early Modern Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion and Society in Early Modern Europe 1500-1800* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Josef Foschepoth and Rolf Steininger (eds), *Die britische Deutschland- und Besatzungspolitik 1945-1949* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds), *The Development of Trade Unionism in Great Britain and Germany, 1880-1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds), *Imperialism and After. Continuities and Discontinuities* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *The Policies of Genocide. Jews and Soviet Prisoners of War in Nazi Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Ralph Uhlig, *Die Deutsch-Englische Gesellschaft 1949-1983. Der Beitrag ihrer "Königswinter-Konferenzen" zur britisch-deutschen Verständigung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds), *Max Weber and his Contemporaries* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987)

Peter Alter, *The Reluctant Patron. Science and the State in Britain 1850-1920* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1987)

Stig Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Ronald Robinson (eds), *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa. The Berlin Africa Conference 1884-1885 and the Onset of Partition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)

Adolf M. Birke, Hans Booms and Otto Merker (eds), *Control Commission for Germany/British Element. Inventory. Die britische Militärregierung in Deutschland. Inventar,* 11 vols (Munich etc.: Saur Verlag, 1993)

Günther Heydemann and Lothar Kettenacker (eds), *Kirchen in der Diktatur* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Dagmar Engels and Shula Marks (eds), *Contesting Colonial Hegemony. Africa and India 1858 to Independence* (London and New York: British Academic Press, 1993)

Ulrike Jordan (ed.), *Conditions of Surrender: Britons and Germans Witness the End of the War* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1996)

Hermann Hiery and John Mackenzie (eds), *European Impact and Pacific Influence. British and German Colonial Policy in the Pacific Islands and the Indigenous Response* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1997)

Peter Alter (ed.), *Out of the Third Reich. Refugee Historians in Post-War Britain* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 1998)

HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Lothar Kettenacker and Wolfgang J. Mommsen (eds), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1978-1983* (London, 1983)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Two Centuries of Anglo-German Relations. A Reappraisal* (London, 1984)

Adolf M. Birke, *Britain and Germany. Historical Patterns of a Relationship* (London, 1987)

Frank Rexroth (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1983-1988. An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1990)

Gerhard A. Ritter, *The New Social History in the Federal Republic of Germany* (London, 1991)

Adolf M. Birke and Eva A. Mayring (eds), *Britische Besatzung in Deutschland. Aktenerschliessung und Forschungsfelder* (London, 1992)

Gerhard A. Ritter, *Big Science in Germany. Past and Present* (London, 1994)

Adolf M. Birke, *Britain's Influence on the West German Constitution* (London, 1995)

Otto Gerhard Oexle, *The British Roots of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* (London, 1995)

Ulrike Jordan (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1989-1994. An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1996)

Andreas Fahrmeir (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1995-1997. An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1998)

***Annual Lectures** of the German Historical Institute London*

1979 Samuel Berrick Saul, *Industrialisation and De-Industrialisation? The Interaction of the German and British Economies before the First World War* (London, 1980)

1980 Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Gustav Stresemann: The Revision of Versailles and the Weimar Parliamentary System* (London, 1981)

1981 A. J. P. Taylor, *1939 Revisited* (London, 1982)

1982 Gordon A. Craig, *Germany and the West: The Ambivalent Relationship* (London, 1983)

1983 Wolfram Fischer, *Germany in the World Economy during the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1984)

1984 James Joll, *National Histories and National Historians: Some German and English Views of the Past* (London, 1985)

1985 Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Britain and Germany 1800 to 1914. Two Developmental Paths Towards Industrial Society* (London, 1986)

1986 Owen Chadwick, *Acton, Döllinger and History* (London, 1987)

1987 Hagen Schulze, *Is there a German History?* (London, 1988)

1988 Roger Morgan, *Britain and Germany since 1945. Two Societies and Two Foreign Policies* (London, 1989)

1989 Thomas Nipperdey, *The Rise of the Arts in Modern Society* (London, 1990)

1990 *Not available*

1991 Lothar Gall, *Confronting Clio: Myth-Makers and Other Historians* (London, 1992)

1992 Keith Robbins, *Protestant Germany through British Eyes: A Complex Victorian Encounter* (London, 1993)

1993 Klaus Hildebrand, *Reich – Nation-State – Great Power. Reflections on German Foreign Policy 1871-1945* (London, 1995)

1994 Alan Bullock, *Personality and Power: the Strange Case of Hitler and Stalin* (London, 1995)

1995 Ernst Schulin, *'The Most Historical of All Peoples'. Nationalism and the New Construction of Jewish History in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (London, 1996)

1996 Michael Howard, *The Crisis of the Anglo-German Antagonism 1916-17* (London, 1997)

1997 Johannes Fried, *The Veil of Memory. Anthropological Problems when Considering the Past* (London, 1998)

1998 David Blackbourn, *A Sense of Place. New Directions in German History* (London, 1999)

***Bulletin** of the German Historical Institute London*, Issue 1 (Spring, 1979)-

***Bulletin** Index, 1979-1996* (London, 1996)